

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INSTITUTIONAL
LANGUAGE POLICY IN A MULTILINGUAL SOUTH
AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION SOCIETY**

E. Tait

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INSTITUTIONAL
LANGUAGE POLICY IN A MULTILINGUAL SOUTH
AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION SOCIETY**

EDWARD TAIT

**Dissertation presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree**

MAGISTER TECHNOLOGIAE

LANGUAGE PRACTICE

in the

**Department of Communication Sciences: Faculty of Engineering,
Information and Communication Technology**

at the

Central University of Technology, Free State

**Supervisors: Dr HL Esterhuizen
Prof HR Hay**

Bloemfontein

November 2007

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENT WORK

I, EDWARD TAIT, do hereby declare that this research project submitted for the degree MAGISTER TECHNOLOGIAE: LANGUAGE PRACTICE, is my own and independent work that has not been submitted before to any institution by me or anyone else as part of any qualification.

.....
SIGNATURE OF STUDENT

.....
DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to:

- ❑ The Lord most High who made all this possible.
- ❑ Dr Nick Esterhuizen – for his humour, wisdom, input and calm influence- indeed, a gentle man.
- ❑ A heartfelt sincere thank you to Prof Driekie Hay for her unstinted endeavours and efforts, for giving so generously of her time and who so willingly rallied to assist. Her unwavering support and assistance can only be but lauded and commended. Indeed, such selflessness and consideration is not easily forgotten.
- ❑ The ladies at the Central University of Technology, Free State library for assistance in procuring an abundance of sources.
- ❑ My wife, Blanche, family and friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENT WORK	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	x
SUMMARY	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xix
LIST OF TABLES	xx

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH STATEMENT

1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	HYPOTHESES	5
1.3	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	6
1.4	METHOD OF RESEARCH	7
1.5	PRELIMINARY RESEARCH	7
1.6	EMPIRICAL RESEARCH	8
1.7	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	10
1.8	DEFINITION OF TERMS	10
1.8.1	Acquisition	10
1.8.2	Additive bilingualism	11
1.8.3	Anglicisation	11
1.8.4	Augmentative and alternative communication	11
1.8.5	Higher education	12
1.8.6	Language in education	12
1.8.7	Language proficiency	12
1.8.8	Multilingualism	12
1.8.9	Official language	13
1.8.10	Universities of technology	13
1.9	DIVISION OF CHAPTERS	14
1.10	CONCLUSION	15

CHAPTER 2 MULTILINGUALISM AND THE LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY

		16
2.1	INTRODUCTION	16
2.2	THE IMPORTANCE OF MULTILINGUALISM	16
2.3	THE PROMOTION OF MULTILINGUALISM IN SOUTH AFRICA	19
2.4	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LANGUAGE POLICY	20
2.4.1	The pre-apartheid years	20
2.4.2	The apartheid years	21
2.4.3	The post-apartheid years and recent developments (1994 onwards)	23

2.5	THE NEW MULTILINGUAL LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY (LIEP)	24
2.6	POTENTIAL INHIBITING FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY	26
2.7	CONCLUSION	28
CHAPTER 3	LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE PLANNING IN SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION	32
3.1	INTRODUCTION	32
3.2	CURRENT LANGUAGE POLICY AND PRACTICE IN SOUTH AFRICA	34
3.3	CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE POLICY	35
3.4	LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE PLANNING: A SEARCH FOR DEFINITIONS	36
3.4.1	Basic principles for a language policy	40
3.4.2	Language policy requirements	40
3.4.3	Models for language policy in universities of technology and universities	42
3.4.3.1	The <i>laissez-faire</i> model	43
3.4.3.2	The <i>ad hoc</i> model	44
3.4.3.3	The centralised designation model	45
3.4.3.4	The numerical formula model	47
3.4.3.5	The incentive model	48
3.4.3.6	The multilingualism model	49
3.4.4	Steps in the making and applying of language policy	52
3.4.4.1	Step 1: information	53
3.4.4.2	Step 2: formulation attempts	53
3.4.4.3	Step 3: experimentation	53
3.4.4.4	Step 4: determination	54
3.4.4.5	Step 5: implementation	54
3.5	LANGUAGE PLANNING	54
3.5.1	Introduction	54
3.5.2	Language planning defined	55
3.5.3	Sub-divisions of language planning	56
3.6	CONCLUSION	59
CHAPTER 4	AN ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION	61
4.1	INTRODUCTION	61
4.2	THE IMPORTANCE AND NATURE OF IMPLEMENTING POLICIES	62

4.3	STRATEGIES AND WAYS OF IMPLEMENTING POLICIES	64
4.3.1	Recognising policy change/mutation	64
4.3.2	The role of the individual in policy implementation	66
4.3.3	The individual's relationship to policy implementation	67
4.4	PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATION POLICIES	70
4.5	CONCLUSION	72
CHAPTER 5	THE ROLE OF SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTIONS IN PROMOTING SOUTH AFRICAN LANGUAGES	75
5.1	INTRODUCTION	75
5.2	SOUTH AFRICA'S CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND LANGUAGE	78
5.2.1	Legislation dealing with the use of language	78
5.2.1.1	The language legislation position	79
5.2.1.2	The state of supportive policy documents	80
5.2.1.3	The state of language infrastructure	81
5.2.1.4	Language planning agencies	83
5.3	ANALYSIS OF THE RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ON LANGUAGE AND SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTS	83
5.3.1	The Constitution of South Africa (language stipulations and educational stipulations)	84
5.3.2	The Bill of Rights	86
5.3.3	The South African Language Bill	87
5.3.4	The language plan for South Africa	88
5.3.5	Norms and standards regarding language policy published in terms of section 6(1) of the South African schools Act and the Language in Education policy in terms of Section 3(4)(m) of the National Education Policy Act, 1966 (Act 27 of 1996)	88
5.4	SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE POLICIES, PLANS AND PRACTICES	89
5.4.1	Linguistic landscape at South African universities	90
5.4.2	Institutional university language policies in higher education	91
5.4.3	Language policies at higher education institutions in South Africa	94
5.4.3.1	Language policy of the University of Pretoria (UP)	95
5.4.3.2	Language policy of the University of Stellenbosch (US)	97
5.4.3.2.1	The language plan of the University of Stellenbosch	99
5.4.3.2.1.1	Language options for modules	99
5.4.3.2.1.2	Afrikaans as academic language	100
5.4.3.2.1.3	Language plan for administration and management	101

5.4.3.2.1.4	Management of the language plan	101
5.4.3.2.1.5	Role of the language centre	101
5.4.3.2.1.6	Conduct for language in the classroom	101
5.4.3.2.1.7	Language policy and plan in electronic media	102
5.4.3.3	Language policy of the University of the Free State (UFS)	102
5.4.3.3.1	Dominance of English and Afrikaans	102
5.4.3.3.2	Intrinsic nature of the university	103
5.4.3.3.3	Language proficiency	103
5.4.3.3.4	Promotion of multilingualism	104
5.4.3.3.5	Parallel-medium teaching	104
5.4.3.3.6	Research	104
5.4.3.3.7	Support services for faculties	104
5.4.3.3.8	The University of the Free State language committee	104
5.4.3.4	Language policy of the North West University (NWU)	104
5.4.3.5	Language policy of the University of Cape Town (UCT)	106
5.4.3.5.1	Teaching and examinations	107
5.4.3.5.2	Admissions	107
5.4.3.5.3	Administration	108
5.4.3.6	Language policy of the University of the Witwatersrand (WITS)	109
5.4.3.6.1	Introduction	109
5.4.3.6.2	Language policy	109
5.4.3.6.3	The policy: specific goals	109
5.4.3.6.4	Implementation	110
5.4.3.7	Language policy of the Central University of Technology, Free State (CUT)	110
5.4.3.7.1	Policy statement	110
5.4.3.7.2	Medium of instruction	111
5.4.3.7.3	General administration	112
5.4.3.8	Language policy of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology	112
5.4.3.8.1	Vision of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT)	113
5.4.3.8.2	Medium of teaching and assessment	114
5.4.3.8.3	Medium of communication	114
5.4.3.8.4	Multilingualism	114
5.4.3.8.5	Access and equity	115
5.4.3.9	Language policy of the Vaal University of Technology	116
5.4.3.10	Language policy of the Tshwane University of Technology	116
5.4.3.11	Language policy of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	117
5.4.3.12	Language policy of Rhodes University as revised in August 2005	120
5.4.3.12.1	Policy objectives	121

5.4.3.12.2	Policy implementation	121
5.4.3.12.3	Language of teaching and learning	122
5.4.3.12.4	Support for South African languages	123
5.4.3.12.5	The study of foreign languages	125
5.4.3.12.6	Review procedure	126
5.4.3.13	The University of the Western Cape language policy	127
5.4.3.13.1	Languages of teaching, learning and assessment	127
5.4.3.13.2	Languages used in lectures, tutorials and practicals	128
5.4.3.13.3	Languages used in the setting of tasks, assignments, tests and examinations	128
5.4.3.13.4	Languages in which texts are available	128
5.4.3.13.5	Access to academic and professional discourse	129
5.4.3.13.6	Promoting multilingualism	129
5.4.3.13.7	Language of internal communication	129
5.4.3.13.8	Languages of external communication	130
5.4.3.13.9	Assessment policy and responsibility for assessment	131
5.4.3.13.9.1	Assessing against outcomes	131
5.4.3.13.9.2	Assessment criteria	131
5.4.3.13.9.3	Validity and appropriateness	131
5.4.3.13.9.4	Authenticity of evidence	131
5.4.3.13.9.5	Formative and summative assessment	132
5.4.3.14	The University of KwaZulu-Natal language policy (amended draft 13/9/99)	132
5.5	CONCLUSION	134
CHAPTER 6	EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE POLICIES	143
6.1	INTRODUCTION	143
6.2	POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AT HIGHER INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA	144
6.3	SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS	145
6.4	POLITICAL LANGUAGE BACKGROUND TO SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS	145
6.5	EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE POLICIES	150
6.6	DATA GATHERING: THE SURVEY	153
6.6.1	Purpose of the survey	154
6.6.2	Research findings	155
6.6.2.1	Brief overview of existing policies	155
6.6.2.2	Knowledge about the institution's language policy	157
6.6.2.3	Formulation of language policy	158
6.6.2.4	Coherent, structured, co-ordinated and precise imple-	

	mentation of language policy	158
6.6.2.5	Monitoring procedures and follow-up measures	160
6.6.2.6	Consultation of the language policy for comments and inputs	160
6.6.2.7	Audit of language policy	161
6.6.2.8	Language used for tuition and administrative matters	162
6.6.2.9	Language policy issues (staff)	162
6.6.2.10	Language policy issues (students)	166
6.7	CONCLUSIONS	170
CHAPTER 7	CONCLUSIONS, MAIN FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	175
7.1	INTRODUCTION	175
7.2	OBSTACLES AND PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING A LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLAN FOR AN INSTITUTION	176
7.3	LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING PROCEDURES	178
7.4	MAIN FINDINGS	179
7.5	SHORTCOMINGS OF THE STUDY	180
7.6	RECOMMENDATIONS	182
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	186
	ADDENDA	
A	Letter of request to institutions for language policies	206
B	Reminder: follow-up letter	207
C	Questionnaire (staff)	209
D	Questionnaire (students)	217
E	Informal staff questionnaire (faculty, administrative, instructional cleaners/employees, etc.)	224
F	Informal semi-structured student questionnaire to assess multilingual aspects of university experience regarding language policy	226
G	Letter: Distribution of questionnaire	228

The language I have learnt these forty years,
My native English, now I must forgo;
And now my tongue's use is to me no more
Than an unstring'd viol or a harp;
Or like a cunning instrument cas'd up
Or, being open, put into his hands
That knows no touch to tune the harmony.
Within my mouth you have engaol'd my tongue,
Doubly portcullis'd with my teeth and lips;
And dull, unfeeling, barren ignorance
Is made my gaoler to attend on me.
I am too old to fawn upon a nurse,
Too far in years to be a pupil now.
What is thy sentence, then, but speechless death,
Which robs my tongue from breathing native breath?

William Shakespeare, *Richard II* ((1595:1, 3).

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to show, as so aptly put by Bamgbose (1996:111) that, given the 'inheritance situation' and the colonial legacy that continue to dominate education policies and practices in Africa, language policies are essentially characterised by the following features: avoidance, vagueness, arbitrariness, fluctuation, and declaration without implementation. The South African government has declared eleven languages as official to replace the former apartheid legislation which privileged English and Afrikaans as the sole languages of the country. The post apartheid eleven official language policy has been described by Bamgbose (1996 111) as, 'the new enlightened South African language policy on languages,' 'a very progressive policy' and 'Africa's best ticket'. The major concern raised was whether the language policy could be implemented. An attempt will be made to undertake a critical review of language planning under a democratic dispensation.

If a government deals with eleven languages as official languages, it can be construed as a political decision for a country. This brings about contradicting interests from various language and political groups as evidenced in the media. This has also brought about a language policy which has engendered internal conflict amongst different participants and stakeholders. However, this gives meaning to the nature and essence of language policy in a multilingual society. The example that can be taken is that while the constitution accords all languages a special place in terms of their development and promotion, it also makes special provision on how they can be used whenever and wherever it is, 'practical' to do so. As so aptly put, 'everyone has the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice in public educational institutions where that education is reasonably practicable. In order to ensure the effective access to, and implementation of this right, the state must consider all reasonable educational alternatives, including single medium institutions, taking into account, (a) equity; (b) practicability and (c) the need to redress the results of past racially discriminatory laws and practices' (South African Constitution 1996).

The study shows how researchers of the South African language policy criticise the policy on the basis of the practicality or the impracticality of its implementation (Alexander 2002, Kamwangamalu 2001). This criticism stems from the growing gap between language policy and its implementation in the domains of especially education, the mass media, administration and the judiciary.

An attempt is also made in this study to deliberate on the problems related to the co-existence of English and African languages in South Africa. It is now more than ten years since South Africa's first democratic elections but it appears that insufficient progress has been made. The study will review the higher education landscape and contemplate the government's constitutional obligations of implementing language policy after it has accorded eleven languages official status. What has happened to the commitment to a multilingual approach with the purpose of empowering people through African languages? It is so that party activists are often quick to declare policies which they know cannot be implemented. Bamgbose (1996:117) gives a good illustration of declaration of policy without implementation: 'a policy may be declared, and escape clauses may be built into the policy, thus effectively giving an alibi for non-implementation,' Also, 'a policy may be declared but implementation procedures may be left unspecified with the result that the policy remains only on paper'.

The dissertation also attempts to review what happens at higher education level and whether students are knowledgeable about their own institutional language policies and whether these policies are in fact only lip service. Bamgbose (1996:111) discusses language policies and observes that, 'no matter how good they are, they are characterised among other aspects... declaration without implementation'. This underscores the fact that there are odds against the implementation of these policies at higher education level and elsewhere.

The study has shown that language policy involves the formulation of language policy more than what language does. The South African government has the

power to enforce language policy in society. Instead of imposing a unitary language policy on South African society a multilingual strategy was adopted. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:16) point out that the designation of a set of languages often represents a political response to the reality that no one language will be accepted by the entire population and that no one language can be practically disseminated throughout the entire population.

In sum, the purpose of the study is also to establish the many misconceptions and strictures made against the revised language policies of the various institutions as to why it is an unacceptable choice and why it cannot be implemented, as heard by students and lecturers alike, for example: 'African languages will always be a few steps behind English; it is not practical and too expensive to translate documents into eleven languages to satisfy all students, not forgetting the choice of their language and that of the lecturers'. Other comments that are often made are, for example, English is dominating, it is still the medium of instruction; language policy is a waste of time and encourages diversity; language policy does not give fair treatment to all languages; some languages dominate and cater for one or two groups only.

With regard to the afore-going, a number of recommendations are offered by the researcher of this study. With an eye on future lecturers and other staff involved in higher learning, it should be a legal requirement to have basic communicative competence in at least one Black African language within five years after being appointed. Alexander (1992:177) argues that staff need to be taught and encouraged to learn other languages and incentives should be given for learning African languages since indigenous languages are going to become languages of employment, languages of higher education and so on.

The researcher further recommends that since higher education institutions are required to establish their own language policies that they be guided by the constitution as well as the Language Policy for Higher Education (Ministry of

Education 2001:17). As in the case of the Language Policy for Higher Education institutional language policies should address four important issues, namely, languages of instruction, the future of South African languages as fields of academic study and research, the study of foreign languages and the promotion of multilingualism in the institutional policies and practices of higher education institutions (Ministry of Education 2001:17). Furthermore, it is also recommended that higher education institutions abide by regional constitutional requirements as required in terms of the suggested geographical distribution of languages across South Africa. A much-needed framework would enable institutions to make choices and determine priorities (Ministerial Committee Report 2003:17).

With regard to the implementation of policy in higher education, it is recommended that the implementation process itself operates from the top downwards (Gomitza 2003:3). Examples such as goal clarity and consistency, the degree of system change envisioned, factors that will bring about change, organised and continuous attention to policy, adequate financial resources, available management capacity to deal with the influx of government policies and commitment to the objectives of reform must be considered. As indicated by Satyo (1999:158), the constitution cannot implement itself, it needs to be implemented. For the implementation of language plans to succeed, the main propelling power is for political will to step in and take a stance.

A very strong recommendation involves the necessity for universities to develop multilingual policies with specific recommendations for African languages as subject and in the long term, for African languages as languages of learning and teaching. Granville, Janks and Mphahlele (1998:254) emphasise that an explicit multilingual policy must be seen as part of a transformation agenda for universities and should be addressed in their mission statements. A policy of this nature will bring pressure to bear on universities to find the means and the resources for facilitating the acquisition of an African language. This, will of course mean subsidising costs of tuition, making time for staff to learn an African

language, funding research, encouraging collaboration across language departments and so on. However, in the long run university lecturers will have the skills and ability to speak an African language because of the language policy of the institution (Granville *et al.* 1998:263).

OPSOMMING

Die doel van hierdie studie lê in die woorde van Bamgbose (1996:111) opgesluit. Hy beweer dat, in die lig van die 'oorerwingsituasie' en koloniale erfenis wat steeds die onderwysbeleid en praktyk in Afrika domineer, taalbeleid deur ontwyking, vaagheid, willekeurigheid, fluktuasie en verklaring sonder implementering gekenmerk word. Die Suid-Afrikaanse regering het elf tale as amptelik verklaar om die vorige apartheidswetgewing te vervang wat voorkeur aan Afrikaans en Engels as die enigste twee tale in die land gegee het. Die post-apartheidbeleid is al beskryf as die 'nuwe verligte Suid-Afrikaanse taalbeleid oor taal,' 'n baie vooruitstrewende beleid,' en 'Afrika se beste kaartjie.' Die vernaamste bekommernis was of die taalbeleid implementeerbaar is.

Die gebruik van elf amptelike tale kan as 'n politieke besluit gesien word wat teenstrydige belange van verskillende taal en politieke groepe uitlok soos in die media gesien (Blaine 2004; Rademeyer 2007). Dit het ook 'n taalbeleid meegebring wat interne konflik onder die verskillende deelnemers en belanghebbendes aangemoedig het. Nietemin gee dit ook betekenis aan die aard en wese van taalbeleid in 'n veeltalige samelewing. Terwyl die grondwet byvoorbeeld aan alle tale 'n spesiale plek in terme van hul ontwikkeling en bevordering toeken, maak dit ook spesiale voorsiening vir hoe om dit te gebruik, wanneer en waar dit ook al prakties is.

Die studie sal aandui hoe navorsers oor die Suid-Afrikaanse taalbeleid die beleid op grond van die praktiese of onpraktiese implementering daarvan kritiseer (Alexander 2002; Kamwangamalu 2001). Hierdie kritiek is gegrond op die groeiende gaping tussen taalbeleid en implementering veral op die gebied van onderwys, die media, administrasie en die reg.

'n Verdere poging word aangewend om te besin oor die probleme wat met die gelyktydige bestaan van Engels en Afrikaans in Suid-Afrika gepaardgaan. Dit is tans meer as tien jaar nadat Suid-Afrika 'n demokrasie geword het, maar

onvoldoende vordering is gemaak. Die studie neem die tersiêre onderwyslandskap en die grondwetlike verpligtinge in oënskou nadat amptelike status verleen is aan elf tale. Wat het geword van die toewyding aan 'n veeltalige benadering met die doel om mense deur middel van Afrikatale te bemagtig? Dit is so dat party-aktiviste baie gou is om 'n beleid te verklaar wat hulle weet nie geïmplementeer kan word nie. Bamgbose (1996:117) gee 'n goeie illustrasie van die verklaring van beleid sonder implementering: 'beleid kan verklaar word en voorbehoudsbepalings kan in die beleid ingebou word wat op doeltreffende wyse 'n alibi vir nie-implementering gee. Beleid kan verklaar word, maar implementeringsprosedures word nie gespesifiseer nie, met die gevolg dat die beleid net op papier bly.'"

Hierdie navorsing poog ook om 'n oorsig te gee van taalbeleid wat op tersiêre vlak gebeur, en of studente van hul instellings of universiteite se taalbeleide kennis dra en of dit bloot net lippetaal is. Bamgbose (1996:111) bespreek taalbeleide en merk die volgende op: 'dit maak nie saak hoe goed hulle (taalbeleide) is nie'. Taalbeleide word gekenmerk deur aspekte soos verklaring sonder implementering. Hierdie feit verklaar waarom beleide dikwels nie suksesvol geïmplementeer word nie.

Die Suid-Afrikaanse regering het die mag om taalbeleid in die land te bekragtig. In plaas van om een taal as taalbeleid vir die Suid-Afrikaanse samelewing voor te skryf, is 'n veeltalige taalbeleidstrategie aangeneem. Kaplan en Baldauf (1997:16) dui aan dat die aanwys van 'n aantal tale baie keer 'n politieke antwoord is vir die realiteit dat nie net een taal deur die hele bevolking aanvaar sal word nie en dat een taal nie prakties uitgebrei kan word onder die bevolking as geheel nie.

Ter opsomming kan gestel word dat die doel van die studie is om vas te stel wat die moontlike wanopvattinge en ongunstige kritiek teen die nuwe taalbeleid (Julie 1997) is, waarom dit 'n onaanvaarbare keuse is en waarom dit nie geïmplementeer kan word nie, so sal Afrikatale byvoorbeeld altyd minder

erkenning geniet; dit is onprakties en te duur om dokumente in elf tale te vertaal. Die taalkeuse van die student en dié van die dosent moet in ag geneem word. Ander kommentaar wat gereeld gehoor word is: Engels domineer en is nog steeds die voertaal by die meeste instellings; taalbeleid is 'n verkwisting van tyd en moedig diversiteit aan; sommige tale domineer en maak voorsiening vir slegs een of twee groepe.

Met die voorafgaande in gedagte word 'n paar aanbevelings deur die navorser gemaak. Met die oog op toekomstige dosente en ander personeel wat by hoër onderwys betrokke is, sou dit miskien wenslik wees dat hulle wetlik vereis word om 'n basiese taalbevoegheid in ten minste een swart inheemse Afrikataal binne vyf jaar na aanstelling te hê. Personeel behoort geleer en aangemoedig te word om ander tale aan te leer, en ook daarvoor vergoed word aangesien inheemse tale ook tale van werksgeleenthede, tale van hoër onderwys, ensovoorts, gaan word (Alexander 1992:177).

Die navorser beveel verder aan dat, as gevolg van die feit dat van hoëronderwysinstansies vereis word om hulle eie taalbeleide op te stel, dat hulle deur die grondwet, sowel as die Taalbeleid vir Hoër onderwys (Ministry of Education 2002:17) gelei word. Soos in die geval van die Taalbeleid vir Hoër onderwys (Ministry of Education 2002:17), behoort institusionele taalbeleide vier belangrike kwessies aan te spreek, naamlik:

- tale van onderrig,
- die toekoms van Suid-Afrikaanse tale op die gebied van akademiese studie en navorsing,
- die studie van uitheemse tale; en
- die bevordering van veeltaligheid in die institusionele beleide en praktyke van hoëronderwysinstansies (Language Policy for Higher Education 2002:17).

Verder word daar ook aanbeveel dat hoërondewysinstansies voldoen aan streeksvlak konstitusionele vereistes soos vereis deur die verspreiding van tale regdeur Suid-Afrika. 'n Raamwerk, waarvoor daar 'n sterk behoefte is, sal instansies in staat sal stel om keuses te maak en prioriteite vas te stel (Ministerial Committee Report 2003:17).

Met betrekking tot die implementering van beleid in hoërondewys word daar aanbeveel dat die implementeringsproses vanself van bo afwaarts in werking tree (Gomitza 2003:3). Voorbeelde soos helderheid van doel en konsekwensie, die graad van die stelsel wat beoog word, faktore wat veranderinge sal meebring, georganiseerde en voortdurende aandag aan beleid, voldoende finansiële bronne, beskikbare bestuurskapasiteit om die toename van regeringsbeleide te kan hanteer en gebondenheid aan die doelstellings van hervorming moet in ag geneem word. Satyo (1999:158) dui aan dat die grondwet vanself nie geïmplementeer kan word nie. Vir die suksesvolle implementering van taalplanne kan die primêre dryfkrag politieke wil wees om in te tree en om standpunt in te neem.

'n Sterk aanbeveling is die noodsaaklikheid vir universiteite om 'n veeltalighedsbeleid vir Afrikatale as tale van leer en onderwys te ontwikkel. Granville, Janks en Mphahlele (1998:254) beklemtoon dat 'n uitdruklike veeltalige beleid as deel van 'n transformasieagenda gesien moet word vir universiteite en moet in hul missieverklarings aangespreek word. Verder moet alle universiteitsdosente die geleentheid gegee word, gemotiveer en aangemoedig word om 'n Afrikataal aan te leer. So 'n beleid sal op universiteite druk plaas om 'n weg en hulpbronne te vind om die aanleer van 'n Afrikataal te fasiliteer. Dit sal die subsidiëring van die koste van klasgelde beteken, tydinwinning vir personeel om 'n Afrikataal te leer, die befondsing van navorsing, aanmoediging van taaldepartemente om saam te werk, ensovoorts. Universiteitsdosente sal egter op die langer termyn die vaardighede en vermoë hê om 'n Afrikataal te kan praat as gevolg van die taalbeleid van die instansie (Granville *et al.* 1998:263).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

HEA	Higher Education Act
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HEQC	Higher Education Quality Committee
LIEP	Language in Education Policy
LLP	Language Policy and Plan
LOLT	Language of Learning and Teaching
NCHE	National Commission on Higher Education
NPHE	National Plan for Higher Education
NRF	National Research Foundation
SADC	Southern African Development Countries
SRC	Student Representative Council
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UWC	University of the Western Cape

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	The official Languages of South Africa	17
Table 2.2	Language dispensation at higher education institutions in 1994	24
Table 6.1	Merges and incorporations of universities and universities of Technology	147
Table 6.2	The extent of linguistic diversity within individual institutions	152
Table 6.3	Language policies – availability (Staff response)	156
Table 6.4	Language policies – availability (Students response)	156
Table 6.5	Knowledge of institution’s language policy (Staff)	157
Table 6.6	Knowledge of institution’s language policy (Students)	157
Table 6.7	Language policy audit (Staff)	161
Table 6.8	Language policy audit (Students)	161
Table 6.9	Negative or positive impact on implementation (Staff)	163
Table 6.10	Negative/positive impact on implementation (Students)	166
Table 6.11	Language policies in terms of media of instruction and medium of administration	171

1.1 Introduction

The issue at stake is one which the researcher can strongly identify with, namely, that language policy plays an important role in the lives of South Africans as a means of the everyday, language of wider, efficient communication. Language policy also plays its role as a means of creative and artistic expression and as an expression of individual and collective identity. Another issue that the researcher wishes to proffer and, which is the core of this study, is that although it is possible to have a linguistic policy which is more or less acceptable to a linguistic community (students and staff), the approach of the linguistic policy and the results of the application of its implementation may not correspond to what is expected and may vary. Put differently, institutions have in all probability 'good' policies in place but students, staff and other stakeholders are unhappy – the potential causes of this phenomenon: usually a lack of 'political will' on the part of management and resources to implement the approved policy and secondly, a struggle between the languages of the various groupings in their daily interaction, be it academic, administrative, social or otherwise. Furthermore, higher education institutions and systems influence these issues through their language policies or even lack of such policies for, 'a lack of policy is never a neutral act' (Bergan 2001:8).

Bamgbose (1996:111) comments that language policies in Africa irrespective of how good they are, are characterised by amongst other aspects ... 'declaration without implementation'. The chances are that many a language policy is a question of lip service on paper or to keep the 'wolf away from the door'. It is now ten years

after South Africa has given official status to eleven languages, but has anything been achieved? The Advisory Panel to the Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology in its final draft, (DACST 1996), Towards a National Language Policy Framework, makes the point that, 'Public and private institutions are taking *ad hoc* language decisions that tend to negate the constitutional provisions and requirements relating to language'. It is also pointed out that there are, 'short-sighted, bureaucratic attitudes against implementing multilingualism'. Furthermore, 'it is imperative that language policy be implemented as a matter of urgency' (Bangbose 1996:111).

In his criticism of Pretoria University's language policy, Webb (1997:9) describes the policy as having serious flaws, as well as being inadequate. He continues his argument by saying that the policy is not accompanied by a specific plan of implementation, (detailing how it plans to achieve the goals of the policy and specifying clearly what needs to be done, who has done it, with what means, how and when). Webb (1997:9) also points out that the policy contains a number of, 'escape clauses' and if the language policy document is to serve a useful purpose in policy implementation, these need to be defined. It may be deduced that the majority of higher education institutions attract students whose home language is not the language of learning. Higher Education institutions complain of academically under-prepared output. In South Africa at large, students and parents take the stance that entry requirements do not match the output from the schooling system (Council on Higher Education, Higher Education Quality Committee 2001:2).

In an article, Dlamini (2001:1) reiterates this view when he contends that although South Africa has eleven official languages only two, namely, Afrikaans and English are used as medium of instruction in higher education. This is of disadvantage to those students, mostly Black students, for which English or Afrikaans is a second language. They are denied mother tongue instruction and are obliged to use a language which they must grapple with and which not only places pressure on them but also because they have to struggle with the content and concepts of subjects.

It may be that there are historical, socio-economic, and political reasons for the non-use of African languages as medium of instruction at university level. It is of import to note that the issue of multilingualism at higher education institutions is complex as it is interrelated with culture, prejudice, the economy and politics. There is no motivation for students to use their mother tongue although mother tongue instruction is the most effective (Dlamini 2001:4).

Blaine (2004:1) heads her article in Business Day, 'Mother Tongue will raise standards say experts', and also, 'Language barrier blamed partly for tertiary level failures'. She contends further that the significance of this must be seen in the light of repeated complaints from higher education institutions that many matriculants have trouble writing clear, grammatical sentences and do not have adequate mathematical proficiency. Rademeyer (2007:3) in her article in Volksblad (Tuesday, 3 July, 2007) entitled, 'English of aspirant students shock,' reveals that the English proficiency of 86% of non-mother tongue Afrikaans and English students who were tested at a previous Technikon for admission, was below the grade 8 level. Rademeyer (2007:3) continues by saying that this shock finding came to light as a result of a study by Hough and

Horne (2007:Online), evaluators and consultants on literacy, functional literacy (Abet) and communication skills. Only 1% (71) out of a total of 6 139 aspirant students was on grade 12 level or above.

In essence, the reason for the core theme of this study is the concern about the practicality of not implementing or the partial implementation of the policy of multilingualism at higher education level. This is aptly echoed by Pienaar (2001:1) who posits that the language policies of tertiary institutions in South Africa do not reflect the multilingual nature of our society or the mother tongue of our students and personnel corp. The reasons are apparently unknown. It could be attributed to the supposedly undeveloped status of the African languages as opposed to the supposedly developed status of English and Afrikaans and the accompanying lack of study material in the African languages.

Comments by other researchers on the South African language policy criticise this policy on the basis of the practicality or impracticality of its implementation (Alexander 2002; Kamwangamalu 2001). Literature reviews reveal that such criticism stem from the growing gap between language policy and its implementation in the areas of education, administration, mass media and the judiciary (Phaswana 2000:18). Another example of this is Obanya (2004:14) who says that, 'there has been a wide gap between the zeal of intentions and the sloth of implementation'.

The questions that need to be addressed are: Have higher education institutions put in place a fully-fledged, coherent, precise language policy, language planning and implementation plan for a multilingual society? Is the policy aligned with stipulations or

declarations of intent as indicated in the South African Constitution (1996), the Government's Language Policy for Higher Education (2002), the 2001 Guidelines of the Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB), the National Policy Framework (March 2003) as well as relevant institutions and other pertinent legislation? According to the Constitution (1996) a basis for a comprehensive language policy is that certain principles need to be followed – how is this reflected in the language policy? In addition, have certain strategic goals been set to be achieved and in particular, language strategy. Furthermore, in order to establish whether a language policy has been implemented, one would need to look at language policy requirements – how have these been addressed, if at all?

1.2 HYPOTHESES

H1:

- (a) The institutional language policy and practices are implemented practically, consistently, precisely and coherently whereby outcomes are achieved and is clearly measurable (refer pages 1; 2; 4; 8; 61; 62; 63 – 74; 145; 146; 159; 160; 161; 179; 181 – 186)
- (b) The institutional language policy provides for students to participate in a functional, multilingual society (refer to pages 1; 2; 4; 12; 16; 18; 19; 24; 25; 49; 134; 135 136; 137; 138; 139; 140).

H2:

- (a) The institutional language policy and practices are not implemented practically, consistently, precisely and outcomes are not achieved

and are not clearly measurable (refer to pages 1; 2; 4; 8; 61; 62; 63 – 74; 145; 146; 159; 160; 161; 179; 181 – 186)

- (b) The institutional language policy does not provide for students to participate in a functional, multilingual society (refer to pages 1; 2; 4; 12; 16; 18; 19; 24; 25; 49; 134; 135 136; 137; 138; 139; 140).

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

- ❑ Critically assess language policies and how the outcomes relate to higher education in terms of constitutional principals and stipulations – what alignment and interface is there? (refer to pages 4; 78 – 89; 151; 152; 171 -176; 178; 181; 182; 183; 184; 185 and 186).
- ❑ To ascertain whether there are detailed, specific implementation plans followed in order to achieve goals (3; 4; 30; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68 – 74)
- ❑ To ascertain whether there is a case for multilingualism, bilingualism or English only in classroom practice? In addition, determining what is being done at institutions as far as multilingualism is concerned (refer to pages 3; 12; 16; 17; 18; 19; 24;25; 49; 134; 135; 136; 137; 138; 139 and 140).
- ❑ To attempt to analyse (from a sociolinguistic perspective) the implementation of the language policy in formal education (in the lecture rooms) and non-formal settings -staff and the public (refer to pages 3; 4; 22;23; 28; 30; 63; 64; 65; 66 and 145).
- ❑ To review the language policies of the past and to describe and analyse the current language policy in order to determine its relevancy to the needs of students and other stakeholders at higher education institutions (refer to pages 1; 2; 4; 91; 92; 134 - 143).
- ❑ To gain insight and to elucidate problems regarding the implementation of an institutional language policy and

implementation plan regarding the provision of educational human resources (3; 4; 22; 23; 52; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66 – 74 and 145).

- ❑ To survey various policy models and to suggest one direction which could be utilised by institutions for further development (32; 42; 49; 70; 71; 72; 156; 157; 158; 160 and 161).

1.4 METHOD OF RESEARCH

Over a period, the research developed into two phases, namely, a preliminary research phase and an empirical phase.

1.5 PRELIMINARY RESEARCH

- (i) A literature study of a collection of qualitative data, library and internet resources (articles, journals, books, and theses) dealing with the following was carried out.:
 - ❑ Language policy from a national and institutional South African and general international perspective (refer pages 32; 33; 34; 35; 36; 139; 140; 141; 142 and 143).
 - ❑ Multilingualism in a South African perspective (refer pages 3; 12; 16; 17; 18; 19; 24;25; 49; 134; 135; 136; 137; 137; 138; 139 and 140).
 - ❑ Implementation of language policy(3; 4; 22; 23; 49; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 145 and 146).
 - ❑ Language diversity within institutions of South Africa (refer page 153).
 - ❑ Higher education and constitutional principles and stipulations (refer pages 78 - 89).
 - ❑ Historic, linguistic issues - historical, economic, social, political (refer pages 20 - 24).

- Language spread and language maintenance – focus on language-in-education (refer pages 24 - 25).
- (ii) Informal discussions on an ad hoc basis with the past SRC Sabbatical and SRC President, the Registrar of the Central University of Technology, Free State (CUT), the Head of the CUT Institutional Research Unit and general staff of CUT served as basis for identifying the problem. Their inputs helped with the drafting of questionnaires. Research into the topic was also motivated and stimulated in debate at meetings of the Student Academic Affairs Committee and Student Services Council. Here some students brought to the table the conflict of having an own African identity but not having being taught in the mother tongue (Sesotho, Tswana, IsiXhosa, IsiZulu etc.) on the one hand, and the struggle to access and accommodate English on the other hand – the ‘we-they’ divide between students who are African language speakers and non-African language speakers, excluding English and Afrikaans.

1.6 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Based on the information derived from the qualitative data, searches on the internet, readings and informal, semi-structured interviews with students, staff and members of some higher education institutions, two separate questionnaires were drawn up. Discussions/interviews were also held with focus groups such as officials from the educator sector, lecturers, students, administrative staff, school principals and teachers generally. A covering letter and copies of questionnaires were sent to the Heads of higher education institutions as well as the SRC Sabbaticals/Presidents respectively. Formal as well as informal interviews were conducted during the study. The focus groups were essentially students and members of the university fraternity of the various institutions (refer

appendices E and F as well as Chapter 5 for the list of institutions). Ideas for the basis for drawing up these questions were found in Dalvit (2004:127) and the Treasury Board of Canada (1996:3 – 26).

In the case of the informal interviews, the researcher attempted to structure the interview by using guiding or leading questions. The respondent on the other hand then had a reasonable idea of what the issues were that were going to be discussed. Suitable dates, a time and place were set and agreed upon by the researcher and respondent/informant. In essence, the idea was not to structure the interview for the simple reason that people from especially the education sector are suspicious of being identified and from the researcher's experience (recent interview with departmental official regarding evaluation and screening of textbooks) not very helpful. For example, 'what do you think of the South African language policy? How does it compare with our neighbour, Namibia? Do you think it is fair that lecturers or personnel from the SADC countries are appointed at CUT (valid personal discussion with a CUT staff member, where for example, other staff members asked to check a question paper, translate correspondence etc. because the appointee's English was not up to standard). These questions and the questionnaires assisted to a large extent in drawing conclusions and making appropriate recommendations.

In order to undertake this study, the researcher adopted a predominantly qualitative approach with a lesser inclination toward quantitative research. In terms of a qualitative study as opposed to a quantitative, the researcher had an opportunity to obtain much more detail and could embrace a larger variety of perspectives with regard to the language policy issues under investigation. From a qualitative perspective the researcher could probe and select issues

as the discussions progressed (Meloy 2002:148). In sum, an attempt is made to look at the data, finding the meaning of the data, interpreting the meaning of data and applying data in the best suitable manner (Henning, Van Rensburg and Smit 2004:4).

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The researcher hopes that the research will add value to the many challenges for language policy and language planning. In addition, language planning is seen as vital in the provision of effective and efficient, quality higher education. Furthermore, that institutions consistently follow up on the implementation of policy and not just regard this as a task imposed upon by government/management. Implementation of an institutional language policy and plan would perhaps encourage people to use their language in all domains. According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:48) the systematic development of official languages and the availability of learning material in all official languages in South Africa serves as a means and an opportunity for the development of these languages. This development is central to information access and dissemination which is necessary to the functioning of modern societies.

1.8 DEFINITION OF TERMS

1.8.1 Acquisition

A term used to describe language being absorbed without conscious effort; i.e. the way children pick up their mother tongue. Language acquisition is often contrasted with language learning. The internalisation of rules and formulas which are then used to communicate in the L2. For some researchers, such as Krashen,

'acquisition' is unconscious and spontaneous, and 'learning' is conscious, developing through formal study Krashen (1987:16).

1.8.2 Additive bilingualism

This is a process by which individuals develop proficiency in a second language after or at the same time as the development of proficiency in the primary language, without loss of the primary language; a bilingual situation where the addition of a second language and culture are unlikely to replace or displace the first language and culture (www.finchpark.com/courses/glossary.htm).

1.8.3 Anglicisation

Anglicisation is a process of making something English. The term most often refers to the process of translating words or phrases into an English equivalent. People may also be anglicised – an immigrant to England becomes anglicised as he or she acclimates to the culture (wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglicization).

1.8.4 Augmentative and alternative communication

This term refers to ways other than speech that are used to send a message from one person to another. People use augmentative communication techniques such as facial expressions, gestures and writing as part of their daily lives. In difficult listening situations (noisy rooms, for example) we tend to augment our words with even more gestures and exaggerated facial expressions. People with speech or language problems must rely on these standard techniques - the use of sign language, Morse code, charts bracelets and language boards (The American Heritage Dictionary 2004).

1.8.5 Higher education

Higher education is education provided by universities and other post collegial institutions that award academic degrees. Higher education includes teaching, research and social services activities of universities, and within the realm of teaching, it includes both the undergraduate level (sometimes referred to as tertiary education) and the graduate (or postgraduate) level (sometimes referred to as graduate school). Higher education differs from other forms of post-secondary education such as that offered by institutions of vocational education (American Heritage Dictionary 2004).

1.8.6 Language in education

Language in education embraces the wider questions of (i) the languages taught and learnt in the educational system, and (ii) the languages used for educating at various levels and sectors of a national system (Obanya 1996:1).

1.8.7 Language proficiency

Language proficiency can be defined as the level of competence at which an individual is able to use language for both basic communicative tasks and academic purposes (American Heritage Dictionary 2004).

1.8.8 Multilingualism

This is a term that can refer to a phenomenon regarding an individual speaker who uses two or more languages; a community of speakers where two or more languages are used, or between speakers of

different languages. Sociologists distinguish between 'multilingualism at the personal level', 'multilingualism at the societal level' and 'multilingualism at the interactional level'. More specifically, the terms 'bilingual' and 'trilingual' are used to describe comparable situations in which two or three languages are involved (American Heritage Dictionary 2004:234).

1.8.9 Official language

An official language is a language that is designated as 'official' by a state, or other legally-defined territory, usually by legislation, and required in all official government communications - spoken and written. Its required uses can extend to national traffic signs, product labels, storefront signage, voting materials, driving license exams, and other official and legal forms. (www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/lo-ol/pubs/census2001/9_e.cfm).

1.8.10 Universities of Technology

These institutions are distinguished by the following: Career-oriented: educates people for the world of work:

- Relevant: industry makes input into its diploma and degree programmes
- Practical: programmes are practical and hands-on (what do you need to know and how do you apply it)
- Work-integrated Learning: Experiential Learning is part of the qualification and enables graduates to 'hit-the-ground-running' when they enter the workplace
- Applied Research: Research is practical and applied. It seeks solutions to modern-day problems; and

- ❑ Education in the Real world. (Du Pree, Koorts, Mjoli, Moore, van Rensburg 2003:16).

1.9 DIVISION OF CHAPTERS

Chapter 1 introduces the reader to the essence of the study as well as raising issues that needs to be addressed, the hypotheses, purpose of the study and method of research.

Multilingualism and the Language in Education Policy are tackled in **Chapter 2**. Multilingualism is defined and the necessity for multilingualism is queried. A historical background is provided and the new language in Education Policy is analysed.

Chapter 3 deals with defining language policy and language planning implementation and a survey of several models for language policy in schools and universities is also provided.

An analysis of the implementation and language policy in higher education is deliberated upon in **Chapter 4**, focussing on what implementation is about and how policies are implemented.

Chapter 5 looks at the role of South African institutions in promoting African languages and their institutional language policies, plans and practices. In particular, constitutional provisions and language stipulations are looked at as well as some of the language policies at universities and universities of technology. An attempt is also made to address the issues raised in Chapter 1, paragraph 1.3, for example, 'critically assess language policies and how the outcomes relate to higher education in terms of the

constitutional principles and stipulations – what alignment or interface is there’?

Chapter 6 is devoted to the researcher’s conclusions originating from the literature study as well as the empirical investigation. The chapter concludes with a number of suggestions/recommendations on which an institution of higher learning can build a language policy framework.

Chapter 7 brings the reader to conclusions drawn based on the findings emanating from the literature and empirical study.

Chapter 8 is the final chapter and is rounded off with suggestions as to how the issue of implementation of language policy may be approached in institutions of higher education within South Africa.

1.10 CONCLUSION

The basis of the study in this chapter is to seek and fathom the relationship between the formulation of language policy in South Africa and its mode of implementation. It is also an investigative study of the relation between education and South African society as revealed by the implementation of the language policy in education and in society. Further examination is done regarding the way in which language planning theory, language in education policy and how the approach to multilingualism at higher institutions of learning can inform language policy decision. The status of mother tongue in higher education in South African higher society is also reviewed. The requirements, anticipations and hopes of policy commentators for multilingualism are also brought into the spotlight in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2: MULTILINGUALISM AND THE LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The rationale for this chapter is to establish a springboard from which to give direction to the essential essence of this study, which is to reflect on the promotion or non-promotion of African languages. For this reason, the researcher starts off by defining multilingualism. The medium of instruction also comes under the spotlight as well as the new Language in Education Policy (1997) because of the underlying thread Language in Education Policy (LIEP) has in formulating language policy and the promotion of language policy. In addition, the LIEP is considered to be a template for a multilingual and multicultural educational system (South African Schools Act 1996; South African Constitution, 1996).

2.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF MULTILINGUALISM

As indicated in chapter one, multilingualism is a term that can refer to a phenomenon regarding an individual speaker who uses two or more languages, a community of speakers where two or more languages are used, or between speakers of different languages. A multilingual person is broadly defined in terms of multilingualism as anyone with communicative skills in more than one language. According to the *Wikipedia Encyclopaedia* (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multilingualism>) multilingual speakers have acquired at least one language during childhood, the so-called, first language. The first language types are those languages that are acquired without formal education. Furthermore, multilingual

speakers have extra languages at their disposal and these can be learnt at a later stage.

Multilingualism is the norm rather than the exception in the majority of countries today (UNESCO 1999:18). Language has played a vital role in the history of both industrial and developing countries. Thus, it is self-evident that language must play a key role in adult literacy. Literacy and power are closely linked. One of the major constraints in the implementation of an effective literacy programme is the lack of recognition given to language usage. Almost all multilingual and bilingual countries face the situation (UNESCO 1999:18). Below is a table reflecting the breakdown of the population of each province by home language. The percentage total 100% down the columns, for each province separately.

Table 2.1: The official Languages of South Africa

Home Language	Eastern Cape	Free State	Gauteng	KwaZulu Natal	Limpopo	Mpumalanga	Northern Cape	North West	Western Cape	South Africa
Afrikaans	9,3	11,9	14,4	1,5	2,3	6,2	68,0	7,5	55,3	13,3
English	3,6	1,2	12,5	13,6	0,5	1,7	2,5	1,2	19,3	8,2
IsiNdebele	0,1	0,4	1,9	0,2	1,5	12,1	0,1	1,3	0,0	1,6
IsiXhosa	83,4	9,1	7,6	2,3	0,3	1,5	6,2	5,8	23,7	17,6
IsiZulu	0,8	5,1	21,5	80,9	0,7	26,4	0,3	2,5	0,2	23,8
Sepedi	0,0	0,3	10,7	0,1	52,1	10,8	0,1	4,2	0,0	9,4
Sesotho	2,4	64,4	13,1	0,7	1,3	3,7	1,1	5,7	0,7	7,9
Siswati	0,0	6,8	8,4	0,1	1,6	2,7	20,8	65,4	0,1	8,2
Setswana	0,1	0,3	1,4	0,1	1,1	30,8	0,1	0,6	0,0	2,7
Tshivenda	0,0	0,1	1,7	0,0	15,9	0,2	0,0	0,5	0,0	2,3
Xitsonga	0,0	0,3	5,7	0,0	22,4	3,8	0,0	4,7	0,0	4,4
Other	0,2	0,2	1,0	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,7	0,6	0,4	0,5
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Source: Census 2001. Census in brief/ Statistics South Africa. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa, 2003.

Marais (Lit.Net: Online) refers to South Africa as a multilingual and multicultural country whereby the South African Constitution affirms and acknowledges this reality by declaring eleven languages as official. The majority of citizens neither speak nor understand English but economic practices and policies oppose this reality. South African society at large is multiracial, multicultural, multi-religious and multilingual, hence the place of work within all the sectors should be a microcosm of the society (Reagan 2001:53).

Language provides people with the opportunity to acquire, demonstrate, practice and receive knowledge, information, skills, competencies, services and values. Language enables people to express in words what they know, what they see, what they experience and what they feel. The use of a language is a human right and a basic need which enables people to acquire the most basic of human resources. It is a basic tool for human survival, for development and advancement and through language, people interact with their own world at social, cultural, religious or economic levels (Lit.Net: Online).

For this reason and to truly understand South Africa's new Language in Education Policy (LIEP), the policy must be examined in the context of historical and recent developments. It is also necessary to examine the context in which processes by which it was forged. Below follows a brief historical background regarding issues concerning the LIEP. Factors impeding its implementation are also discussed.

2.3

THE PROMOTION OF MULTILINGUALISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

The promotion of multilingualism and the advancement of African languages are the two main threads running through language in education proposals and statements (Thobeka 1997:1). South Africa's new Language in Education Policy reveals decisions about which languages to use as languages of learning and teaching, (Barkhuizen 2002:1). The following questions need to be addressed in this regard:

- ❑ How does one go about promoting multilingualism in higher education institutions if African languages are not used as a medium of instruction?
- ❑ Why is it that Black parents are opting for English-medium education from day one of schooling and in many instances, at great cost and sacrifice move their children to an institution where English is the medium of instruction? (Kamwangamalu 2001:409)
- ❑ Should multilingualism be enforced as a goal in itself? should entirely monolingual higher education be effectively forbidden?
- ❑ Should students have the right to course material (tutorials) in their mother tongue?
- ❑ Should students have the right to use multilingual material?
- ❑ Should course content and material be multilingual as a general policy?

Holmarsdottir (2003:1) points out that in spite of a progressive Language in Education Policy (July 1997) many speakers of African languages still use English as their medium of instruction from the fourth grade. Holmarsdottir (2003:1) argues further that the policy is not implemented in the spirit it was intended. Over and above, the policy is filled with a number of obstacles which make

implementation difficult. Furthermore, 'the lack of political will among political leadership of the country to seriously implement the national ideals expressed in the Constitution and the LIEP may be little more than a symbolic gesture or a strategy to obtain public support without any intention of bringing about to real change in society'.

2.4 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LANGUAGE POLICY

Hartshorne (1992:186-187) points out that language policies for education are highly charged political issues which are seldom, if ever, decided upon educational grounds alone. In South Africa these decisions have to do with issues of political dominance, the protection of power structures, the preservation of privilege and the distribution of economic resources. With regard to schooling, it has been an instrument of social and political control (Thobeka 1997:3). Pattanayak (1985:37) indicates that language politics is intimately connected with economics and resource planning. Should resources be so developed that sub-groups within a region or culture groups within a diverse nation get equal opportunity for their creative fulfilment, language is inevitably used for divisive purposes.

2.4.1 The pre-apartheid years

The importance of the LIEP exhibits itself if one takes a step by step look at the history of the development of languages in South Africa from 1652, 'when the first group of Dutch Boer settlers arrived in South Africa through to the politically tumultuous 1990's when the forces of democracy toppled the apartheid regime and paved the path toward a multilingual, pluralistic society' (Thobeka 1997:4). The pre-apartheid years of South African education reflected in the

main the struggle of the Afrikaner people to escape the domination of the policy of Anglicisation during the earlier part of the 19th century (Kamwangamalu 2001:388).

Dutch served as the medium of instruction in Dutch schools until 1914 when its offspring, Afrikaans took over unofficially as the medium of instruction. The African languages had no place in the state's educational system whether as a medium of instruction or as a subject. For the Afrikaners the continued domination of English in education constituted a barrier to the spread of Afrikaans and was seen as a threat to Afrikaner culture and identity (Kamwangamalu 2001:388). Afrikaners felt that speaking English would imply that they were slaves. Along these lines, the Afrikaner 'Broederbond' (sworn brotherhood) initiated the language struggle ('taalstryd') against the language of the enemy ('die vyand se taal'). This struggle expressed itself in a commitment to separate schools and a rigid mother tongue education policy. In 1948, the policy of mother tongue education culminated into what was to become known as the Bantu Education Act (Kamwangamalu 2001:388).

2.4.2 The apartheid years

The year 1948 marks the apartheid era when apartheid policy became the law of the land in South Africa. This era in South Africa had 19 distinct departments of education: one national and four provincial departments for White education, one department for Indian education, one for Coloured education and 12 for Black education. Each education department had its own language policy. Separate institutions at both universities and colleges of education were set up for Black, Coloured, Indian and White students. As in the case of primary and secondary schools, White universities were

also divided into Afrikaans and English medium universities respectively. The division possibly still exists to this day and it needs to be noted that the division is aimed at meeting the needs not only of Whites but also of the Afrikaans and English speaking population at large. In order to cater for this population, by and large, most historically Afrikaans universities are increasingly becoming dual medium institutions, offering tuition in English and Afrikaans (Kamwangamalu 2001:389).

For Indian education, English was used as medium of instruction, for Coloured education, Afrikaans was generally the medium of instruction, English for Whites of British descent and Afrikaans for Afrikaners. However, in Black schools, an African language was used as a medium of instruction for the first four years of primary education and from grade two onwards, English and Afrikaans were taught as subjects. From the fifth grade, English became the medium of instruction. The switch from an African language to English as a medium of instruction may be the reason for the high rates of failures and extensive dropout (Kamwangamalu 2001:389).

Black education changed drastically with the coming of the Bantu Education Act of 1953 which had far-reaching implications for language in education. The Act also impacted negatively on Black South Africans' attitudes towards the use of African languages as media of instruction and had serious implications for the languages of learning and teaching in Black schools. First language education became stigmatised in South Africa. Afrikaans was rejected as a medium of instruction in 1976 and the position of English was advanced. Attempts to promote the indigenous African languages were looked on with suspicion (Kamwangamalu 2001:389).

Kamwangamalu (2001:390) further points out that the legacy of the Bantu Education Act of 1953 foreshadowed current, negative attitudes towards the use of African languages of learning and teaching. This may be seen as a stumbling block in efforts to promote African languages. Furthermore, it is against this background and in an attempt to break with past language-in-education discriminatory policies that the South African current multilingual policy was developed and enshrined in the Constitution.

2.4.3 The post-apartheid years and recent developments (1994 onwards)

Because of the death of Apartheid, a number of changes have taken place in the South African education system. Before and during the apartheid era, education was not compulsory for Black children. However, now in post-apartheid South Africa, education is compulsory for children of all population groups including children between seven and 15 years of age. Secondly, a single unified and non-racial education system has been established. The nineteen education departments have been abolished and South Africa has a single, national education department and nine provincial education departments. A third major change in the South African education system is the new national curriculum which is based on the principles of outcomes-based education (Kamwangamalu 2001:391).

Some other changes flagged by Thobeka (1997:2) are, for example, the first democratic elections of 1994, the country's 1996 adoption of a new constitution, its founding provisions and Bill of Rights. Along in the same year came the South African Schools Act, the generation of national educational policy and documents such as the 1997 Draft White Paper on higher education. Thobeka (1997:3)

relates further that in October 1995 the Pan South African Language Board was created whose mission includes promoting and creating conditions for the development, use and respect for all official languages, non-official languages and sign language. There is also the increasing acceptance and promotion in recent years, in both the Constitution and recent education policy documents of multilingualism and multiculturalism as assets and valuable resources in the education process. Last, but not the least, one needs to mention the creation in 1995 of the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) which in December 1996 released its Green Paper on Higher Education transformation which served as the basis for the Higher Education Act in 1997. The Act challenged South African colleges' and universities' alleged resistance to broadening the number of official languages of instruction used at institutions of higher education (Thobeka 1997:5). The table below illustrates the language dispensation at higher education institutions in 1994 (Du Plessis 2005:100).

Table 2.2: Language dispensation at higher education institutions in 1994

Type	Afrikaans	English	Bilingual	Total
Universities	5	13	3	21
Technikons	0	8	7	15
Total	5	21	10	36

2.5 THE NEW MULTILINGUAL LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY (LIEP)

The task of developing the LIEP was handed over to the care of the Language Plan Task Team (LANGTAG), a national policy advisory

body appointed in 1995 to establish language principles for all spheres of South African society under the auspices of the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (DACST) and the national Department of Education (Thobeka 1997:5). LANGTAG's brief was to provide the then Government of National Unity with guidelines for the realisation of language policy across all social sectors, the promotion of multilingualism and more specifically the development of African languages and combating the trend towards unilingualism resulting from the perception by many South Africans that multilingualism is a problem (Kamwangamalu 2001:416).

In July 1997, the new South African Language in Education Policy saw the light of which the main aims are:

- ❑ to promote full participation in society and the economy through equitable and meaningful access to education;
- ❑ to pursue the language policy most supportive of general conceptual growth amongst learners, and hence to establish additive multilingualism as an approach to language in education;
- ❑ to promote and develop all official languages;
- ❑ to support the teaching and learning of all other languages used for religious purposes as well as languages which are important for international trade and communication, South African sign language and alternative and augmentative Communication;
- ❑ to counter disadvantages resulting from different kinds of mismatches between home languages and languages of learning and teaching;
- ❑ to develop programmes for redress of previously disadvantaged languages (Department of Education 1997 (a):3).

2.6 POTENTIAL INHIBITING FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY

Kamwangamalu (2001:417) points out that there are a number of language planning agencies and government sponsored bodies such as for example, the State Language Services, the South African Association for Language Teaching (SAALT), the Project for Alternative Education in South Africa (PRAESA), the Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG), the Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB) who supports the new multilingual language policy and want to see it implemented. However, there are factors which interact in complex ways to hinder policy implementation. Some of these impedimentary factors as indicated by Kamwangamalu (2001:418) include:

- ❑ The legacy of Apartheid education which have rendered black languages instrumentally valueless and brought about negative attitudes towards suggestions that these languages be used as languages of learning.
- ❑ Market forces are constrained because there is no sustained demand for multilingual skills in the African languages for academic, economic, administrative and employment purposes.
- ❑ Elite closure is defined as 'linguistic divergence' created as the result of using a language which is only known to or preferred by the elite, in this case English.

Skutnabb-Kangas (1998:13) and also Phillipson (1998, 1992) defines *Linguicism* as referring to, 'ideologies and structures which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources between groups which are defined on the

basis of language'. In such ideology, the language of the politically or economically dominant group or class is given a higher social status than the indigenous languages. Such a view is self-evident in South Africa where English and Afrikaans have historically been given a higher status than black African languages. As a consequence Western donors, for instance tend to support educational programmes that promote subtractive and transitional bilingual programmes, where black African languages are used in the early years of schooling, and as a result, a world language such as English takes over as preferred medium of instruction.

There is an increasing mismatch between South African stated official policy and its gradually evolving realities (Webb 1999:27). Several obvious reasons can be given for this mismatch between policy and practice, such as the issue of the lack of financial, human and educational resources. However, Webb (1999:28) gives a further three possible reasons for the situation, namely, the sociolinguistic character of South Africa, the inadequate language policies and the apparent lack of political will. Kamwangamalu (2001:429) also reiterates this stance, that there is, 'a mismatch between South Africa's multilingual language policy on the one hand, and language practices on the other'. He maintains that the mismatch between language policy and language practices derive in the main from three factors, comprising the status and instrumental value of English as a global language, the ambivalent language-related clauses in the country's Constitution, and the legacy of Apartheid's language-in-education policies, especially the Bantu Education Act of 1953. Furthermore, these factors, coupled with vested interests and market forces, 'have been a stumbling block in South Africa's efforts to promote the status of African languages in

the higher domains, including education' (Kamwangamalu 2001:429).

Thobeka (1997:6-9) quotes the availability of teachers, textbooks and even learners who continue to affect the language of instruction. In addition, African language speaking parents may be resistant to the LIEP idea that instruction in African languages has benefit for their children because they blame Apartheid as contributing reasons for their disadvantage concerning schooling. Added to this, according to Thobeka (1997:6-9) English and Afrikaans remain powerful and continue to enjoy the privilege as favoured languages. As a consequence, there are a few incentives for non-African languages or for South African learners to demand their rights with regard to their languages.

2.7 CONCLUSION

In concluding this chapter, it needs to be indicated as pointed out in the Language Policy for Higher Education (2002:5) that a number of challenges faces higher education in order to ensure the simultaneous development of a multilingual environment in which all our languages are developed as academic/scientific languages, while at the same time ensuring that existing languages of instruction do not serve as a barrier to access and success. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education recognises the important role of higher education in the promotion of multilingualism for social, cultural, intellectual and economic development. All higher education institutions are encouraged to promote multilingualism. Higher education institutions are also required to indicate in their three-year rolling plans the strategies that they have put in place to promote multilingualism. All higher education institutions are furthermore

required to develop their own language policies, subject to the policy framework.

In a draft discussion document, PANSALB (1998:1-13) makes its position with regard to the promotion of multilingualism very clear and explains The Pan South African Language Board's understanding of multilingualism and language development in the context of language legislation as embodied in the Constitution and other legal documents. PANSALB is charged with developing and promoting the use of all the languages of South Africa, including the ancient indigenous languages of South Africa's 'first people', the Khoe and San. The mission of the Board is to promote multilingualism in South Africa by creating conditions for the development and the equal use of all official languages.

In another document by PANSALB (2001), Guidelines for Language Planning and Policy Development the benefits of multilingualism is listed, namely, that it enhances effective communication; increases efficiency in business by optimising the use of linguistic resources; contributes to health and safety standards; enables informed and participatory decision-making; makes education and training opportunities more accessible and equitable; improves working conditions and enhances acceptance and understanding of other cultures and traditions and contributes to changing attitudes towards different languages and practices. PANSALB (2001) also advises on the value of multilingualism in that if the value of linguistic pluralism is reclaimed, it will bring about a rediscovering of a hidden store of knowledge. In addition research (PANSALB 2001) has indicated that bilingual people demonstrate greater social tolerance than monolingual people. The promotion of multilingualism will thus likely have important advantages for the entire South African society.

However, on the other far end of the scale, Reagan (2001:62) draws our attention to the fact that similar attempts like these all might sound quite promising because Government has put in effort to protect language rights and engage in language attitude planning which are both noteworthy and formidable. These developments have been overshadowed by other social and economic changes. There is the overwhelming dominance of English which is supported by both economic factors and by a tacit government acquiescence in the onslaught of linguistic diversity. Reagan (2001:67) refers to Mazrui (1998), Pennycook (1994, 1998, 2000) and Phillipson (1992, 1998). Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1995) who are of the same opinion that the economic return on competence in English is effectively overwhelming efforts to encourage competence in other languages. English medium schooling is rapidly becoming the dominant model in much of South Africa. The study of other languages and even indigenous languages has substantially declined and is continuing to do so (Reagan 2001:62).

Dlamini (2001:1) points out that although the ideal is that of the equality of treatment of all languages in the country, in practice it is not an easy matter to effect. Only two languages have been developed to be media of instruction at higher education level, namely English and Afrikaans. The attainment of multilingualism at universities are therefore inhibited. It may be an advantage that only two languages can be used for instruction and this in itself promotes effective communication across colour and racial lines. It is a distinct disadvantage because it means that African languages cannot be used and developed to the same levels. Furthermore, English is the language of commerce and politics in the country. Many people may be under the impression that if one needs a decent job English is the prerequisite. It makes sense because if you cannot speak the

language of the employer, communication will be inhibited from both sides.

Roodt (2001:2) indicates that the language policy of higher education is characterised by strong preference for the use of English which is revealed in functions such as lecturing, study material, tests and examinations administration, recruitment of personnel and students, research, research publications, conferences and so on. However, he believes that multilingualism at tertiary level will lead to better quality of decision-making, will give students a better understanding of subject content and will lead to better personnel relationships. Also, that most of the approaches of historical Afrikaans universities can be brought into line with general PANSALB criteria, the constitutional framework, the existing legislative framework as well as the expected framework which will lead to possible representation from all population groups.

CHAPTER 3: LANGUAGE POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND LANGUAGE PLANNING IN SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of five sub-sections. The introduction deals with a literature review. In sub-section 3.1 language policy and language planning in South Africa is introduced. Definitions by various writers, educationists and language policy theorists are explored. In sub-section 3.2 current language policy and practice is deliberated upon briefly. The question of the promotion and extensive use of English and the hegemony of English is raised. These tendencies serve as a basis for assessing language policy. Hence they connect this sub-section with sub-section 3.3. Section 3.4 explores language policy and language planning definitions, basic principles for language policy, language policy requirements, models for language policy in universities of technology and universities and steps in the making and applying of language policy. Section 3.5 rounds off this chapter by defining language planning and outlining its boundaries.

One of the means of distinguishing, 'language policy,' from 'language planning,' is to consider 'language policy,' as the expression of ideological orientations and views, and 'language planning,' as the actual proposal that makes up its implementation (Bakmand 1966:1). Language policies are for all intents and purposes best considered as a subset of language planning, being an important field of sociolinguistics. This field of language planning found itself repeatedly having to do with language policies for linguistic minorities. Paulston (1997:77) and Eastman (1991:96) posit that no society exists without a language policy, although

many policies exist implicitly in the absence of language planning. Paulston (1997:77) quotes Heath (1976) who indicates that, 'even the absence of explicit policy is in itself an act of language policy'.

Tollefson (1991:16) says that the commonly accepted definition of language planning is that it 'refers to all conscious efforts to affect the structure or function of language varieties'. These efforts may, 'involve creation of orthographies, standardization and modernization programmes, or allocation of functions to particular languages within multilingual societies'. The commonly accepted definition of language policy is that it is, 'language planning by governments'. Tollefson (1991:16) contributes to the debate in maintaining that the traditional definition of, 'planning' or 'policy' expresses an implicit belief in, 'essentially a historical, unconstrained action and choice'. However, although many people may feel that they participate in such activities, largely, such a conception does not provide insight into the ideological or structural basis of language planning or policy, nor its connection with power, hegemony and dominance or its role in struggle and exploitation. According to Neustupny (1970:18), societies plan language through policy or cultivation via correction and management of language, resulting in language treatment (organised and deliberate attention to language) or planning for language treatment that seeks to be theoretically structured and systematic.

A concept of language policy which opposes this idea is one which seeks to locate language policy within a general social theory or structure so that language determines who has access to political power and economic resources. Tollefson (1991:16) continues to say that a language policy is one mechanism by which dominant groups establish hegemony in language use. Such a conception of

language policy gives reason to think that there is a dynamic relation between social relations and language policy. Exploitive language policies which give advantage to groups speaking particular language varieties imply a hierarchical social system. Exploitive policies can be seen in, 'educational systems that impose disadvantages on minority groups and in restrictions placed on bilingualism among dominant populations' (Tollefson 1991:17).

3.2 CURRENT LANGUAGE POLICY AND PRACTICE IN SOUTH AFRICA

According to Roodt (2001:2) higher education is presently characterised by policy which gives strong preference to English which is revealed in functions such as lecturing, study material, tests and examinations, administration, recruiting of staff and students, research, research publications and conferences. The prominent role for English is supported by the great availability of English material, the language medium of the internet and the choice of many African speakers (parents and students). Roodt (2001:2) continues his argument by saying that the financial sustainability of the advantages and disadvantages of a language policy which provides for multilingualism instruction is not known or has not been tested as yet. Furthermore, the design of a proper language policy and framework for the development and implementation of multilingualism is defeated by the above-mentioned factors. Roodt (2001:2) attests that no university in the country advances an African language as a medium of instruction with the exception of the relevant language and literature studies. The majority of universities of technology and universities use another language, apart from English as a language of instruction

(namely Afrikaans). The historically Afrikaans universities have practically all become dual or parallel medium institutions.

Roodt (2001:3) contends further that the position of Afrikaans at tertiary institutions is presently enjoying more prominence than is usually the case. Compared to English institutions, the greatest workload is alleged to fall on the shoulders of Afrikaans speaking lecturers. Also, the approach to keep English and Afrikaans on a parallel level is no different compared to what had transpired in the apartheid years. The creative presence of Afrikaans is already critically on par with the hegemony of English, but Afrikaans needs to show solidarity with the other indigenous languages.

3.3 CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE POLICY

Roodt (2001:5) points out that in the higher education environment a number of general requirements for policy statements can be identified. A language policy must for example, be in written form and made available to all relevant stakeholders (legislative requirement), describe both the ideal and the language reality of the institution and describe how the reality and the ideal may be reconciled. The policy must also contain guidelines which concretise the language practice of the policy at tertiary level, especially that which concerns translation during lectures, key texts need to be translated and additional assistance to students and lecturers to improve language proficiency must be given. There is also the need for the availability of selected texts in more than one language as well as the vouch for and the confirmation of the willingness to test the validity of conclusions in practice and to bring about any changes to the policy from time to time.

3.4

LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE PLANNING: A SEARCH FOR DEFINITIONS

A large number of countries around the world have an own language policy which is or was designed to discourage the use of a particular language or set of languages (Schiffman 1996:9). Nations have historically used language policies quite regularly to promote and advance one official language at the expense of others. However, many countries now have policies designed to protect and promote regional, provincial and ethnic languages whose viability is threatened (Encyclopaedia Wikipedia 2005:Online). Politicians, educationists, leaders of linguistic communities, scientists and the general public regard cultural and linguistic diversity as a major concern. There are many factors which affect the existence of usage of any given human language such as the size of the native speaking population, its use in formal communication, the geographical dispersion and socio-economic weights of its speakers. National language policies can either mitigate or exacerbate the effects of some of these factors.

Schiffman (1996:29) contends that language policy is what government does officially through legislation, court decisions, executive action, or other means. The purpose is to determine how language is used in public contexts, to cultivate language skills needed to meet national priorities or to establish the rights of individuals or groups to learn, use and maintain languages. Language policy is also defined as government regulations of its own use, including steps to facilitate clear communication, train and recruit personnel, inculcate political participation and provide access to public services, proceedings and documents. According to what Schiffman (1996:30) says and the Encyclopaedia Wikipedia

2005:Online), 'language policy,' can be can be categorised in various ways.

Below are some of the ways that language policies can be defined and also, how language policies can be categorised:

(i) Assimilation policies

A policy of assimilation is one that uses measures to accelerate the downsizing of one or more linguistic minority group(s). The ultimate goal of such policies is to foster national unity inside a state. Examples of jurisdictions having such a policy are Afghanistan, Brazil, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and Thailand.

(ii) Non-intervention policies

A policy of non-intervention consists in choosing to allow normal rapport between the main linguistic group and minorities to evolve on its own. This almost invariably favours the dominant group. Sometimes, such policies are accompanied by administrative measures protecting certain minorities. Examples of jurisdictions having such a policy are Angola, Australia, Ghana, Germany, the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia.

(iii) Valorisation of the official language policies

A policy favouring the official language is a policy of unilingualism. Sometimes it favours the natural language, sometimes it favours a colonial language with a strong influence internationally. In some cases, such policies are accompanied by measures recognizing and protecting minority languages. Examples of jurisdictions having

such a policy are Egypt, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico and Poland.

(iv) Differentiated legal statute policies

A policy that recognises a different legal statute for a given language usually aims at allowing the co-existence of multiple linguistic groups inside a state. Typically, the majority has all the linguistic rights secured or sometimes protected while the minorities are given special protection for their language. Examples of jurisdictions having such a policy are China, the Netherlands, Sweden, Wales and New Mexico.

(v) Bilingualism or Trilingualism policies

A policy favouring the two official languages is a policy of bilingualism. There are many ways in which these policies can be applied.

(a) Based on non-territorialised individual rights

A policy of bilingualism based on non-territorialised individual rights recognises the same rights to all members of a community whatever their location on the national territory. South Africa, Canada, Tanzania, Ireland, Kenya, Norway, New Zealand and Hong Kong serve as examples.

(b) Based on territorialised individual rights

A language policy based on territorialised individual rights recognises the same rights to all members of a community within a

specific region. Examples which illustrate the notion are: Scotland, Hawaii, Northern Ireland and Finland.

(c) Based on territorialised rights

The rights to use a particular language may be restricted to a particular territory within the polity (nation), or even certain domains within a restricted territory. Examples of jurisdictions having such a policy are Switzerland, Belgium and Cameroon.

(vi) Covert versus overt policies

Covert policies are *de facto*, unstated, customary, traditional, grass roots and implicit, without necessarily having any written support in legal documents.

Overt policies are *de jure*, explicit constitutional, statutory, specific and which are specifically and legally defined. It also refers to a document which has been compiled by the authorities of an institution or country to regulate the use of language falling under their jurisdiction. Such a policy also determines what languages are to be used.

(vi) Egalitarian versus restricted

(a) An egalitarian policy treats languages, even of a small minority as totally equal, always putting both (or all) languages on an equal footing, addressing all citizens as if they are bilingual (Schiffman 1996:30).

(b) Restricted policies are not as open and equal for all.

3.4.1 Basic principles for a language policy

In accordance with the South African Constitution (1996), the basis for a comprehensive language policy consists of the following essential principles, namely:

- (a) promoting and protecting linguistic and cultural diversity
- (b) supporting democracy through the entrenchment of language equity and language rights
- (c) asserting the view that multilingualism is a resource
- (d) redressing the marginalisation of indigenous languages and
- (e) encouraging the learning of other South African languages.

3.4.2 Language policy requirements

Adhering to the South African Constitution, the basic requirements for a language policy for South Africa have to be:

- (a) consistent with the constitutional provisions on language, including those relating to language as a human right; and are
- (b) fundamental to the management of our diverse language resources, the achievement of government's goals for the promotion of democracy, equity and national unity, and addressing the language use, needs and priorities of the people of South Africa.

This would imply putting into practice an essential, functional multilingualism language policy and would necessitate soliciting the support of all South Africans from all walks of life. Such a language policy to be implemented, it would have to have to be aligned with the Constitution and these requirements would include:

- (a) Supporting the development of human resources with a view to implementing the policy of multilingualism;
- (b) professionalisation of the activities of language practitioners through legislation;
- (c) development of an efficient language industry by, among other things, using and developing appropriate technology;
- (d) special redress for the marginalised languages, that is, the African languages including the Khoe and San Languages, as well as Sign Language/s;
- (e) supporting the provision for the learning and teaching of South African languages;
- (f) encouraging the private sector to promote, support and implement a policy of multilingualism; and
- (g) providing adequate financial support for the implementation of the language policy.

Kamwenda (2000:5) enquires about what a good language policy is and what the features of a good language policy are. Lo Bianco (2004:2) rules that a language policy has the following features: In the first instance, it can be defended with the use of evidence from research. Secondly, it must be realistic and take note of the available resources. Put differently, the policy must be down to earth. Thirdly, the policy must be humanitarian, just and democratic. More clearly, a good language policy promotes the culture of good governance and respect for human rights. Lastly, a good language policy must adequately address national interest, without

compromising the linguistic needs and opportunities of the various social or linguistic groups in a country.

Indeed, South Africa has produced a policy that can be considered as suitable in addressing language problems in a multilingual society. As indicated before, language planning in South Africa could be considered as one of the best in the world but the argument prevalently is that the most problematic area of language planning is the issue of language policy implementation. Currie (1996:37) asserts that the actual content of the official language policy is determined by specific regulation of language use in interactions between the state and the subjects. On the other hand, there is the sustained use of English at the national level. The bone of contention is that even if other languages are promoted to be used at this level, certain considerations on usage, practicability, expense and regional circumstances should be made as well as the balance of the needs and preferences of the population. The practicability depends on the number of people who speak a particular language in a particular area (Currie 1996:37).

3.4.3 Models for language policy in universities of technology, and universities

A number of models have been proposed by the 'Taalsekretariaat' known as an independent, non-political organisation with its own administrative structure, staff and funding (LitNet:1). Herewith, below follow their submission on the proposed national language policy as announced by the then Minister of Education, Kader Asmal.

3.4.3.1 The *Laissez-Faire* Model

The *Laissez-Faire* model has been openly supported by the governing bodies of most educational institutions in South Africa, and is widely accepted by the country's economic elite. The view is that language policy and practice should be left to the judgement of the institutions concerned regarding respecting the autonomy of institutions of learning by not allowing any government interference in the language policies and practices of such institutions and the belief that it goes some way towards realising the language rights of prospective students by making allowances for the use of different languages by different institutions, and through a 'free market' process of supply and demand (LitNet:5).

Objections to the model (LitNet:5) includes, in the first instance, that although it is conceded that the autonomy of (semi-) public institutions, like schools, universities of technology and universities, is protected by the Constitution as an indispensable component of any truly democratic order, the model is inhibited by, and should therefore be balanced against, other, equally indispensable rights enshrined in the Constitution, such as rights of access to public facilities, to mother-tongue education, to language equity, to protection against discrimination, and to affirmative action for previously disadvantaged sections of the population and their languages (LitNet:5). Secondly, experience, both locally and internationally, has shown that a 'free market' approach to language in education, like unrestrained 'free market' approaches in other spheres of public life, do not lead to an equitable distribution of language and educational rights, yet, on the contrary, tends to favour already privileged sections (language groups) for the simple

reason that they are in a better position, socially and economically, to claim their rights and defend their interests (Litnet:5).

3.4.3.2 The *ad hoc* model

For the reason that there is no clear and articulate language policy for education, the *ad hoc* model has become the default model supported in practice by the Department of Education. The model is in principle preferable to the laissez-faire model in its most extreme form since this model identifies with the state in ensuring that language policies do not infringe on the constitutional rights of South Africans (LitNet:6).

The following significant weaknesses of the model are identified (LitNet:6): Firstly, because of the inevitable predictability with any *ad hoc* approach to policy issues, interventions by the state have so far been unbalanced. Such intervention - whether by national or provincial departments of education - has usually involved the insistence that particular institutions offer tuition in English. To date no institution has been instructed to use an African language for instruction and/or communication, and in no case has Afrikaans been protected against replacement or marginalisation by another language. Secondly, the reason why irregular interventions do not form part of a well-considered and coherent language policy is that they tend to take place only as a response to emergency situations that arise in education. The result is that they do not engender any deep, structural changes in the existing language pattern.

A third weakness is that *ad hoc* interventions by the state are unpredictable. Because of this, such interventions add to an atmosphere of uncertainty in institutions of learning, leading to the undermining of efficient planning, particularly regarding the internal

language policies and practices of institutions and programmes for the improvement of access and diversity of these institutions. Lastly, the *ad hoc* model has a very high conflict potential. Large institutions are, by their very nature, averse to outside interference. If the institutions concerned are educational facilities, and if the interference concerns language, wider communities of interest are also immediately involved.

3.4.3.3 The centralised designation model

The underlying character of the model is where the state tasks certain languages to specific institutions so as to ensure an equitable language dispensation. The institutions identified are then given the task of 'developing' the language in question 'as a language of science and scholarship'. This may involve using that language as the (primary or exclusive) medium of instruction. (LitNet:8). This model is implicit in the recommendations of the Gerwel Advisory Committee (2002), appointed by the Minister to investigate the role of Afrikaans in higher education.

The crucial viewpoints which support this model are in the main that the centralised designation model embraces a concerted attempt by the state to ensure, by means of legislation if necessary, that provision is made in the education system for the needs of speakers of all languages. A second supporting factor is that educational language policies along the lines of this model are being increasingly followed in multilingual states world-wide (e.g. Belgium and Canada). Thirdly, in setting out to serve the use of all official languages as languages of science and scholarship, the viability of the cultural communities whose languages they are, is ensured, since such communities depend for their continued long-term survival on the use of their language for 'higher' functions,

such as education. In the fourth instance, arguments in favour of this model would mean not only safeguarding Afrikaans against further marginalisation because of the increasing dominance of English, but it would also enable the other official languages to take their place in the field of education (LitNet:8).

Essential disadvantages of the centralised designation model embrace the following: The model is not easily reconciled with the Constitution, and for this reason proponents of the model often make a case for constitutional changes as a precondition of language equity. Secondly, despite the fact that the centralised designation model is preferable to the *laissez faire* and *ad hoc* models, in that it might bring about structural changes to the existing language pattern by ensuring the use of several languages in education, it lends itself open to charges of discrimination and inequitable division of resources. In anticipation of a model of this nature endless conflict would be the result between particular language communities and government as well as among the language communities over the number of institutions that they are entitled. As a result the policy would have to be continually adapted (LitNet:9).

In addition, as indicated, before the element of discrimination or unequal treatment is also clearly discernible in the simple fact that, under a policy of this kind, different rights and duties are accorded to different institutions and languages. A uniform language policy, which makes the same rules for all institutions and languages, would be preferable. Furthermore, the benefits of being taught in the mother-tongue are beyond dispute among experts but it remains a fact that a large number of South African parents and students of all races, especially among the economic elite, are not yet convinced of this. Added to this there is a wide economic and

social gap between many White and Black South Africans because of past injustices (LitNet: 9).

Unfortunately, this gap also corresponds roughly to language preferences and abilities. English is the mother-tongue of mostly white South Africans. A significant proportion of Afrikaans speakers (nearly half) are also white. All the other official languages are spoken nearly exclusively by black South Africans. In such a context, institutions designated as exclusively English or Afrikaans, with other institutions taking care of the African languages, will tend to become enclaves of privilege in a sea of poor and struggling African language institutions (LitNet:10).

3.4.3.4 The numerical formula model

The numerical formula model stipulates that the language policy of any educational facility is determined by public demand. The difference between this and the *laissez faire* model is that it is linked to a numerical formula. Should a certain number or percentage of students insist on being served in a particular language, the institution in question is obliged to offer that language as an option.

Major advantages over the other models that have been mentioned to date include the following: Because the same formula can be prescribed for all institutions of learning, the model foresees a uniform language policy which applies to all languages and institutions equally. As a consequence it avoids the danger of different rights and duties being accorded to different institutions and languages. The model does not prescribe a specific distribution of languages and for this reason it can accommodate changes in language demography and preferences without having to be continually amended. The model is serious about the constitutional

right to mother-tongue education by empowering students and parents in claiming those rights, and by respecting their personal freedom.

Shortcomings of the model reveal that the numerical formula model empowers South Africans to claim their language rights if they so wish, it offers no positive incentive for them to do so. In all probability, the greatest weakness of the model is the practical problems to which it could give rise. Many institutions serve learners from several language communities but it would be unreasonable to expect a single institution to accommodate three or four languages. The financial costs of such a procedure alone are already sufficient to make it impracticable. The model makes existing language preferences decisive for the language policy of institutions, which means that current language patterns - and the associated patterns of marginalisation and exclusion - are to some extent entrenched, albeit less so than in a centralised designation model based on existing language preferences. Thus a policy based on this model is not likely to increase multilingualism in the academy (LitNet:12).

3.4.3.5 The incentive model

The incentive model takes as its point of departure that those institutions who use more than one language for instruction and communication should receive larger subsidies. The purpose of these subsidies is intended to finance the use of an additional language and to encourage institutions to consider the multilingual option.

Arguments favouring this model are as follows that the model regards as significant both the autonomy of institutions of learning

and the duty of government to ensure that language policies do not discriminate or restrict access unfairly; the model, 'avoids the charge of discrimination against particular institutions and languages arising from the ad hoc and centralised designation models'; similarly, as in the case of the numerical formula model and it allows for shifts in language patterns, but without causing the administrative and financial havoc implied by that policy. (LitNet:12). Language criteria can quite easily be included in the formula according to which institutions are currently subsidised by the state and learners are empowered to demand tuition in the language of their choice by removing the excuse of prohibitive costs often put forward (LitNet:15).

Censure of the model to be taken into account is most significant in that the model does not really offer an incentive for the promotion of multilingualism as it is intended to do. In addition, those sectors opposed to this model often share the notion that 'a policy of subsidising additional languages would be maintained only up to the point where the language shift (towards the increased dominance of English in all institutions) has become irreversible'. It is argued that the additional subsidy would be withdrawn and that the less dominant languages would consequently disappear (LitNet:15).

3.4.3.6 The multilingualism model

The multilingualism model stipulates that every institution of learning in the country - from the primary to the higher education level - is required by law to use at least two official languages for instruction and communication across the board. The decision as to which two languages will be used is left to the governing body of each institution. As one of the languages, 'institutions (particularly at

the tertiary level) should be allowed to choose a 'language block' or 'family of languages', such as the Nguni languages, the Sotho languages or Afrikaans/Dutch as one of their languages' (LitNet:17).

It is required of all teachers/lecturers, as part of their employment contract, to be able to teach, answer questions, lead discussions and evaluate exams and projects in both languages. Existing staff who do not meet this requirement are given a fixed time-frame within which to acquire the language(s) that they do not understand. They are also assisted with language acquisition courses.

All learning materials (except textbooks at the tertiary level), administrative documents and official correspondence are made available in both languages. Classes are conducted in both languages on either parallel-medium (separate classes) or dual-medium (both languages in the same classroom) basis, depending on student numbers and financial viability (LitNet:18).

Advantages of the multilingual model are as follows: The model reaches a compromise in that it strikes a balance between respecting the autonomy of institutions of learning on the one hand, and on the other, such institutions are obliged to respect the language and other human rights of learners. This is effected by making the use of at least two languages compulsory, while leaving the choice of languages up to each institution. Since the system is introduced gradually, it allows for proper planning and budgeting (unlike the *ad hoc* model), and it may not, like the numerical formula model, be disruptive or impracticably feasible. The model leaves adequate space for market forces (e.g. language preferences, affordability and so on) to influence the language policies and practices of institutions, without taking those forces as normative or

sacrificing institutions to their destructive, disempowering effects, as does the *laissez faire* model.

Another advantage of this model is that a policy based on this model would not only make multilingualism in education possible or affordable, as would the numerical formula and incentive models respectively, but would ensure that multilingualism increasingly becomes a reality in all institutions, including the existing English-medium institutions. Also, the multilingualism model would in all probability increase the range of languages available as media of instruction. This would especially be so at the level of primary and secondary education where the second language adopted (usually in addition to English) would be one of the indigenous African languages, for the simple reason that the language in question is already understood (usually better than English, which is used at present) by most or all of the teachers and learners in the institution.

Furthermore, this model does not discriminate against particular institutions or languages. It applies the same rule - and a very simple rule at that - to every educational facility and all languages in the country. Because of this, it makes room for the important role of English as one of the international languages, but without putting Afrikaans as a language of science and scholarship in danger, and - most importantly - while increasing the chances of the indigenous African languages to acquire full public recognition within the foreseeable future.

The model also has the advantage that it does not categorise students into separate institutions based on language. Because every institution, from primary schools to universities of technology and universities, would eventually be fully bilingual, every South

African learner would be exposed on a day to day basis to a much greater diversity of fellow-students than is currently the norm. Because every language, by its very nature, functions as a barrier to access for those who do not understand it, the use of an additional language would automatically make every institution of learning in South Africa accessible to a greater number of South Africans, and therefore more representative of the population as a whole.

A final advantage, but not the least, is that the implementation of a multilingualism policy may affect all sectors of South African society. It would strengthen the public role of the African languages, not only in the academic field, but also in the workplace generally, the courts, the media, politics and economic life. Most significantly it may be that it would contribute to a sense of dignity among the speakers of every language in South Africa, affirming to each of them that s/he is recognised and valued as a full citizen of this country, and therefore accommodated and made to feel welcome (LitNet:19).

3.4.4 Steps in the making and applying of language policy

Ramos (1967:5) informs us that language is a peculiar human activity whenever humans live together. Influence on language activity, apart from normal maturation and acculturation processes, must be exercised indirectly and within limits which are culturally tolerable. Language policy planning involves support and direction by official sanction or by government regulation to language utilisation and usually, to language teaching. Policy also implies philosophy, which to be effective must recognise cultural value and tradition. Above all language policy needs public approval and support.

Ramos (1967:6) in his discussion on the determination and implementation of policy, indicates that If a policy is to be established, it should be formulated with certain principles in mind as necessary ingredients. The principles are also steps in the process of making and applying educational policy. There are at least five listed as follows: (1) information (2) formulation (3) experimentation (4) determination and (5) implementation.

3.4.4.1 Step 1

Information begins with an awareness of needs and problems. To begin building a policy, two kinds of data are necessary:

- (a) knowledge of what other nations have done in similar circumstances and what results their policies have brought, and
- (b) knowledge of the specific facts of the local situation.

3.4.4.2 Step 2

Formulation attempts to define tentative solutions to potential problems, hypotheses to be considered and new directions to be incorporated. This should not be confused with step 4, discussed below, since an extremely important procedure must first be included.

3.4.4.3 Step 3

Experimentation or research on feasibility, practicality and acceptability. Tentative formulations should be pilot-tested in carefully, controlled, impartial experiments to assess their real value. A theory may look consistent and promising, but it must not

be foisted off on a national school system without the assurance that it will indeed work when it moves from the drawing board to the classroom.

3.4.4.4 Step 4

Determination, is the act of officially establishing, a policy which must be done by a body with competence and authority. The policy must be stated in specific terms, understandable to the lay public as well as to professional educators and administrators. Determination involves decisions as to directions, changes, emphases, made on the basis of solid evidence and careful deliberation.

3.4.4.5 Step 5

Implementation, is the application of decisions taken in step 4, putting policy plans into practice. The final step is of great importance, since its neglect can negate all the steps that precede. Even the best policy, when it involves a change in previous practices must be wisely applied. Materials must be prepared and be available. This is an area where it is wise to make haste slowly, for the risk to a good policy is high if it is not given its best chance to succeed.

3.5 LANGUAGE PLANNING

3.5.1 Introduction

Gadelli (1999:3) argues that when the term 'language planning' comes up, a first reaction may be that it is unnecessary or that it is an activity that is difficult to accomplish. People may think of

language as something that cannot be planned. He contends further that people cannot communicate with each other as they used to in the past. Society is developing and language has to adjust to reality. Politicians take decisions which mean that new communities are created which may lack a common means of communication. In cases such as these, language planning is desirable and indeed necessary.

3.5.2 Language planning defined

Cooper (1989:29) purports that there are a myriad of definitions of language planning and it has been pointed out on occasion that there is no single universally accepted definition of language planning. There has also been disagreement as to what term should be used to denote the activity. Cooper (1989:45), after having examined some twelve different definitions of language planning, refers to language planning, 'as the deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes'. Also, this definition, 'neither restricts the planners to authoritative agencies, nor restricts the type of target group, nor specifies an ideal form of planning'. Furthermore, 'it is couched in behavioural rather than problem-solving terms' and, finally, 'it employs the term influence rather than change inasmuch as the former includes the maintenance of or preservation of current behaviour, a plausible goal of language planning, as well as the change of current behaviour'. Some of the other ways of defining language planning are listed below to give more specific definition of language planning as quoted by Cooper (1989:30):

- ❑ The term language planning refers to the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at government level (Fishman 1974:79).
- ❑ Language planning may be defined as a government authorised, long term sustained and conscious effort to alter a language itself or to change a language's functions in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems (Weinstein 1980:55).
- ❑ We do not define language as an idealistic and exclusively linguistic activity but as a political and administrative activity for solving language problems in society (Jernudd & Das Gupta 1971:211).
- ❑ Language policy making involves decisions concerning the teaching and use of language, and their careful formulation by those empowered to do so, for the guidance of others (Prator cited by Markee 1986:8).

3.5.3 Sub-divisions of language planning

Language planning are divided into three sub-divisions (Wikipedia Encyclopaedia 2005).

- (a) Corpus planning (related to language itself) refers to intervention in the form of a language, for example, by creating new forms, modifying old ones or selecting from alternative forms. It also refers to activities such as coining new terms, reforming spelling and adopting a new script (Cooper 1989:31). Corpus planning aims to develop the resources of a language in that it becomes an appropriate medium of communication for modern topics and forms of discourse, equipped with the terminology needed to function as the medium of administration, education and so on. Corpus planning is sometimes related to the standardization of a language, involving the preparation of a normative orthography, grammar and

dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community. For a previously unwritten language the first step in corpus planning is the development of a writing system.

- (b) Status planning (related to choices and uses of languages) refers to deliberate efforts to allocate the functions of languages and literacy's within a given speech community (Wikipedia Encyclopaedia 2005). Cooper (1989:31) cites Stewart (1968) who developed a now very well-known list of language functions. Herewith below are a few examples:
 - (i) Official: a legally, appropriate language for all politically and culturally representative purposes on a nation wide basis. Often the official language of a country may be constitutionally specified. This gives it statutory official status. A language may also be a working official language if it is used for its day to day activities or it may be a symbolic official language if it is used for example, as a symbol of the state;
 - (ii) Provincial: a language used as a medium of communication across language boundaries within the nation, and
 - (iii) Wider communication: a language used as the medium of primary or secondary education either regionally or nationally. It is of import to note that this function does not include post secondary education. The choice of language of education very often has strong political roots. As Cooper (1989:112) puts it, 'Since education is, from the state's point of view, a primary means of social control and from an individual or family's point of view, a

means of social mobility, it is scarcely surprising that the language of instruction should be an important political issue.

- (c) Acquisition planning (related to users of the language) concerns the teaching and learning of languages whether national languages or second and foreign languages. It involves efforts to influence the number of users and the distribution of language and literacies, by creating opportunities or incentives to learn them. Acquisition planning is directly related to language (Cooper 1989:12). Acquisition planning involves efforts to influence (i) the number of users (ii) the distribution of languages and literature by creating or improving appropriate incentives to learn them (iii) both users and languages.

In discussing acquisition planning, Cooper (1989:113) says that two distinct aspects need to be considered:

- (1) The overt language planning goal(s) which generally include at least one of the following: (a) acquisition of the language as a second or foreign language; (b) reacquisition of the language by populations and (c) language maintenance.
- (2) The method(s) which are used to attain the goal(s) are comprised of three types: (i) methods designed to create or improve the opportunity to learn the language; (ii) methods designed to create or improve the incentive to learn the language and (iii) methods designed to create or improve both opportunity and incentive simultaneously.

This chapter brings to mind what the essential characteristics of policies are and also underscores what is understood by the notion of policy. There is also a dire need for explicit policies and plans to be clearly specified. An attempt was also made in this chapter to give an outline of the various options available and the context in which each option is suitable. Options not discussed in this chapter include the single language model, the dual medium model and the parallel medium option. It was also argued that since we are dealing with the social and institutional power of the African languages, it is up to the Government as prime agent of the transformation process to give clear and unambiguous direction.

Human (1998:150 – 152) characterises policies as precise and detailed instruments. He maintains that they must explicitly state the goals they wish to achieve, clearly indicate how these goals are to be achieved and specify the tasks which need to be performed. Policies must also be based on suitable factual information; they must be based on a thorough understanding of all the relevant variables and they must specify the resources required to realise their aims; the skills needed and the necessary structures. They must therefore specify what must be done, how, by whom, with what and when. Furthermore, policies are mission statements and must contain a detailed list of tasks to be performed in order to realise the vision the political leaders have for the country as a whole.

The Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, also aptly sums up the afore-going chapter in her speech at the Language Policy Implementation in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) Conference

at the University of South Africa, Pretoria (Department of Education 2006:1). There she pronounced that the Language in Education Policy (1997) and the Language Policy for Higher Education (Ministry of Education 2002) were designed to promote multilingualism and their aim is to ensure that all South African languages are 'developed to full capacity while at the same time ensuring that existing languages of instruction (English and Afrikaans) do not serve as barriers to access and success. The Minister also referred to the Ministerial Committee appointed in 2003 who recommended that each tertiary institution in South Africa should identify an indigenous African language of choice for initial development as medium of instruction. She was pleased that a number of universities have responded positively to the language policy for higher education and that some of the recommendations made by the Committee have been developed and incorporated into their language policies. Some of the institutions had also revised their institutional language policies to align them with the national policy.

The following chapter sets out as its goal to provide an examination of what language policy is all about. The various influences and issues in an analysis of implementation with regard to higher education is scrutinised. A definition for implementation as well as ways of implementing policies is sought. The various strategies, ways of implementing policies and problems encountered with the implementation of policies are discussed. Chapter 4 concludes by highlighting the challenges in terms of implementation.

CHAPTER 4: AN ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

As indicated in Chapter 1, the intrinsic focus of this study is on the implementation of language policy at South African higher education institutions. Issues surrounding the implementation of policies are of intense interest to policy makers and practitioners around the world but more so in South Africa (Gomitza 2003:3). The transition to democratic rule brought about an abundance of new policies in a myriad of areas, including higher education. Furthermore, accompanying this the deeply consultative process of churning out new higher education policies was applauded as exemplary, as well as the final outcomes in providing a framework for the transformation of higher education. However, it appears that 'producing policy is far easier than putting it into practice or implementing it in social reality that is messy and complex' (Gomitza 2003:3). The researcher is of the opinion that partial or non implementation policy should also be considered since having no policy at all is also policy.

Educational policy is constantly subjected to various influences, and it is usually in practical application that distortions and obstacles to successful implementation become apparent. Examples include concrete, visible steps, the allocation of financial resources, setting up time schedules for completion, audits, evaluation, assessments and so on. The process of implementation must be examined in relation to the policies from which they are derived. Policy implementation is understood as a process and includes research into the educational policy process itself, as well as procedures

around implementation and policy impact and evaluation (NRF 2005:1).

The following pertinent issues are raised in the implementation analysis of a higher education report by Gomitza (2003:3) namely, what do we mean by implementation? What constitutes implementation? How do we define implementation? At the root of these questions, Gomitza (2003:3) further points out in her report that another set of issues is related to the nature of the expectations to which policy formulation gives rise. Implementation studies, as well as the practical experience upon which such studies are based, are, 'often bedevilled by the assumption that there is a linear process from policy formulation to implementation to evaluation'. The study of implementation is made all the more interesting because of the gap between expectation and realisation. Webb (1999) supports this view when he argues that there is a mismatch between dream (policy) and reality (practice). Sayed (2002:29) agrees by saying that 'the 'policy gap' is understood as the mismatch between policy intention and policy practice and outcome'.

4.2 THE IMPORTANCE AND NATURE OF IMPLEMENTING POLICIES

In a handout entitled, 'Implementation and Language Policy: The 'Achilles Heel' of language policy implementation is defined (Schiffman 1996:1 – 5) as follows:

- Implementation in language policy consists of the measures (plans, strategies, timetables and mechanisms) that provide the authoritative backbone (including financial rewards and resources) to achieve

the goals of the language policy, and the motivation to use the language by the people affected.

- ❑ According to Schiffman (1996:1 – 5) implementation is sometimes referred to as the ‘carrot and stick’, the carrot being the rewards and incentives and the stick being the enforcement: the decentives or penalties.
- ❑ Implementation may also be highly dependant on funding, which is usually a sticky issue. Funds may be available when the policy is first promulgated, and then may dwindle, as other priorities come to the fore or there may be foot-dragging.
- ❑ In study after study of language policies, various scholars according to Schiffman (1996:1 – 5) point out that no matter how benign or enlightened a language policy form may be, it needs to be implemented carefully or it will certainly fail to achieve the outcome its planners intended.

In essence then, implementation is simply the plan by which a policy is put into practice. This will imply the steps that will be taken and by whom or who. In addition, who will be in charge to make sure that things happen as planned and that passing of the buck will be prevented. Cognizance needs to be taken of the bodies and organs of the state/institution that will have the authority to take these steps (and enforce the policy if the plan is not followed). Implementation requires vigilance to see that all the important issues are being looked after: the timetable, the enforcement, the funding, the record keeping and so). Furthermore, the resources (funding, publication, etc.) that are available for policy and the time table or calendar according to which various aspects of the plan will be expected to take effect needs to be considered. Policies may also involve evaluation, that is, a way to check periodically to see whether the policy is being implemented as planned and, if not, to

consider the measures that can be taken to rectify the shortcomings or weaknesses (Schiffman 1996:1 – 5).

4.3 STRATEGIES AND WAYS OF IMPLEMENTING POLICIES

Ayyar (1996:347) contends that the challenge in implementation lies in mastering the logistics of bringing resources and actors together and deploying them to achieve agreed goals. Although negotiations are not recognised, it is at the heart of most of these processes. In policy planning as well as implementation, the task of combining the strategic vision of the institution with tactical decisions and responses to the emerging situation is formidable.

Drawing from practising academics of language policy and planning to bridge the gap between policy studies and qualitative research to explore innovative ways to expand our understanding of policy implementation, Duemer, Mendley and Morse (2002:3), refer to three issues of informal lines of communication and how their role in policy implementation can yield a more comprehensive understanding of how policies are implemented. An examination of informal lines of communication and their role in policy implementation can yield a more comprehensive understanding of how policies are implemented.

4.3.1 Recognising policy change/mutation

Implementation is defined by Duemer *et al.* (2002:3) as the means by which policy is carried into effect and can also refer to a one time-effort at enacting a policy, or a continuous process such as strategic planning. The implementation process may involve many different people and levels of hierarchy, any of which may change

the nature of policy from decision to implementation. Williams (1976:3) asserts that, 'In any event, implementation involves the process of moving from decision to operation'. Understanding efforts to mutate policy during implementation is essential to recognising how policy may change through implementation, from its original form.

Of import is that once an individual or policy-making body sets a policy, there is no guarantee that it will be implemented in the same way that it was originally intended. The difference between institutions and individuals is central to an understanding how policy can change from development to implementation. Pressman (1984:143) contends that mutation is more likely when policy is developed in a climate that regards implementation as merely technical detail. When a governing board directs an institution's officers to implement a new policy, but does not confine any operational limitations or delimitations, there is no way of knowing how implementation will occur or in what manner. Under such conditions it is inevitable that implementation will be influenced by individual perceptions. Mutation can also occur as policy is processed through the levels of an organisation's hierarchy. Elster (1989:157) declares that policy can be changed from inception to implementation in a manner that more closely meets the conception of what is in their or the institution's best interests. Individuals can surreptitiously undermine a policy initiative or at least decline to work actively toward its implementation even if they claim to support it.

4.3.2 The role of the individual in policy implementation

Institutions are composed of individuals and those individuals should be the focal point of inquiry and attention. In order for institutions to accomplish anything, it has no alternative but to rely on individuals. Individuals have their own interests and reflect larger societal interests, any of which may conflict with those of the institution. Greenfield (1984:152), Elster (1989:13) Feinberg and Solitis (1992) point out that the use of qualitative methods is consistent with the theory that recognises institutions to be composed of human will and the idea of institutions as a group mind or social reality that is beyond control, is rejected. An understanding of the human element in policy is a central aspect of qualitative research, as the human element is the basic unit of social life. Institutions are themselves held together and maintained by individuals who share, to varying degrees, similar interests or goals.

In order to understand policy implementation, it is essential to understand the actions and interactions of individuals. Elster (1989:27) emphasises that a human-centred focus, versus an institution-centred focus avoids the pitfall of understanding institutions in terms of key leadership positions such as the study of leadership which is limited to a very narrow spectrum of all individuals in an institution. March (1984:20) asserts that the efficiency of bureaucratic organisations is compromised by the interpretations individuals make in policy implementation as the result of their own interests. The logic of the matter is that if one recognises individual influence, one must reject the idea that institutions are rational bureaucratic organisations where decisions are regulated by a structure of rules and sanctions.

4.3.3 The individual's relationship to policy implementation

According to Duemer *et al.* (2002:5) investigations that centre on the role of individuals reject the idea that an institution can embody any value, or that any individual can embody the values of an institution. Such individual centred investigations reflect a perspective that recognises the power of individuals to impact policy implementation and establishes a framework where competing values are uncovered and examined to develop an understanding of policy implementation. In order to further understand the human role, Duemer *et al.* (2002:5) frame an individual's relationship to policy implementation in terms of orientation, degree, resources, activity, autonomy, societal values, institutional values, rationale and power relationship.

The questions that follow establish a framework that informs us about individual perspectives toward policy and policy implementation. These criteria establish a relationship to policy implementation in individual terms and recognise that the relationship between the individual and the organisation is reciprocal rather than un-directional.

- ❑ Orientation refers to one's position in terms of attitude, judgement, inclination, or interest. Was the individual supportive, oppositional, or neutral towards the policy in question? Did the person voice his or her stance on the policy?
- ❑ Degree indicates the scale of intensity or amount. Questions related to degree are for example, to what degree did the individual support or oppose the policy? If one opposes the policy in question, to what degree did that person attempt to stop, obstruct, or mutate implementation? Did the individual share his or her opposition or

support with others in the organisation? What means of communication was used? To whom was the stance on the policy communicated?

- ❑ Resources give an indication of the money, influence, information, expertise, or measure that can be brought to influence or use. What resources were available to the individual/institution that could help or hinder implementation?
- ❑ Activity refers to specific deed, action, or function, use of force influence, or process. Here one would ask for example, what communication actions did the individual take to support or obstruct the policy? How much communication activity did the individual expend to support or obstruct policy?
- ❑ Autonomy indicates the degree of independence, how closely one has to adhere to prescribed guidelines. A high degree of support or opposition will not have had much impact on expense of energy and resources if the individual had little autonomy to exert influence on policy. What level of autonomy did the person have in his or her position? How does the person influence/utilise the communication modes available to her or him?
- ❑ Societal values represent the ideals or customs for which people have an affective regard. How could societal values influence implementation? To what extent does the individual accept or reject specific values that influenced implementation?
- ❑ Institutional values underlines professional ideals or customs for which members have an affective regard. The following questions may be asked: How did institutional values influence implementation? How are the institutional values communicated to the individual? To what extent does the individual accept or reject specific institutional values that may influence implementation? How does actions or decisions of the individual change the institutional climate?

- ❑ Rational refers to fundamental underlying reasons to account for something. Questions which could be posed are: What explanation does the individual provide for his or her orientation toward the policy? Does the individual have superseding interests, loyalties or values that conflict with policy?
- ❑ Power relationship reflects the degree or status relative to individual position. What type of communication, both informal and formal, occurred between same or different power levels?

Ngobo (2007:14) makes the point that there are certain strategies to be followed if one wishes to ensure successful implementation of a language policy. The argument put on the table is that any language can only be developed and preserved properly through corpus planning. Allwood, Grönqvist and Hendrickse (2003:191) say that languages of European origin were developed through a strong focus on corpus planning. Consequently, according to Anita (2001:21) these languages are able to serve as means of communicating specialised information and knowledge, 'crucial to the pursuit of goals on the global agenda, for example, the environment, international public health, empowerment, democratisation and good governance, etc'.

The argument is further elaborated upon by Allwood *et al.* (2003:191) who mention that socio-economic pressures, the need for international communication standards and stable geo-political relations are the contributing factors towards language shift and a shift to monolingualism. They also advise that 'although the greatest potential for the survival of a language would be when it can function at all levels in society, it would be an unrealistic immediate expectation with regard to all languages spoken in South Africa'.

The implementation of a language policy requires the development of teaching material and other application (Ngobo 2007:15). Since the policy is status orientated, there is a need to focus on corpus since this is an incentive to language's coercive status. Corpus planning involves providing terminologies to serve socio-economic development. It also involves developing new vocabulary and discourse which will in turn help in the development of teaching and other applications. Ngobo (2007:15) says that another strategic approach to successful language implementation is to encourage people to use their language in all domains. There is a need to establish a context and innovative influence through information and motivation. The availability of learning material in all official languages in South Africa serves as means and provides an opportunity for development and motivation in these languages. The systematic development of these languages needs to be pursued until people accept their languages as commonly used in all domains (Ngobo 2007:15).

4.4 PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATION POLICIES

Hadebe (2001:17) informs us that that there are different ideas surrounding the problems of implementation. Sabitier and Mazmanian (1981) as well as Lane (1993:102) believe that the unambiguity of goals, good management and political skills and support are the key to successful implementation. Hadebe (2001:17) quotes Hood (1976:6 – 8) who advocates strict authority and control to enforce objectives and perfect coordination. Hadebe (2001:17) argues for a coalition of factors from various public and private organisations who share a set of beliefs and who seek to realise their common goals over time. Also, these views are no

quick solutions to the problems of implementation because the environment and the actors in implementation have implications for the degree of failure or success of policies. Anderson (1997:214) regards policy implementation as neither routine nor a highly predictable process. It means that strict control and excellent coordination cannot on its own guarantee effective implementation (Hadebe 2001:18).

Hadebe (2001:18) goes on to argue that the environment inhabited by the policy implementers has its limitations for successful implementation. The shortage of resources for executing policy and unconducive outside world of organisations are some of the factors that may influence implementation. Conflicting perceptions about value, practical utility and objectives of policy are more likely to impact negatively on its implementation. It can thus be assumed that the interaction of the environment, policy makers, implementers and recipients determine the success of policies. Hanekom (1987:54) points out that, 'it should be accepted that during the implementation process problems could crop up because of too little information, insufficient resources, unsuitable institutions or inadequate control measures.'

The degree of the success of some policies can be lessened because of shortage of funds, suitable human resources and unclear objectives. No implementation may take place if implementers are uncertain about how to implement policies. From this it can be assumed that the lack of capacity of implementers is an issue to consider even if there is adequate control by officials. In order to remedy this capacity enhancing techniques such as job training, information and counselling programmes should be put in

place so that implementers can be motivated to do what is required (Hadebe 2001:19).

4.5 CONCLUSION

In concluding this chapter the researcher needs to reiterate once again that one of the main challenges to the South African language policy is the problem of implementation. Hogwood and Gunn (1984:24) contends that an institution needs the intellectual capacity, strong planning competence, resources, authority to take action and complete understanding of the goals of the organisation if there is to be an attempt at successfully implementing its policies. Similar variables feature in the works of various researchers such as Sabitier and Mazmanian (1981) who emphasise that statutes or objectives of the policy should be clear and unambiguous and the implementing agency should be sympathetic to the objectives (Mmusi 1999:24). Linder and Peters (1987:457 – 576) agree that these conditions were necessary as this would ensure compliance down the line. Put differently, people would do whatever they have to do because they know exactly what to do.

Ngobo (2007:10), in a paper discussing the problem of implementation and 'escape clauses,' argues that the new language policy could be seen as having potential for a single language situation while encouraging other languages. This policy also provides for contextual language choice. Also, language differences are allowed to address the communication situation of a particular community. Moodley (2000:7) makes the point that in making one or more designated languages official does not necessarily or automatically entail major legal consequences. Ngobo (2007:10) also reiterates that the language of choice only means the language

that could be used insofar as that would be 'reasonably practicable'. Furthermore, this is what Webb (2002:51) refers to as the 'escape clauses' (together with usage, expense, regional circumstances, etc.), which in the absence of clearer definitions could be used to undermine the language stipulations.'

Bamgbose (1996:111) points out that the South African language-in-education 'policies' to a greater or lesser degree reveal the same weaknesses as listed by him as typical of African countries, namely, avoidance, vagueness, arbitrariness, fluctuation and declaration without implementation. Avoidance in the policy is shown in the number of escape clauses, such as reasonably practicable, reasonable alternatives, equity and practicability. Vagueness is revealed on the basis that some of the basic elements such as multilingualism can be interpreted in various ways. Webb (1999:14) says that the stipulations are too flexible having too few details of what should be done. On the same level there is no clear guidelines on implementation procedures, in particular: who has to do what? when? how? by which body? Also, if the documents are read negatively, it can be deduced that the policy is a 'declaration without serious intent'. Bamgbose (1996:17) says, 'lack of specificity effectively gives government an alibi for non implementation'.

This chapter made an attempt to give an analysis of language policy implementation in higher education and tackled issues such as the importance and nature of implementing policies, strategies and ways of implementing policies and problems encountered with the implementation of education policies. In retrospect, the researcher is of the opinion that the process of implementation is undoubtedly a daunting challenge and a difficult culmination of the stage of the policy because of the fact that strategies involve the

entire population. It is thus difficult to determine how people and in this case the higher education fraternity react to their particular policy in question. Bearing in mind the title of this dissertation, the assumption is made that those who set the goals of the language policy and plan (LLP) ensure the effective and efficient implementation of the LLP by soliciting the concerns of the majority of the population (higher education institutions).

CHAPTER 5: THE ROLE OF SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTIONS IN PROMOTING SOUTH AFRICAN LANGUAGES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The 1996 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa defines Higher Education as a national competency as opposed to a provincial competency. Because of this, higher education falls under the jurisdiction of the national Ministry of Education. The higher education sector in the past comprised public institutions, technikons, colleges of education, agricultural and nursing colleges. South Africa has in 2005 established 24 consolidated Higher Education institutions, including two national institutes for Higher Education, out of the former 36 universities and technikons. Key policy initiatives and processes, policy events and products and their outcomes since 1990 have seen intense activity over a wide front. This is to be expected of a government that has established a comprehensive circle of higher education transformation and one who seeks urgently to transform Higher Education to serve new social goals and imperatives (Department of Tourism 2005:3).

Three periods of policy activity can be identified on the basis of the nature of policy making, the principle policy actions and the outcomes of policy activity, namely:

- The first is the 1990 – 1994 period. During this period, the dominant concerns were the questions of principles, values, vision and goals. These were relatively unconstrained by issues of financial and human resources and policy planning and implementation to effect transformation of the inherited system (Department of Tourism 2005:3).

- A second period began in 1995 and lasted until 1998. The new African National Congress (ANC) led government began to come to the fore in policy-making. From the National Commission on Higher Education to the development of the Education White Paper 3 and the Higher education Act of 1997, the concern now became elaborating in greater detail an overall policy framework for higher education transformation and the more extensive and sharper definition of goals, strategies, structures and instruments for the pursuit of these goals (Department of Tourism 2005: 3).
- A new period began in 1999 that continues until to-day. It has been characterised by the attempt on the part of the Ministry to make decisive choices and take tough decisions that have to date not seen much progress. The most crucial of these areas is that of creating a national, integrated and co-ordinated yet differentiated higher education system that transcends the apartheid legacy (Department of Tourism 2005:5).

In an address Pityana (2004:1) contends that the policy approach has to be about dealing with the legacy of the past and yet one which shapes and prepares South African universities for the future. He argues further that, whatever understanding there is of the policy thrusts of the South African higher education system it must be viewed against the backdrop of our institutional imperatives. This vision is best captured in the preamble to the Constitution, which aspires to establish a society based on democratic values, social justice and fundamental human rights and to build a democratic and open society in order to improve the quality of life for all citizens and free the potential of each person (Constitution of South Africa, 1996:1). The then Minister of Education, Kader Asmal is cited by Pityana (2004:3) who indicated that the strategic objective of the government in higher education was to produce students who are

well rounded and thoroughly grounded and who are skilled and competent; who are creative, flexible and adaptive to challenges and who are adept in critical thinking and cultural literacy.

Mseleku (2004:2) urges all to share the view that there is a need for civil society, government and our higher education system to continuously reflect on the role of higher education in the 21st century and to continuously seek to make it relevant to our conditions and needs. He goes on to say that central to the vision which is captured in the draft White Paper on higher education (1997) is, 'the vision that the higher education system should be able to meet are the learning needs of our citizens and the reconstruction and development needs of our society and economy'. Also, many institutions have initiated approaches to curriculum development that attempt to respond in creative ways to the needs of students and society more broadly, but that these developments do not permeate institutions and in some areas change is slow.

Mseleku (2004:2) argues that the teaching of African languages is still taking place through the medium of English. African authors who write in English still remain marginal to English literature courses. Mseleku (2004:2) quotes in an article Prah, amongst others, who contends that, 'cultural continuity of Africans is preserved in our languages as living and current forms... and since African languages in their living forms have become the last outpost for the preservation and development of African culture, and if they are left to die then Africans as cultural and historical entities die with the languages'. This poses a challenge to our education system as a whole, since we preserve our cultures and traditions that define who we are and which are deeply embedded in our languages.

5.2 SOUTH AFRICA'S CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND LANGUAGES

South Africa opted for an explicit, hands-on language policy. Such a 'hands on' approach to language policy is one where the Constitution spells out explicit provisions concerning the official languages or national languages in a country, or in any case contains specific language stipulations, for example, languages in education (University of Free State 2003:6). The focus of countries having a 'hands on' approach with regard to their constitutional provisions on language may vary but such provisions form part of official language legislature, from which further language legislation may follow. Official language legislation is legislation which regulates the use of languages in government domains, namely, education in legislation and the legal authority. Distinction is made between primary language legislation, (for example, constitutional provisions, acts, white papers, and so on) and secondary language legislation (for example, regulations and directives). Additional, other documents that are generated by the state, work towards language legislation in a complementary manner (University of the Free State 2003:6).

5.2.1 Legislation dealing with the use of languages

Webb (1994:260) posits that if one wishes to determine the state of affairs in respect of language policy development, three aspects may be pertinently investigated, namely, language legislation, supportive language policy documents and language infrastructure. Beukes (2004:7) cites Fishman (in Heugh 1995:3) who argues that very little language planning practice follows language planning theory. She also declares that language processes in the new

South African democracy did, by and large, follow the 'classical' approach and quotes Jernudd and Das Gupta (1975 in DACST, 1996:10):

'The broadest authorisation of planning is obtained from the politicians. A body of experts is specifically delegated the task of preparing a plan. In preparing this, the experts ideally estimate existing resources in terms of development targets. Once targets are agreed upon, a strategy of action is elaborated. These are authorised by the legislature and are implemented by the organisational set up authorised by the planning executive. In these ideal processes, a planning agency is charged with the over-all guidance'.

5.2.1.1 The language legislation position

Below follows primary language legislation and other applicable documents concerned with the establishment of language infrastructure (Beukes 2004:8; Kamwangamalu 2001:416; Webb 1994:261).

- ❑ The Constitution of South Africa (Section 6,9, 29 – 31, 31, 35, 185, 186, 235);
- ❑ Multilingualism Bill (May 2000);
- ❑ Pan South African Language Board Act (4 October 1995);
- ❑ Republic of South African Schools Bill (1996);
- ❑ Statement by Prof S Bengu, Minister of Education on a New Language Policy in General and Further Education (4 July 1997);
- ❑ The Council for South African Geographical names Act, 1998 (Act No. 118 of 1998);

- ❑ The Pan South African language Board Amendment Act, 1999 (Act No. 10 of 1999); and
- ❑ The South African Languages Bill, Government Gazette, 30 May 2003.

Herewith, secondary language legislation and other applicable documents passed after 1994, concerning education, the founding of PANSALB's provincial and national advisory bodies and findings by PANSALB concerning violations of language rights (Beukes 2004:8; Kamwangamalu 2001:416).

- ❑ Language and education policy in terms of Section 3(4) (m) of the National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Government Notice No. 383, Vol. 17997);
- ❑ Norms and standards regarding policy established in terms of section 6(1) of the South African Schools Act (Government Notice No. 383, Vol. 17997);
- ❑ Recognition and establishment of Provincial Language Committees (Board Notice 120 of 1997); and
- ❑ Recognition and establishment of language Bodies (Board Notice 121 of 1997).

5.2.1.2 The state of supportive policy documents

Important complementary language documents which have been released deal with a 'framework' for the implementation of a national language policy as well as a language policy in respect of higher education institutions, namely:

- ❑ DACST 1996;
- ❑ Towards a National Language Plan for South Africa;

- ❑ Language Requirements for the Purposes of Government (TWC 1999);
- ❑ Language Policy Framework for South African Higher Education (Council on Higher Education 2001);
- ❑ Guidelines for Language Planning and Policy Development (PANSALB 2001);
- ❑ Costing the Draft Language Policy for South Africa (Emzantsi Associates 2001);
- ❑ The Gerwel report on the position of Afrikaans within the University framework (Informal Advisory Committee to the Minister of Education 2002);
- ❑ Language Policy for Higher Education (DoE 2002 - 5 November 2002);
- ❑ National Language Policy Framework (DACST 2002 -13 November 2002); and
- ❑ Guidelines on the layout of a Language Policy Document for Institutions of Higher Education (PANSALB 2003).

The National Language Service (NLS) and PANSALB have also released a number of additional documents dealing with aspects which concern the implementation of a multilingual policy (inaugural address in Bloemfontein at the University of Free State, Du Plessis (2003:8).

5.2.1.3 The state of language infrastructure

Responsibilities regarding the three familiar dimensions of language policy, namely, language status, language corpus and language acquisition, are divided amongst three primary role-players in South Africa, namely, the National Language Service (NLS) of the Department of Arts and Culture (DAC), the Department of

Education (DoE) and the Pan South African Language Board. Their responsibilities in respect of the three dimensions can be summed up as follows:

1. The NLS's primary responsibility as far as language is concerned, lies in language status planning, chiefly because this is the government department that is responsible for most national language legislation.
2. The DoE's primary responsibility as far as language is concerned, lies in language acquisition planning. This Department is responsible for language in the schools, and pays specific attention to two curriculum-related policies, the so called Language of Learning and Teaching policy and the Language as Subject policy (DoE 1997a), as well as the language policy of schools in general.
3. PANSALB is primarily responsible for language corpus planning, which it carries out via its 11 Lexicographical Units, which develop dictionaries for the official languages, as well as via its 14 National Language Bodies, which are responsible for the standardisation and promotion of the official languages, the development and promotion of the Khoe and San languages and Sign Language, as well as the promotion of the so-called heritage languages. However, PANSALB is also involved in language status planning, hence its role in monitoring and initiating language legislation, by means of its language policy advisory role and also by means of its mediation of language rights (University of Free State, Du Plessis 2003:10).

5.2.1.4 Language planning agencies

Webb (1994:261) lists a number of agencies, both government and non-government who have over a number of years played a significant role in shaping South Africa's language planning. These include: Government Ministries; National Terminology Language Services, State Language Services (Government sponsored bodies); Language bureaux of major corporations (postal and telephonic services, the Electricity Supply Commission, the South African Broadcasting Corporation); Universities; Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology; National and Provincial Language Committees; Professional language associations: Linguistic Society of Southern Africa (LSSA), the African Languages Association (ALASA), the South African Applied Linguistics Association (SAALA), the South African Association for Language Teaching (SAALT), the English Academy, the Stigting vir Afrikaans (Foundation for Afrikaans) and the Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns (The South African Academy for Arts and Sciences).

Apart from these language planning agencies, there were other individual government sponsored language planning bodies which include: The Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa (PRAESA) and The Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG).

5.3 ANALYSIS OF THE RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ON LANGUAGE AND SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTS

Bamgbose (2003:5) points out that South Africa's language diversity is supported by, 'arguably the most progressive constitutional language provisions on the African continent'. Mutusa

(2003:1) indicates that the language policy is regarded as, 'an epitome of meaningful change in language policies throughout the world and in South Africa in particular'. In addition, the language policy is considered by scholars as one of the most progressive language policies in the world.

5.3.1 The Constitution of South Africa (language stipulations, educational stipulations)

The Constitution prescribes parity of esteem and equitable treatment for all official languages (Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, Siswati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, Afrikaans, English, IsiNdebele, IsiXhosa and IsiZulu (The Constitution, 1996, Chapter 1, Section 6(1). Secondly, the Constitution commits the Government to the promotion of all non-official languages commonly used by communities (including sign language, religious languages, and the country's first languages – Khoi, Nama and San) and lastly gives explicit recognition to the principle of diversity.

According to Webb (2002:4), the Constitution stipulates, 'a philosophy of political pluralism'. Beukes (2004:7) refers to, 'linguistic pluralism,' which is enshrined in the Constitution in that the former language dispensation was based on official bilingualism and is now replaced by official multilingualism. Equal rights are extended for the eleven languages used by 99% of the South African population (Beukes 2004:7).

Webb (2002:4) informs us that the constitutional languages (official languages) stipulated have been criticised in at least three ways. The first criticism commonly expressed is that it is impossible to implement a policy of eleven official languages, because it will cost

too much and cannot be implemented in practice. Secondly, criticism of the language stipulation is that the principles they espouse (parity, esteem, equity, language promotion) are in potential conflict with the qualifying clauses (sometimes negatively called 'escape clauses') making it possible for state institutions to avoid adopting and implementing language policy in the spirit of the constitution. The third criticism is that state institutions become more monolingual in practice (that is, more English) which means that the government acts contrary to the spirit of the Constitution.

Following the announcement to recognise eleven languages as official, The Language Task Group (LANGTAG), the precursor to PANSALB, was appointed by the Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology. Its brief was to produce a framework for the development of a comprehensive national language policy. Such a report would provide the government of National Unity with guidelines for the realisation of language policy and planning across all social sectors; the promotion of multilingualism and more specifically, the development of African languages and combating the trend towards unilingualism resulting from the perception by many South Africans that multilingualism is a problem (Kamwangamalu 2001:413).

LANGTAG completed a report in 1996 entitled, 'Towards a National Language Plan for South Africa' (DACST 1996). The report contains discussions of, recommendations for and data on various aspects of language policy and planning in South Africa among them language equity, language in education, language as a resource, etc.

At the same time an independent statutory body, PANSALB appointed by the Senate and enshrined in the country's new Constitution was established. Its aims as stipulated in the 1996 Constitution, Chapter 1 section 5 are:

- (a) to promote, and create conditions for the development and use of (i) all official languages; (ii) the Khoi, Nama and San languages; and (iii) sign languages and
- (b) promote and ensure respect for (i) all languages commonly used by communities in South Africa, including German, Gujarati, Hindi, Portuguese, Tamil etc. and (ii) Arabic, Hebrew, Sanskrit and other languages used for religious purposes in South Africa (Kamwangamalu 2001:413).

Apart from promoting the country's languages, PANSALB is also charged with monitoring the implementation of language stipulations. Financial constraints and the lack of political support have made it difficult for PANSALB to execute its constitutional mandate to promote multilingualism (Kamwangamalu 2001:413). The Board's functions can be described as advising government, making proposals on language policy and investigating complaints concerning language rights. However, the Language Board has not been in a position to contribute a great deal to the achievement of a multilingual policy in post apartheid South Africa (Henrard 2001:90).

5.3.2 The Bill of Rights

The language clause (Section 6[2]) is supported by the Bill of Rights (1996) which recognises language as a human right and needs to be considered: Everyone has the right to use the language and

participate in the cultural life of his/her choice, but no one exercising these rights may do so in a manner inconsistent with any provision of the Bill of Rights (Section 30).

5.3.3 The South African Language Bill (Final draft 24 April 2003)

The proposed Language Bill is a document which must be taken note of. The list contained in the Bill begins with details of strategic goals namely:

- (a) to facilitate individual empowerment and national development;
- (b) to develop and promote the African languages;
- (c) to provide a regulatory framework for the effective management of the official languages of the public service;
- (d) to facilitate economic development via the promotion of multilingualism;
- (e) to enhance the learning of the South African languages;
- (f) to develop the capacity of the country's languages, especially in the context of technologisation.

The Bill proposes the following policy decisions:

- (1) the national government should use less than four languages for official work;
- (2) these languages should be selected from each of our categories of official languages on a rotational basis, namely: the Nguni languages (isiNdebele, isiSwazi, isiXhosa and isiZulu); the Sesotho languages (isiPedi, SeSotho and Setswana); Tshivenda and Xitsonga/Shangaan; Afrikaans and English;

- (3) governments at provincial and local level as well as institutions which perform public functions should be subject to the policy provisions of the Bill;
- (4) the policy should be applicable for legislative, executive and judicial functions;
- (5) language units should be established to implement and monitor the policy and to conduct language surveys and audits; and
- (6) regulations concerning language codes of conduct for public officials should be produced.

5.3.4 The Language Plan for South Africa

The Language Plan for South Africa, developed by the language Directorate, is envisaged as becoming a very important tool for the effectiveness of multilingualism in South Africa and has as its central principles, language equity and widespread facilitation services (Henrard 2001:96).

5.3.5 Norms and Standards regarding language policy published in terms of Section 6(1) of the South African Schools Act and the Language in Education Policy in terms of Section 3(4)(m) of the National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Act 27 of 1996).

The basic principles of the Norms and Standards document should be set against the background of the Language in Education Policy which underscores the importance of multilingualism and additive bilingualism in education (see glossary of terms for explanation). These national norms and standards can be considered as a genuine attempt to realise as much as possible the individual student's choice concerning the medium of instruction while taking resources and other practical constraints into account. The Norms

and Standards document makes explicit what is meant by, 'where reasonably practicable'. It also takes into account issues such as local conditions, the need to co-ordinate policy choices at regional level and the need for the minimum number of students asking or willing to follow education in that language. Henrard (2001:96) objects to some of the issues in the policy saying that although the policy seems rather progressive, the principles can be criticised regarding some of its components. No attention at all is given to non-official languages such as Indian languages despite its significance in KwaZulu-Natal. The numerical criteria (number of students/learners) are so elevated that the possibility of instruction in the smaller official language such as Venda or Ndebele is excluded. Little attention is paid to the way in which African languages should be promoted and developed as demanded by section 6 (2) of the 1996 Constitution.

5.4 SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE POLICIES, PLANS AND PRACTICES

Van Wyk (1998:7) in commenting about parent involvement in decision making and the issue of policy, posits that it is not because new education policies are poor, but rather because cognisance is not always taken of the complexities and uniqueness of individual schools and communities. Moreover, it should be kept in mind that for policy to have a chance of success, a sufficient number of people must be persuaded that it is right, necessary and implementable. Almost any education policy will fail if it does not have the support of two essential constituencies: those who are expected to benefit from it and those who are expected to implement it. This means that both parents and teachers need to be convinced that a partnership between the school and the home will

benefit all concerned, particularly the learner. What applies to the school situation is similarly appropriate for the student at university in terms of language choice.

5.4.1 Linguistic landscape at South African universities

In regard to the issue of linguistic landscape at South African universities, Anthonissen (2004:2) declares that the provisions for language policy was formalised in the National Language Policy (2002) as follows: 'Language/s of learning and teaching (LOLT): Since language as the fundamental instrument of learning and teaching, is at the heart of all education, learners should be strongly encouraged to use their primary languages as their main LOLT at all levels of schooling. In addition, all learners must have the opportunity to learning additional languages to high levels of proficiency'.

Anthonissen (2004:2) further points out that the position at universities does not meet this encouragement to use students' primary language. For the majority of South African universities the language of learning is English only. No indigenous black African language is used as a language of learning at tertiary level. It has become a matter of much debate whether there is a need or the will to develop the indigenous African languages to become languages of learning in circumstances where English (a second language for the majority) gives wider access in the global context.

Alexander (2001b:3) declares that it is an equally, 'incontrovertible fact,' that in South Africa presently only the children of English speaking homes enjoy mother tongue medium education from the, 'cradle to the university or technikon'. All other children, more than 86% of the school going population, are taught in a second

language, or in most urban areas, even in a third language, one which most of them have only a very inadequate grasp of. Added to this they are taught by teachers who themselves have only a very limited proficiency in the language of teaching (medium of instruction).

Furthermore, as pointed out by Brock-Utne (2002:3 – 4), another important reason underpinning why rote learning exists and flourishes in African education has to do with the fact that teachers are forced to teach, and learners to learn, in a language they do not command well. This begs serious and important questions about issues surrounding language in higher education. How does one develop skills of abstraction and system thinking if you are required to do this in an unfamiliar language? How can one develop the ability to communicate if one is forced to communicate in a language you do not command well?

Perhaps it needs to be emphasised that multilingualism/bilingualism is not without disadvantages, especially where it is concealed and is in reality not bilingualism/multilingualism education. In addition, students whose mother tongue is ignored at educational institutions and who receive tuition in a second/third language in which they are not capable and who belong to a marginalised group, are candidates for underachieving. Educational underachievement is usually the result of collectively contributing factors.

5.4.2 Institutional university language policies in higher education

Bergan (2001:14) makes the point that the issue of institutional language policies in higher education is an important one that can, in any given circumstance lead to acute conflict. The issue can be

seen as consisting of two sub issues, namely, institutional policies with regard to the native language(s) of the country or region in which the institution is located and policies with regard to foreign languages.

Bergan (2001:14) goes on to contend that the question concerning native languages is particularly contentious in situations with a fair number of linguistic minorities. Also, the issue concerns situations in which a sizeable group speaking a language other than the official state language demands higher educational provision in its own language. This language may or may not be spoken by a majority in a specific part of the country, and it may or may not be an official language in that part of the country.

Bergan (2001:15) also refers us to what is, 'correct' or best practice which may depend on a variety of factors including, firstly, the number of speakers of the language. While educational provision in minority languages is an important measure, it is at least to some extent subject to considerations of economy. Secondly, in the case of the academic fields concerned a choice may have to be made between numerically small groups of the various fields and kinds of provision. Thirdly, there is the geographic concentration of speakers of the languages(s). In the fourth instance, the educational level of the population in question where the linguistic minority is also educationally disadvantaged, This may be an argument for more extensive higher education provision in the language. In the fifth instance, the political situation also impacts on best practice. A minority group that feels secure, will more easily accept education provision in minority languages than that threatened by that minority, whereas a polarized political situation may also imply increased demands from minority groups for higher education in

their language. Lastly, the state versus private provision also plays an important role. Some minority groups may find the opportunity to organise their own private higher education satisfactorily, whereas other groups may demand state provision in their own language.

In a report reflecting on the various language policies that are implemented at higher education institutions internationally and which could be applied regionally within the SADC and nationally at universities and universities of technology, Chambers (2003:2) gives an account of the European Language Council (ELC) interest group with regard to questions relating to language policy:

- (i) Does your institution have a language policy or a language plan?
 - (ii) If your institution were to develop a language policy or a language plan, what in your view are the five most important elements which should be included?
 - (iii) What potential obstacles do you think you would encounter in developing a language policy or a plan for your institution?
- (b) With regard to content of language policy recommendations, it is proposed that two language should be learned in addition to the mother tongue.
- (c) In terms of models or questions for language policy the following questions are applicable:
- (i) What factors have led your university to decide to develop a language policy?
 - (ii) What procedure is being used to develop it? (Has a committee or group been set up? What sections of the university are

represented? What is the function of the person chairing the group? Who does the group report to? Is there an expected completed date?

(iii) At what level in the university will the policy be accepted?

(iv) Have any of the aspects of the content of the policy been decided?

There are important elements in a language policy or plan which include the need for a policy to be firmly embedded within the structures of an organisation. Furthermore, there is the need for language study to be integrated into programmes of study, and for courses to focus on languages for specific purposes. Multilingualism is an important component of language policy and thus there is a need for language courses to be provided for teachers and administrative staff. The importance of encouraging learner autonomy and self study, assisted by information and communication technologies is vital and the importance of recognition and possible compulsory equal status of languages can only be but emphasised. The necessity of adequate financial and physical resources and the importance of integrating culture in the language courses needs also to be considered.

5.4.3 Language policies at higher education institutions in South Africa

Written requests were made by the researcher to various higher education institutions nationally for their individual language policies. Telephone calls were also made to the Registrars of some institutions as a follow up measure. Furthermore, in terms of a literature review of the language policies of higher institutions in South Africa it was found that not all higher institutions have

language policies. However, it has been pointed out that the absence of a language policy may also be considered as a policy position in itself. In addition, it would seem that some policies were still in draft form and that there was a reluctance to forward these. The reason for this could possibly be attributed to the merging of some higher education institutions who opted to remain with the *status quo*, that is not having a language policy or are still in the process of drafting policies for the amalgamated institutions.

Note should be taken that at the time of writing, these policies could have been outdated and could have been amended/revised. In some instances policies of institutions have also been quoted *verbatim* because of its briefness and also for policies not to be misinterpreted. In sum, all policies received by post or electronically, are herewith acknowledged.

5.4.3.1 Language policy of the University of Pretoria

The University of Pretoria gives the assurance of providing an intellectual home to anyone who has the interest and ability to participate in its programmes offered. The University acknowledges that every student has a right to excellent training. The University undertakes to develop and use the languages of instruction, Afrikaans and English, as valuable instruments of science.

The language policy of the University of Pretoria (UP) (<http://www.up.ac.za/policies/language.html>): has been designed and based on the acknowledgement that there are eleven official languages, that all official languages have equal status and that they all should be treated equitably; promotes the development not only of all the official languages but also of other languages used in

the South African community; recognises the right of every individual to receive tuition at a tertiary institution via the medium of the official language or languages of his or her choice, to the extent that it is fair and feasible for a particular institution to provide tuition through the official language or languages concerned; adopts the principle that a language policy may not cause any persons to be denied reasonable access to higher education and adopts the principle that a language policy must be affordable.

Bearing in mind the above considerations/principles, the following language policy is proposed by the university:

- ❑ In conducting its business, the University shall use two official languages, namely, Afrikaans and English.
- ❑ Training programmes can be presented either in Afrikaans or in English or in both these languages of instruction, provided that there is a demand for instruction in the language(s) concerned and that such programmes are academically and economically justifiable.
- ❑ Afrikaans and English are to be used and developed as academic languages in order to achieve excellence in academic communication.
- ❑ The University shall promote the development of other languages (official and non-official) by, *inter alia*, presenting language courses and language programmes in these languages, provided that there is a demand for such courses and that such courses are academically and economically justifiable.
- ❑ In respect of administrative and other services, clients shall have the right to choose whether the University should communicate with them in Afrikaans or in English.

- ❑ There is to be no discrimination against any staff member or student who has command of only Afrikaans or of only English or of only these two languages.
- ❑ The University shall provide staff members with the necessary support and training to enable them to communicate in Afrikaans and in English.
- ❑ The University shall support students by providing tuition in the languages of instruction.
- ❑ Each unit within the University shall implement the above policy.

5.4.3.2 Language policy of the University of Stellenbosch (US)

The core of the policy of the University of Stellenbosch (<http://www.sun.ac.za>) declares the University's commitment to the use and sustained development of Afrikaans as an academic language in a multilingual context. Language is used at the University in engaging with knowledge in a diverse society. The language policy discussed here is the one that existed at the time of writing this research report. This university's language policy is guided by the following principles:

- ❑ The University is a centre of excellence directed toward the production of knowledge through research, learning and instruction.
- ❑ The University recognises the particular status of Afrikaans as an academic language and shares the responsibility for promoting Afrikaans as an academic language with other like-minded academics.
- ❑ The University recognises the status of English as an important local language and also acknowledges it as an international language.

- ❑ The University recognises the status of IsiXhosa as an important local language, but also as a developing academic language, and intends to contribute actively to its development.
- ❑ The Language Policy takes into account the diversification goals of the University.
- ❑ The Language Policy places the University in a position to make a particular contribution to the promotion of multilingualism as an asset.
- ❑ The University's commitment to Afrikaans as an academic language does not exclude the use of various languages at the University in its engagement with knowledge apart from Afrikaans, English, and IsiXhosa, Dutch, German and French.
- ❑ The University is committed to the exploitation of the academic potential of Afrikaans as a means of empowering a large and diverse community. This includes a significant group from disadvantaged communities, a considerable number of non-Afrikaans speakers as well as Afrikaans speakers with a better command of Afrikaans and English.
- ❑ The University of Stellenbosch makes use of English in its engagement with knowledge because of the language's international and local function.
- ❑ The University undertakes to contribute by means of particular initiatives to the development of IsiXhosa as an academic language.

The following provisions with regard to the language policy are applicable:

- ❑ Afrikaans is the default (automatic) language of undergraduate learning and instruction.
- ❑ English is used in particular circumstances as a language of undergraduate learning and instruction.

- ❑ Afrikaans and English are used in postgraduate learning and instruction.
- ❑ The default institutional language of the University is Afrikaans.
- ❑ Provision is made for IsiXhosa in some programmes with a view to professional communication.

5.4.3.2.1 The Language plan of the University Stellenbosch

The Plan devotes attention to: Afrikaans and English in the contexts of learning and instruction; the implementation of the Language Policy in the contexts of learning and instruction; the promotion of Afrikaans as an academic language in a multilingual context; the implementation of the Language Policy in the context of administration and management; the management structures responsible for the Language Policy and Plan; the role of the Language Centre and the establishment of an effective environment for language services.

5.4.3.2.1.1 Language options for modules

The policy has four options for modules: A = Afrikaans; E = English; T = Bilingual; A&E = Afrikaans and English in separate 'streams', sometimes also called parallel medium. The A option (Afrikaans) is the default choice or it automatically applies for all undergraduate modules. This means that:

- (a) The prescribed textbooks are in Afrikaans and/or English
 - (b) Class notes drawn up by the lecturer are fully in Afrikaans, or where possible, fully in Afrikaans and fully/partially also in English.
- The T language option (bilingual) entails an extended use of English in particular learning and instruction contexts where the

target group of students have appropriate proficiency in Afrikaans and English: (a) The level of language proficiency is established in entrance tests. Students will receive appropriate help where necessary. (b) Prescribed textbooks are in Afrikaans and/or English (c) Class notes drawn up by the lecturer are: (i) fully in Afrikaans and fully in English (ii) alternately in Afrikaans and English. There are special guidelines for use of T (bilingual) options.

The A&E (Afrikaans and English) option entails that separate 'streams' are offered in Afrikaans and English. It is an option that is academically possible and affordable in highly exceptional circumstances and is not regarded as a viable option for the University. The A&E language option is considered a choice where it can be introduced for the full duration of a programme. This option is characterised by: (a) Prescribed textbooks are in English (b) Class notes drawn up by the lecturer are fully in English or, where possible, fully in English and fully/partially (e.g. core class notes) also in Afrikaans. There are special guidelines for implementing the various A&E options.

5.4.3.2.1.2 Afrikaans as an academic language

The policy commits the University to the sustained use and continuous development of Afrikaans as an academic language to be promoted in different areas using different means. It will be promoted specifically through the following functions: Undergraduate learning and instruction; postgraduate learning, instruction and research; research publications; public lectures; popular science and terminology.

5.4.3.2.1.3 Language plan for administration and management

The policy states that (a) Afrikaans is the default institutional language of the University. This means that all documents, in whatever medium, must at least be available in Afrikaans. It means further that Afrikaans is the normal language of official occasions such as official meetings, ceremonial occasions, inaugural lectures.

5.4.3.2.1.4 Management of the language plan

The final responsibility for the implementation of the Language Policy rests with the Council. The language committee, a committee of Council, is responsible for implementing the language policy and plan.

5.4.3.2.1.5 Role of the Language Centre

The Language Centre accepts responsibility for provision and coordination of the relevant language support required for effective implementation of the language.

5.4.3.2.1.6 Conduct for language in the classroom

The Code of Conduct provides practical guidelines for understanding and also for the implementing of the Language Policy and Plan of the US. The Code of Conduct specifies, on the one hand, lecturers' responsibilities and lecturers' expectations and, on the other hand, it also specifies students' responsibilities and students' expectations regarding the implementation of the Language Policy and Plan of the University.

5.4.3.2.1.7 Language policy and plan in electronic media

The Faculty of Theology, on its website, provides a brief but detailed version of both the policy and plan and their usage in both undergraduate and postgraduate learning and teaching in the faculty. Other faculties mention the policy without being as detailed as the Theology Faculty's embedding of the policy within its faculty processes. The e-Campus implements the A specification of the language plan.

5.4.3.3 Language policy of the University of the Free State (UFS)

The Language Policy of the University of the Free State. (<http://www.uovs.ac.za>) respects, and is founded on the UFS's vision and commitment to quality and equity. It takes into account the constitutional, legislative, as well as the national policy and statutory context of the UFS. The language policy of the UFS acknowledges and respects the stipulations and intentions of the Constitution that pertain to language diversity.

5.4.3.3.1 Dominance of English and Afrikaans

The policy acknowledges that: English and Afrikaans remain and will continue to serve as the dominant languages of instruction in higher education. The policy furthermore stipulates the following:

- A medium and a long-term strategy to promote multilingualism, with specific reference to the development of other South African languages for use in instruction, be accepted.

- ❑ Strategies to promote skills in the designated language(s) of instruction be encouraged to prevent language from becoming an obstacle to equity, access and success.
- ❑ As a language of scholarship and science, Afrikaans is a national resource; that retaining Afrikaans as a medium of academic expression and communication in higher education is supported fully by the Minister of Education, who is committed to ensuring that this capacity of Afrikaans is not eroded; and that responsibility for the sustained development of Afrikaans rests with all historically Afrikaans universities.

5.4.3.3.2 Intrinsic nature of the university

The language policy of the UFS recognises, is founded on, and is directed at revealing the intrinsic nature of a university as a place of scientific practice and scholarship.

5.4.3.3.3 Language proficiency

There is an integral part of various university activities such as teaching, learning, intellectual development, research, scientific analysis, academic discourse in the diversity of disciplinary communities, professional preparation and training, external liaison, as well as academic and administrative management.

5.4.3.3.4 Promotion of multilingualism

Multilingualism at the UFS is sought and promoted within the context of the two main languages, namely, Afrikaans and English, including, alongside the development of Sesotho.

5.4.3.3.5 Parallel medium teaching

The UFS maintains a system of parallel-medium teaching in Afrikaans and English and the additional use of Sesotho and where this is practicable, it is encouraged.

5.4.3.3.6 Research

The language of the research environment is managed in ways that promote the objectives within the spirit, framework and values of the language policy, and within the context of the institution's commitment and sensitivity to multilingualism and diversity.

5.4.3.3.7 Support services for faculties

English is used alongside Afrikaans for purposes of management and administration. Depending on the preference of a student, official statements and study records issued to students are dealt with in Afrikaans or English, depending on a student's preference.

5.4.3.3.8 The University of the Free State language committee

The language committee of the UFS must report annually to executive management, the Senate and Council with respect to policy matters on the campus of the university.

5.4.3.4 Language policy of the North West University

The North West University (<http://www.nwu.ac.za>) has decided to develop a pragmatic language policy, based on the needs of different campus constituencies. For tuition purposes, the Mafikeng

campus uses English and the Vaal Triangle campus uses both Afrikaans and English. The Potchefstroom campus uses Afrikaans as the medium of instruction at undergraduate level, but ensures access for non-Afrikaans speaking students in strategic programmes *via* simultaneous interpreting of Afrikaans classes, for example in Engineering, Pharmacy, Law, Nursing and Theology.

In a short language position statement, the University claims a unique status in that it celebrates the country's diversity through its motto of 'Many people in one'. The University is a multilingual, multicultural institution that celebrates the richness of a diversity society. It pursues multilingualism through the use of Setswana, English and Afrikaans. Its succinct policy states that the official medium of instruction at the PUK (means Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education) Campus is Afrikaans, but every effort is made to accommodate other languages. In practice this means:

- (a) Correspondence with the PUK campus may be conducted in Afrikaans or English.
- (b) Full time, undergraduate lectures are presented in Afrikaans at the PUK campus and in English at the Vaal Triangle campus.
- (c) Tests and examinations are set in both Afrikaans and English, and may be answered in either language.
- (d) Postgraduate lectures are conducted in either Afrikaans or English. In the BML (Bachelor of Management and Leadership) postgraduate programmes, most of the lectures are presented in English in order to prepare Afrikaans speaking students for careers in industry.

5.4.3.5 Language policy of the University of Cape Town

The University of Cape Town's (UCT's) language policy (<http://www.uct.ac.za>) , approved by Senate on 23 June 1999 and revised in 2003, takes as its starting point the need to prepare students to participate fully in a multilingual society, where multilingual proficiency and awareness are essential.

An important objective pertains to the development of multilingual awareness on the one hand, and multilingual proficiency on the other. Language and literature departments at UCT that teach South African languages other than English or international languages are expected to play a key role in exploring ways of assisting the UCT community to achieve such awareness and proficiency.

English is the medium of instruction and administration. English is an international language of communication in science and business, but it is not the primary language for many of our students and staff. A major objective is, therefore, to ensure that our students acquire effective literacy in English, by which we understand the ability to communicate through the spoken and written word in a variety of contexts: academic, social, and in their future careers.

5.4.3.5.1 Teaching and examinations

English is both the medium of teaching and of examination except in language and literature departments where another language is taught and may be used. This applies at all levels, and to dissertations and theses for higher degrees.

To further the objective of the promotion of multilingual awareness and proficiency, all academic programme convenors and teachers will be required, with the aid of language and literature departments, staff in the Centre for Higher Education Development, and CALSSA (The Centre for Applied Language Studies and Services in Africa), to explore and implement ways in which these aims may be achieved through the undergraduate and postgraduate programme structures.

5.4.3.5.2 Admissions

All applicants, whether at undergraduate or postgraduate level, must have attained a certain level of proficiency in English and must be required to submit evidence of this as part of their application to study, as outlined below.

UCT language policy in respect of South African Senior Certificate undergraduate applicants:

- South African Senior Certificate undergraduate applicants to UCT must have achieved a pass at 40% or more on the Higher Grade in English (First or Second Language) at Senior Certificate/Further Education and Training Certificate level. UCT language policy in respect of undergraduate or postgraduate English Foreign Language (EFL) or Foreign Permanent (FP) applicants whose primary language is not English (note: an EFL country is defined as one in which English is not, for example, the medium of communication between educated groups of people who do not share a common language, or is not the medium of instruction in schools or a significant medium of written communication):

- ❑ Applicants as indicated above, are required to submit one of the following: a recent score obtained within three - five years before application for admission) of at least 570 (paper-based test) or 230 (computer-based test) on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL); a recent overall band score of 7.0 (with no individual element of the test scoring below 6.0) on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS); or, noting that this may only be written at certain designated venues within South Africa, a score of at least 65% on the university's Placement Test in English for Educational Purposes (PTEEP).
- ❑ on arrival at the university, all EFL undergraduate students are required to write the PTEEP for placement if necessary, in an academic literacy course or a mainstream course with an academic literacy component.

5.4.3.5.3 Administration

English is the language of internal governance and of administration. All English communication must be clear and concise and gender-sensitive. All administrative heads of department will be required, with the aid of language and literature departments, and CALSSA (The Centre for Applied Language Studies and Services in Africa), to explore and implement ways in which the aims of multilingualism awareness and proficiency may be promoted.

5.4.3.6 Language policy of the University of the Witwatersrand

5.4.3.6.1 Introduction

The Language Policy of the University of the Witwatersrand (<http://www.wits.ac.za>) was adopted on 14 March 2003. At the University 76 home languages are spoken by staff and students on campus. SeSotho and IsiZulu are the most widely understood African languages in the immediate environment of the University. The University has committed itself to developing SeSotho in the belief that institutions in KwaZulu Natal are more suited to the development of IsiZulu. The development of SeSotho will have four phases.

5.4.3.6.2 Language policy

The language policy of the University commits itself to: multilingualism and the phased development of SeSotho as a language that can be used as a medium of instruction together with English; to complete Phase 1 of the Policy, namely the development of SeSotho, by 2010 and in 2011 Phases three and four will be considered.

5.4.3.6.3 The policy has four specific goals:

- (a) Support multilingualism by allowing the use of all eleven languages official languages for interaction on the University campus.
- (b) Developing SeSotho language through research, language teaching resources, materials and courses in SeSotho for staff and students.

- (c) Develop the linguistic abilities of staff by requiring full competence in English from all academic staff by the end of their probation period.
- (d) Develop the linguistic abilities of students by requiring all students to achieve full competence in written and spoken English by the end of their first degree by providing the necessary support for academic literacy in English. The policy justifies its goals by giving a rationale for each of the following key policy variables: multilingualism; translating and interpreting; choice of SeSotho and choice of English.

5.4.3.6.4 Implementation

The implementation is linked through each of the successive phases with the success of each phase depending on the previous one. However, success of phases three and four depend on the progress made in primary and secondary education as well as the progress of national and provincial language policy.

5.4.3.7 Language policy of the Central University of Technology, Free State (CUT)

The language policy of the Central University of Technology, Free State (<http://www.cut.ac.za>) as set out, determines the languages of communication at the CUT.

5.4.3.7.1 Policy statement

The Central University of Technology, Free State is committed to promoting accessibility for all higher education learners and to redressing the results of past discrimination. The CUT shall, in all its

endeavours, promote multilingualism and the development of multilingualism, especially with regard to the predominant regional languages. The official language policy of the Central University of Technology, Free State is based on mutual tolerance and respect amongst all cultural groups, and should be as apolitical as possible. It should be guided by the following principles: adherence to the constitution of the Republic of South Africa; promotion of diversity, equity and reconciliation; fulfilment of regional needs; cost effectiveness and justifiability, as far as possible; promotion of accessibility and commitment to multilingualism.

Policies, procedures and resources will be ensconced to promote the proficiency of all learners and staff in the main languages of communication at the CUT. In line with the national trend, the emphasis shall be on English as the primary language of communication. The Central University of Technology, Free State language policy shall be revised in conjunction with the National Higher Education Language Policy developments and at least every three years.

5.4.3.7.2 Medium of instruction

The Central University of Technology, Free State is committed to providing access for as many higher education learners as possible. English will be used as the primary language of instruction. Afrikaans and Sesotho will be used as supplementary languages of communication, in consideration of the regional preferences. Where viable, these languages may be used as parallel media of instruction. Learning and assessment materials will be made available in Afrikaans, if possible.

5.4.3.7.3 General administration

English will be the primary language of administration. The use of a particular language should not exclude anybody from participating in official proceedings, such as meetings and ceremonies. Committees must conduct their activities with due consideration of the Language Policy, but no member of a committee may be restricted in his / her use of English. The Section: Language Services at the CUT, which has translation and interpretation facilities, will be expanded to provide these services in more languages and on a wider basis.

5.4.3.8 Language policy of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology

There is an acknowledgement of the importance of language as communication tool and tool for teaching and learning amongst the community of Cape Peninsula University of Technology (<http://www.cput.ac.za>). There is also an understanding of how language can be used in the process of nation building given the diverse linguistic community of Cape Peninsula University of Technology. The purpose of a language policy for this institution is to ensure that individuals may realise their full potential to participate in and contribute to all aspects of life in South Africa.

The language policy at Cape Peninsula University of Technology is formulated within the following framework:

- ❑ The Constitution of South Africa (1996 Act 108 of 1996).
- ❑ The changing political and social order in South Africa. During the apartheid era educational institutions were forced to serve a particular race group. However, the student demographic profile

has changed dramatically over the past 10-12 years and the language policy of higher education institutions has to be adapted to make allowance for this changing student profile.

- Post 1994, South Africa found itself being slowly integrated into the global community, economically, socially and educationally. This internationalisation of higher education in South Africa is evident given the fact that South Africa is ranked in the top forty of the world's host countries to international students. Demands by commerce and industry in post 1994 saw many opportunities created for Cape Peninsula University of Technology graduates in commerce and industry as well as in local government. English is accepted as the *lingua franca* in commerce and industry despite the fact that for a large portion of the South African workforce, English is an additional language.
- The key challenges facing the South African higher education system. The challenges outlined in the higher education policy documents state that past inequalities must be addressed so that higher education can serve a new social order, to meet pressing social needs, and to respond to new realities and opportunities.

5.4.3.8.1 Vision of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology

As part of the vision of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology, the institution is recognised by the community, commerce, industry and the public sector as being responsive to the needs of society. The demographic profile of staff and students at Cape Peninsula University of Technology. The three regional languages (English, Xhosa and Afrikaans) account for 90% of the home language distribution of students, with a 51% Xhosa-speaking majority. The data obtained for staff home language distribution indicate that 89% of staff have at least one of the three regional

languages as their home language, with 61% having English as their home language. There is a difference between the home language distribution for permanent and non-permanent staff, as has been borne out by the language survey data which only sampled the perceptions of permanent staff. These figures were obtained from the Management Information Office, and are consistent with the language survey conducted in April, 2003.

5.4.3.8.2 Medium of teaching and assessment

According to the survey done in 2003 and the empirical evidence gleaned from it the majority of respondents agreed to English being the medium of instruction. However, academics are cognisant of the fact that this might be a barrier to the achievement of academic success. For this reason students at all levels (but especially those at first year level) will receive the required support to develop academic literacy in English.

5.4.3.8.3 Medium of communication

According to a survey done on campus with staff and students, it becomes apparent that all business communication and official documentation will be in English. The other two regional languages should be used as a support mechanism when required as medium of communication.

5.4.3.8.4 Multilingualism

Multilingualism will be promoted through the multilingual classroom, encouraging students to use their home language during class discussion to facilitate better understanding of learning content, staff training in all three regional languages and developing

multilingual glossaries of key concepts in the different disciplines. The implementation of multilingualism will take place within the constraints of resource availability.

5.4.3.8.5 Access and equity

The National Plan for Higher Education (2001:14) refers to 'increased equity in access and success rates'. It is important for the Cape Peninsula University of Technology to link increased access to student success. One of the ways to do this is through a language policy which is sensitive, supportive, non-discriminatory and facilitative.

The following guidelines on language should be adhered to in the admission process: proficiency in a single language should never be used as a criterion in isolation. This criterion should be balanced against, and take into account, a variety of other criteria; whether or not an applicant is a home language speaker of the language of instruction should never be a consideration in selection; good grades in languages other than the medium of instruction should not be ignored, since they may indicate an innate aptitude for languages that is to be valued in an academic institution.

A student may be required to write a proficiency test in the medium of instruction, the results of which will inform curriculum choices. However, foreign students should submit proof of a recent proficiency test and may be required to attend a special course in the language of instruction before enrolment at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology.

Language plays a crucial role in all facets of everyday life at Cape Peninsula University of Technology. For this reason, this language policy should be implemented with sensitivity and used as intended: to frame and guide the way in which language is regarded and used for the betterment of everyone in our community at Cape Peninsula University of Technology, both educationally and socially. As language is a dynamic phenomenon, it will be necessary to review the language policy from time to time as is deemed necessary.

5.4.3.9 Language policy of the Vaal University of Technology

The new language policy of the Vaal University of Technology (<http://www.vut.ac.za>) with English as the official language, comes into operation from the beginning of the new academic year (2008).

5.4.3.10 Language policy of the Tshwane University of Technology

In accordance with Council policy, the Tshwane University of Technology (Pretoria, including Arts and Arcadia, Nelspruit, Polokwane and Witbank) is a bilingual institution where Afrikaans and English are spoken and where lectures are presented in Afrikaans and English. These campuses are not parallel medium campuses and the language medium for lectures of the Tshwane University of Technology (<http://www.tut.ac.za>) is determined by the lecturer in consultation with his or her class group. In all cases key terms and concepts are also provided in the alternative language and the right of students to discussions, study material, tests and examinations in the lecturing language of their preference is recognised and supported.

At the Soshanguve and Ga-Rankuwa Campuses the language medium for lectures is English.

5.4.3.11 Language policy of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University

The Language Policy of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) is designed to be consistent with Sections 6 and 29(2) of the Constitution of South Africa, Section 27(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1997, the National Plan for Higher Education of 2001, the report from the Council on Higher Education, July 2001 ('Language Policy Framework for South African Higher Education'), and the report from the Gerwel Committee, January 2002, on the position of Afrikaans in the university system. The nature and spirit of these national policy documents suggest that the acceptance of the linguistic realities of South African society by incorporating the principles of multilingualism can only lead to communicative empowerment and the optimisation of our country's intellectual potential. In the context of the geographical area served by the University, this would mean the appropriate and sensible utilisation of established proficiency in the languages best known to learners, coupled with the enhancement of academic skills in English as the predominant language of tuition and assessment. At the same time, it embraces the imperative to develop and promote the Xhosa language and culture and to ensure as far as possible the retention and strengthening of Afrikaans as an established language of scholarship and science.

The Language Policy of the NMMU (<http://www.nmmu.ac.za>) seeks to be in consonance with the NMMU's Vision, Mission and Values Statement. This will be done through the recognition of the linguistic and cultural needs of the University's diverse communities, the

eradication of all forms of unfair language discrimination (in accordance with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights) and the promotion of equal access to knowledge by providing for the development of multilingual skills. Council, senior management, all staff and students are required to adopt a tolerant approach and a preparedness to give effect to the principles of functional and additive multilingualism through the implementation of this policy.

The Language Policy is designed:

- (i) to promote diversity, equity and reconciliation;
- (ii) to be constitutional and in consonance with the Language Policy for Higher Education;
- (iii) to be responsive to the needs of the university's constituency;
- (iv) to be sensitive to the changing language needs and circumstances of the staff and students and
- (v) to be academically justifiable, inclusive, non-discriminatory and practicable.

In terms of flexibility and tolerance it is accepted that the success of this policy is dependent on the adoption, throughout the institution, of a tolerant, flexible approach to matters concerning language and the recognition of the value of language in communicating clearly and providing unimpeded access to knowledge. The official languages of the NMMU will be English, Afrikaans and Xhosa and its corporate image must reflect this lingual identity. Language use for communication will be English for practical reasons and to avoid duplication.

The issue of assistance for people with disabilities (PWDs) is important. The NMMU will ensure effective communication with

PWDs in dealing with students, staff members and the public. The following measures, inter alia, will be implemented: People with physical disabilities will be accommodated through the provision of information in localities where they can read or hear it, e.g. by lowering counters and having notice-boards for people using wheelchairs and providing access to important information via website pages, bulletin boards, etc. For people with vision disabilities the NMMU will strive to provide information in Braille, raised letters, large print, audio cassette or other audible medium, such as a dial-in telephone service;. For people with hearing disabilities the NMMU will strive to provide visual information, including sign language. For people with speech disabilities the NMMU will strive to provide alternative media of communication, e.g. by allowing them to use writing to communicate with officials and allowances for PWDs in the assessment process will be made on the recommendation of the Student Counselling Unit.

As far as the implementation of the language policy is concerned, a joint Management and Senate Committee, consisting of relevant stakeholders in the University community, will be appointed and be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Language Policy. The University acknowledges that the implementation of this policy may give rise to uncertainties in its practical application from time to time. For that reason, the University commits itself to playing a supportive role in assisting staff to meet their commitments in terms of the policy. The Implementation Committee is empowered to issue guidelines at the request of individual staff members and/or faculties to serve as guidelines on how this policy should be applied.

5.4.3.12 Language policy of Rhodes University- revised August 2005

Implementation and monitoring of the language policy of Rhodes University (<http://www.ru.ac.za>) will take place along the following lines: The Vice-Principal, through the Quality Assurance Committee, will ensure that the various strategies outlined in this policy are implemented. Deans will monitor the broad implementation of the policy in their respective faculties.

Specific task-linked responsibility rests at several levels, as follows: Language of teaching and learning and development of Academic Literacy rests with the Academic Development Centre and the Registrar's Division. Promotion of multilingualism and sensitivity in language use is the concern of the Academic Development Centre and Communications and Development Division. Support for South African languages and the study of foreign languages lies with the School of Languages, Department of English Language and Linguistics and the Department of English and Human Resources division. Each of these divisions will submit a report every three years to the Vice-Principal with respect to their areas of responsibility.

Rhodes University undertakes to foster and encourage an awareness of and sensitivity towards the multilingual nature of the University community in order to promote intercultural understanding and, at all levels, to make communication more effective.

The policy declaration states: 'The language of teaching and learning at Rhodes University is English. However, the University supports the national commitment to ensuring that language should

not act as a barrier to equity of access and success. The University further recognises the multilingual nature of the University community and the country, and aims to adopt a wide range of strategies which will create a higher education institution whose identity is multilingual and proudly South African' (Rhodes University Language Policy 2005:2).

5.4.3.12.1 Policy objectives

The University language policy accordingly presents strategies for:

- ❑ promoting proficiency in English, its designated language of teaching and learning;
- ❑ recognising and advancing the academic viability and status of the three major languages of the Eastern Cape Province: isiXhosa, Afrikaans and English;
- ❑ the promotion of multilingualism and sensitivity in language usage in such a way as to create and foster a supportive and inclusive, non-sexist and non-racist environment in which all members of the University can feel they belong;
- ❑ advancing the study of foreign languages by offering students the choice of a range of languages to study;
- ❑ providing appropriate support for the development of academic literacy.

5.4.3.12.2 Policy implementation

The actions and processes by which the objectives will be achieved, will take the route where the policy will be widely distributed to all members of the University community, included in the University Calendar and displayed on the web-page.

5.4.3.12.3 Language of teaching and learning

In order to ensure that language does not act as a barrier to equity and access for students from all linguistic backgrounds, Rhodes University aims to strengthen existing English language support structures and put additional measures into place that will improve competence in English. Accordingly, the Academic Development Centre will:

- ❑ further develop the extended studies programmes in which the use of English as the language of learning and teaching is supported;
- ❑ continue to promote awareness of the crucial role of language competence as central to learning through the provision of formal staff development programmes leading to qualifications such as the Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education (PGDHE);
- ❑ continue to offer support to staff in the development of curricula, the construction of personal teaching portfolios and the optimal identification of valid and reliable assessment strategies in order to ensure that language development is facilitated and that the assessment of language use is valid and appropriately weighted;
- ❑ regularly up-date language-learning materials, both written, and audio-visual to facilitate the acquisition of English as an additional language; and
- ❑ make these available to all members of the University community and encourage the use of web-based resources and technology to support the learning of English.

Academic Departments will continue to evaluate the extent to which course design and teaching methods are appropriate to those for whom English is an additional language as well as the extent to which they facilitate the students' ability to use English as the

language of learning and teaching and ensure that all their prospective international students, who are not English first language speakers, comply with the IELTS / TOEFL criteria before they are permitted to register (TOEFL: Test of English as a Foreign Language; IELTS: International English Language Testing System).

The Registrar's Division will carry out an annual survey during registration to ascertain the linguistic demography and the linguistic practices of students, and to monitor students' views on the medium of teaching and learning at Rhodes University. The Registrar's Division will also ensure that, where feasible, official university correspondence with prospective and current students, staff and the public is available on request in at least two of the major provincial languages, taking into account the multilingual nature of the University community.

5.4.3.12.4 Support for South African languages

Rhodes University aims to maintain and strengthen the full academic courses which it currently offers in English, isiXhosa for non-mother-tongue speakers and in Afrikaans. In particular, given the unfortunate legacy of apartheid, it aims to promote the offering of courses in isiXhosa. The Department of English Language and Linguistics will continue to teach a module in South African Sign Language. The University also aims to strengthen the current status of isiXhosa by promoting its usefulness as a medium of communication for all academic and support staff.

The School of Languages will devise strategies to recruit students into courses in isiXhosa and Afrikaans; where appropriate, encourage departments to make isiXhosa definitions of technical

terms in a wide range of disciplines available to staff and students in order to facilitate learning. The School of Languages will also facilitate the use of isiXhosa and Afrikaans in informal non-academic communication where possible; explore the feasibility of providing the region with a centre for postgraduate programmes in Afrikaans and isiXhosa and collaborate with colleagues from neighbouring universities where appropriate. Furthermore; the School of Languages will explore the feasibility of reintroducing a programme in isiXhosa at post-graduate level for mother-tongue speakers by offering incentives such as scholarships to such students.

The Communications and Development Division will, where feasible, annotate key documents (e.g. application forms, bursary forms etc.) by providing addenda with explanatory notes in isiXhosa and/or Afrikaans; make budgetary provisions to enable them to provide additional signposting in isiXhosa and Afrikaans for the main buildings on campus, and to enable them to translate key University documents. The Human Resources Division on the other hand, will devise strategies to encourage members of the University who do not speak isiXhosa to enrol for the short communicative course in isiXhosa and ensure that advertisements for vacant positions indicate that competence in more than one official language will be a recommendation.

The Academic Development Centre will through workshops and formal programmes, sensitise staff and students to the need to counteract possible implicit sexist or racist bias in the language of materials for teaching, assessment and everyday usage; foster mentoring programmes which promote opportunities for interlingual contact where appropriate; devise strategies (in addition to the

Alternative Admissions Research Project) to attract students from all linguistic groups with sufficient English proficiency and academic potential to succeed; establish appropriate courses to ensure that new lecturers receive training in methods and techniques for teaching students who speak a range of different languages and that existing staff are also encouraged to undertake training.

5.4.3.12.5 The study of foreign languages

Recognising the cultural and religious significance of various foreign languages in South Africa, Rhodes University aims to continue to work towards ensuring the ongoing viability and development of its foreign-language courses in French (the major European language of Africa), German, Classical Studies and Netherlandic Studies by consolidating present foreign language offerings over the next three years and promoting the study of foreign languages, including Dutch, French, German, Latin and Greek through adequate staffing, regular review of programmes and publicity for the School of Languages as a major centre for language studies at university level within South Africa.

In embracing the concept of Academic Literacy and the need to master the forms and conventions of the languages used in academic contexts, Rhodes University aims to support both undergraduate and postgraduate students in providing access to knowledge and knowledge production within the University. The University acknowledges that the ability to use English as the language of learning and teaching at tertiary level goes beyond the mastery of the formal structures of the language and encompasses the way language users relate to both spoken and written texts in academic contexts, which is itself underpinned by values about

what constitutes knowledge and learning. The University undertakes to provide all students with the means to improve their competence in the use of language for academic purposes.

The Academic Development Centre will continue to support the acquisition of academic literacy through the development of extended programmes; strive to ensure that posts dedicated to literacy development are equitably distributed across the University; through the Office of the Dean of Research, investigate the viability of making writing respondents available to postgraduate students and continue to support students in the acquisition of academic literacy through their engagement with mainstream programmes. This support will take the form of tutorials and the provision of interactive learning materials; continue to promote awareness of the existence of a range of literacies through the provision of formal staff development programmes leading to qualifications such as the PGDHE; continue to support mentoring programmes which will assist students in understanding and acquiring the 'rules and conventions' which underpin the way knowledge is constructed and accessed.

5.4.3.12.6 Review procedure

The Quality Assurance Committee should set up a sub-committee (Language Policy Review Committee) to reconsider the effectiveness of the Rhodes Language Policy at the beginning of 2008. This committee should include the following people, or their nominees: Head: Department English Language and Linguistics (Convenor); Head: Academic Development Centre; Head: Communications and Development Division; Head: School of Languages; Head: Department of English; Dean: International

Office; Registrar; Director of Finance; Human Resources Division; Director, Academic Planning and Quality Assurance; President: SRC.

The Committee will receive reports every three years from all Divisions and Departments with specific responsibilities. Its recommendations will then be submitted (via the Quality Assurance Committee Minutes) to Senate and Council for consideration. If revisions are recommended and approved, a copy of the revised policy must be widely distributed by the Committee Secretariat, and the web version must be replaced by the new policy.

5.4.3.13 The University of the Western Cape language policy

The University of the Western Cape (<http://www.uwc.ac.za>) is a multilingual university, alert to its African and international context. It is committed to helping nurture the cultural diversity of South Africa and building an equitable and dynamic society. This language policy relates to one aspect of that commitment. It attempts to guide institutional language practice so that it furthers equity, social development, and a respect for our multilingual heritage.

5.4.3.13.1 Languages of Teaching, Learning and Assessment

The languages of teaching, learning and assessment will be discussed under the following headings: language(s) used in lectures, tutorials and practicals; language(s) used in the setting of tasks/assignments/examinations; languages(s) used/allowed in the writing of assignments/examinations; language(s) in which

text material is available; language(s) students use in their self-directed learning processes and activities.

5.4.3.13.2 Languages used in lectures, tutorials and practicals

Lectures, tutorials and practicals for any module will be delivered in the language formally approved by the Faculty concerned, in accordance with the spirit of the policy. If lecturers are competent users of other languages, they are encouraged to use these languages in addition to the main language of teaching, if such a practice facilitates communication or discussion.

5.4.3.13.3 Languages used in the setting of tasks, assignments, tests and examinations

Regarding the languages used in the setting of tasks, assignments, tests and examinations, English, Afrikaans and Xhosa should be used wherever it is practicable to do so. As far as languages used in writing tasks, assignments, tests and examinations and unless otherwise negotiated between a student or a class and a lecturer, the language in which tasks, assignments, tests and examinations should be completed shall be English.

5.4.3.13.4 Languages in which texts are available

Regarding the languages in which texts are available, efforts should be made to provide alternatives and options in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa wherever it is practicable and academically desirable to do so. Texts here refer to support materials such as course outlines, lecture notes and computer courseware as well

as languages students use in self-directed learning processes and activities. Regarding the languages students use in their self-directed learning processes and activities, departments should actively seek to appoint some student tutors who can assist students in Xhosa and/or Afrikaans, as well as English.

5.4.3.13.5 Access to academic and professional discourse

All students will have access to entry-level courses aimed at strengthening their English oral and aural communication skills and improving their academic literacy in English. All students will have access to support services to assist them in developing their academic literacy in English.

5.4.3.13.6 Promoting multilingualism

The University undertakes to make language acquisition courses in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa available to both administrative and lecturing staff. All students will be encouraged, through enrichment programmes, to develop proficiency in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa.

5.4.3.13.7 Languages of internal communication

The main language of internal communication for academic and administrative purposes shall be English. However, the University will progressively make important information available in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa. Essential information such as rules will be made available in the three languages as a matter of priority. If departments for whatever reason deem it necessary, or because research into the needs of the client group

reveals a clear need, Afrikaans and Xhosa translations of formal communications should be made available, provided that it is practicable to do so.

In spoken debate and deliberation, the objective is to be understood by everyone present. Should a speaker prefer to speak in Afrikaans or Xhosa, use will be made of informal interpreting if it is practicable to do so. The University shall have staff available to assist enquirers in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa, particularly in advisory sessions and at registration and in the examination periods. In appointing administrative staff that deal directly with students, the University will make their capacity to assist students in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa a strong recommendation. In these ways it will attempt to nurture and use the abilities of all in the University community in accordance with its mission statement, and to promote multilingualism, linguistic diversity and racial harmony at UWC.

5.4.3.13.8 Languages of external communication

The language used for external communication shall normally be English, unless sensitivity to the recipient requires use of another language. If individuals request information from the university in either Afrikaans or Xhosa, the information will be translated into that language, and the translated version will be sent to the individual accompanied by the English version. In all cases the official version shall be the English version. Signage on campus will progressively be in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa. having due regard to readability and aesthetic considerations.

5.4.3.13.9 Assessment policy and responsibility for assessment

In each module, the module co-ordinator is responsible for overseeing the design of assessment exercises, for the marks given to assessment exercises and for recommending students' final grades to the Faculty Assessment Committee.

5.4.3.13.9.1 Assessing against outcomes

A learner's performance is measured against pre-determined and pre-stated expectations of achievement and competence.

5.4.3.13.9.2 Assessment criteria

The expectations of any assessment task, including the specific criteria by which such a task will be judged, shall be made clear to students from the outset, in order to ensure transparency in the process of assessment decision-making.

5.4.3.13.9.3 Validity and appropriateness

Care must be taken to ensure that the assessment methods chosen and the assessment tasks designed accurately match what is being assessed, be it knowledge, understanding, subject content, skills, information, behaviour, etc. For assessment to be valid, it must accurately measure what it claims to be measuring.

5.4.3.13.9.4 Authenticity of evidence

Lecturers must make appropriate arrangements to ensure the authenticity of assessment evidence, in other words, to ensure

that the evidence produced by the learner is in fact attributable to the learner.

5.4.3.13.9.5 Formative and summative assessment

It is expected that in all disciplines assessment, including languages, shall be both formative and summative. The purpose of summative assessment is to judge students' performance, to allocate grades and to pass or fail students. The purpose of formative assessment is to provide regular feedback to students on their progress, and such feedback should identify strengths and weaknesses and ways to improve.

5.4.3.13.9.6 The University of KwaZulu Natal language policy (amended draft 13/9/99)

The University of KwaZulu-Natal (<http://www.ukzn.ac.za>) identifies with the goals of South Africa's multilingual language policy and seeks to be a key player in the successful implementation of this policy through its own language policy and practices; fostering research in language planning and development and teaching that raises awareness of the benefits and challenges associated with multilingualism; promotes respect for and proficiency in the languages referred to in the Constitution and others that facilitate potentially valuable cultural, scientific and economic ties.

The University of KwaZulu-Natal recognises that its language policy will need to reconcile a number of competing imperatives. Two such imperatives are the need to promote the use and respect for minority languages and the need to promote proficiency in foreign languages for cultural, scientific and economic reasons, such as

scientific co-operation, tourism and international trade. Two other competing imperatives are the need to promote proficiency in English and develop and promote proficiency in official indigenous African languages. The benefits for students becoming proficient in English, the dominant medium of academic communication and of trade and industry internationally, and an increasingly important *lingua franca* in government and institutions in South Africa, are obvious. Not least important, in the context of diminishing funding, the University of KwaZulu-Natal will need to have a language policy that will not add significantly to administrative and teaching costs. The following principles are applicable:

- ❑ The principal language of learning and instruction will be English. The use of other languages, where this is clearly appropriate, will be encouraged, e.g. in language courses and where such use can facilitate understanding of academic content.
- ❑ To gain access to the University students will need to demonstrate that they have communication skills in English sufficient for them to follow lectures and to express themselves sufficiently well to demonstrate their capacity to follow lectures.
- ❑ To assist students to achieve cognitive/academic proficiency in English for academic success in their chosen fields of study, appropriate credit-bearing foundation English courses will be available for students.
- ❑ The principal language of administration will be English and all administrative documents addressed to students will be in English. For effective communication with staff, important documents will be made available in both English and isiZulu.
- ❑ The University of KwaZulu-Natal will encourage staff already in its employment to improve their proficiency in the major languages used in KwaZulu-Natal and in South Africa generally and will facilitate

the process wherever possible. Where it can be demonstrated to be beneficial, the capacity to interact with students and the wider community will count positively in the performance evaluation of staff. Multilingual competence will count positively in the hiring of staff.

- ❑ Ceremonial occasions will be used where practicable to underline the multilingual and multicultural character of South African society.
- ❑ The University of KwaZulu-Natal will, to the practical extent, promote multilingual proficiency amongst its students to ensure that they will be able to function effectively as professionals in the multilingual local context, and have proficiency in languages of wider currency in promoting international trade, tourism, cultural and academic contact.
- ❑ The University of Natal will promote research and development related to multilingualism and to the expansion of the resources and uses of indigenous South African languages so that they can be used effectively in an increasing range of prestigious public domains.
- ❑ The University's Equal opportunity/Affirmative Action committee should be tasked with monitoring progress in the implementation of the University's multilingual language policy and advising Senate.

5.5 CONCLUSION

Chapter 5 provided a comprehensive in-depth discussion and overview of the role of South African institution's languages. South Africa's language diversity which has been described by Kamwangamalu (2001) as having the most progressive language policy provisions on the African continent, led the debate. Legislation dealing with the use of languages was also deliberated on in length such as the Multilingualism Bill, the Pan South African Language Board Act, Republic of South African Schools Bill, the South African Languages Bill and so on. Supportive policy

documents also took its turn. Language infrastructure, language planning agencies etc. (refer chapter 5, paragraph 5.2.1.1.) were also outlined. South African language policies, plans and practices, the linguistic landscape at South African universities and a number of university language policies were put on the table.

In reflecting on concluding the chapter, the researcher sets out to make a comparative study of the language policies of South African institutions of higher education. The purpose was also to establish differences, similarities and possible trends with regard to language policy. The idea was also to research language policies in terms of common ground for uniformity and diversity on the other hand. Universities take into consideration the realities of the economic and sociolinguistic context with which it is challenged.

In all of the policies of the institutions which responded (10 universities and 4 universities of technology) the declaration of intent is to promote and attain multilingualism. Generally, in the researcher's opinion, language, language policy and language planning is not taken seriously. In the light of this and with regard to language policy, stronger, more vigorous language policy statements are required at all institutions as a matter of urgency. The researcher is also of the opinion that it is an unrealistic, impossible dream to expect the implementation of multilingualism. Institutions of higher learning would be crippled financially and academically. The simple fact of the matter is that South Africa has a language policy involving eleven official languages which is expensive, needs extensive resources, specialisation and infrastructure which the country does not have.

In a review of the language policies of higher education institutions in South Africa, the format and nature of the language policies to a large degree differ from one institution to another. The researcher is of the opinion that just as higher institutions have mission statements, so too, should they have language policy statements. Policy statements are used to designate a straightforward statement or declaration and are usually short and concise and do not include background information or discussion relative to the policy. In reading the language policies of some historically advantaged universities, the impression is that it is a position paper. Here background information is given and discussed and the rationale behind the position(s) are set out, for example where English or Afrikaans is defended.

There are guidelines for contextualisation but these directives are not always utilised, for example, PANSALB provides guidelines for language planning and policy development as well as a language policy framework for South African higher education provided by the Council on Higher Education (2001:10-14). PANSALB (2001:6-7) suggests that a language policy document should contain at least the following information in its outline of a language policy and planning document: - In terms of a preamble the following should be addressed, namely, constitutional obligations, recognition and acceptance of linguistic diversity, equal language rights and aims and objectives of the language policy that follows. As far as contextualisation is concerned, the following should be addressed: Current practice in the organisation, the need for change, benefits of harnessing linguistic resources, language preferences, language rights, optimal use of linguistic resources, functional multilingualism and cost effective language policy development.

The Council on Higher Education (2001:10-14) provides a language policy framework for South African Higher Education. For the sake of brevity only the most salient recommendations will be flagged. The recommended policy framework is divided into three categories, namely, steps that can be implemented immediately, measures that can be undertaken in the short term and proposals for medium to long term. In terms of measures that can be implemented immediately, all higher education institutions must submit full statistics reflecting the position of languages of tuition and formal academic languages, a language policy document, spell out the role of indigenous languages and earmark funds for the implementation of language related activities. Measures to be undertaken in the short term include developing a specific language policy and participate in facilitating and promoting the goal of the national language policy. As far as medium to long term measures are concerned, Centres for Language Development should be identified and a step by step development plan should be formulated for each of the relevant languages to be used as languages of tuition.

The Language Policy for Higher Education (2002:15) requires all higher education institutions to develop their own language policy subject to the policy framework provided. Du Plessis (2005:15) contends that in designing such a policy, institutions should be clear on what is required in terms of language policy design, for example, what does language policy consist of in terms of the framework as suggested by the Language Policy for Higher education? As far as language policy design is concerned, it must be borne in mind that a written (overt) policy is intended. A well-formulated document that regulates explicitly the use of language in the various operational domains of the institutions (see staff and student questionnaire in

the addendum) that is lecture room, research, administration etc. Du Plessis (2005:17) further emphasises that the document should spell out the monitoring of the policy. The document must be short and simple. The language policy should inform a comprehensive plan as well. The language plan should assist management to implement the decisions on language policy. Thus, a language plan is more detailed reflecting strategies, timeframes and involve details regarding language development course, language certification and so on.

Roodt's (2001:5) interpretation of the criteria for the evaluation of language policy in the higher education environment is that a number of general requirements for the declaration of language policy can be identified. Language policy must, for example, be in writing and be made available (a legal requirement). Both the ideal and the language reality of the institution must be sketched. In addition, how the reality can be reconciled with the ideal must be described. Furthermore, the language policy must contain guidelines for the language practice which concretises the policy on tertiary level, especially with regard to strategic interpretation during lectures. The policy must also translate key text, provide additional assistance to students and lecturers to improve language skills and make available selected texts in more than one language, demonstrate a willingness to test the validity of inferences in practice and to bring about amendments or refinement to the policy.

According to Roodt (2001:5 - 7), PANSALB envisages to promote language diversity and respect for language diversity and respect for language rights by means of multilingual functionality. PANSALB wants institutions to move away from rigid monolingualism in order to make space for marginalised languages. Considerations which

play a role in decisions by PANSALB about language policy includes, amongst others, the necessity to be able to prove that the institution has completed an investigation. In the higher education institution environment a number of factors can be looked at, for example, the language preference and use by students (and their parents) and personnel, language proficiency levels of students, personnel and intending staff members, language attitudes amongst students, lecturers, management and society, the necessity of consultation with not only the stakeholders but also with the Department of Art, Culture, Science and Technology and the necessity to request that regular language planning be done on the basis of the results of language investigations which are commensurate with the results.

The following assessment of the various language policies is not to laud or to denigrate the various language policies of South African higher education institutions but rather to support institutions in decision making processes and to possibly assist institutions in helping students to have a better understanding of their subject content, staff members to have insight into problematic issues of language policy and planning and the communities who are the reason for the existence of higher institutions. Put differently, if you take away the student variable, the reason for the existence of the institution is declared null and void. The researcher is of the opinion that lecturing staff is dependent on student intake for employment. If there are no students, lecturers cannot lecture and do not have work.

On a positive note, some of the 14 policies selected for evaluation have many positive features, for example, the policy is designed to be commensurate with constitutional, legislative requirements as

well as statute requirements, for example, Section 6 and 29 (2) of the Constitution of South Africa Section 27(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1997, the National Plan for Higher Education of 2001, the Centre for Higher Education Transformation analysis report of 2003 (Gormitza 2003), the Gerwel Committee Report (2002) etc. One other similarity and somewhat glaring at times is the absolute slavish, if not euphoric commitment to multilingualism of 10 of the institutions and in one instance, 'functional multilingualism'. In the main, Language Policy for Higher Education (2002) requirements appear to have been consulted.

One other positive feature, chiefly, is the concerted effort of institutions to marry the reality with the ideal, for example, the status of English and Afrikaans as academic languages and efforts made to accommodate other languages. The ideal to accommodate competence amongst students and staff in South African languages also comes strongly to the fore. It is heartening that in 10 of the institutions there is recognition and acceptance of linguistic diversity.

However, on the downside there are a number of negative policy issues that needs to be put on the table. Throughout the policy statements of the historically Afrikaans and English institutions there is the tendency to be very lengthy, unnecessarily verbose if not bombastic, for example, 'an intellectual home,' 'excellence in academic communication', 'engagement with knowledge' 'foreseeable future,' 'academic discourse,' 'the diversity of disciplinary communities' and so on. On the other extreme side there are policy statements which are far too short, one sentence or a few sentences completes the policy statement.

These documents also abound with 'legal jargon' such as 'shall,' 'will' and so on. The idea is that it is something that is still going to happen but not now. Du Plessis (2005:2) maintains that some language policy statements create the impression of a declaration of intention rather than of a policy. Some researchers also speak of 'escape clauses.' Webb (1997:6), for example, refers to, 'fair and feasible,' 'affordable,' 'academically justifiable' and 'economically viable.' The impression given is that they do not serve a useful purpose in policy implementation.

The majority of the institutions (12 out of 14) attests to its pursuance of multilingualism but does not elaborate on its policy of multilingualism *per se*. No clear indication is given on what is envisaged by multilingualism and, in essence, multilingualism is used rather loosely and without any focus. One of the institutions makes use of the terms, 'functional multilingualism' and 'an accommodative multilingual framework' but without any end in sight.

Of the 14 policies under review, only one is accompanied by a comprehensive well-thought out specific plan of implementation. The implementation plan thoroughly details how it plans to achieve the goals of the policy. Clear specifications are also given of what needs to be done, the person/s responsible, timeframes and how this is to be effected. Three other institutions refer to the question of implementation but in some cases, there is no evidence of a development and implementation of a communication plan. Mention is also not made of language measures and guidelines for a development and implementation plan. There is also no mention made to, for example, the evaluation of results, questionnaires to gauge the satisfaction of the tertiary fraternity or the setting in

motion of a process in corrective measures or the development of a follow up plan (promotion of languages, staff support in terms of training in African languages and English, supporting students by offering tuition in English and Afrikaans, etc.).

Of vital importance, in the opinion of the researcher, is the question of a sociolinguistic audit/and or research. According to Webb (1997:12), language policy and development and language planning is a rational and a systematic exercise and thus language policy and language planning must be based on facts and not just ideology. It is thus necessary that facts relevant to language policy and language planning such as languages and their distribution in an institution, the language proficiency of all at the institution, linguistic preferences, language attitudes and so, on be collated. In the policies reviewed these scientific facts do not permeate the language policies.

In sum, institutions need to be lauded and congratulated in dealing with the implementing of a language policy aimed at utilising indigenous languages with its manifold advantages. A great deal has been said in this chapter about the Constitution, some very imposing language planning decisions as well as the many important supporting structures quoted, but it can categorically be stated, and the researcher cannot help but to agree with Webb (1999:12), that very little seems to have changed in the language practice of institutions of higher learning and South African communities. Furthermore, Webb (1999:14) indicates that there are signs that South Africa is regressing to where it was before the Apartheid era and that the country was becoming more and more monolingual in its public life.

CHAPTER 6: EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION IN THE PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE POLICIES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Peterson (2005:1) argues that language is education and language is culture and describes language as an important tool for daily communication between individuals. Senkoro (2004:1) points out that language plays an important role in our daily lives, for example, it has played and continues to play an important function in learning and teaching processes. Because language enables teaching and learning activities to be well accomplished, both teachers and learners should be familiar with the language to be used. Malekela (2004:8) contends that if learners and even teachers are incompetent in the language which is used as a medium of instruction, then the learning process cannot take place effectively. In this case, language can simultaneously play conflicting roles in the educational sphere. It can be a factor in either providing or withholding access to education.

Educators and learners should be familiar with the language which is used, because effective language usage enables teaching and learning activities to be accomplished optimally. However, if a student and even a lecturer are not competent in the language which is used as medium of instruction, the learning process cannot take place effectively. Language can be a factor in either providing or withholding access and success to education (Peterson 2005:1).

A worrying factor to the researcher is whether first year incoming students have had the same language of instruction in their final

matriculation year (grade 12) as the language of instruction that the institution of higher learning is going to offer. The researcher's reason for this dilemma is that many a student, from personal experience, would come to the office of the DVC: Student Services at the Central University of Technology, Free State. and ask if they could speak in Sesotho if they had a query. (The researcher was Personal Assistant to the DVC: Student Services) The concern is what happens in class during instruction time and student and lecturer interaction?

6.2 POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AT HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

De Klerk (1997:3) quotes Alexander (2000), Desai (1999), du Plessis (1995), Mc Clean (1999) and Webb (1999) and declares that many analyses that have been offered as to why implementation of a multilingual policy has not happened on a large scale focus by and large on matters such as the unassailable hegemony of English or a lack of political will. Added to this, according De Klerk (1997:5), the human rights framework itself has innate limitations in South Africa where it is coupled with the alleged stigma associated with mother tongue promotion. Furthermore, the constitution provides a human rights framework for promoting and supporting multilingualism but enforceable clauses are lacking.

Hogwood and Gunn (1984:29) points out that an institution needs brains, strong planning, resources, and authority to act and complete understanding of the goals of the organisation in an attempt to successfully implement its policies. Sabitier and Mazmanian (1981:19) asserts that statutes or objectives of the policy should be clear and unambiguous and that the implementing

agency must be sympathetic to the objectives of the policy. Linder and Peters (1990:16) support this view, because of the argument that these conditions were necessary because they would ensure compliance down the line.

On the other hand, Mmusi (1999:24) argues further that a policy is unlikely to be implemented if there is a shortage of financial and human resources. Factors which hinder or are deterrents for successful policy implementation are often vague, multiple and conflicting policy objectives which include poor communication of policies.

6.3 SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Universities and Universities of Technology in South Africa are autonomous institutions, meaning that their respective Councils are fully responsible for their management. The role of higher education in South Africa is threefold, namely, 'human resource development for mobilisation of human talent and potential through lifelong learning in order to contribute to the social, economic, cultural and intellectual life of a changing society'. Secondly, high level skills training – the training and provision of person power is needed to strengthen the country's enterprises, services and infrastructure. Thirdly, there is part played by production, acquisition and application of new knowledge (Department of Tourism 2005:1).

6.4. POLITICAL LANGUAGE BACKGROUND TO SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

English is the major language of public life in South Africa, Afrikaans can be said to be a minority language in public life and

the African languages, though numerically larger, can be said to be minoritised languages (Webb, 2005:3). In 1994 there were 36 higher education public institutions in South Africa of which 21 were universities and 15 were institutions for technological training called technikons. Two universities were bilingual (the former university of Port Elizabeth and the University of South Africa/Unisa) and nineteen monolingual institutions, namely, five Afrikaans and fourteen English (Webb 2005:3).

Presently, after the recent merges and incorporations there are 16 universities and five universities of technology. Du Plessis (2005:9) makes the point that there are no longer wholly Afrikaans institutions of higher education and none that uses an African language for tertiary teaching and research. Since 1994, the criteria for admission of students to tertiary institutions were changed so that access to higher education institutions may not be denied on the basis of language, that equity be encouraged and that the results of past racially discriminatory laws and practices be redressed. This has brought about a dramatic change to the demographic character of formerly White South African institutions. The Government has also indicated that it prefers parallel/ dual medium institutions because such institutions will enhance inter-group contact and promote diversity (Webb 2005:3).

South Africa's universities are leading the way in Africa according to Webb (2005:4). Recently restructured, the country's public higher education institutions offer a range of study and research options for both national and international students. The restructuring focussed and, in some cases, re-configured the programmes on offer at South Africa's universities which still reflected the structure and priorities of the old apartheid based system. Hereunder, follows

an alphabetical list of South Africa's 21 universities (Department of Tourism 2005:1).

TABLE 6.1: Merges and incorporations of universities and universities of technology

	University/University of Technology	Comments
1.	Cape Peninsula University of Technology	Incorporating the former Cape and Peninsula Technikon, the university is the largest in the Western Cape – English and Afrikaans medium of instruction.
2.	Central University of Technology	Incorporated the former Technikon Free State and Vista University (Welkom campus). Although language of instruction is English, the university plans to offer parallel instruction in Afrikaans and Sesotho.
3.	Durban Institute of Technology	Incorporated the former ML Sultan, Natal and Mangosotho Technikon, as well as the former University of Zululand (Umlazi campus).
4.	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	Incorporated the former PE Technikon, University of Port Elizabeth and Vista University (Port Elizabeth campus).
5.	North West University	Incorporated in the former University of Bophuthatswana, the North West University offers parallel instruction in English, Afrikaans and Setswana

		spread over four campuses and is experimenting with similar instruction on its Potchefstroom campus.
6.	Rhodes University	Situated in the Eastern Cape town of Grahamstown.
7.	Stellenbosch University	Situated in the wine-growing region of Stellenbosch. The university has four campuses.
8.	Tswane University of Technology	Incorporated the former Northern Gauteng, North West and Pretoria Technikon.
9.	University of Cape Town	The University of Cape Town is the country's oldest university.
10.	University of Fort Hare	Fort Hare has three Eastern Cape campuses in Alice, Bisho and East London.
11.	University of Johannesburg	Incorporated the former Rand Afrikaans University, Technikon Witwatersrand and Vista University (Johannesburg campuses).
12.	University of KwaZulu-Natal	Incorporated the former Durban-Westville and Natal universities and covers five campuses in Durban and Pietermaritzburg.
13.	University of Limpopo	Formerly the University of the North and is situated in South Africa's Limpopo province.
14.	University of Pretoria	Officially established in 1930 and one of South Africa's largest institutions.
15.	University of South Africa	Incorporated the former Unisa, Technikon SA and Vista (distance

		education), the Pretoria based University of South Africa offers distance education programmes.
16.	University of the Free State	Incorporated into the University of QwaQwa and established in 1904, the university is home to around 16 000 students.
17.	University of the Western Cape	Originally established as an ethnic college for 'Coloured' students and has now grown into internationally recognised institution.
18.	University of the Witwatersrand	Situated in Johannesburg, Wits University is one of the country's leading research institutions.
19.	University of Venda	The University of Venda for Science and Technology is situated in Thohoyandou in Limpopo.
20.	Vaal University of Technology	The university has its main campus in Vanderbijlpark, 60 km south-west of Johannesburg and four satellite campuses which include the Sebokeng campus of the former Vista University.
21.	Walter Sisulu University	Incorporated the former Border and Eastern Cape Technikon and the University of the Transkei – spread across campuses in East London, Butterworth, Queenstown and Mthatha.

6.5

EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE POLICIES

Part of the study involved an empirical investigation of several language policies of universities and universities of technology as indicated in Chapter 5. Both qualitative and quantitative research was used. Qualitative research appealed to the researcher because it is a descriptive, analytical and interpretive method. Since documents such as language legislative prescriptions, policy guidelines and language policy and language planning documents, etcetera were needed, the researcher could focus on depth of information rather than breadth. Truth and objectivity of reality could be ascertained in terms of responses to issues concerning language policy at institutions. Characteristic of qualitative research, an interpretive approach could be followed to ascertain how students and staff feel about language policy implementation. Quantitative research was used in the quantification and analysis of findings.

Employing the interview in the research methodology provided for conversation, the asking of questions and listening. This served as a spring board to get the respondents more intimately involved as to how they think and feel about the language issues. The advantage was that a wealth of detail and accurate responses were provided. However, although the interview provides the opportunity to follow up on reasons for a response, motives, feelings, etc. the interview technique also has its own limitations.

Informal, semi-structured and formal staff questionnaires (faculty, administrative, instructional staff, cleaners, employees, etc.) regarding matters pertaining to staff were used. For students,

informal, semi-structured and formal questionnaires were used to assess multilingual aspects of university experience regarding language policy. In using the questionnaire as a method of research, it was possible to focus on important aspects such as reliability and validity especially as far as the issue of language policy is concerned. The aim in using the questionnaire was also to elicit responses which were evaluative and analytical. A variety of questions were used such as, for example, open-ended questions which were aimed at eliciting the respondents' broader perspective to language policies and its implementation at universities and universities of technology.

As can be seen from Chapter 5 of the study the format, scope and nature of the various language policies differ from one institution to another. These language policies take the form of a written (overt) document as required. Bruen (2003:1) informs us that a language policy defines the language learning profile of an institution by presenting a considered view of the diversity of languages to be offered and to whom. Furthermore, policies generally also describe the decision-making structures required to facilitate their development and implementation as well as at least some of the following: teaching and learning procedures designed to support and encourage language learning, desired language learning outcomes, the monitoring and evaluation of student achievement and the quality of language teaching and learning and, finally, the training and professional development of teachers.

The Language Policy for Higher Education (2002) requires that all higher education institutions will develop an own language policy. In designing their own language policy, institutions are provided with the necessary framework and which addresses the following issues:

- ❑ Languages of instruction;
- ❑ The future of South African languages as fields of academic study and research;
- ❑ The study of foreign languages;
- ❑ The promotion of multilingualism in the institutional policies and practices.

By way of background information and perhaps for further elucidation it would be wise to note that the South African student population is linguistically diverse as is indicated in the table below of the breakdown of the home language of students registered in public universities and technikons in 2002. As indicated, although English and Afrikaans are the two most frequently reported home languages, the extent of linguistic diversity is evident in the fact that 50% of total student enrolments report an indigenous language or another language as home language. The extent of linguistic diversity within individual institutions depends on the degree to which students are recruited locally, regionally or nationally.

Table 6.2: The extent of linguistic diversity within individual institutions

Home language	Universities	Technikons	Total	% of total enrolments
Afrikaans	71,979	27,363	99,342	16
English	136,957	55,509	192,466	32
IsiNdebele	2,641	637	3,278	1
IsiXhosa	38,247	28,396	66,643	11
IsiZulu	39,363	28,509	67,872	11
SeSotho	22,176	15,597	37,773	6
SeSotho sa Lebowa	20,818	10,332	31,150	5
Setswana	19,661	15,542	35,203	6

SiSwati	4,236	2,242	6,478	1
Tshivenda	9,199	4,817	14,016	2
Xitsonga	9,239	5,547	14,786	2
Other language	21,319	4,070	25,389	4
Language unknown	6,294	4,805	11,099	2
TOTAL	402,129	203,366	605,495	100

Language Policy for Higher Education (2002:6-7)

6.6 DATA GATHERING: THE SURVEY

Questionnaires were developed by reflecting on the relevant literature as well as looking at questionnaires in similar and other studies especially at tertiary level. Because of the general trend of low response rates an attempt was made by the researcher to reward respondents by showing positive regard, maintain a consultative approach and to make the questionnaire interesting. An attempt was also made to make the task of completing the questionnaire easier by taking into consideration the level of proficiency of students in English.

The empirical research was initiated at the end of March 2005. Questionnaires were sent to the 21 universities in the country (after the mergers/incorporations had taken place) since 2003. Two sets of questionnaires were sent out, one for completion by members of staff (see Addendum C, p. 209) and the other for students (see Addendum D, p. 212) together with letters soliciting their assistance. One of the reasons was to test validity in terms of, for example, whether the institution has a language policy indeed of which all were aware of and whether the policy was in fact

implemented. In addition, to assess validity in terms of language policy with regard to both staff and students as far as, for example, whether students/staff do or do not have the choice of language he or she wishes to be addressed in. Furthermore, apart from drawing on staff input, by embracing student participation one would be involving the most important stakeholder who matters the most, namely the student.

6.6.1 Purpose of the survey

1. The survey had the following aims in mind as far as students (Addendum D) are concerned:
 - (a) To obtain information on the present situation concerning language policy among institutions and to assist those interested in developing the design of their language policies.
 - (b) What are the issues that need attention with regard to language policy which affects students adversely?
 - (c) Is the institution student-friendly as far as their preferred language is concerned on campus in all operational domains?
 - (d) Does the institution make a case for multilingualism, if at all, in their language policy and plans?

2. The survey had the following aims in mind as far as staff (Addendum C) is concerned:
 - (a) To obtain information on the present situation concerning language policy among institutions and to assist those interested in developing the design of their language policies.
 - (b) To discover which institutions have language policies and what the main focus is and the relevancy thereof.

- (c) To establish whether language policies are being implemented and what the issues that need to be addressed to improve student performance are.
- (d) Do the staff have a say in policy input, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
- (e) To obtain information on the current situation, in particular, in the area of languages in the institutions surveyed from which language policies may be inferred where they are not explicitly stated.

6.6.2 Research findings

6.6.2.1 Brief overview of existing policies

This part of the study focussed on the questionnaire by capturing existing policies as they were formulated by the various South African universities.

Question 1.1 Does your institution have a language policy?

As indicated, questionnaires were sent (refer Addendum D) to the recently restructured country's 21 public higher education institutions (refer paragraph 6.4 for list of institutions) – questionnaires were addressed to the SRC Presidents, SRC Sabbaticals, Vice-Chancellors and Registrars of the relevant institutions. A decision was made to target these students (SRC Presidents and SRC Sabbaticals because they make regular, daily contact with most students). As a staff member of the Central University of Technology, Free State, the researcher wrote a letter to the Registrar who is also the compliance officer for the institution's language policy, requesting permission to administer

the questionnaire to students and staff. The purpose was to pilot the survey and to get the general feel of the response.

In regard to the first request (refer to addendum A) for a copy of the institution's language policy, out of the 21 institutions, 14 institutions responded and 11 students responded. This accumulated to 67% for staff members and 52% respectively for students (See table 6.1 and 6.2). The researcher can only but surmise that institutions who did not respond, do in fact have draft policies and that restructuring (mergers/incorporations) had some role to play in that some policies are not fully developed as yet. However, the researcher did come across policies of the older institutions such as RAU, the University of Natal and the University of South Africa. Apart from repeated requests and searches on the internet, language policies of the following institutions could not be secured, namely, The Durban University of Technology, The University of Fort Hare, The University of Limpopo, The University of Venda and The Walter Sisulu University.

Table 6.3: Language policies – availability (Staff response)

	Respondents	Response %	Non response %
Questionnaires (Staff)	14	67	33
TOTAL	21	100	

Table 6.4: Language policies – availability (Student response)

	Respondents	Response %	Non response %
Questionnaires (Students)	11	52	48
TOTAL	21	100	

6.6.2.2 Knowledge about the institution's language policy

Question 1.2 Do you know what the language policy is all about?

Table 6.5: Knowledge of institution's language policy (Staff)

	Yes		No	
	Count	%	Count	%
Do you know what the language policy is about? (Staff)	12	86%	2	14%

Table 6.6: Knowledge of institution's language policy (Students)

	Yes		No	
	Count	%	Count	%
Do you know what the language policy is about? (Students)	4	36%	7	64%

A significant number of staff members (86%) indicated that they understood what the language policy of their institution was about and 14% replied in the negative. The aim of this question was to test whether there was some form of language policy practised or not. This also affirms that the institution does indeed have a language policy. The idea was also to determine the extent to which policies are being developed. Conversely 64% of the student responses indicated that they did not have knowledge of the language policy of their institution and the researcher could deduce from the responses and their later responses (refer 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.10.1, and 1.10.2) that they were not consulted or had not received any form of orientation.

6.6.2.3 Formulation of language policy

Question 1.3 Do you agree with the formulation of the contents and find it acceptable?

With reference to this question, 86% of the same staff respondents confirmed that they agreed with the formulation of the policy and found it acceptable. Students responded to the contrary with regard to 1.3. As indicated in the questionnaire, few students had been informed about the language policy and that made it difficult for them to comment on the formulation let alone the acceptability of the language policy *per se*.

6.6.2.4 Coherent, structured, co-ordinated and precise implementation of language policy

Question 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7 (Has the Language Policy of your institution been implemented in a coherent, structured, co-ordinated precise manner in your opinion? Do you view the policy as a good one or a bad choice? Give reasons why you say it is a good or why it is a bad one). These four questions were grouped together (refer to Addendum C) to save space and because the purpose is to assess to what extent the language policy has been implemented.

From an analysis of the answers to questions 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7, it can be concluded that 43% of staff at the institutions under survey gave an indication that although the policy was in place, its practical execution was not precise, nor was it functioning effectively in all the operational domains of the institution (refer question 3). However, 86% agreed with the formulation of the contents of the policy and pointed out that it is first rate showing that they do not have a problem with a policy with which they could

identify which is clear, unambiguous and well-formulated. The response rate of students accumulated to 30% revealing that these students were in favour of a policy which was clearly set out and which they understood. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that although the policy is a written (overt) one in theory, it does not appear to be applied in practice.

The following general responses were given by respondents and quoted verbatim regarding the reasons given why the policy can be described as bad (refer to question 1.6 as responded to by staff).

- 'Bad – on demand classes must be given in both English and Afrikaans, even to small classes of 2 or 3 students'.
- 'Not all participate – gaps in the policy, some people might feel excluded'.
- 'Not all correspondence is sent in all three languages'.
- 'It doesn't work!'
- 'What about multilingualism'?
- 'We don't get informed about these things – nobody knows what's happening'.

However, there were some positive reasons given why the policy could be described as good:

- 'It complies with (a) PANSALB's requirements which calls for equitable treatment of the Eastern Cape's predominant language (English and Afrikaans) and isiXhosa.
- 'It complies with Constitutional requirements'.
- 'Because it caters for the majority of the provincial population'.
- 'Good practical and realistic; transparent'.

- 'Takes into account diversified Free State cultures, need some kind of structure to co-ordinate language usage and it's good that English is used mainly – it is universal, Afrikaans and Sotho are secondary'.

6.6.2.5 Monitoring procedures and follow up measures

Question 1.8 and 1.9 (Has any monitoring procedures or follow up measures been put into place to ensure that the Language Policy has actually been put in practice?). These two questions (refer to Addendum C and Addendum D) have been grouped together to save space and because the purpose is to assess to what extent the language policy has been monitored.

79% of staff and 82% of students specified that there were no set rules, policy or procedures in place. Item 1.9 was left blank in all cases with no comment of what these procedures were or explanation given.

6.6.2.6 Consultation of the language policy for comments and inputs

Question 1.10, 1.10.1, 1.10.2 (Has the Language Policy been consulted upon for comments/inputs/recommendations?)

64% of staff of the institutions who responded (refer Addendum C) indicated that the policy had gone out for consultation and 27% of students (refer Addendum D) indicated that it had been received for their inputs. The people consulted and involved in reviewing the language policy for making inputs as indicated on the questionnaire were: Language Policy Committees, Senates, Institutional Forums, SRCs, Heads of Department, Trade Unions, Legal Services, Lecturers, Professors and Programme Heads.

6.6.2.7 Audit of language policy

Question 2 (Has a comprehensive study or any audit been done of the language policy of the institution on any aspect or a theme audit, for e.g. client satisfaction, customer care or student needs or an element of a programme component such as the availability in official languages of regular and widely used work instruments (policy documents and procedural manuals)?

43% of staff members and 36% of students were aware of an audit that had been done with regard to language matters.

Table 6.7: Language policy audit (Staff)

	Count	%
Has a study or any audit been done of the Language Policy of the Institution? (Staff)		
Yes	6	43%
No	2	14%
Unsure	6	43%
Total	14	100%

Table 6.8: Language policy audit (Students)

	Count	%
Has a study or any audit been done of the Language Policy of the Institution? (Students)		
Yes	4	36%
No	1	9%
Unsure	6	55%
Total	11	100%

6.6.2.8 Language used for tuition and administrative matters

Question 3 What languages/language is/are used during lectures, tutorials, seminars, practicals and examinations? What is the language preference of students, academic and administrative staff and general staff?

In respect of languages used at institutions during lectures, tutorials, seminars, practicals and examinations, 79% of the lecturers largely use English, 14 % both English and Afrikaans and another 14% use Afrikaans most of the time. With regard to the language used for the functioning of administrative matters, English is predominantly used at the historically English speaking institutions for internal oral and written communication, official documents, forms, reports, notices and so on. However, depending on the province, respondents indicated that notices, forms, reports, signage and posters were translated from English into Afrikaans and into the dominant language of the province. From an analysis of the data, it can be concluded that academic and administrative work (meetings, graduation ceremonies, and social functions) as well as the business of the day, English usage translates into being used by 86% of the respondents because of the hegemonic position of English. Similarly, 82% of student respondents indicated that they were obliged to use English for academic and administrative matters; 64% revealed that they used English in other situations.

6.6.2.9 Language Policy issues (staff, Addendum C)

Question 4 What are the issues which impacts negatively or positively on implementation?

Table 6.9: Negative or positive impact on implementation (Staff)

	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Don't know	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
No matters deserving attention					14	100%				
All staff should be made aware of their rights and responsibilities with regards to Language Policy on a regular, ongoing basis	8	57%	6	43%						
Official language of choice is not respected and treated with disdain			3	21%			10	72%	1	7%
English and Afrikaans speakers are treated differently	3	21%			4	29%	4	29%	3	21%
Personal services (benefits, health services, administrative matters, data processing, counselling, financial queries, etc. are not offered to staff/students in the official language of their choice			2	14%	4	29%	5	36%	3	21%
Communication channels to address queries, written or verbal are not satisfactorily addressed in the official languages			2	14%	4	29%	5	36%	3	21%
Grievances/student unrest or staff/student dissatisfaction are generally handled in the official language of choice of the staff member/student	4	28,8%	4	28,6%			4	28,6%	2	14%
Staff does not have the choice of language he/she wants to be addressed in	1	7%	1	7%	4	29%	5	36%	3	21%
Senior staff members are not adequately capable of functioning in the language chosen by the student			4	29%	2	14%	8	57%		
Regular and widely used work instruments (e.g. policy documents, manuals of procedure and policy) are provided to students and staff in the official language			3	21%	4	29%	4	29%	3	21%
Lectures are given in English or Afrikaans depending on the students	4	29%	5	36%	2	14%	3	21%		
The language policy and language situation is acceptable as is and must not change	5	36%	4	29%	3	21%	2	14%		

Lecturers should be allowed to teach in English and Afrikaans	4	29%	4	29%	3	21%	3	21%		
There should be separate lectures for English and Afrikaans students	6	42,8%	3	21,4%	3	21,4%	2	14,4%		
Training and development courses for staff and students are offered in Afrikaans only	2	14,3%	2	14,3%	8	57,1%	2	14,3%		
Employees/students are satisfied with the use of English and Afrikaans as official languages	3	21%	3	21%	4	29%	4	29%		
Communication between the offices of the institution does not comply with the language policy of the institution	4	29%	5	36%	1	7%	1	7%	3	21%

The essence of the framing of these questions served to reawaken and to draw the attention of staff members to those language issues which are vital for the realisation of language policy and not what is just written on paper. Indeed, the responses would enable the researcher and others to explore and highlight the standpoints of staff with regard to the implementation of their particular, individual institutional language policies in terms of philosophical and scientific discourse. Herewith, an analysis of the findings:

- 100% of respondents (staff) confirmed the importance with regard to consultation and making input by emphasising that there were matters deserving attention.
- 100% of respondents (staff) recognised the importance of being aware of their rights, responsibilities and obligations with regard to language policy (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- 78% rated respect for choice of language as a matter of course (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or unsure* for the relevant statement above).

- ❑ 58% rated the treatment meted out to speakers of English and Afrikaans in a balanced way (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or do not know* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ Personal services not being offered in the official language of choice were rated by more than half (65%) of the respondents (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or do not know/ unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ Queries were satisfactorily addressed and was agreed upon by more than 65% of the respondents (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 57% of the respondents rated the handling of grievance dissatisfaction as being done in the language of choice (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 65% of the respondents indicated in their rating that they had the choice of being addressed in the language demanded by them (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 71% emphasised that senior staff members were capable of functioning in the language chosen by the student (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 58% of respondents acknowledged that regular and widely used work instruments were provided to students and staff (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 65% of respondents confirmed that lectures were given in English and Afrikaans depending on the student (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 65% accepted the present language policy (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).

- ❑ 58% of respondents decided that lecturers should be allowed to teach in English and Afrikaans (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* or *unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 64% of respondents made a plea for separate lectures for English and Afrikaans students (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 71% of respondents showed their disapproval for the claim that courses were offered in Afrikaans only (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or unsure* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 58% of respondents did not concede to the notion that students were satisfied with the use of English and Afrikaans as official languages (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 64% corroborated that communication between the various offices did not comply with the language policy of the institution.

6.6.2.10 Language Policy issues (Students, Addendum C)

Questions having a bearing on students were put to students with regard to language policy matters which overlap with those questions put to staff.

Question 4 What are the issues which impacts negatively or positively on implementation?

Table 6.10: Negative or positive impact on implementation (Students)

	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Don't know	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
No matters deserving attention					9	82%	2	18%		0%
Students should be aware of their rights and responsibilities with regards to Language Policy and be informed on a regular, ongoing basis	10	91%	1	9%						0%

Class tutorials/examinations/tests/handouts/assignments should be in Afrikaans and English or in the language of choice of the student who can then respond in English or Afrikaans	8	73%	1	9%			2	18%		0%
Notes/handouts/timetables/messages should be in English and Afrikaans and the predominant language of the Province	6	55%	1	9%	1	9%	3	27%		0%
Some lecturers speak too fast, are in a hurry and should explain the tasks and learning material in a less hurried way	2	18,2%	2	18,2%	3	27,2%	4	36,4%		0%
Communication channels to address queries, written or verbal are not satisfactorily addressed in the official languages	3	27,2%	2	18,2%	3	27,3%	3	27,3%		0%
Student grievances/student dissatisfaction are generally not handled in the official language of choice of the student			4	36,36%	4	36,36%	3	27,28%		0%
Students do not have the choice of language he/she wants to be addressed in			4	36,36%	3	27,28%	4	36,36%		0%
Lecturers are not adequately capable of functioning in the language chosen by the student	2	18,2%	2	18,2%	4	36,4%	3	27,2%		0%
Regular and widely used work instruments (e.g. policy documents, manuals of procedure and policy) are not provided to students in the official language of choice	5	45,4%	4	36,4%			2	18,2%		0%
Lectures are given in English or Afrikaans depending on the lecturers	2	18,2%	2	18,2%	3	27,3%	4	36,3%		0%
The language policy and language situation is acceptable as is and must not change	1	9%	6	55%	4	36%				0%
Lecturers should be able to teach in English and Afrikaans	3	27,3%	3	27,3%	3	27,3%	2	18,1%		0%

There should be separate lectures for English and Afrikaans students	3	27,3%	3	27,3%	1	9,1%	4	36,3%		0%
Lectures are offered in Afrikaans only					4	36%	6	55%	1	9%
The use of an African language is rarely used in lectures	9	82%	2	18%						0%
Lecturers should respond in the same language when asked a question by a student be it Afrikaans or English	5	45,5%	5	45,5%					1	9%
English and African students insist that lectures	2	18,2%	2	18,2%	3	27,3%	4	36,3%		0%

must be in English even though the lecturer and students are Afrikaans speaking										
Very little transformation has taken place and the whole institution is still Afrikaans orientated	3	27,3%	2	18,1%	3	27,3%	3	27,3%		0%
There should be more lecturing staff of other races so that students can feel at ease and have a will to participate in class discussion	1	9%	6	55%			4	36%		0%

- 100% of respondents (students) acknowledged the importance with regard to consultation and making input by emphasising that there were indeed matters deserving attention.
- 100% of respondents (students) substantiated the importance of being aware of their rights, responsibilities and obligations with regard to language policy (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- 82% of the respondents rated the importance of the advantage of having academic matters made available in the language of ones choice (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- The importance of notes/ handouts/timetables and ways of communication were given a rating of 64% by respondents (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or do not know* for the relevant statement above).
- 64% of respondents gave credit to lecturers for satisfactory delivery of lectures (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- 55% of the respondents rated communication channels for addressing queries as not dealing with their needs satisfactorily (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- 64% of respondents ruled that student grievances were not dealt with satisfactorily).

- ❑ 64% of respondents indicated in their rating that they had the choice of being addressed in the language demanded by them (by selecting *strongly disagree or disagree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 64% of respondents conceded that lecturers were capable of carrying out their academic functions in the language chosen by the students (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or do not know* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 82% of respondents were in corroboration in their rating that regular and widely used documents were not provided in the language of their choice (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or do not know* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 64% of respondents acknowledged that lectures were given in English and Afrikaans depending on the lecturer (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 64% rated their language policy as unacceptable and demanded change (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 55% of respondents rated their stance in favour of lecturers being able to teach in English or Afrikaans (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 55% of respondents rated their inclination for separate lectures in English and Afrikaans (by selecting *strongly agree or agree or do not know* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 91% of respondents confirmed that more than one language was used by lecturers (by selecting *strongly agree or agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 100% of respondents rated African languages as not being used in lectures (by selecting *strongly agree, agree or do not know*) for the relevant statement above).

- ❑ 91% of respondents corroborated the importance of lecturers responding in the same language (Afrikaans and English) as used by the student.
- ❑ 64% of respondents confirmed that students did not demand for lectures to be in English (by selecting *strongly agree* or *agree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 55% of respondents conceded that transformation had taken place (by selecting *strongly disagree* or *disagree* for the relevant statement above).
- ❑ 64% of respondents rated the need for equitable distribution of staff for students to feel at ease (by selecting *strongly agree* or *agree* for the relevant statement above).

6.7 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter concludes by looking at some key policy issues addressed in the empirical investigation. In reflecting on some of the empirical investigation to see whether language policies are practically implemented and on an assessment of the literature, not all higher education institutions have language policies. Some of the policies reviewed were painstakingly and conscientiously well thought out.

However, as pointed out earlier, having no policy is considered as a policy position in itself. Du Plessis (2005:102) points out that the language policies of the historically Afrikaans medium universities fall into two categories, namely, brief language policy statements (universities of Johannesburg and Pretoria) and more detailed language policies (provided by the Universities of the Free State, North-west and Stellenbosch). Furthermore, the Universities of North-West and Stellenbosch offer a brief language policy statement that is supported by a detailed language plan, whilst the University of

the Free State seems to represent a kind of hybrid variety since it contains elements of a language plan. However, the University of the Free State does not have a language plan similar to that of the other two historically Afrikaans-medium universities in this group. The following table by Du Plessis (2005:103) gives a summary of the mentioned universities in terms of instruction as well as the medium of instruction.

Table 6.11: Language policies in terms of media of instruction and medium of administration

University	Campus and mode	Institutional language of Instruction	Administration	Language requirements of Students	Appointments	Language assistance to Students	Staff
NWU	Potchefstroom Evening Telematic Distance Vaal triangle Postgraduate Mabatho campus	Afrikaans (examination also in English) Afrikaans or English English Afr. or Eng. English Afr. or Eng. English	Afrikaans or English			Non Afrikaans speaking students	
UJ	Auckland Park Evening Postgraduate Vista campuses Witwatersrand	English and Afrikaans ¹ (PME) According to practical circumstances ¹ English	Afrikaans and English	Either Afrikaans or English		Unless student has passed a university course	
UFS	Bloemfontein e-degree QwaQwa Vista campus	Afrikaans and English(PME) DME ³ or single medium education subject to approval English	Afrikaans and English	In language of instruction or both	According to inherent requirement of post	Language proficiency course to students below desired standard	Appropriate language proficiency courses
UP	Not specified	Afrikaans or English ²	Afrikaans and English	No discrimination on grounds of competency	According to inherent requirement of post	Tuition in language of instruction	Support and training to communicate in Afrikaans
US	Undergraduate Postgraduate	Afrikaans (default language); English under special circumstances Afrikaans and English	Afrikaans (default language) English under special circumstances if required			Academic literacy	

¹ Requires proficiency test in Medium of instruction

² Subject to demand and when academically and economically justifiable

³ Parallel medium English, Dual medium English

Some institutions refer to the development of South African languages (refer chapter 5) but there is no serious attempt to adopt an African language as medium of instruction alongside English and Afrikaans. It appears, in the researchers opinion, that English medium, historically liberal as well as historically black institutions, have to date not adopted an African language as medium of instruction. It seems to be the case that only historically Afrikaans institutions are moving in that direction.

The principle of multilingualism as well as the advantages of multilingualism is alluded to in some of the policies but institutions cling to an English only policy. The Language Policy for Higher Education (2002:7) indicated that, 'evidence suggests that the majority of universities and technikons use English as the sole medium of instruction or as in the case of most historically Afrikaans medium institutions.' However, Alexander (1996:7) cites Heugh (private communication and unpublished draft submission prepared for the Constitutional Assembly) and sums up the results of language policies which attempt to use one language for education, government and language used in the economy in multilingual context as follows: greater access to the dominant language for the majority has never been facilitated, the dominant language has not promoted national unity, the majority remains on the fringe, language based divisions increases, the monolingualism policies have not been cost-efficient and economic development has not reached the majority.

In addressing a key policy area such as the formulation of policy (Section A, 1.3 of the questionnaire in the addendum), the approach of the majority of institutions can, in the researcher's opinion, be more vibrantly creative in aligning framework for policies with chapter 1, Section 6 of the new constitution. This can be effected in conjunction with the relevant clauses given adequate direction from which the language policy for higher education must be derived. The Constitution makes provision for promoting multilingualism, the equal treatment of languages and the development of local languages. Then there are the criteria of PANSALB and other general guidelines together with stakeholders from all population groups which will hopefully effect an effective multilingual policy document commensurate with a truly democratic multilingual society.

Questions 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7 in Section A of the questionnaire (in the addendum) is intended to highlight a vital policy issue, namely, that for policies to be effective they need to be a great deal more specific and concrete. This is not the case as found in this study. There is also a lack of detailed plans in many instances. Policies and plans need to be more explicit and have concrete and specific measures built in the policy. Students, parents and staff, in the researcher's opinion, are daunted by the verbose and bombastic terminology pervading many of the language policies. Simple, uniform impartial balanced policies are required with regard to the various languages and institutions, for example, if one reads between the lines some institutions unabashedly and unashamedly, set out to promote their language of choice, be it English or Afrikaans.

One other key language policy area of concern is that a vigorous pro-active policy formulation and implementation approach deserves

attention. There is a need, through the implementation of institutional language policies to make basic philosophies and practices as well as the mission of the institution transparent to their constituency and the community at large. Thus, language policies need to be taken seriously and not be seen as, 'keeping the wolf away from the door'. Client satisfaction, customer care or student needs (Question 2, Section B of the questionnaire) and so on, needs to be addressed. Students, staff and the community must be provided with all the information relating to language (policy documents, procedural manuals, data on language, language preferences, pass/failure rates, language skills, assessment, etc.).

Last but not least is the issue of developing multilingual proficiency as well as English language proficiency. Concrete positive steps need to be taken to foster multilingualism and multilingual awareness. The researcher suggests that various ways of promoting multilingualism be considered by institutions. Already universities and universities of technology have the development of an African language as an explicit objective. This is indeed a move in a positive direction. The upgrading of English language proficiency should also be included as a top priority in the policy objectives of institutions as well as for improving skills in Afrikaans.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS, MAIN FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

From Chapters 2 to 4 a background literature study had been done upon which this research has been done. The empirical study is discussed in Chapter 6. This final chapter includes inferences based on important aspects which surfaced from both the empirical study and the preceding literature. In various instances the empirical data took into consideration the foregoing literature as well. Chapter 7 covers aspects such as obstacles and problems in developing a language policy and plan for an institution in order to illustrate the main findings more clearly. In Chapter 5 and from the information gathered from the higher education institutions the researcher concludes that either English or Afrikaans or the use of both languages is the medium of instruction in higher education and operates in the various domains of examinations, administration and management (refer analysis of survey). Although English is an international language of communication, science and business, it is not the first language of a great many staff members and students. It would thus be imperative for institutions of higher learning to ensure that students gain competent and effective language skills in English in order to communicate through the spoken and written conventions in social and academic situations.

However, the implications of all this is that the researcher is of the opinion that English must of necessity play a focal role in higher education institutions as a language of learning and teaching. The fact of the matter is that English is regarded internationally and locally as the leading language of science and technology, the

major language of the labour market and the language which most students want to learn and use socially and professionally.

As far as Afrikaans is concerned, it is vital that it be maintained as an academic language and as a language of tertiary activity. Webb (1997:3) maintains that Afrikaans is the language through which the knowledge and skills of thousands of South African students can be established and developed because it provides access to a considerable number of academic texts, it is already well-developed and is still an important language of professional and occupational activity of the workplace.

The researcher concurs with Webb (1997:4) that African languages, including Afrikaans, be promoted as academic language. Webb (1997) asserts that this is necessary for the transformation and reconstruction of South African society, the development of democracy, the promotion of equity and the elimination of discrimination and inequality. Ultimately, in the long run it will contribute to developing the students' knowledge and skills to their full potential. Webb (1997:4) further argues that there is no reason why African languages cannot be used as serious languages of science and technology. However, the development of the African languages as fully-fledged academic languages is a long term goal requiring strong pro-active approaches.

7.2 OBSTACLES AND PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING A LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLAN FOR AN INSTITUTION

There are a number of obstacles encountered in developing a language policy for an institution. The researcher is of the opinion that lack of support and genuine commitment represent an

important obstacle to a language policy and plan. In personal communication with the Programme Head for Communication Science at the Central University of Technology, Free State, it was intimated that stakeholders are requested to make inputs to the language policy when it has to be reviewed but do not do so. When the time comes for finalising matters they only then make inputs and table objections which delay matters.

The implementation phase of the language planning process cannot be underestimated. As indicated earlier in the study, it is a process that demands putting strategies into operation whereby the process of actual language planning and putting the policy into place is effected. However, in a review of the policies studied, it appears that not all stakeholders were actively involved in the making of inputs and in the persuasion and motivation of everybody by the higher education fraternity concerned to accept the proposed plan and policy. Indifference, on the part of role players is an obstacle and needs to be addressed if an institution wants to successfully implement a language policy and plan.

A number of obstacles and problems have been identified earlier in the study. However, the issue of evaluation remains a challenging one. In practically all of the language policies studied, very little evidence of formal evaluation was found. The stance taken by the researcher is that it is an important stage where planners and stakeholders can assess and see if the plan has worked and also be able to establish the successes or effectiveness and the limitations of the language plan. Actual outcomes can be matched to those predicted. Reagan (1995:320) agrees that both goals and the resultant policies should be critically evaluated. Formal evaluation adds greatly to the planning process because it helps to

isolate and assess alternative goals, strategies and predicted outcomes (Mutasa 2003:34).

Last, but not least, Webb (1997:8), on commenting on the negative flaws in a policy points out that policy decisions do not go far enough. In addition, policies contain suggestions of actions that a university wants to take, but there is no evidence of follow-up plans. Chambers (2003:7) lists financial constraints as a major consideration as found in the research done. Other obstacles given include lack of student motivation, cultural/psychological issues and resources.

7.3 LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING PROCEDURES

PANSALB (1998) offers steps needed for the effective implementation of a policy. In the first instance, the guiding principles as set out in the Constitution must be spelt out clearly. Secondly, a language policy needs to be extrapolated and defined based on these principles. Thirdly, the language planning paradigm which is most likely to implement these principles must be selected and boundaries need to be defined. In the fourth instance, the implementation plan must be drawn up which includes participation of government and civil society. There is also the requirement that the language policy and plan are knitted into the national development plan. The principle obstacles also need to be defined and these must be dealt with expeditiously. In the fifth instance, target timeframes must be identified and government and civil society to be informed adequately.

7.4

MAIN FINDINGS

From an analysis of the written policies of the higher institutions who responded, it can be concluded that many higher education institutions are not yet prepared to take the risk of using any of the South African languages apart from English and Afrikaans as media of instruction. This is corroborated and supported by the Language Policy in Higher Education (2002:8) namely,... 'other spheres of society, higher education has not yet succeeded in establishing multilingualism in both the day-to-day institutional life and in core activities. For example, few institutions include an African language as a training requirement for undergraduate and postgraduate study, or offer short courses in African languages as in-service learning opportunities for professionals in practice. The failure to promote multilingualism also hampers the creation of an inclusive institutional environment advancing tolerance and respect for diversity'.

By and large, institutions have made statements with regard to their language policies on language matters. The concern and at the heart of this study is whether these are just verbose, bombastic statements of intent rather than a serious programme of implementation. Put differently, rather than prescriptive, regulatory policy which is expected when dealing with a policy of language, there is the idea of a declaration of intention, indicating something which is still going to happen.

An in depth study of the language policies of institutions reveals that the policies do not adequately meet the needs of the country and the constitution. It appears that language planners at some of the institutions do not take language serious enough and do not realise

how basic the language issue is in providing effective education. As indicated before, the perception is that once some sort of policy has been 'developed' and the demands made by government, 'big brother, obligations have been met and as such, the institution has, 'done enough'.

In sum, using the above conclusions as a basis, the researcher concludes and supports the hypothesis, (refer to Chapter 1) which argues:

H2:

- (a) Institutional language policies and practices are not implemented practically, consistently, precisely and outcomes are not achieved and are not clearly measurable.
- (b) Institutional language policy does not provide for students to participate in a functional, multilingual society.

7.5 SHORTCOMINGS OF THE STUDY

Essentially, one of the major shortcomings of the study is that the response rate by students and staff was too low. The reason for this may be that the language policies of institutions are regularly under review. The validity and comprehensiveness of language policy and plans cannot be assessed at one 'sitting.' Another reason may be that language is not taken serious enough as cited by Webb (1997:16), 'they relegate the language policy report to the appendix, along with the 'terms of reference' and 'abbreviations' or simpler, this is he general trend when it comes to research questionnaires. One other reason for non-compliance might be that with the amalgamation of institutions higher education, institutions are still finding their feet.

One other aspect of this study is the fact that there is a very strong case for multilingualism as indicated by substantial research in this regard. Multilingualism is not unique to South Africa and if one looks at Africa one sees that multilingualism is the norm and a worldwide phenomenon (Alexander 2001b:116). Limitations placed on this study is that multilingualism is seen as problematic and a liability (Bamgbose 1991:2). The issue in short is: the application of multilingualism has reference only to state organs, is handled superficially and the potential cost associated with the implementation of multilingualism. The question is where, in regard to this study, must the emphasis be, on the actual implementation of a South African institutional policy *per se* or contentious issues such as national unity, bilingual institutions, one official language, etc.

However, one other shortcoming is that very little research has been done on the implementation of multilingualism as well as the language preferences of South African peoples at large. The intention of this study was to investigate the implementation of multilingualism at higher education institutions. The limitation of the study is that the majority of South Africans and in this case students, are in favour of English. A national sociolinguistic investigation by PANSALB has proved that although South Africans are multilingual they love their mother tongue. The results also indicate that only 50% of the non-English speaking population understands the various forms of communication. At the core of these limitations, hypotheses and theme of this project and emphasised by Sweetnam-Evans (2001:47) with regard to educational underachievement the following: being instructed in a second language in which one has low levels of competence'; having to rely on second language for learning and reading and

learning'; having one's mother tongue largely or totally ignored in the educational process'; not having access to the elaborated linguistic code used in formal education and having low level reading skills and low level- level listening skills.

7.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are herewith submitted and shared with institutions of higher learning grappling with the formidable, if not mammoth task of attempting to implement their language policies, given the many and diverse constraints:

From the afore-going chapters, the dire need for effective proper access to English has been identified and because of this, institutions should make planned and effective provision for access to English as an important part of their language policies. The majority of students need to master English and use it as a tool in order to access knowledge. They need to do this because English is not their mother tongue. In this regard, English language proficiency needs to be drastically upgraded at all levels of university life. This task should be delegated to units involved in this process, for example, at the Central University of Technology, Free State, the Counselling and the DVC: Academic sections perform this task. There is conflict between the students' African identity and access to English or Afrikaans and institutions should take this into consideration.

Universities should develop multilingual language policies and the regional African language spoken in the province should be the long-term goal as a language of learning and teaching. Lecturers

and support staff should be encouraged to learn an African language and courses should be provided for this purpose.

Of great importance is that language policy and language planning should give a brief adumbration of the monitoring of the policy and route of recourse. Language planning and language policy also needs to be evaluated and revised on a regular basis. All stakeholders must be involved and regular feedback must be given to all concerned. It is important that a programme of evaluation follow soon after the policy has been implemented. Evaluation should also take the form where all stakeholders are involved and should be an ongoing continuous process. Furthermore, evaluation should be the tool to identify weaknesses, strengths and lead to ultimate refinement. Of importance is that provision be made for evaluation in the language policy and plan.

The major concern here is the language policy and as such, the implementation of the language policy must be discussed in the language plan. The logistics and specific details as to how and when implementation will occur must be stated and outlined in the language policy plan. Implementation should be well thought out and have realistic outcomes and attainable deadlines. As the process unfolds, regular times can be fixed for certain aspects to be focussed upon. Areas of success or issues of where problems were encountered should be recorded.

A well-coordinated, practical, precise, consistent and coherent language policy should be the order of the day and should unambiguously give direction for the use of language in the various domains of the institution (administrative, lecturing rooms, research and so on). The policy document should also be short and simple which will allow each member of the institution to understand what

the document is all about. The persons involved in the language plan should have excellent language backgrounds and should be committed persons who have experience in formulating policy and have a valid interest in the institution.

What goes hand in hand with this is that a comprehensive, detailed language plan would be needed to assist management to implement the decisions on language policy as agreed to by the institution. The detailed language plan should spell out time frames and should include details of specific activities and provide a budgetary framework. Details concerning language development courses, language certification, bilingual studies etcetera. would also be matters taken into consideration as part a strategic plan.

The promotion of functional multilingualism in the institutional policies deserves great attention. The language policy and language plan should be clear on what is envisaged by multilingualism. It is recommended that the language policy be organised largely according to the Language Policy for Higher Education requirements. The success of multilingualism can only be measured if institutions put it to the test. The question is, how else can we convince South Africans at large if we do not even attempt to implement multilingualism in some way or the other.

The study of foreign languages and dealing with challenges facing foreign students should also be incorporated in the majority of policies. This is one area, in the researcher's opinion, where very little has been done to recruit foreign students. There is a wealth of opportunity for institutions to learn from foreign students' experience for recruiting and increasing numbers now that the first intake of students as well as more strict credit controls have become the

order of the day. In sum, all the afore-mentioned aspects affecting language policy must be explored.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, N. 1992. *Language planning from below*. Herbert, R.K., Language and Society in Africa. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Alexander, N. 1996. *Language Policy and Planning in South Africa. Project for the study of alternative education in South Africa*. University of Cape Town. Cape Town.

Alexander, N. 2001a. *Why a multilingual policy for South Africa?* In Deprez, K, Du Plessis, T. & Teck, L. (eds.). *Multilingualism, the judiciary and security services*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Alexander, N. 2001b. *The Language Question and South African Universities Today*. Seminar Paper to be presented on Friday, 17 August 2001. Cape Town. University of Cape Town.

Alexander, N. 2002. *Linguistic rights, language planning and democracy in post apartheid South Africa*. South Africa: University of Cape Town.

Allwood, J., Grönqvist, L., & Hendrikse, A. 2003. Developing a tagset and tagger for the African languages of South Africa with special reference to Xhosa. In *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 21 (4), 223-237.

Anderson, J.E. 1997. *Public policy making: an introduction*. Boston, Mass: Houghton Mifflin.

Anita, B. 2001. *Terminology and language planning: An alternative framework of practice and discourse*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Anthonissen, C. 2004. *Walking the Tightrope between Policy and Practice: Testing a National Policy of Language diversity in Higher Education language Practices*. Linguapax Congress 20 – 23 July 2004:1-6.

Ayyar, RVV. 1996. Educational Policy Planning and Globalization. *International Journal Educational Development*. 16 (4): 347– 353.

Bamgbose, A. 1996. *Language and the nation. The language question in Sub-Sahara Africa*. Edinburgh University Press for the International African Institute, First Published 1991. Fourth printing 1996.

Bamgbose, A. 2003. *The future of multilingualism in South Africa: From policy to practice. Paper read at language conference of the department of Arts and Culture, Kopanong, Johannesburg, 12 – 13 June 2002.*

Bakmand, B. 1996. *National Language Planning, why not?* [Online] Article. Available from: <http://www/immi.se/Intercultural/nr3/bakmand.htm> [Accessed 7 April 2005].

Barkhuizen, GP. 2002. *Language-in Education Policy: Students' perceptions of the status and role of Xhosa and English System*. 30(4):499 -515. Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?ob=ArticleURL&asset=v-a-w-BY=M3>. [Accessed 21 September 2005].

Bengu, S. 1997. 'Statement by Prof S M E Bengu, Minister of Education, on the *New Language Policy in General and Further Education*.' In Brown D (ed.), *Educational Policy and the Choice of Language in Linguistically Complex South African Schools*. Durban: Education Policy Unit (Natal).

Bergan, S. 2001. *Language policies in Higher Education- Introduction to a debate* In Bergan, Sjur (Ed) *Language policies in Higher Education: Invitation to a*

Census 2001. Census in brief/ Statistics South Africa. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa,2003.

Debate. A result of round table debate of the Council of Europe's Higher Education and Research Committee. Language Policy Division. Strasbourg.http://europa.eu.int.comm.education_policies/educ/higher/higher-en.html [Accessed 4 November 2005].

Beukes, A. 1991. The politics of Language in Formal Education: The position of Afrikaans. *Journal for Language Teaching.* 25 (1).

Beukes, A. 2004. *The First Ten Years of Democracy: Language Policy in South in South Africa.* Forum Barcelona. May 19-23, 2004.

Blaine, S. 2004. *Business Day* (South Africa) Sept 3, 2004) http://www.asu.edu/eps_LPRU/newsarchive/art_4714.txt. [12 January 2005].

Brock-Utne, B. 2002. *Formulating Higher Education Policies in Africa – The Pressure from External Forces and the Neoliberal Agenda* [s.a.].

Bruen, J 2003. *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity. An Actor Plan.* (COM (2003) 449 final) European Commission.

Canadian Heritage Dictionary. www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/lo-ol/pubs/census2001/9_e.cfm. [Accessed 16 October 2005].

Chambers, A. 2003. *Language policy in higher education in Europe: A pilot survey.* London: University of Limmerick, IE.

Constitution of South Africa 1996. Act 108 Of 1996, Pretoria: South Africa.

Cooper R. L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Council on Higher Education. 2001. *Language Policy Framework for South African Education*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Council on Higher Education. 2002. *Language Policy Framework for South Africa Higher Education*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Currie, I. 1996. Minority rights: Education, culture and language. In M. Chaskalson, et al. (Eds.) *Constitutional law of South Africa*. (35.1-35.35). Kenwyn: Juta.

Dalvit, L. 2004. Attitudes of IsiXhosa-speaking students at the university of Fort Hare towards the use of IsiXhosa as a language of learning and teaching (LOLT) (unpublished Ph.D. thesis.) Rhodes University. Port Elizabeth.

De Klerk, V. 1997. *A draft Language Policy for Rhodes University*. Discussion document.

De Klerk, V. 2001. *From the sublime to the ridiculous or somewhere in between? A language Policy for an Historically English medium University RAU* [Online] available from: <http://general.RAU.c.za.aambeeld/junie2001/Ridiculous.htm>

De Klerk, V. 2002. Mother Tongue Education in South Africa: The weight of History. *International Journal Social Language*. 154:29.

Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (DACST) 1996. *Towards a National Language Policy Framework. Final Report of the Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG)*. Pretoria: DACST.

Department of Education. 1995. *Towards a Language Policy in Education. Discussion Document*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1997a. *Language-in- Education Policy*. 14 July 1997. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1997b. *Green Paper: Higher Education Transformation*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1997c. *Draft White Paper on Higher Education*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Department of Education. 1997d. *Higher Education Act (Act 101 of 1997 as amended)*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2000. *Partnership for Higher Education in Africa 2001:1*[Online] Available from:<http://www.foundation-partnership.Org/pubs/South africa/ondex.php? chap2> [Accessed 18 February 2005].

Department of Education. 2002. *Language Policy for Higher Education*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2006. *Language Implementation in Higher Education Institutions*. Speech delivered at a Conference held at the University of South Africa Pretoria. Government Printers

Dlamini, C.R.M. 2001. *The Attainability of Multilingualism at University* (<http://general.rau.ac.za/Aanbeeld/June 2001/attainability.html> [Accessed 5 July 2004]).

Duemer L. S Mendley & Morse S. 2002. Recovering Policy Implementation -

Understanding Implementation Through informal Communication *Education Analysis*: 10(39):1-11.

Du Plessis, T. 2005. *From Monolingual to Bilingual Higher education: The repositioning of Historically Afrikaans medium universities in South Africa*. *Language Policy* 5:87 -113.

Du Pree, R H., Koorts, A, Mjoli, QT., Moore, D van Rensburg, D.J.J. *Report of the CTP Task Team on Universities of Technology*. Pretoria, 2001. Council on Higher Education.

Eastman, C.M. 1991. *Language Planning: An Introduction*. San Francisco: Chandler and Sharp Publishers Inc.

Elster, J. 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for social sciences*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Emzantsi Associates. 2001. *Costing the Draft National language Policy and Plan for South Africa*. Report to the National Treasury and the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology.

Feinberg, W. & Solitis, J. 1992. *School and society*. New York: teachers college press.

Fishman, J.A. 1974. *Language Planning and Language Policy Research: The State of the Art*, in *Eastman* (1991).

Gadellii, KE. 1999. *Language Planning: Theory Practice Evaluation of Language Planning Cases worldwide*. Paris Unesco.

Gerwel, G.J. 2002. *Report on the Position of Afrikaans in the University system*. Pretoria: Ministry of Education.

Gomitza, A. 2003. *Implementation Analysis of Higher Education*. Centre for Higher Education. Transformation, (CHET) Univ. of Pretoria, Groenkloof Campus.

Granville, H. Janks, J. Mphahlele, M. 1988. English With or Without G (u) ilt: A Position paper on Language in Education Policy for South Africa. *Language in Education* 12(1): 254 - 270.

Greenfield, T. 1984. *Leaders and schools: Willfulness and nonnatural order* in organisations. In T.J. Sergiovanni, T.J & Corbally, J.E. (Eds.). 1984 *Leadership and organisational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp 142 – 169). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Hadebe, T 2001. Issues arising from the Implementation of Language policy in historically disadvantaged schools in greater Pietermaritzburg: A policy analysis. Thesis (MA). University of Natal. Pietermaritzburg.

Hanekom, S.X. 1987. *Public policy: Framework and instruments for action*. Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers.

Hartshorne, K. 1992. *Crisis and challenge: Black education 1910-1990*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W.A.J. & Smit, B. 2004. *Finding your way in qualitative Research*. Pretoria: Van Schaick Publishers.

Henrard, K, 2001. Language Rights and Minorities in South Africa. *International Journal of Multicultural Societies*. 3(22001):85-105.

Heugh, K. 1995. *Multilingual Education for South Africa*. Isando: Heinemann Publishers.

Human, P. 1998. *Yenza*. OUP. Cape Town.

Hogwood, B.W. & Gunn, L.A, 1984. *Policy analysis of the real world*. London: Oxford University Press.

Holmarsdottir, H.B. 2003. *Literacy in two languages? Implementing Language Language Policy in a Post Colonial Context*. Paper presented at the NEETREED Conference Gausdal Hoyfjellshotell, Norway 8-10:1-32.

Hough & Horne ABET consultants, Communication Skills and Training English. 2007. [Online www.tjhorne.co.za].

Jernudd, B.H. and Das Gupta J. 1971. *Towards a theory of language planning*. In Rubin, and Jernudd, B.H. (eds.), *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii: 195 – 215.

Kamwenda, G.H. 2000. Interfacing Language research with Policy: The Case of Language in Education in Malawi. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* (9): 1-10.

Kamwangamalu, N.M. 2001. The Language Planning situation in South Africa. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. 2 (4): 361 - 445. Issues in language.

Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B. 1997 *Language and Planning: From Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

Krashen, S.D. 1987. *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. Prentice-Hall International.

Language Policy of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology. 2004. Cape Peninsula of Technology. Cape Town. [online] Available from <http://www.cput.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

University of Cape Town Language Policy. Rondebosch. Cape Town. Available from <http://uct.ac.za/uct/policies.php> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the Central University of Technology, Free State. 2003. Central University of Technology, Free State. Bloemfontein. Available from <http://www.cut.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005]

Language Policy of the University of the Free State. 2003. University of the Free State: Available from <http://www.uovs.ac.za/about/E-language.php> [Accessed 1 December 2004].

Language Policy of the University of KwaZulu Natal. 2003. University of KwaZulu Natal. Durban. Available from <http://www.ukzn.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005]

Language Policy of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. Port Elizabeth. Available from <http://www.nmmu.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the North West University 2003. (Potchefstroom campus). Potchefstroom. Available from <http://www.nwu.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the University of Pretoria. [online] Available from <http://www.up.ac.za/policies/language.html>: [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of Rhodes University. 2003. Grahamstown. University of Rhodes. Available from <http://www.ru.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the University of Stellenbosch. 2002. Stellenbosch. Language Committee. Available from <http://www.sun.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the Tshwane University of Technology. 2004. Tshwane University of Technology. Available from <http://www.tut.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the Vaal University of Technology. Vaal University of Technology. Available from <http://www.vut.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the University of the Western Cape. 2003. University of the Western Cape. Cape Town. <http://www.uwc.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language Policy of the University of the Witwatersrand. University of the Witwatersrand. Available from <http://www.wits.ac.za> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Language and education policy in terms of Section 3(4) (m) of the National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Government Notice No. 383, Vol. 17997).

Lane, J. 1993. *The public sector: concepts, models and approaches.* London: Sage Publications.

Linder, S.H. & Peters, B.G. 1987. A design perspective on policy implementation: The fallacies of misplaced prescription. *In Policy Studies Review* (6):459-576.

LitNet. Taaldebat. 2005. *Submission of the Taalsekretariaat on the proposed national language policy for education as announced by the Minister of Education.* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.litnet.co.za/taaldebat/education.asp> [Accessed 28 October 2005].

Lo Bianco, J. 2004. *Language policy and Language planning handout*. [online] University of Hong Kong. Hong Kong. Available from: < jib/hkv talk on Lpp/08/12/04.

Majeke, A.M.S. 1994. *1976 Soweto Uprising: Education, Law and the Language usage in South Africa*. Michigan: U.M.I.

Malekela, G. 2004. *Secondary School Students' Views on the Medium of Instruction in Tanzania*. Paper presented at the LOITASA Workshop, 26-28 January 2004, Arusha, Tanzania.

Mansour, G. 1993. *Multilingualism and Nation Building*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Marais, K. *A paper presented at the MWU Conference on Multilingualism in The workplace.LitNet Taaldebat*. [s.a]:1-5. Available from:<http://www.litnet.co.za/taaldebat/kmarais.asp> [Accessed 28 October 2005].

March, J. 1984. *How we talk and how we act: Administrative theory and administrative life*. In T.J Sergiovanni & J.E. Corbally (Eds.) *Leadership and organisational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp 18 – 35). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Markee N. 1986. Unpublished Prospectus in Applied Linguistics. UCLA.

Maseko, I.M. 1995. *The eleven language policy and vertical communication*. Witwatersrand: University of the Witwatersrand.

Maximo, R. 1967. *The Determination and Implementation of language Policy*. Qezon City. Philippines.

Meloy, J.M. 2002. *Writing the qualitative dissertation – understanding by doing*. New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Inc.

Ministry of Education. 2001. *National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa. February*. Pretoria. Department of Education.

Ministerial Committee, 2003. *The Development of Indigenous African Languages as mediums of Instruction in Higher Education*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Mmusi, E.J. 1999. Implications of South Africa's New Language policy with Special reference to the Implementation of African languages as Medium of instruction. Thesis (MA). University of Cape Town.

Moodley, K. 2000. African renaissance and language policies. *Politikon*, 27, 2.

Mseleku, T, 2004. *African Scholarship: Some challenges Facing Intellectuals in South African Higher Education Institutions*. [Online], Vol.1 No. 2. Available from: <http://ingedej.ukzn.ac.za> [Accessed 21 December 2005].

Multilingualism Bill. May 2000. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Mutasa, D.E. 2003. The language policy of South Africa: What do people say? (unpublished Ph.D. thesis.) University of South Africa. Pretoria.

National Commission on Higher Education, 1997. Language Policy: Executive Summary: NCHE. Pretoria: Government Printers.

National Research Foundation (NRF). 2005. *Education and the Challenges for Change*. [Online]Available: <http://www.nrf.ac.za/focusareas/educate/> [Accessed 21 December 2005].

Neustupny, J.V. 1970. *Basic types of treatment of language problems*. In Linguistic Communications, 1:77 – 98.

Ngobo, M. 2003. Language planning and the politics of compromise: A critical analysis of the South African language policy. (Dissertation) UMI: Proquest.

Ngobo, M 2007. Language planning, Policy and Implementation in South Africa. Draft Discussion document. Cape Town. University of Cape Town.

Norms and standards regarding policy established in terms of section 6(1) of the South African Schools Act. Government Notice No. 383, Vol. 17997.

Obanya, P. 1996. *Language in Education in Africa. Lessons for and from Nigeria*. Fafunwa Foundation. Internet Journal of Education:1-7.

Obanya, P. 2004. *Learning In, With, and from the First language*. In *Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa*. University of Cape Town. Cape Town.

PANSALB's Position on the Promotion of Multilingualism in South Africa: A draft Discussion Document. 1998. Pretoria. PANSALB.

Pan South African Language Board. 2001. *Guidelines for Language Planning and Policy development*. PANSALB Occasional Papers No. 6. Pretoria. Pan South African Language Board.

The Pan South African Language Board Act (4 October 1995). Pretoria Government Printers.

The Pan South African Language Board Amendment Act, 1999 (Act No.10 of 1999). Pretoria Government Printers.

PANSALB. 2003. *Guidelines on the layout of a Language Policy Document for Institutions of Higher Education* Pretoria. PANSALB.

Paulston, B. 1997. Language Policies and Language Rights. *Annual review of Anthropology*. Vol.26:73 October 1997.

PANSAT. 2001. Geleentheidspublikasie no.1. *Taalgebruik en Taalwisseling in Suid-Afrika*. PANSAT: Continuous Business Forms. Pretoria.

Pattanayak, D.P. 1985. Diversity in communication and languages: Predicament of a multilingual national state- India, a case study. In Wolfson & J Manes (Eds.) *Language of inequality* (399-407). Berlin: Mouton Publishers.

Peterson, R. 2005. *The use of an African Language of instruction at University Level: The example of Kishwahili Department at the University of Dar-es Salaam* In Tanzania. Paper presented at the NEETREED Conference. December 5th -8th.

Phaswana, NE. 2000. Languages of use by the South African National Government. Thesis (PhD). Michigan. Michigan State University.

Phillipson, R 1998. *Linguicism: Structures and ideologies in linguistic*. In T Skuttnab-Kangas and J Cummins (eds) *Minority Education: from Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pienaar, M. 2001. *Op pad na veeltaligheid*. *Rand Afrikaanse Universiteit* [Online] Available from: <http://general.rau.ac.za/aambeeld/junie2001/veeltaligheid.htm>

Pityana N. B. 2004. *Higher Education in South Africa: Future Perspectives*. [Online]Keynote address at Bill Venter/ Altron Literary Awards 2003: Wednesday, 7 April 2004. [Retrieved on 11 December 2004].

Pressman, J. W. 1984. *Implementation*. Berkeley, CA. University of California Press.

Rademeyer, A. 2007. *Voornemende studente se Engels skok*. Volksblad 31 Julie:3.

Ramos, M., Aguilar, J. and Sibayon, B. 1967. *The determination and implementation of language policy*. Philippines: Alemar-Phoex Publishing House.

Reagan, T. 2001. The promotion of linguistic diversity in Multilingual settings. *Language Problems & Language Planning*. 25(1): 52-53.

Reagan, T.G. 1995. Language planning and language policy in South Africa: perspectives. In Mesthrie, R (ed), *Language and Social History: Studies in South African Sociolinguistics*. Cape Town. David Phillip.

Recognition and establishment of Provincial Language Committees. Board Notice 120 of 1997. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Recognition and establishment of language Bodies. Board Notice 121 of 1997. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Ricento T.K. & Hornberger, N.H, 1996. Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT Professional. *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3): 401.

Roodt, H.C 2001. *Taalbeleid in Hoër onderwys: Veeltaligheid as vereiste van die grondwetlike en wetlike raamwerk.* Available from: <http://general.rau.ac.za/aambeeld/june2001/taalbeleid.htm> [Accessed 27 July 2004].

Sabitier, P.A. & Mazmanian, D. 1981. The conditions of effective implementation: A guide to accomplishing objectives. In *Policy Analysis*. (5):481-504.

Satyo,S. 1999. Eleven official languages: One plus one equals two. In K. Prah (ed.), *Knowledge in black and white: The impact of apartheid on the production and reproduction of knowledge.* Cape Town: *Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society Back Series* (2): 148-158.

Sayed, Y. 2002. Education Policy in South Africa: From opposition to Governing and Implementation. *International Journal of Education*. 22: 29-33.

Schiffman, H.F. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*: London. Routledge.

Senkoro, F. 2004. *Teaching in Kiswahili at University level: The case of Kiswahili Department at the University of Dar-es-salaam.* Paper presented at the LOITASA International conference on Languages of Instruction in education, 26-27 January 2004, Arusha, Tanzania.

Sergiovanni, T.J & Corbally, J.E. (Eds.). 1984 *Leadership and organisational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp 18 – 35). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Shakespeare, W. 1564 1616. *The Oxford Shakespeare: the complete works of William Shakespeare.* London. Oxford University Press 1914.

Skuttnab-Kangas, T. 1998. *Multilingualism and education in minority children*. In T Skuttnab-Kangas and J Cummins (eds) *Minority Education: from Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

South Africa, 2005. Department of Tourism. 2005. *South Africa's Universities* Available from: <http://www/southafrica.info/essinfo/sa-glance/education/highere2005.htm>. [Accessed 18 November 2005].

South Africa. Department of Education. 2006. *Speaking notes, Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor MP at the Language Policy Implementation in Higher Education Institutions (HEs) Conference*. University of South Africa. Pretoria.

South African Languages Bill. Government Gazette, 30 May 2003. Pretoria. Government Printers.

Sweetnam-Evans M, 2001. *Academic Achievement, Underachievement and Bilingual/ Multilingual Education: Aambeeld/Anvil* 29 (1): 47-53.

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Fourth edition Copyright 2004. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Company.

The South African Schools Act (Government Gazette, Volume 377, Number 17679). Cape Town. Government Printers.

The Council for South African Geographical names Act, 1998 (Act No. 118 of 1998). Cape Town. Government Printers.

Thobeka, VM. 1997. Issues in the making of South Africa's Language-in-Education Policy. *Journal of Negro Education*. 66(4):366-376.

Tollefson, J.W. 1991. *Planning language, Planning Equality*. New York: Longman.

Treasury Board of Canada, 1996. Official languages program in Organizations Subject to the Act (Audit Guide). http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/dcpubs/TB_H4/offl_l_e.asp [Retrieved on 11 February 2004].

TWC Task Team. 1999. *Language requirements for purposes of government*. Pretoria: Technical Constitutional Working Group (TWC) of the department of Constitutional Development. Pretoria: Government Printers.

UNESCO 1999. *International Conference on Adult Education*. Hamburg: UNESCO.

UNESCO 2000. *World language survey. Department of Arts and Culture, Sep. 2000*. Paris: UNESCO.

University of the Free State. 2003. *Inaugural Address delivered 3 August 2003*. Bloemfontein. *On the way to a Babelised reality? Critical perspectives on language Policy developments in South Africa*. Available from: <http://72.14.207.104/Search?cacheEzEvSyYeHmEJ:www.uovs.ac.za/faculties/doc>

University of the Free State. 2003. *Language policy of the University of the Free State*: <http://www.uovs.ac.za/about/E-language.php> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

University of Cape Town. 2003. *University of Cape Town Language Policy*. Rondebosch: University of Cape Town. <Http://www.uct.ac.za/uct/policies.php> [Accessed 12 June 2005].

Van Wyk, N.1998. *Organisation and governance of education South Africa* in Pretorius and Lemmer, E. (eds) *South African education and training. Transition in a democratic era*. Johannesburg. Hodder & Stoughton.

Webb, VN. 1994. Language and Planning in South Africa. In W. Grabbe *et al.*(eds) *Annual review of Applied Linguistics*,14:254-273. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Webb, VN. 1997. *Constitutional Principles and challenges for language Policy and Planning*. Seminar [Online] Available from:<http://www/up.ac.za/academic/Libarts/crpl/principles-tertiary-ed.pdf>.

Webb, VN. 1999. Multilingualism in democratic South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 19 (4-5):351-366.

Webb, VN. 2002. *Language Policy Development in South Africa*. Paper presented at the World Language Congress on language Policies, Barcelona, April 2002: 16-20. Available: <http://www.linguapax.org/Congres/taller3/webb.htm> [Accessed 15 November 2005].

Webb, VN. 2005. Electronic mail: *Lote as languages of science in multilingual South Africa: A case study at the University Pretoria*. Paper presented at the Conference on Bi-and multilingual Universities – challenges and future prospects, University of Helsinki, 1-3 September 2005.

Weinstein, B. 1980. Language planning in Francophone Africa. *Language problems and language planning*. (4): 55-57.

Williams, W.E.R. 1976. *Social program implementation*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Wikipedia Encyclopaedia. *Wikipedia Encyclopaedia* [Online] Available from:
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multilingualism>. [Accessed 29 January 2005].

wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglicization.

www.finchpark.com/courses/glossary.htm -

ADDENDUM A

303 Soete Inval
Park Road
Willows
BLOEMFONTEIN
9301

Dear Sir/ Madam

REQUEST FOR INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION LANGUAGE POLICY PLAN

1. I am presently assistant to the DVC: Student Services at the Central University of Technology, Free State and am doing research on the practical implementation of language policy and planning at Higher Education institutions in South Africa.
2. Kindly please provide me with a copy of your language policy document and possibly an implementation plan.
3. Attached, also is a questionnaire with regard to language policy and how this is implemented at your institution.

It would be highly appreciated if you could complete the questionnaire and return to me at your earliest convenience.

Please be assured that your assistance and co-operation in this regard is highly appreciated.

E Tait

ADDENDUM B

Park Road
Willows
BLOEMFONTEIN
9300

The Registrar
Central University of technology, Free State
Private Bag X 20539
Park Road Willows
BLOEMFONTEIN
9300

Dear Sir/Madam

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE WITH RESEARCH: PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLAN

Herewith a sincere request for assistance with my research, being a student in the Faculty Engineering, Information and Communication Technology, Central University of Technology, Free State.

It is felt that many students, especially first time students lack specific language competencies. Language proficiency in everyday tertiary activities is largely abysmal. Thus, an institutional language policy must of necessity include measures to support the development of the institution's language of learning and academic literacy and discourse.

Bamgbose (1991:111) comments that language policies in Africa irrespective of how good they are, are characterized, by amongst other aspects, ...'declaration

without implementation'. The chances are that many a language policy is a question of lip service and on paper or to keep the 'wolf away from the door'. It is now ten years after South Africa has been given official status to the eleven indigenous languages, but has anything been achieved?

In his criticism of one institution's language policy, Webb (1997:9) describes the policy as having serious flaws, as well as being inadequate. He goes on to say that the policy is not accompanied by a specific plan of implementation, (detailing how it plans to achieve the (implied) goals of the policy and specifying clearly what needs to be done, who has done it when, with what means, how, and when.

It is along these lines that I wish to solicit your assistance by requesting a copy of your institution's language policy as well as in the completion of a short questionnaire which should not take long.

Please be assured that all information will be treated confidentially.

A sincere thank you.

E Tait

ADDENDUM C

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire to be completed by **staff**.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to establish whether there are coherent, consistent, co-ordinated language policies and implementation plans that are used in a focused and practical way. Does the policy and implementation plan of the institution provide for a multicultural dispensation within the parameters of the constitution and is it in concert with broad planning and transformation in South Africa?

The questionnaire may be completed by you and as many staff members as possible if not all – extra copies included.

Be assured that all responses will remain anonymous and you will not be identified in any way.

Thank you most sincerely for your time and effort. The results will hopefully ensure that institutions equally enable all students to learn, excel and achieve their academic goals.

E Tait

Fax No 051 4444 386

E-mail address: eddietait@telkomsa.net

SECTION A

1. Please provide the information and tick the relevant answers where applicable.

1.1 Does _____ (your institution) have a language policy?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

If yes, kindly please provide a copy of the document or refer me to the relevant policy documents (legislations, statute, institutional regulatory code etc).

1.2 Do you know what the Language Policy is all about?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

1.3 Do you agree with the formulation of the contents and find it acceptable?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

1.4 Has the Language Policy of your institution been implemented in a coherent, structured, co-ordinated precise manner in your opinion?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

1.5 Do you view the policy as a good or a bad choice?

Yes	1	No	2

1.6 Give your reasons why you regard the policy a good or bad? _____

1.7 Do you rate the Language Policy as neither good nor bad?

The Language Policy is neither good nor bad	
---	--

Reasons: _____

1.8 Has any monitoring procedures or follow up measures been put into place to ensure that the Language Policy has actually been put in practice?

Yes	1	No	2

1.9 What are these? _____

1.10 Has the Language Policy been consulted upon for inputs/comments?

Yes	1	No	2

1.10.1 Who was involved? _____

1.10.2 What are their backgrounds as stakeholders? _____

SECTION B

2. Has a comprehensive study or any Audit been done of the Language Policy of the Institution on any aspect or a Theme Audit, for e.g. client satisfaction, customer care or student needs or an element of a programme component such as the availability in official languages of regular and widely used work instruments (policy documents and procedural manuals)?

Yes	1	No	2	Unsure

3. What languages/language is/are used for prescribed tuition in?

3.1 Lectures in class? _____

3.2 Textbooks/academic texts/resource material? _____

- 3.3 Tutorials? _____
- 3.4 Other situations? _____
- 3.5 What dominant languages/language is/are used for the function of assessment in?
- 3.6 Written examination papers: _____
- 3.7 Examination answers: _____
- 3.8 Oral examinations: _____
- 3.9 What predominant language/s is/are used for the function of Student Affairs/Services?
- 3.10. Mass meetings and social functions: _____
- 3.11 Graduation ceremonies: _____
- 3.12 Official documents, forms, reports, notices, etc: _____
- 3.13 Advertising student matters: _____
- 3.14 Signage, posters, student badges, etc: _____
- 3.2 What is the language preference of the following in your opinion?
- 3.2.1 Students: _____
- 3.2.2 Academic staff: _____

3.2.3 Administrative: _____

4. The following are possible issues not often addressed or are not/are attended to in the Language Policy of the Institution and which impacts negatively/positively on implementation.

Kindly tick those that you think deserves attention and matters that need to be taken into consideration with regard to Language Policy, Planning and implementation.

- | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|
| 4.1 | No matters deserving attention. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.2 | All staff should be made aware of their rights and responsibilities with regards to Language Policy on a regular, ongoing basis. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.3 | Official language of choice is not respected and treated with disdain. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.4 | English and Afrikaans speakers are treated differently. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.5 | Personal services (benefits, health services, administrative matters, data processing, counselling, financial queries etc are not offered to staff/students in the official language of their choice. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.6 | Communication channels to address queries, written or verbal are not satisfactorily addressed in the official languages. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.7 | Grievances/student unrest or staff/student dissatisfaction are generally handled in the official language of choice of the staff member/student. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.8 | Staff does not have the choice of language he/she wants to be addressed in. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.9 | Senior staff members are not adequately capable of functioning in the language chosen by the student. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.10 | Regular and widely used work instruments (e.g. policy documents, manuals of procedure and policy) are provided to students and | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- staff in the official languages.
- 4.11 Lectures are given in English or Afrikaans depending on the students.
- 4.12 The language policy and language situation is acceptable as is and must not change.
- 4.13 Lecturers should be allowed to teach in English and Afrikaans.
- 4.14 There should be separate lectures for English and Afrikaans students.
- 4.15 Training and Development courses for staff and students are offered in Afrikaans only. Staff and students too polite to object.
- 4.16 Employees/students are satisfied with the use of English and Afrikaans as official languages.
- 4.17 Communication between the offices of the institution does not comply with the language policy of the institution.

5. Do you have the language data regarding the language profile of the following in terms of percentage of first language/home language speakers of each of the official languages?

Yes	1	No	2

5.1 Afrikaans: _____

5.2 English: _____

5.3 IsiNdebele: _____

5.4 Sepedi: _____

- 5.5 Sesotho: _____
- 5.6 SiSwate: _____
- 5.7 Xitsonga: _____
- 5.8 Setswana: _____
- 5.9 Tshivenda: _____
- 5.10 IsiXhosa: _____
- 5.11 IsiZulu _____
- 5.12 other: _____

ADDENDUM D

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire to be completed **only** by **students**.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to establish whether there are coherent, consistent, co-ordinated language policies and implementation plans that are used in a practical way.

The questionnaire may be completed by as many **students** as possible if not all – **extra copies included**.

Be assured that all responses will remain anonymous and you will not be identified in any way.

Thank you most sincerely for your time and effort. The results will hopefully ensure that institutions equally enable all students to learn, excel and achieve their academic goals.

E Tait

Fax No 051 507 3787

E-mail address: eddietait@telkomsa.net

SECTION A

1. Please provide the information and tick the relevant answers where applicable.

1.1 Does _____ (your institution) have a language policy?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

If yes, kindly please provide a copy of the document or refer me to the relevant policy documents (legislations, statute, institutional regulatory code etc).

1.2 Do you know what the Language Policy is all about?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

1.3 Do you agree with the formulation of the contents and find it acceptable?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

1.4 Has the Language Policy of your institution been implemented in a coherent, structured, co-ordinated precise manner in your opinion?

Yes	1	No	2
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

1.5 Do you view the policy as a good or a bad choice?

Yes	1	No	2

1.6 Give your reasons whether good or bad: _____

1.7 Do you rate the Language Policy as neither good nor bad?

The Language Policy is neither good nor bad	
---	--

Reasons: _____

1.8 Has any monitoring procedures or follow up measures been put into place to ensure that the Language Policy has actually been put in practice?

Yes	1	No	2

1.9 What are these? _____

1.10 Has the Language Policy been consulted upon for inputs/comments?

Yes	1	No	2

1.10.1 Who was involved? _____

1.10.2 What are their backgrounds as stakeholders? _____

SECTION B

2. Has an audit or analysis been done of the Language Policy of the Institution?

Yes	1	No	2	Unsure

3. What languages/language is/are used for prescribed tuition in?

3.1 Lectures in class? _____

3.2 Textbooks/academic texts/resource material? _____

3.3 Tutorials _____

3.4 Other situations? _____

- 3.5 What dominant languages/language is/are used for the function of assessment in?
- 3.6 Written examination papers: _____
- 3.7 Examination answers: _____
- 3.8 Oral examinations: _____
- 3.9 What predominant language/s is/are used for the function of Student Affairs?
- 3.10. Mass meetings and social functions: _____
- 3.11 Graduation ceremonies: _____
- 3.12 Official documents, forms, reports, notices, etc: _____
- 3.13 Advertising student matters: _____
- 3.14 Signage, posters, student badges etc: _____
- 3.2 What is the language preference of the following in your opinion?
- 3.2.1 Students: _____
- 3.2.2 Academic staff: _____
- 3.2.3 Administrative _____

4. The following are possible issues not often addressed or are not/are attended to in the Language Policy of the Institution and which impacts negatively/positively on students performing badly or failing.

Kindly tick those that you think deserves attention and matters that need to be taken into consideration with regard to Language Policy and how this can benefit students in achieving academic success.

- | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|
| 4.1 | No matters deserving attention | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.2 | Students should be aware of their rights and responsibilities with regards to Language Policy and be informed on a regular, ongoing basis. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.3 | Class tutorials/examinations/test/handouts/assignments should be in Afrikaans and English or in the language of choice of the student who can then respond in English or Afrikaans. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.4 | Notes/handouts/timetable/messages should be in English and Afrikaans an the predominant language of the Province. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.5 | Some lecturers speak too fast, are in a hurry and should explain the tasks and learning material in a less hurried way. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.6 | Communication channels to address queries, written or verbal are not satisfactorily addressed in the official languages. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.7 | Student grievances/student dissatisfaction are generally not handled in the official language of choice of the student. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.8 | Students do not have the choice of language he/she wants to be addressed in. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.9 | Lecturers are not adequately capable of functioning in the language chosen by the student. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.10 | Regular and widely used work instruments (e.g. policy documents, manuals of procedure and policy) are not provided to students in the official languages of choice. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4.11 | Lectures are given in English or Afrikaans depending on the lecturers. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

-
- 4.12 The language policy and language situation is not acceptable as is and must not change.
- 4.13 Lecturers should be able to teach in English and Afrikaans.
- 4.14 There should be separate lectures for English and Afrikaans students.
- 4.15 Lectures are offered in Afrikaans only.
- 4.16 The use of an African language is rarely used in lectures.
- 4.17 Lecturers should respond in the same language when asked a question by a student be it Afrikaans or English.
- 4.18 English and African students insist that lectures must be in English even though the lecturer and students are Afrikaans speaking.
- 4.19 Very little transformation has taken place and the whole institution is still Afrikaans orientated.
- 4.20 There should be more lecturing staff of other races so that students can feel at ease and have a will to participate in class discussion.

ADDENDUM E

Informal, semi-structured staff questionnaire (faculty, administrative, instructional staff, cleaners/employees, etc.).

1. Educational institutions should provide support services and in particular, students services, to promote the intellectual and interpersonal development of students. Does the institution enable students to learn and excel? More importantly, are students, whose first language is not English provided with the services and support that they need to achieve academic success.
2. Educational institutions should articulate a commitment to supporting access to higher education for a diverse group of students , thus providing an opportunity for all students to benefit from a multilingual learning environment. Does the department/ faculty operate in a manner that values a multilingual learning environment in which all students will learn in terms of your language policy? Is there any tangible evidence of efforts made to recruit staff from a diverse work force? How supportive is the work environment
3. Professional development programmes should be made available by educational institutions to help staff and faculty to understand the ways in which social group identifications such race, ethnicity, disability and in particular home language influence individuals. Is faculty or staff encouraged to improve, revise or to develop programmes based on information learned from multilingual professional development activities?
4. In your opinion, do employees, administrative staff, faculty, lecturers, hostel personnel, cleaners and so who are assigned to provide service to students, clients and the public have sufficient language proficiency to ensure that their needs are met given the institution's activities?

5. Are staff informed of their official languages responsibility in terms of the language policy of the institution? (distribution of information, documents, brochures, memorandums, directives etc.
6. Is service comparable in terms of the official language policy and are clients satisfied with the quality of service in each language? Is data compiled on the type, nature and frequency of complaints and what does an analysis of complaints reveal? Are complaints regarding language resolved satisfactorily and as quickly as possible and are employees involved in corrective measures?
7. Have employees been informed of their official languages rights and responsibilities and have they been clearly informed that they can file grievances in the official language of their choice? Have trade union representatives been made aware that grievances are handled in the official language in which they are presented?
8. Are personal services (pay and benefits, health services, career counselling) and human resource central services (administration, finance, data processing) offered to employees in the official language of their choice.
9. Is training and development courses offered in the official language of choice of the employee and does he have the language of choice in which he wishes to be supervised?
10. Does communication with the employees take place in the employee's language of choice, notably during meetings and in the minutes of meetings?
11. Are employees satisfied with the use of Afrikaans and English and the other regional language within their work environment?

ADDENDUM F

Informal, semi-structured student questionnaire to assess multilingual aspects of university experience regarding language policy.

1. Does your institution operate in a manner that values a multilingual learning environment?
2. Are students involved in decisions made that affect their learning such as making inputs towards the language policy of the institution?
3. At your university, do you feel that you or any of your class mates are being discriminated against on the basis especially home language and does this discrimination hinder your opportunities to participate fully in your educational institution?
4. Through your interaction with administrators, faculty and staff of all the various units, do you think that they empathise with you with a factor such as home language?
5. Do administrators, faculty and staff talk much about the many problems associated with multilingualism?
6. What do you think of using English as a language of LOLT and do you think it is a good choice?
7. What do you think of your level of English and do you think you are being disadvantaged? Do you feel advantaged because you were tutored in English as mother tongue from the cradle upwards?
8. What do you think of English as medium of instruction and have you heard of the concept of the hegemony of English?
9. What is your opinion of your own language (Sesotho, Afrikaans, IsiNdebele, IsiXhosa, IsiZulu and so on).
10. How many of the lecturers teaching you can speak any of the languages of your fellow students? Do you think it unfair/fair that they cannot speak your language? Should they learn your language and teach in it?

11. Do you think that your language could help students in academic context?
Do you think that there is place for your language in academic context?
Do you think the university should translate manuals, tutorials, notes and so on into your language? Does cost matter?
12. Was your choice of institution based on language preference, language policy or whatever reason?
13. Do you think that the subject that you are now studying could be taught in your language and do you think you will have adequate resources.
14. Is there a future for your institution becoming a multilingual institution?

ADDENDUM G

303 Soete Inval
Park Road
BLOEMFONTEIN
9301

The Registrar
Central University of Technology
Private Bag X 20539
BLOEMFONTEIN
9300

Dear Sir

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO DISTRIBUTE QUESTIONNAIRE AMONG CUT STUDENTS AND STAFF

I have enrolled for an MA course at the CUT and intend distributing a questionnaire to student and staff of Higher Education nationally. (See attached covering letter and questionnaires).

As I am not au fait with the protocol involved in the circulation of questionnaires for CUT, I herewith kindly request your permission to distribute my questionnaires to the CUT fraternity. Alternatively, kindly advise me on the procedure.

With every good wish.

Eddie Tait