RESEP WORKING PAPER

Mother-tongue instruction or straight-for-English? The primary education policy dilemma

Nompumelelo Mohohlwane

RESEP

Research on Socio-Economic Policy

UNIVERSITEIT
STELLENBOSCH
UNIVERSITY

Department of
ECONOMICS

Mother-tongue instruction or straight-for-English? The primary education policy dilemma

Nompumelelo L Mohohlwane
*†

April 2020

Language-in-education policy has a powerful influence on social and economic relations, with complex dimensions in multilingual and unequal societies such as South Africa. There are practical considerations around how best to use language to achieve better educational (and consequently economic) outcomes for those in historically disadvantaged language groups within available means (financial, human and linguistic resources), but the approach taken will also have implications for identity and power. This was clearly demonstrated historically throughout the various stages of the development of Afrikaans. This paper presents the Mother-tongue instruction or straight-for-English education policy dilemma. The historical discussion on the development of Afrikaans, including the political events, policies and organisations that were part of its development, and the implications of this for African languages provides the background. This is followed by a discussion on the curriculum and language in education policy and practice response through an analysis of ten South African language in education policies from 1994 to date. The paper then considers why the language policy dilemma persists though the discussion of economic returns to language, namely a high economic return to English mastery with no returns for African languages and concludes with proposing three alternative policy solutions within a multilingual education context. The first policy option is maintaining the status quo, teaching in the various African mother tongues for the first three years while also introducing English and then transitioning to English from Grade 4. This would continue to use African languages as a bridge to English, with economic returns retained only for English. The second option is the unification of Nguni and Sotho languages respectively, with these taught as regional languages for the first six years of schooling followed by a transition to English. What would happen to the remaining languages, Tshivenda and Xitsonga still requires careful consideration.

---

*Nompumelelo Mohohlwane is a doctoral student in the Department of Education Policy at Stellenbosch University and she is a researcher at the Department of Basic Education in Pretoria, Email address: n.nyathin@gmail.com

† This paper is an extended and updated version of a book chapter titled *How Language Policy or Practice Creates or Sustains Inequality in Education* in Nic Spaull and Jonathan D. Jansen (Eds). 2019. *South African Schooling: The Enigma of Inequality - A Study of the Present Situation and Future Possibilities*. Springer.2019

However, the regional use of these languages may increase their use within the formal economy, creating an enabling environment for their economic value. The third option is in line with the most recent language in education policy development, providing mother tongue education for the first six years within the existing language in education policies, making English compulsory as a First Additional Language while also specifically introducing an African First Additional Language through all phases of schooling including tertiary education. This third option provides a comprehensive approach to enabling African language use not only as a bridge to English but as a language of society, education and formal work while still recognising the role of English. Over time this may create a strong rationale for economically rewarding African languages in the same way English is rewarded. What is clear from the development of Afrikaans highlighted early in the paper, is that successful implementation of language policies is complex and requires political, technical and social collaboration from a range of stakeholders. Regardless of the policy option selected, this will require the deliberate and careful development of indigenous South African languages foregrounded in education resourcing, prioritization and directly addressing the question of economic returns for African languages.

1. Introduction

Approximately 81% of the 57.7 million people in South Africa are racially classified as African. Correspondingly 76% speak an indigenous South African language as their first language (Statistics South Africa, 2012, 2018). Yet more than 80% of Grade 4 learners tested in these languages could not make sense of explicitly stated information, actions or ideas in an internationally benchmarked reading assessment.[3] Learners tested in all official languages did not reach the international centre point of 500 points. There was, however, a difference of 96 points between those that wrote in Sepedi and those writing in English or Afrikaans, favouring the latter, which is equivalent to more than two years of schooling (Howie et al., 2017). This colossal difference is consistent across all the indigenous languages when they are compared to English or Afrikaans. In summary, learners that are receiving their Foundation Phase education in indigenous South African languages are still performing far below their counterparts that are receiving this in English or Afrikaans. These literacy results reflect a relationship between language and literacy that continues to be one of the overlapping dimensions of inequality in education practice and outcomes.

The purpose of this paper is to present the Mother-tongue instruction or straight-for-English education policy dilemma. The historical discussion on the development of Afrikaans, including the political events, policies and organisations that were part of its development, and the implications of this for African languages provides the background. This argument is taken further by synthesising empirical data on the complex relationship between language and literacy and the distinctions in learner performance between indigenous South African languages and English and Afrikaans. This is followed by a discussion on the developments in curriculum and language in education policy and practice. The roles and responsibilities of education stakeholders in shaping the language and literacy landscape are examined through the discussion of ten language in education policies, namely the Constitution of South Africa, the National Education Policy Act, the South African Schools Act, the Norms and Standards for language policy in public schools, the Language Compensation policy in the National School Certificate, the National Curriculum Statements, the Incremental Introduction of African Languages (IIAL), the draft Basic Education Laws Amendment (BELA) Bill, the Provision and Management of Learning and Teaching Support Material (LTSM) and the Revised Language Policy for Higher Education. A

---

[3] This is based on the performance of a nationally representative sample in the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2016 assessment (Howie et al, 2017, p. 185)

critique of these policies is provided and specific areas of possible improvement are identified as well as interpretation within a policy and implementation theoretical framework. The paper then considers why the language policy dilemma persists though the discussion of economic returns to language. The paper concludes with possible policy solutions within a multilingual education context.

2. Why Language Matters

South Africa's history showcases the interrelationship between power, identity and language. Language does not develop incidentally, it is the product of deliberate efforts; the discipline of language planning defines this interrelationship most clearly. A quotation by Robert Cooper reflects this interrelationship, "To plan language is to plan society" (Cooper, 1989, p. 182). Language planning first appeared in literature in 1959 in the work of Huaguen (Cooper, 1989; Ngcobo, 2009). The term has since become commonly used with the broad definition: deliberate language cultivation that encompasses administrative and political efforts to solve a language goal in society. Therefore, there should be no question regarding *whether* language can be planned, but rather *how* it should be planned with the aspects emphasised being *who* plans *what*, *for whom* and *why* (Cooper, 1989, p. 31; Reagan, 2002). The answers to these questions vary greatly depending on the specific context. The South African response to these questions will be illustrated in the case of the development of Afrikaans and African languages in the section that follows.

Language planning has two foci, corpus planning and status planning. Corpus planning entails the development of terms, standardisation, grammatical rules and other linguistic development aspects, while status planning focuses on the use and function of languages, including use as the medium of instruction in schools or as the language of business, as well as more complex aspects such as language minority rights (Cooper, 1989). It is important to regard the political and societal aspects and it would be unwise not to see that the definition of language planning as a social resource developed through political, educational, economic and linguistic authorities speaks to the dynamics at hand (Ngcobo, 2009; Reagan, 2002).

A good language planning policy or approach should apply four criteria: firstly, desirability, whether the community believes in the policy goal; secondly, justness, whether the policy is fair

and equitable; thirdly, effectiveness, whether the policy achieves its objectives; and lastly, tolerability, whether the policy is resource-sensitive or viable within its context (Reagan, 2002).

The development of Afrikaans as summarised in the section that follows illustrates the concrete steps taken to develop Afrikaans and oppose English and African languages and affirms the nature and practice of language planning as defined above. This section provides three such cases from different historical times. The sections end with a reflection of how African languages were developed to offer a counterfactual, enabling comparison.

2.1 The Colonization of South Arica

The first European language formally spoken by settlers in South Africa was Dutch. This followed the colonization of the Cape by European settlers who were mostly Dutch[4]. Over time the local Dutch evolved into Afrikaans (Hans, 2012; Marjorie, 1982; Silva, 1997). In 1795 the Dutch handed power over to the British following instructions from Holland. Although this transition was resisted, British rule persisted and in 1822 English was formally introduced as the language of learning, business and government in the Cape (Hans, 2012; Marjorie, 1982; Silva, 1997). Further changes to the Dutch way of life were the abolition of slavery and land occupation and ownership competition. These changes are cited as the main reasons for the Afrikaner Great Trek in 1836. However, the Voortrekker meta-narrative emphasizes the loss of language autonomy amongst the primary reasons for the Afrikaners' Great Trek. There is evidence that emphasizing language in the careful reconstruction of the motivation for the Great Trek was a fundamental part of the Afrikaner patriotism and nation-building efforts in the 1930s and 1940s (Bond, 2003; Grundlingh & Huigen, 2011; Somerville, 1990).

The historical timeline and developments between 1652 and the Great Trek are well documented, except for the development of the Afrikaans language, beyond its relationship with Dutch. In more recent accounts, although contested, this development has been attributed to primarily three groups; the European settlers, mostly represented by the Dutch; the colonised or indentured Khoi and San; and enslaved people of African descent, mostly from Angola, and those of Indo-Asian

---

[4] A Dutch company established a trading station in the Cape in 1652. The Cape had previously been used by the English and Portuguese as a trade stopover. These European settlers were mostly Dutch speaking but other European nationalities including the Portuguese, Germans and Huguenot French were present. They formed a new Cape Dutch community simply labelled Dutch. This community later evolved into the Afrikaner nation with a new language known as Afrikaans (Marjorie, 1982; Mesthrie, 2002).

descent largely from Malaysia and the Indian subcontinent (Geffen, 2003; Roberge, 2002; Terreblanche, 2002). Complementarily, the sources of the first 'truly Afrikaans' written texts are cited as a doggerel poetry verse in 1795, a transcribed dialogue by a Dutch traveller in 1825, letters to newspapers in 1830, as well as texts used in the mosque based on Arabic orthography within the Cape Muslim community in 1830 (Dangor, 2003; Davids, 2011; Mesthrie, 2002a).

It would be remiss to discuss language without discussing the church. A recognition of the strategic importance of the school as an instrument for reformed faith is well documented (Malherbe, 1977). Malherbe highlights the relationship between the state, the church and education dating this back to Dutch settlements in South Africa based on the establishment in 1658 of the first school within a white settlement. The purpose of the school was to instruct mostly West African slaves on the Dutch language and the core elements of Christianity. This was extended to white learners in 1663, closely followed by schooling for Coloured learners in 1676. Malherbe (1977) provides a detailed account of how the relationship between the church and state was highly integrated; this quotation on the ideal teacher illustrates the point:

"The ideal teacher [of those days] is a man who is gentle, true, of good family and of good reputation. He is a man who knows how to write a good hand and who is good at reading… who can write letters and requests; who understands the scriptures so that he can educate the people; and who knows how to set a clock, how to manage, oil and clean it."

A formalisation of this Dutch competency requirement manifested through the Cape Commissioner-General, J.A de Mist, who systematised education and introduced a requirement for all people holding office to speak, read and write in Dutch from 1 January 1800 (Malherbe, 1925). A brief period of anglicising the Afrikaners was introduced by Alfred Milner between 1901 and 1905 (Mesthrie, 2002b), with English emphasised over Dutch in schools through the provision of state education for whites while the education of blacks was left to the churches and mission schools. However, following the South African war which took place in 1899 and 1902 and subsequent political developments, the privileging of English was rejected.

Language development efforts by the 'Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners' (The Fellowship of True Afrikaners') were extensive (Davenport, 1966). The organisation was formed following initial discussions about translating the Bible into Afrikaans in 1875. The organisation was pivotal in lobbying for the official status of Afrikaans as well as ensuring that the language was written and

formalised (Mesthrie, 2002; Roberge, 2012). Davenport sites the fervour of this work based on an understanding of the Afrikaans language as God-given with specific translation work of the Bible into Afrikaans as a critical step towards standardisation. The organisation produced the 'Eerste Beginsels van die Afrikaanse Taal' (First Principles of the Afrikaans Language), serving as grammars and dictionaries and led in providing literature and material infrastructure establishing 'Die Afrikaanse Patriot' newspaper in 1876, a publication that largely communicated political ideas. Over time it printed more than 93,650 Dutch and 81,000 Afrikaans books. The explicit aim of this society was establishing Afrikaans as a language in its own right, with a clear link to also reaching a political end. At their first meeting, the society identified three types of Afrikaners, those with Afrikaans hearts, those with Dutch hearts and those with English hearts. An explicit decision was taken to mobilise those with Afrikaner hearts (Antonissen, 2017; Davenport, 1966).

The contribution of media and communication is demonstrated through the establishment of Naspers[5], a publishing company, in 1915. The publications by Naspers included an Afrikaans (initially Dutch) daily newspaper, 'Die Burger', published from 1915 and edited by DF Malan until 1924. Malan later became the Prime Minister in 1948 when the National Party regained power. The newspaper served as a mouthpiece for the National Party until 1990 (Davenport, 1966). A further significant organisation that influenced Afrikaans culture and nationalism was 'Jong Suid-Afrika' (Young South Africa), which later became the Afrikaner Broederbond (Afrikaans brotherhood). The organisation formed by young Afrikaners in 1918 worked towards Afrikaner nationalism, maintaining an Afrikaner culture, developing an Afrikaner economy, and gaining control of the South African government. The organisation extended its influence and political activism, ultimately creating the Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurvereniginge (FAK - Federation of Afrikaans Cultural Societie) as a public organisation responsible for Afrikaner culture while it focused on politics, ultimately becoming a secret organisation. According to (Davenport, 1966) at the end of Apartheid, most Cabinet members were affiliated to the Broederbond. It is difficult to find additional evidence on this matter or the specific activities of the Broederbond due to the secret nature of the organisation.

Considering this reframing in the development of Afrikaans, it is unsurprising that there are three basic varieties of Afrikaans customarily identified, namely, Cape Afrikaans, East Afrikaans and Orange River Afrikaans. These differed based on the influence, population and distance between

---

[5] Naspers was established under the name De Nationale Pers Beperkt (National Press Ltd)

the language contributors. However, the standardised Afrikaans is largely based on the Eastern Afrikaans which is most similar to Dutch and was largely spoken by the Dutch population. Standardisation also included adopting Dutch language prestige norms (Pretorius, 2014). As discussed in the understanding of language planning, standardisation of Afrikaans was informed by power and politics with a deliberate effort to create a racially exclusionary variant of Afrikaans that privileged Afrikaner nationalism rather than inclusivity or following formal standardisation processes (Alexander, 2009; Giliomee, 2004). This account is supported by the documented ideals of Afrikaner nationalism and the conceptualization of 'die volk' as best articulated by Hertzog and Malan, which referred exclusively to white people committed to the idea of a distinct people when speaking about Afrikaners (Giliomee, 2004; Malherbe, 1925, 1977). Through these and other efforts Afrikaans was recognised as a medium of instruction by the Provincial Education Departments in 1914 and as an official language in addition to English in 1925 (Mesthrie, 2002b; National Language Service Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, 2011; Roberge, 2002).

It is clear from the discussion above that the establishment of Afrikaans was not only a linguistic effort but that cultural and societal organisation and the media were at the forefront, demonstrating that nationalism and language development are a societal and political process. As stated at the start of this section on language planning, the development of Afrikaans during this era clearly met the criteria of corpus and status planning. The linguistic development was always accompanied by practical purpose and use situated within society, politics and governance. The language policy was therefore desirable, tolerable, just and fair amongst its proponents. All of these are markers of good language policy as described earlier.

2.1.1 The development of African languages during colonialism

The section above mapped out the development of Afrikaans during the colonial era. This section provides a discussion of the counterfactual, the development of African languages during the same period. The discussion on African languages must start with the recognition of Khoi and San languages, which are now largely extinct. The records on the number and range of languages cite 11 variants and although linguists consider these languages as distinct, the word 'Khoisan' is typically used to refer to these different groups of people and languages (Marks, 1972). The factors contributing to the death of these languages have been cited as colonialism, population decreases based on disease, particularly smallpox, and the compulsory education of Khoisan,

initially in Dutch and subsequently in Afrikaans (Traill, 2002). A 1950 examination of speakers of the Nama language in Northern Cape revealed that the change in the language of education impacted on the affiliation of speakers from monolingual Nama speakers to Afrikaans. A further language of assimilation was isiXhosa (Marks, 1972; Traill, 2002).

The remaining languages spoken in South Africa, often referred to as African languages, are linguistically labelled as part of the Southern Bantu languages. The first classification of these languages as Bantu languages was by Doke (Maake, 1993). This broader language family extends across a third of Africa and a range of countries, including Cameroon, Kenya and South Africa, numbered at approximately 400 variants spoken by approximately 250 million people (Herbert & Bailey, 2002). There is little written on the pre-Bantu population and the spread of the language families, although agriculture, village life and societal economic developments are cited as the main influential factors (Herbert & Bailey, 2002).

The term Bantu was first used by W. H. I. Bleek in 1857 or 1858, citing it as a frequently occurring plural form of the word meaning person (Silverstein, 1968). A reading of literature explains the label as a linguistic classification based on the recurrent patterns amongst the categorised languages. The word Bantu translates to people and occurs across most of the languages (Herbert & Bailey, 2002; Herbert & Huffman, 1993; Silverstein, 1968). The use of the word was not, however, only restricted to a linguistic label, it became objectified almost immediately and used as an ethnic label for ethnographic purposes (Herbert & Huffman, 1993). Alternative terms used have been Bantoid, Semi-Bantu, and Sub-Bantu amongst others, in a contested manner largely based on linguistic properties (Herbert & Bailey, 2002). In current conversation, the term remains somewhat controversial due to its politicised nature that will be discussed in the section that follows. The linguistic language label, however, remains the official categorisation of these languages to date.

Much has been written about the controversial role of the church in the development of African languages, emphasising either the philanthropic aspects or the imperialist aspects of the missionary efforts (J. Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986). In their examination Comaroff & Comaroff (1986) focus on the cultural implications and how this, in turn, affected the political local environment, arguing that the impact of missionaries differed across groups and place. How the missionaries were perceived is not well documented; suffice it to say that the relationships emerged based on their temporary advantages of military aid and guns as well as technical skills

like building irrigation systems. The presence of several missionary societies is recorded. These include the British and Foreign Bible Society, the American Bible Society and the French Bible Society (Hermanson, 2004). Three perspectives of the missionaries are summarised in Comaroff & Comaroff (1986): firstly, the Methodists who actively sought political influence through chiefdom recognition and collaboration with the local authorities; secondly, those that participated in local life amongst the Tswana's, influencing a shift in cultural beliefs; and thirdly, individual evangelists that transacted with the local population, the colonial state and economic interests. Along with the initiation of time as a resource to be scheduled and monitored, the missionaries introduced literacy as a non-conformist aspect of missionary endeavours. The church and school were seen as companions, with learning regarded as the door to the church. The Protestant faith was grounded in the reading of the Bible, thus several missionaries, including the Methodists, were devoted to translating, printing and teaching the Bible from as early as 1830 (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1997). Between 1857 and 1936, Bibles were translated into six of the nine African languages, the first of these being Setswana followed by isiXhosa. The translations were completed by groups of missionaries, often from the same Bible society (Alexander, 1989; Doke, 1958; Hermanson, 2004). This education of a selection of the Africans created a black elite that was then serendipitously or intentionally employed by the colonial state. Thus the interaction between the church and the state was solidified and even those not converted to the beliefs of the Christian faith viewed it as an educational opportunity and thus participated (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1997; Hermanson, 2004; Alexander, 1989).

As translation theory was not well developed in the early 19th century (Hermanson, 2004), the approach used by most missionaries was the study of Latin, Hebrew and Greek, with some attempts to complete word for word translations or idiomatic uses of African languages. This was done in collaboration with local native speakers. Mesthrie (2002b) comments that certain components such as prefixes, infixes and suffixes within-subject nouns and verbs were only discovered and documented 30 years after the initial African languages were documented. He also highlights the prestige and official status that the selected dialects enjoyed at the cost of other dialects or consensus within the language group. This continues to be a divisive factor amongst African language speakers. Heugh (2016) argues that the ethnic and language distinctions in much of Africa did not exist before colonization (before the 19th century), much the same as the geographical nation-state divisions.

The first Setswana Bible translation was more perilous (Doke, 1958), compiled by Moffat, a missionary who was neither a linguist nor a competent Setswana speaker. He is quoted as framing his translation shortcoming as a result of deficiencies in the language. The development of the isiXhosa translation by Rev. J. W. Appleyard was far more rigorous and followed the Greek method mentioned above; however, the critique is that as much as these were earnest efforts, there were misinterpretations of idioms (Doke, 1958; Hermanson, 2004). Furthermore, the less than benign translation of the Bible is highlighted in the choice of wording (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1997); a translation by A.J. Wookley in 1908 chose the word 'ancestor' for translating 'demon'. Badimo (ancestors) are sacred beings in Setswana and Maluleke (2005) argues that a better choice of the word could have been used. This definition serves as one example of many and is not only present in the Bible translation, but also in the early Setswana dictionaries developed by missionaries. Such mistranslations present the African languages translations of the Bible not just as indigenous access to the Bible but show the interaction between specific cultural and political values held by the missionaries. Maluleke (2005) further confirms the relationship between the Setswana Bible and learning to read; those that were interested in the Bible were afforded educational opportunities. Finally, Maluleka (2005) argues that African language Bible translations were not singular events to be documented and dated but reflect an interaction between society and politics. It follows that these translations are incomplete and limited; translations should, therefore, be a continuous process which requires revisiting.

The development of African languages under colonialism demonstrates the inverse effect colonialism had on African languages compared to Afrikaans. The presence of language planning through corpus and status planning is hardly evident. The development of African languages during this time was incidental and led by religious use rather than state planning, governance or explicit politics. This stands in stark contrast to the preceding discussion on the development of Afrikaans during the same period.

2.2 Apartheid

This next section provides a discussion on the development of both Afrikaans and African languages during the Apartheid era. This is the next substantial period following colonisation discussed earlier. Afrikaans finally consolidated dominion from 1948 when the National Party came into power, conducting governance, business and administration almost exclusively in

Afrikaans. The National Party segregated people by race and language; this was codified in policy including language in education policy. According to Bond, 2003, the 1961 Constitution provided that:

> no court of law shall be competent to enquire into or pronounce upon the validity of any Act passed by Parliament, other than an Act which repeals or amends the provisions of section 128 or 113 ... [referring to English and Afrikaans as official languages].

Segregation was enforced at all levels of schooling and included the development of universities offering education exclusively in Afrikaans to white students. Universities articulated the concept of 'volksuniversiteite', institutions providing students with an opportunity to express their Afrikaner ethnicity and culture and receiving education equipping them to lead Afrikaans people (Seroto, 2013). To foster this development the government spent at least 10 times as much per student on white students as on black students (Bond, 2003, p. 16), although this gap was reduced to 4.5 times by 1991 (Gustafsson & Patel, 2006). This was complemented by increased resource allocation such as textbooks and intensive cultural promotion of Afrikaans (Grundlingh & Huigen, 2011; Silva, 1997). Afrikaner-owned publishing houses became the principal providers of school textbooks. During 1990-1998 Afrikaans clearly dominated literary publishing, defined as poetry, drama and fiction books. The number of Afrikaans books published during this time is estimated at 2800, while only 970 were published in English and a total of 1200 were published across all 9 African languages (Galloway, 2002).

At the end of the Second World War, the education of Black children was mostly under the care of missionaries with the state only providing the salaries of approved teaching posts. The government took over control from missionaries from 1948 (Giliomee, 2009). Although the missionaries were under-resourced for the number of learners they were teaching, and this may have influenced the government, the main reason for taking over was to oversee the discipline of African youth, who were increasingly becoming politically conscious, and to create a semi-skilled labour force. This was accomplished through the withdrawal of state subsidies to missionary schools (Giliomee, 2009, 2012). The closing of missionary schools and the implementation of the Bantu Education Act were strongly opposed by the church (Giliomee, 2012; Greaves, 1955; Seroto, 2013). The Bantu Education Act (Union of South Africa, 1953) solidified the ethnical use of the term 'Bantu' by defining it as synonymous with native, referring to people of aboriginal

descent or the African race. It further defined Bantu schools as those serving Bantu people and created a Department for native education.

The largest contribution of the church to African languages during the Apartheid era was that of the Bible Society of South Africa, which became independent in 1965 and established more robust translation approaches. The most noteworthy of these was the convening of 17 projects working on translations, totalling 100 people in 1967; establishing translation committees introducing the theory of dynamic equivalence[6]; creating training seminars for new translations where necessary, consisting of competent translators who were knowledgeable about the church and theology; and establishing an editorial committee with competence in Greek and Hebrew with at least a thorough working knowledge of African languages and at least two mother-tongue speakers (Hermanson, 2004). The significance of dynamic equivalence was particularly significant as it reduced cultural bias by prioritising the social interpretation of the text.

However, even though these reflect substantial developments for African language Bible contribution, the Afrikaans Bible translation efforts exceeded these by establishing larger editorial committees with academics and representatives from the Dutch Reformed Churches. These panellists were proficient in Afrikaans and Greek or Hebrew and could, therefore, translate from the original texts. The translations were then subject to a larger committee for publications and validation took place over several years of meetings (Hermanson, 2004).

The Bantu Education Act had a strong emphasis on providing mass literacy for Black people. Aside from a concern with the low quality of education preparing Africans for a lower skills level, two points of contention emerged, the issue of language and finances. The government extended mother tongue instruction based on advice from the Eiselen report from four years to the entire primary school phase (Giliomee, 2009, 2012; Seroto, 2013). The negative relationship between Black people and the state as well as well-founded education quality concerns harmed how African languages were viewed. This cast a shadow over the pivotal African language development work of Doke (Maake, 1993) between 1935 to 1953 as editor of the Bantu Treasure series, hosted at the Witwatersrand University Press. The Bantu Treasure series work included 11 publications by Doke as well as publishing work by African scholars, including Sol Plaatje's

---

[6] Dynamic equivalence theory approaches translation from a sociolinguistic perspective. "The readers of a translated text should be able to comprehend it to the point that they can conceive of how the original readers of he text must have understood and appreciated it". (Nida et al., n.d., p. 6)

Setswana translations of Shakespeare, B.W Vilakazi's isiZulu poetry and Mqhayi's isiXhosa poems. Doke influenced and oversaw the translation of several English classic literature works into all the African languages, advocated and led research on African languages and initiated writing in isiZulu amongst his counterparts. Although these had their limitations, the ultimate rejection of this was instituted by the government's language boards (Maake, 1993). The publishing of African language material by Afrikaans publishers who were seen as government collaborators cemented the sense of isolation and protest against African languages by Black anti-Apartheid activists. A government survey (Giliomee, 2009) confirmed the distaste for African languages amongst parents; at least 60% of parents preferred English or English and Afrikaans rather than African languages as medium of instruction in secondary school.

On June 16, 1976, 15 000 young people marched against the Apartheid government in opposition to the language policy as well as other educational inequalities (Grundlingh & Huigen, 2011; Marjorie, 1982). This was after the government's 1974[6] attempts to extend Afrikaans to additional subjects, as one of the languages of learning in Bantu schools (Ndlovu, 2011; Oakes, 1994). This language policy change was rejected by students, parents, teachers, school principals and even homeland leaders. Evidence of this is demonstrated by the submission by the African Teachers Association of South Africa (ATASA) of a memorandum to the Department of Bantu Education in January 1976 [7] (Ndlovu, 2011, pp. 330–331). This memorandum clearly articulated opposition to the language change, but neither the Department nor Parliament recognised the seriousness of this. The opposition escalated, resulting in the June 16 protests by students, parents and communities. Placards at the march included slogans such as 'Blacks are not dustbins' 'Afrikaans stinks', 'Away with Kafer-kaans', and 'Afrikaans is a tribal language' (Marjorie, 1982; Ndlovu, 2011, p. 335; Oakes, 1994). Part of the responses to the protests was the reintroduction of English as a medium of instruction after four years of Home Language instruction (Giliomee, 2009).

It is clear that during Apartheid the status planning aspect in terms of language use including official status was elevated through legislation, a coherent vision and purpose for the use of Afrikaans beyond basic education. At the same time, developments in corpus planning for African languages occurred mostly through the work of missionaries. However, the status aspect through the extended use of African languages in schooling was not coherently communicated or valued and that negatively affected developments.

---

[7] The Bantu Education Act of 1953.

2.3 Democratic South Africa

More recently, between 2015 and 2017, the language in education debate gained particular focus in university provisioning. Universities have since made landmark changes by adapting their academic language policies. The Constitutional Court legitimized these developments by upholding the 2016 University of Free State Senate's decision to have the single medium of English as the language of instruction (*AfriForum and Another v University of the Free State*, 2017; University of Free State, 2016). The university historically provided teaching in Afrikaans, then adopted dual-medium provisioning in English and Afrikaans from 1993 (Botha, 2017). Similar changes have been made within the same timeframe by the University of Pretoria who now offer English as the single medium; and the University of Stellenbosch adopting a dual-medium language policy of English and Afrikaans (University of Pretoria, 2016; University of Stellenbosch, 2016). These changes largely occurred in response to criticism and student protest by learners excluded through the privileging of Afrikaans.

The comparison over three periods discussed above, contrasting the development of Afrikaans and African languages, clearly reflects how carefully and systematically language planning was done particularly concerning Afrikaans. The interplay between political power and identity, corpus planning and status planning is apparent. The questions of who, for whom, why and how that emerged in the discussion also point to why African languages have continued to fail to develop. The significance and the urgency to engage comprehensively in language planning afresh in South Africa cannot be overstated.

3. Language and Literacy

It is difficult to refer to literacy without discussing language, especially in South Africa where levels of literacy differ by language. There is however a distinction – language is not necessarily literacy. In this next section, these concepts are described and South African studies explaining the empirical impact of both language and literacy are discussed. Understanding this distinction helps determine whether inequality lies in language or literacy, or both. The purpose of schooling as articulated in the South African curriculum *is equipping learners with the knowledge, skills and values necessary for self-fulfilment, and meaningful participation in society as citizens of a free country* (South Africa & Department of Basic Education, 2011, p. 4). Literacy skills and knowledge are central to realizing this goal. Literacy is defined by the curriculum as the ability to collect,

analyze, organize and critically evaluate information and communicate effectively using visual, symbolic and/or language skills in various modes (Department of Basic Education, 2011). Literacy in this paper should be understood based on this broad definition as well as the narrow definition of competence in reading and writing through proficiency in specific schooling languages. Language is embedded in the definition of literacy and serves as a tool providing access to knowledge and information. Formally, language is defined as a universal means of human communication to receive or transmit information (National Language Service Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, 2011). Table 1 below provides the figures for language speakers according to language groups and provinces.

Table 1: Population by first language spoken and province

First Language	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GP	MP	LP	SA
Afrikaans	2 820 643	683 410	606 225	340 490	161 876	309 867	1 502 940	289 446	140 185	**6 855 082**
English	1 149 049	362 502	37 842	78 782	1 337 606	120 041	1 603 464	124 646	78 692	**4 892 624**
IsiNdebele	15238	14 854	6 023	10 008	111 675	43 988	380 494	403 678	104 283	**1 090 241**
IsiXhosa	1 403 233	5 092 152	60 187	201 145	340 832	190 601	796 841	48 993	20 275	**8 154 259**
IsiZulu	24 634	31 634	8 501	118 126	7 901 932	84 835	2 390 036	965 253	62 424	**11 587 375**
Sepedi	8 144	14 299	2 431	7 395	20 555	83 999	1 282 896	372 392	2 826 464	**4 618 575**
Sesotho	64 066	158 964	14 136	1 717 881	79 416	201 153	1 395 089	138 559	80 299	**3 849 563**
Setswana	24 534	12 607	373 086	140 228	52 229	2 191 230	1 094 599	71 713	107 021	**4 067 247**
Sign Lang.	22 172	42 235	3 933	32 910	48 575	14 924	52 744	8 932	8 230	**234 655**
Siswathi	3 208	2 020	648	2 246	8 347	12 091	136 550	1 106 588	25 346	**1 297 044**
Tshivenda	4 415	3 663	1 083	2 592	4 309	16 255	272 122	12 140	892 809	**1 209 388**
Xitsonga	9 152	3 092	1 201	8 039	8 936	127 146	796 511	416 746	906 325	**2 277 148**
Other	127 117	36 893	12 385	15 935	77 519	60 872	371 575	39 639	86 322	**828 257**
Total	**5 675 605**	**6 458 325**	**1 127 681**	**2 675 777**	**10 153 807**	**3 457 002**	**12 075 861**	**3 998 725**	**5 338 675**	**50 961 458**

Source: Statistics South Africa Census 2011

Studies contributing to understanding the effects of language on literacy using empirical data have been limited in South Africa. The difficulty in identifying the causal impact of language is due to other confounding factors affecting overall learner performance, including socioeconomic status (SES), ineffective teaching and limited learning and teaching resources (N. Taylor et al., 2013). The National School Effectiveness Study (NSES) is amongst the first few large scale nationally representative[8] studies examining the causal impact of language on Literacy and Numeracy. In 2007 the same test was administered to a national sample of Grade 3 learners through the Department of Basic Education's Systemic Evaluations (SE) and the NSES. The only difference was that the SE was administered in the schools' Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT)[9] and the NSES was in English. The tests were administered a month apart.

The average scores on both tests were very low at 23% in the NSES and 33% in the SE for Literacy; and 34% in the NSES and 37% in the SE for Numeracy. Learner performance for English LOLT learners was similar, approximately 50%, across both tests while performance was different for African LOLT learners. Unsurprisingly, the African LOLT learners performed better when assessed in the African LOLT than in English, with a statistically significant difference of approximately 10 percentage points in the case of Sesotho. However, overall performance was low, below 30% on average, in both tests. Furthermore, there was little difference in achievement between the two tests for those at the lowest levels of performance (Vorster et al., 2013). The main conclusion from this empirical study was that South African learners receiving their education in African languages do not become literate in any language by the end of Grade 3. This applies even in the language they know best and have received schooling in for three years.

In a reanalysis of the NSES and SE data, Spaull (2016) estimated that the size of the language effect is approximately one to two years' worth of learning for literacy and one year for numeracy. The largest effect, however, comes from other factors affecting schooling, such as SES and school quality, and the effect of these factors was estimated as four years' worth of learning. Spaull argued that the low performance in Home Language illustrates that language is not the most important factor determining learner achievement but that overall school quality has an even larger impact. This view is supported by qualitative research which identifies quality inhibitors as

---

[8] Although the intention was that this survey was to be nationally representative, other contemporaneous testing occurring in Gauteng province led to this provinbce being excluded from the NSES.

[9] The LOLT selected by schools mostly matched the language of the majority of learners and was an African language in the majority of schools. LOLT is often referred to as Home Language; however, this may not always be the case.

the loss of teaching time; lack of appropriate literacy and numeracy teaching and learning materials (LTSMs), such as graded readers in African languages; and poor pre-service training of teachers to teach African languages or English to second or third language speakers (Department of Basic Education & Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2017; Murray, 2002; N. Taylor et al., 2013). In Hoadley (2012), classroom-based studies on pedagogical practices of teachers serving African learners show prioritisation of an oral discourse of chorusing with little reading or writing in quality or quantity, slow curriculum pacing leading to a failure to sufficiently cover the curriculum, and little use of textbooks, extended texts and other LTSMs.

Notwithstanding the overall low performance discussed above, literature has shown the benefits of initial learning in the home language. The applicability of this in the South African context has been demonstrated in the work of (Taylor & Von Fintel, 2016). The authors used longitudinal administrative and assessment data from the population of primary schools. The sample was restricted to schools where at least 80% of children were black and officially categorized as the bottom three poverty quintiles. When comparing learners receiving instruction in English to those receiving instruction in African languages, the authors found that learners with African language instruction in the Foundation Phase had significantly improved English acquisition, as measured in Grade 4, 5 and 6. In interpreting these findings it is important to note that English and Afrikaans Home Language speakers still far outperform learners receiving their education in African languages. However, when comparing the same type of African learners affected by the same poor schooling quality constraints discussed and disadvantaged background, these learners perform better in English after receiving their Foundation Phase learning in their Home Language than in cases where these schools adopt English as the LOLT in the Foundation Phase. A study by Eriksson (2014), examining the effect of the 1955 Bantu Education Act which extended the provisioning of Home Language learning from four years to six years, similarly showed a positive impact of increased Home Language literacy on long-term educational outcomes and earnings. Using the 1980 census there is an estimated 1.5% to 4% increase in the earnings of males aged 28 to 48 in the census. These results do not negate the fundamental finding of poor literacy in any language but rather supports the theoretical arguments of Home Language instruction and asserts that the poor performance in literacy and language is not due to an incorrect language policy decision but rather poor implementation.

What is clear in the findings from the empirical data discussed above is that language is a factor with an impact on literacy. However, the quality of instruction in all languages, including African

languages, is inadequate. Furthermore, language is a secondary factor to the quality of schooling, which includes factors such as teacher pedagogy and knowledge in teaching literacy and other subjects. The understanding of this distinction and overlap is crucial in addressing the persistent inequalities that manifest in language and literacy and in understanding the language in education policy. The small number of empirical studies on the language of instruction or African languages, in general, has hindered academic and policy cohesion. There are still largely unanswered questions on when the language transitions should take place in schooling, from which languages and how best this may be mediated. The discourse on language inequality in literacy amongst sociologists, educationists and policymakers has largely been ideological with little use of empirical data to inform objective contributions to this important area. Substantially more research has been completed on English and Afrikaans in South Africa than on African languages (E. Pretorius, 2018). This is disproportionate to the demographics of the South African languages.

4 Language in Education Policy and Practice

The preceding sections have provided a detailed overview of language planning, and the relationship between language and literacy using empirical research to frame the educational experience of African language learners. The section that follows provides a review of post-Apartheid language in education policy. Although education policy is one aspect of language planning, its significance cannot be understated.

There are multiple definitions provided for policy. In summary, these are the problem-oriented policy approach, the policy as legislation approach, and the policy as text and discourse approach.

The problem-orientation approach is based on the work of Lasswell (Farr et al., 2006; Fischer et al., 2007; Lasswell, 1956), arguing for a shift in practice from political sciences as an elite privilege towards orientation to public policy for the good of society. The four common traits defined in this approach are context relevance, problem-orientation, a multi-disciplinary focus and scientific rigour. The critique of Lasswell (Eulau, 1980; Farr et al., 2006; Fischer et al., 2007; Lasswell, 1956) is mainly regarding updating the understanding of the human choice and policy process, that the emphasis on science implies technocracy and thus still presents policy within an elitism practice without accounting for important developments such as the role of quantitative data as a lever in policy.

The second approach, the <u>policy as legislation approach</u>, argues that public policy decisions are articulated and executed through policy papers, written plans or administrative orders (Department of Basic Education, 2019c). This approach emphasises understanding the role and authority of different spheres of government and the relationship between different tiers of government. In addition, it emphasises that understanding the distinctions between functions and authority informs the process of introducing policies or laws in the sector. The critique of this approach (Bowe et al., 1992) is the assumption that policy is a two-step process, firstly, a generating process followed by an implementation process. This top-down understanding portrays a detachment between these two processes, while the actual relationship is far more complex.

The third and final approach is viewing <u>policy as text and discourse</u> (Ball, 1993), defining policy as contested representations encoded and decoded in complex ways, "… always in a state of 'becoming', of 'was' and 'never was' and 'not quite'" (Ball, 1993, p. 11). Ball argues that the very act of writing policy results from contestation and thus a compromise between different interest groups and politics and that this, in turn, shapes interpretation, and both reinterpret and misinterpret. Ball also argues that the formal policy document is an incomplete understanding of policy. The policy is reinterpreted by readers, implementers and critics and thus policy is constantly being reshaped (Ball, 1993; Bowe et al., 1992).

In the reading and interpretation of language in education policy, the tenets of all three policy approaches emerge, namely the idea of policy as a public good, the role of technocracy, the authority of legislation and government responsibilities as well as the implementation of policy beyond a formal declaration. The next section firstly extends the policy conceptual framework by focusing on implementation frameworks starting with what makes a policy successful and how we can conceptualise implementation.

Policy implementation has different definitions (O'Toole, 1986, 2000; O'Toole & Montjoy, 1984), ranging from a reference to only those with authority for implementation to being inclusive of all actors. The main obstacle for implementation is noted as a lack of coherence. Matland (1995), reconciles these approaches by focusing on conflict and ambiguity as crucial factors. In the policy ambiguity/conflict model, Matland provides a more comprehensive basis for understanding implementation and accepting policy ambiguity and conflict as part of the policy process. A more

comprehensive explanation of this is provided in previous work, however, this paper applies this framework. The table below provides a summary of the framework.

Table 2: Conflict and ambiguity framework

		Policy ambiguity	
		Low	High
Level conflict	Low	Administrative implementation (planning and resources)	Experimental implementation (context, variation, learning)
	High	Political implementation (power and feedback)	Symbolic implementation (local coalitions)

Source: Matland 1995

4.1 Language in education policies in South Africa

The language in education policies in South Africa is guided primarily by the rights and responsibilities articulated in the Constitution of South Africa. The Constitution serves to redress historical inequalities and future educational outcomes. The specific declarations on language in education in the Constitution are discussed below as well as ten key policies that respond to the Constitutional prescripts. These policies continue to form the basis for language in education to date. The section first discusses the initial policies and how they relate to language planning and policy, a critique is then offered, incorporating advocacy and societal responses. This is followed by a discussion of the second phase of development with critiques and again, broader societal responses, and then finally the most recent developments.

4.1.1 The first phase of language in education policies in South Africa

The Constitution of South Africa recognizes 11 official languages and gives authority to provinces to use any of these languages for governance, with a minimum of two languages used. The national and provincial government are tasked with monitoring and regulating the use of languages. The Constitution then makes provision for the establishment of a Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB) with the purpose of promoting and creating conditions for the development and use of the official languages. In addition to the 11 official languages, allowance is made for Khoi, Nama and San languages and finally, Sign Language. The promotion and

respecting of other languages commonly used by communities in South Africa, including Hindi and Greek, is also mentioned. In the specific area of education, the Constitution enshrines the right for everyone to receive education in any of the official languages of their choice in public schools, wherever this is reasonably practical. It further proposes that all implementation options should be considered including single medium education (Republic of South Africa, 1996a).

The National Education Policy Act (NEPA) of 1996 provides for the determination of national education policy by the Minister of Education after consultation with the Council of Education Ministers (CEM). The CEM members are the Minister, Deputy Minister and provincial political heads of education. It specifies the function of the Minister as determining the language in education in addition to other functions, while provinces are mandated to coordinate administrative actions and implement national policy (Republic of South Africa, 1996b). The South African Schools Act (SASA) of 1996 then mandates the Minister to determine norms and standards for language policy in public schools. The act delegates the responsibility to determine the language policy of the school to School Governing Bodies (SGBs) (Republic of South Africa, 1996a).

The 1998 Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools, often referred to as the Language in Education Policy (LIEP), is the third component of the language in education policies. It is based on the principle of the right to Home Language instruction while providing learners with access to a global language such as English. In pronouncing on language as a subject, learners are required to study at least one language in Grade 1 with an additional language offered from Grade 3. It further requires learners to study at two languages in Grade 10 to 12 (Republic of South Africa, 1998). In pronouncing on the language of learning and teaching, the policy states that the LOLT of public schools must be an official language; it does not prescribe which language. The policy then categorises the LOLT for Grade 1 to 6, and Grade 7 to 12 providing learner numbers, resources availability and other conditions as determining factors. The implication is that a school's LOLT may be maintained until Grade 6, although a second language as a subject should be offered from Grade 3. The policy design follows the additive multilingualism approach, where mastery of the Home Language arguably enables learning additional languages. It states that multilingualism should become a defining characteristic of being South African. The preamble points to the need for implementation of this policy to continue to be guided by research and a broader national language plan in line with language planning practice. Further aims cited in the policy are the development of all 11 official languages; the development of programmes for the

redress of previously disadvantaged languages; and redressing historically disadvantaged languages in school education (Department of Education, 1997). The policy recognizes parent and learner choice in selecting the LOLT. They are given the discretion to select schools based on the LOLT. The role of the school as mandated in SASA is affirmed. In addition to determining the LOLT through the SGB, schools are required to stipulate how they will promote multilingualism by offering more than one language of learning and teaching. Dissatisfaction by parents, learners or the SGB are to be referred to the provincial education department. This includes incidents where the desired LOLT is not offered in schools or there is dissatisfaction with SGB effort to promote multilingualism. Should these matters not be resolved in a satisfactory matter, the policy makes provision for an appeal to the MEC, PANSALB and the Arbitration Foundation of South Africa (Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools, 1998).

A lesser-known policy in this category is the Language Compensation policy in the National Senior Certificate (NSC), enacted as an examination standardisation process fulfilling the General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Amendment Act (General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Amendment Act, 2008). The NSC is a national school-leaving examination taken at the end of 12 years of schooling. The NSC examinations may only be taken in English or Afrikaans except for the language subject which is taken in any of the 11 official languages or other additional languages. Since 1999 learners whose first language is not English or Afrikaans have received an additional five percent of their original mark on non-language subjects. This is intended to compensate for the language disadvantage experienced by these learners (Umalusi Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training, 2016). The policy was initially introduced as a short-term measure with the expectation that the English or Afrikaans proficiency of mostly African learners would improve. In 2016 the Umalusi Council[10] stated that the language compensation would be retained at three percent from 2016 until 2022 (Umalusi Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training, 2016).

Through the use of four statistical methods including the method used by Umalusi, S. Taylor (2014) provides empirical evidence of the presence of the language disadvantage. Using race as a proxy in one of the methods, black learners who score above 80% on non-language maths

---

[10] Umalusi is the official education quality assurance council. It sets and monitors standards for general and further education and training in South Africa in accordance with the National Qualifications Framework Act No 67 of 2008 and the General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Act No 58 of 2001.

items scored lower than their white counterparts on maths items which included language. This seems to point to a language disadvantage rather than poor content knowledge. Taylor concludes with asserting that if this language compensation policy is based on the existence of a language disadvantage, then it should continue to be implemented.

The five policies discussed reflect the initial phase of the post-Apartheid language in education development. As demonstrated in the discussion on why language matters, the pronouncement on official languages is a political decision in addition to its function of public policy. The pronouncement of the policies governing language in education was preceded by extensive debate and included considerations of the roles and responsibilities of government at the national and provincial level in addition to schools and parents. Although the policies are the most progressive language in education policies to date in South Africa there are gaps, implementation challenges and omissions. Murray (2002) argues that the landmark change was that schools could no longer refuse to accept learners due to their poor language proficiency, as they did in the past. Schools may, however, continue to choose Afrikaans and English as LOLT, as is the case in most high performing schools previously servicing white learners, and thus effectively excluding poorer African learners. The maintenance of the option to not offer any African languages also contributes to the low status of African languages. Finally, concerning the role of parents and SGBs, the assertion that parents and learners have the opportunity to fully exercise school choice based on language does not take into account the confounding factors already discussed that are mostly associated with underperforming schools offering African languages as the LOLT.

In 2003 a Ministerial Committee, chaired by Professor Njabulo Ndebele, was established to provide advice for the development and use of African indigenous languages as a medium of instruction in higher education. The findings were that the current language policies were adequate; however, the future of African languages as mediums of instruction was under severe threat if no actions were taken immediately in a long term national plan with clear implications for the provincial and local levels. The recommendation from the committee included that each tertiary institution in South Africa should identify and develop an indigenous African language for academic use (Department of Education, 2003). A survey of 21 higher education institutions undertaken by the Council of Higher Education in 2000 showed that 16 of those institutions offered English only as the medium of instruction while the remaining ones favoured Afrikaans but had started to introduce English. At the time the University of Stellenbosch was the only institute

offering Afrikaans exclusively (Council of Higher Education, 2001). The use of African languages took place solely as a subject specialisation area and none of the institutions was formally exploring the development of offering any African language as the medium of instruction.

In 2006 at a language colloquium hosted by PANSALB the Minister of Education reiterated that the goals of policy and practice should be to increase the use of and competence in the mother tongue, as a medium of instruction, at least in primary school; improved ability in a second language, such as English, to support further study and respond to the legitimate desires of parents and learners; and the development of communicative ability in at least one African language, for all South African children (Pandor, 2006a). Practically the language policy is sufficient, as it promotes mother tongue until Grade 6 and did not require revision, although implementation had not been adequate. In acknowledging the tension between research findings that promote mother-tongue instruction and the social reality, a major obstacle identified in mother-tongue provisioning was the preference for English as a medium of instruction by parents. This is compounded by the poor English teaching available to learners (Pandor, 2006a). In responding to the findings of the Ministerial task and the colloquium, the Department of Education committed to developing a language plan that focused on the provision of mother-tongue instruction until Grade 6; developing a second language programme for the general and further schooling phase; a national programme to revitalise the teaching and learning of indigenous languages in higher education institutions; and advocacy efforts to empower parents (Pandor, 2006b).

Vorster et al. (2013) identified obstacles to implementing these proposals as a lack of development of the African languages as academic languages; a lack of curriculum statements in African languages; insufficient quantities of teachers with proficiency in effective teaching of African languages; societal lack of the valuing of African languages; and balancing a bilingual approach that provides adequate English teaching to enable the LOLT transition to English in later grades. the requirement to still transition to English while ensuring that adequate language development takes place in English to enable this.

In reflecting on this first phase of development and the critique in light of language planning, it is clear that the main focus of this phase was on status planning as reflected in the declarations of the Constitution of South Africa such as equality, justice and recognising the previous marginalisation of African languages. This was further narrowed to schools as implementation

sites with pronouncements on bilingualism and articulation on the use of African languages in Grade 1 to 6. What was not clearly articulated is the corpus planning aspect such as the development of terminology, and the further development of African languages as academic languages. This is seen in the failure to realise the policy goal of home language teaching until Grade 6 and a lack of change in tertiary education. Reagan (2002) provides four criteria for sound language policy, as discussed earlier, namely, desirability, being fair and equitable, effectiveness and tolerability. This phase of policy development did not satisfy the desirability criteria defined as the community believing in the policy goal. This is seen in the preference of parents for English over home languages. The second aspect is tolerability; the lack of corpus planning may be interpreted to reflect an unwillingness to dedicate resources at the various levels, including tertiary institutions, government and non-government institutions.

Two of the definitions of policy emerge in the interpretation of this phase as conceptual frameworks, namely policy as legislation, and policy as text and discourse. These were discussed earlier with the definitions provided. The five policies developed, described and critiqued are clearly an exercise of policy as legislation, exercising constitutionally vested authority in the language in education space. However, the poor learning outcomes, poor teacher practice, the parental aversion and incomplete implementation are in line with the theoretical framework of policy as both text and discourse (Ball, 1993). The provision of policy as legislation has been necessary but insufficient for success in language policy in education with reinterpretation, critique, resistance and context becoming determining factors.

The third and final application of the theoretical framework is the use of the Implementation and ambiguity framework (Matland, 1995) defined earlier.

Table 3: Conflict and ambiguity framework in language policies South Africa

		Policy ambiguity	
		Low	High
Level conflict	Low	Administrative implementation (planning and resources) **Constitution of South Africa National Education Policy Act South African Schools Act Language Compensation policy in the National Senior Certificate**	Experimental implementation (context, variation, learning)
	High	Political implementation (power and feedback)	Symbolic implementation (local coalitions)

		Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools/ Language in Education Policy (LIEP)	

Source: Matland 1995 adapted

In this framework, where ambiguity and choice are low, with little conflict, there are opportunities for choices based on rational decision-making processes. This largely becomes an *administrative implementation* exercise determined by resources. In this scenario, the policy is explicitly stated for each level of implementation with clear links. The actors are clear about expectations, responsibilities and tasks. The low levels of ambiguity and conflict result in stable environments where standard operating procedures may be developed and efficiencies may be gained. Applying this criterion, most of the policies discussed in this phase of development can be categorised as administrative implementation. The Constitution of South Africa followed a rational process, it provided very specific criteria and applicability in all the sections relating to language status as well as applicability and responsibility. The National Education Policy Act similarly provided clear delegations of authority between the national government and provincial education departments while the South African Schools Act further delegated authority with clear roles and responsibilities for the government and School Governing Bodies.

The main assumption is that implementation largely becomes a technocratic process with debates and discussions focused on details of compliance and monitoring. Therefore the main challenges are expectedly technocratic. To assume that this technocratic implementation is easy is erroneous, as even when there is high consensus, implementation requires substantial effort. In reviewing technical challenges Pressman and Wildavsky identified decision points (Dearlove, 1974). Although this scenario assumes a linear process and the literature discussed in the policy definition section challenges this, some policies become administrative over time with little contestation. The Language Compensation policy in the National Senior Certificate is a case in point. The text of the policy concerning the calculation of marks and the composition of language subjects to attain the certificate are clearly stated and standardised. While the discourse on the quality, value and usefulness is contested, this policy largely complies with the administrative implementation requirements.

In the low ambiguity, high conflict category the defining feature is a non-consensus environment. The expectation can, therefore, be *political implementation* determined by the most powerful actors in terms of influence and resources. In these cases, administrative actors have limited

influence on the outcomes of the policy. Success depends on the extent of dominance of those initiating the policy, whether they have sufficient resources or may coerce or incentivise the dissenting parties and bargain. Although coercion is an option, such mechanisms are only effective if they can be easily monitored or they clearly affect the core mission of those sanctioned. If the sanctions are peripheral in impact, then coercion is ineffective. Segments of the policy that are unresolved may then be included through ambiguous writing for later resolution within a context of fleeting coalitions. This model of implementation complements the contestation discussions in defining policy as argued by Ball and Bowe et al (1992). They argue that policy is fragmented fluid and itself a compromise or a contested product. The Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools otherwise referred to as the Language in Education Policy (LiEP) fits into this category. The role of government is limited, with authority delegated to School Governing Bodies to determine the language of the school. This is decentralisation to the 26 000 plus schools in the country. Testing these parameters was seen in the Mpumalanga Department of Education and Another v Hoërskool Ermelo and Another case (*Hoërskool Ermelo v The Head of Department of Education: Mpumalanga*, 2009). The case resulted from the school's refusal to admit 130 English speaking Grade 8 learners and amend the LOLT policy to the dual medium of English and Afrikaans. The Court found that the SGB failed to act within reason and had not sufficiently demonstrated that the LOLT reflected the community serviced by the school. Similar court cases have since taken place. The court ruled that legally the provincial Head of Department had the right to withdraw the function of determining the LOLT from the SGB if there is reasonable ground. The court case demonstrates a form of coercion remedied by legal intervention in reinterpreting the text of the policy. This demonstrates the idea of a policy cycle and the generation of feedback in a contested space which leads to a reiteration, but without eliminating conflict.

4.1.2 The second phase of language in education policies in South Africa

Curriculum policy is an integral tool in delivering the ideals informing the language of education policies. The second phase of policy development focused on this. The curriculum has been reviewed and revised since the inception of schooling. A substantial body of work has been written on these changes, including reviews of curriculum design, policy and implementation. A detailed discussion of these is beyond the ambit of this pape, but a discussion of the current curriculum policy concerning language cannot be excluded. The current curriculum implemented is the

National Curriculum Statement (NCS) Grade R to 12. The NCS is commonly referred to as CAPS; however, it comprises of the following:

1. National Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements Grades R – 12 in schools (CAPS) for each approved school subject as listed in the policy document National Senior Certificate: A qualification at Level 4 on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF);
2. The policy document, national policy pertaining to the programme and promotion requirements of the National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 12; and
3. The National Protocol for Assessment Grades R – 12

The NCS was gazetted in 2011 and implementation was phased in across different grades. It was implemented in the Foundation Phase and Grade 10 in 2012; in the Intermediate phase and Grade 11 in 2013; and in the Senior Phase and Grade 12 in 2014. The NCS is based on four main principles (South Africa & Department of Basic Education, 2011):

1. Social transformation as a mechanism to create equal educational opportunities for the entire population;
2. Human rights, inclusivity, environmental and social justice;
3. Encouragement of critical learning through engagement with the material as opposed to rote learning based on regurgitation instead of internalisation and reflection;
4. Clearly defined standards of knowledge and skills for each grade of education completed

According to regulations on the NCS specifically on language (Department of Basic Education, 2015), learners are required to offer one official language at the Home Language level in Grade R, with no other languages offered. In the Foundation Phase learners are required to offer two official languages with one at Home Language level and the other at a First Additional Language level. Learners are then permitted to offer a third official or non-official language at the Second Language level or higher, provided that additional time is created in the school day without compromising the first two languages. The regulation then states that if the Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT) in Grades 1-3 is not the same as in Grade 4 onwards, the official language offered at First Additional Language level must be the LoLT for Grade 4. The CAPS documents are available in all 11 official languages for Home Language, First Additional Language and Second Additional Language. In addition, the CAPS documents are provided in all 11 official languages for the remaining two Foundation Phase subjects, namely Mathematics, and Life

Orientation. Effectively the provision of the curriculum resources enables different language choices in both which language to study at the Home Language level, as well as the choice of LoLT.

For the Intermediate Phase and the remaining phases, the regulations again require two languages with at least one at the Home Language level and the second at a First Additional Language level or higher, as well as provision for third languages with similar conditions as in the Foundation Phase. However, CAPS documents for the non-language subjects including Mathematics, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences and Technology are only provided in English and Afrikaans.

A complement to the curriculum statements has been the development of national catalogues of textbooks as recommended by a Ministerial Task Team on LTSM in 2010. A national catalogue for Grades 1-3 and 10 was published in 2011; Grades 4-6 and 11, in 2012 and, lastly, Grades 7-9 and 12, in 2013. In each case, the catalogues preceded the phased curriculum development (Department of Basic Education, 2019b).

The implication of the curriculum policies is that although the national policy allows for Home Language learning at least until Grade 6, the curriculum requires either the same language to be the LoLT throughout primary schooling or a transition to take place after Grade 3 and not Grade 6. Although the curriculum acknowledges all the official languages equally, the interpretation that in fact there is an expected transition to either English or Afrikaans at Grade 4 at the latest is supported by the provision of CAPS documents only in those languages. Similarly, the approved LTSM catalogue developed by the Department of Education only includes English or Afrikaans options for non-language subjects from Grade 4 onwards. In a similar critique offered by the Bua-Lit collective, which comprises of researchers, activists, educators and teacher educators, they state that the curriculum " supports neither teaching through the home language beyond Grade 3 nor dual-medium bilingual education. The language requirements of the CAPS have effectively changed language policy through the back door by introducing an additional language from Grade 1, and by implicitly enforcing a change in the language of learning and teaching (LOLT) for African language children in Grade 4. This change is enforced by providing teaching and learning resources as well as assessments exclusively through English" (Bua-Lit collective, 2018), although the assessments aspect is inaccurate their interpretation is fair.

Similarly, although the LTSM catalogue has improved overall textbook quality, the approved textbooks are only offered in English or Afrikaans in Grade 4 onwards for non-language subjects. The need to provide detailed guidelines on the content for African language material especially in the Foundation Phase has also been acknowledged (Department of Basic Education, 2019b). Even the current provisioning for English is critiqued with the argument made that children transitioning to English as a second or third language as the LoLT require more resources than a single textbook as per the catalogue (Bua-Lit collective, 2018). Furthermore, as stated earlier in the paper, the National Senior Certificate examination in Grade 12 may only be written in English or Afrikaans, and the same applies in tertiary education. Learners are therefore expected to transition to one of these languages as the LoLT during their education.

A recent evaluation of the design and implementation of the NCS commissioned by the DBE found the curriculum to be the best curriculum to date in content and guidance to teachers, but implementation is still ineffective. The main challenges were identified as time management, teacher knowledge, the provision of learning and teaching resources, and assessment practice (Department of Basic Education & Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2017). While acknowledging the progress made, a further critique of the content of curriculum policy for language was discussed in a 2016 unpublished report by Class Act, one of the largest literacy NGOs in South Africa with extensive experience in implementing the literacy curriculum in the African languages. The report was developed as part of the DBE's commissioned research on reading in the Foundation Phase. The critique may be summarised as follows:

1. The curriculum documents specify that learners should use an expanding vocabulary but then does not specify how to do this. In the case of English First Additional Language, a high-frequency word list is provided, but this is not the case in any of the African languages.
2. There is insufficient progression across the year and grades in the listening and speaking curriculum subcomponent. It lacks specific objectives and benchmarks and examples based on different types of stories and stages within stories.
3. There are suggestions on the kinds of phonics that should be taught each term, but a comprehensive list is not provided and the guidelines are inconsistent across languages.
4. Phonemic awareness is mentioned, but there is no consistency or a systematic progression in the teaching of this skill.
5. The curriculum emphasises reading but there is an insufficient supply of reading materials.

A Department of Basic Education report on the Early Grade Reading Study in Setswana in the Foundation Phase (Department of Basic Education et al., 2017) also identified curriculum limitations as:

1. Insufficient allocation of time for group guided reading, which results in substantial numbers of learners losing the opportunity to read individually;
2. Insufficient opportunities to read extended texts; and
3. Low cognitive demand in written work.

There has been substantial development in the curriculum provisioning and specification. However, the gaps in the broader policy, failure in micro policy at the classroom level and weak implementation continue to maintain the language inequality more than 20 years after democracy. There is still little research on how to effectively teach literacy or on standards, including the quantity of writing or reading required for effective education in African languages and English as an additional language. Neither the policies nor the curriculum have successfully specified reading benchmarks, minimum standards for reading materials, a growing body of academic vocabulary or proven programmes on language and literacy in the African languages.

In the last section on this second phase of development, the implementation framework is presented again with the NCS included and a rationale provided for this.

Table 4: Conflict and ambiguity framework in language policies South Africa

		Policy ambiguity	
		Low	High
Level conflict	Low	Administrative implementation (planning and resources) **Constitution of South Africa National Education Policy Act South African Schools Act Language Compensation policy in the National Senior Certificate National Curriculum Statements Grade 1 to 3**	Experimental implementation (context, variation, learning)
	High	Political implementation (power and feedback) **Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools/ Language in Education Policy (LIEP)**	Symbolic implementation (local coalitions) **National Curriculum Statements Grade 4 to 12**

Source: Matland 1995 adapted

The NCS for Grade 1 to 3 falls into *administrative implementation* due to the explicitly stated details for each level of implementation, with clear links. The policy is clear about the different languages and the idea of choice is affirmed by the provision of resources across all 11 languages. There are low levels of ambiguity and conflict, resulting in stable environments where standard operating procedures articulated through CAPS have been developed. The critique is largely about efficiencies such as detailed revision and better material rather than an absence of materials. The main assumption, that implementation is largely a technocratic process with debates and discussions focused on details of compliance and monitoring, is proven again by the critique being on the depth and breadth of materials for implementation or the ability of teachers rather than a lack of clarity in the policy. The NCS for Grade 4 to 12 has characteristics of administrative implementation, as well as political implementation similar to the LiEP policy. However, it may be categorised as *symbolic implementation* in as far as the curriculum policies reaffirm Constitutional values, national language commitments and goals. However, the policies are characterised by high ambiguity and high conflict with contested and competing interpretations that cannot be concurrently implemented. This is seen in the lack of a direct pronouncement on the LoLT, accompanied by the implicit interpretation by the provision of only English and Afrikaans curriculum documents and LTSM for non-language subjects, thus only supporting learning in these languages. As per the criteria for such policies, they aim at redistribution of power or resources. However, very little information on the process and implications as well as how to proceed is provided

4.1.3 The third phase of language in education policies in South Africa

The third phase of language policies spans from 2013 until the current time. The four latest language in education policy developments has been the draft Basic Education Laws Act (BELA) bill, the draft National Policy for the Provision and Management of Learning and Teaching Support Material (LTSM), the Incremental Introduction of African Languages (IIAL) and the Revised Language Policy for Higher Education.

The BELA bill aims to update and amend several pieces of basic education legislation. This includes the National Education Policy Act (NEPA), the South African Schools Act (SASA), the Employment of Educators Act, the General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance

Act, and the South African Council for Educators Act. The initial bill was gazetted in 2011. Consultations were completed with provinces and education trade unions and the bill was approved by Cabinet and subsequently published for public comment in 2017. An overall discussion of the amendment is beyond the scope of this paper. The sections highlighted will be limited to those relating to the language in education policies.

According to the BELA bill, School Governing Bodie (SGBs) must submit the language policy of a public school and amendment to the provincial Head of Department (HOD) for approval and the HOD may approve, reject or make recommendations to the policy. Secondly, the LoLT policy of schools will be expected to be amended every 3 years, if the context changes or when necessary or requested by the HOD. The policy goes on to say the HOD may direct a school to offer more than one LoLT. To enact this the HOD must inform the SGB in advance. The SGB should hold public consultations or hearings and a final public declaration of the decision should be made. Considerations for amendments should include the Constitution and equity; the number of learners speaking the language; effective utilisation of resources; and general language needs of the broader community. The Mpumalanga court case cited earlier in the paper is cited as one of the contributing cases. The main point of emphasis is that the determination of a schools LoLT is a devolved function. However, it is not the exclusive preserve of the school and therefore the HOD is not precluded from intervening. The BELA Bill also makes provision for centralised LTSM procurement to realise economies of scale by suspending the SGB function to procure textbooks. However, this would follow consultation (Basic Education Laws Amendment (BELA) Bill, 2017).

Supplementing the LTSM section has been the 2014 publication of a draft LTSM policy aimed to further guide the sector. This follows recommendations from a 2010 Ministerial Task Team on LTSM (Department of Basic Education & Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2016). The policy aims to guide the development, procurement, and management of all LTSM including textbooks. In addition to the same BELA recommendations on centralised procurement, the draft policy advocates a decentralised approach to LTSM development, providing the DBE with the latitude to generate LTSM from a range of sources, as well as by internally producing or commissioning the development of LTSM for subjects/languages under what is referred to as state publishing. The policy also addresses the issues of intellectual property, clarifying cases where intellectual property and reproduction rights reside with the DBE and where they will reside with the creators and developers of the material (Department of Basic Education, 2014).

Public comments on the draft LTSM Policy were received from various stakeholders ranging from SGBs, universities, political parties, publishers to teacher unions. The main areas of emphasis and discussions among these stakeholders were; central procurement, particularly for section 21.1.c schools who have the right to procure LTSM directly, contending that this ignores SGB powers in the SASA; that the policy should be developed with funding norms and standards of public schools as well, rather than as a stand-alone policy; and that the DBE should consider ratifying the Marrakesh Treaty on copyright practices which require contracting parties to create limitations and exceptions to copyright laws that would facilitate access to printed materials for readers with visual impairment. Other concerns were on the loss of profit by the publishing sector and limitations to teacher flexibility through the provision of core LTSM. Comments received on this section of the BELA bill were similar, indicating agreement with the centralised procurement, recognising that this is about efficiency, particularly as this would be executed in consultation with schools. Due to the interrelationship between these two policies the LTSM policy will only be finalised once the BELA bill, which addresses some concerns, is finalised.

A further significant development was the 2013 publication of the Incremental Introduction to African Language draft policy. The preamble acknowledges the language challenges that have persisted in South Africa and recognises the poor learning and language outcomes in the schooling sector. The policy aims to primarily promote and strengthen the use of African languages by all learners from Grade 1 to 12 at Home Language and First Additional Language level, increasing the confidence of parents in choosing African languages. Secondly, the policy aims to improve access beyond English and Afrikaans, ensuring that all non-African language speakers speak an African language. Finally, the policy also aims to promote social cohesion through the development and preservation of African languages (Department of Basic Education, 2013). The policy was broadly consulted, including with education unions, the education portfolio committee, PANSALB and the Afrikaanse Taalraad.

The policy discusses clear linkages to the Constitution of South Africa, the Bill of Rights, NEPA, SASA and the curriculum developments, framing Incremental Introduction to African Language as a further contribution by providing new opportunities and options. The main proposed change is the introduction of a second First Additional Language offered across all grades instead of just one, as is currently the case. The choices for the language are a selection of Xitsonga, Tshivenda, a Nguni language, a Sotho language or Afrikaans. The selection of a language would be determined by the majority language and where this is not possible schools may be designated

to specific languages, especially in multilingual contexts. Offering English as either Home Language or one of two FAL options would become compulsory. To enable this, the policy proposes an increased school day, ranging from an additional 2 hours per week in Grade 1 and 2 to 5 hours in Grade 10 to 12. (Department of Basic Education, 2013).

The provision of LTSMs is discussed specifically as a requirement. The policy highlights the need to develop material in African languages at the First Additional Language Level. Teacher provisioning is explicitly discussed, with various options for staffing provided including multi-grade teaching, itinerant teachers or roving teachers, while maintaining a 1:20 teacher-pupil ratio in multigrade contexts and a 1:40 ratio in rural contexts. The funding, monitoring and evaluation implications are also discussed.

It was envisaged that the IIAL policy will be implemented incrementally, commencing in Grade 1 in 2015 and continuing until 2026, when it will be implemented in Grade 12 (Department of Basic Education, 2013). In 2018 an IIAL Strategy Sector Plan 2017-2029 was published and shared with provinces with training and additional LTSM developed. However, the policy has not been implemented as originally designed. To date, the DBE has developed Grade 1-3 resources at the Second Additional Language (SAL) level instead of the First Additional Language level. These which include anthologies, workbooks, lesson plans, big books, and posters in ten languages. These resources have been distributed to schools that are implementing the IIAL (Department of Basic Education, 2019b). A further significant divergence is a reduction of the target for full implementation from all schools to a reduced 2 630 schools with approximately 50% of these - 1 324 - implementing (Department of Basic Education, 2018).

Both the BELA bill and IIAL present the most comprehensive responses to the critique of earlier language in education policies. They provide detail on corpus aspects and incorporate additional monitoring and accountability, providing explicit direction on the position and role of African languages. In terms of language planning criteria (Reagan, 2002), these two policies meet two of the four criteria: firstly, desirability, whether the community believes in the policy goal – the policies make a clear case for why this a common good, including the requirement for language to reflect broader society as in the BELA bill and the need for non-African language South Africans to learn African languages; secondly, justness, whether the policy is fair and equitable – both policies provide an extensive discussion and reflection on the current inequalities in the schooling sector and acknowledge that they cannot persist without intervention. The third criterion of effectiveness,

that the policy achieves its objectives, and lastly, tolerability, that the policy is resource-sensitive or viable within the context, are yet to be realised. However, the policy focus shift in the Incremental Introduction of African Language to only focus on schools previously not offering any African language at the Second Additional Language level rather than full policy implementation reflects a lack of effectiveness or tolerability. Part of the implementation challenges cited by the DBE are the lack of availability of teachers competent to teach in African languages and the impression that African languages do not have any international value (Department of Basic Education, 2019a). The scaling down of the implementation is concerning, considering how comprehensive the Incremental Introduction of African Language draft policy is and its potential in shifting the education landscape. In a nationally representative survey conducted in 2017, most Grade 3 teachers felt confident teaching in English at 41% or very confident at 50%, while the next language where confidence was expressed as half of that was isiZulu at 22.4% and the lowest levels were for XiTsonga and Tshivenda at below 1% confidence (Department of Basic Education, 2019a).

The final policy development in this period has been the Revised Language Policy for Higher Education, gazetted in February 2018. The policy revises the 2002 language in higher education policy discussed earlier recognising that the ambiguous wording used previously enabled non-compliance or malicious compliance and that the availability of funding for implementation was a shortcoming. The aim of the revised policy is enforcing the use of all official South African languages in higher education institutions in all functional areas including scholarship, teaching and learning, and broader communication. The broader aim of the policy is fulfilling the Constitutional commitment of language parity, particularly for indigenous African languages. The policy recognises the weak language proficiency of the majority of university students in both English and African languages arguing that proficiency is far worse in English and thus a lack of language support in university for home language speakers is inefficient, serving as a barrier. The policy also argues that the deliberate Apartheid era underdevelopment of African languages and current practice of only using Afrikaans as the medium of instruction in former Afrikaans medium universities is a form of discrimination. The evidence of these has been discussed earlier through several court cases(Government Notice Revised Language Policy for Higher Education.pdf, 2018).

The revised policy proposes universities as the primary custodians of the scholarship of African languages, clarifying the requirement for higher education institutions to diversify the language of

learning to include indigenous African languages, over and above the inclusion of English in relation to scholarship as well as exploring strategies to intellectualise African languages. With regards to communication, higher education institutions are required to translate communication to at least 3 official languages (Government Notice Revised Language Policy for Higher Education.pdf, 2018).

Enabling factors for implementation are recognised as the revision of university language policies and plans, and collaborative programmes across institutions under the leadership of African language departments with centres of language development. The DBE is mentioned as a partner contributing by producing learners competent in their home language. The Department of Arts and Culture is charged with the development of dictionaries across the languages and the creation of a multidisciplinary terminology bank in collaboration with PANSALB. The policy provides a strong emphasis on monitoring and evaluation with Vice-Chancellors expected to report annually, commitment to annual measurements of implementation by DHET as well as the availability of funding through DHET. The implementation timeframe is set to start in January 2019 (Government Notice Revised Language Policy for Higher Education.pdf, 2018). Implementation is still in the early phases. However, DHET has established Centres for African Languages Teaching as a funding mechanism for this policy. The most prominent of these is at the University of Johannesburg, with the explicit aim of conducting practice-based research and research-based practice for the development of teachers who teach African languages in the foundation phase and intermediate phase through the medium of African languages. The two languages of focus are Sesotho and isiZulu. Further information is not yet available.

This third and final major policy in this phase, similar to the BELA Bill and IIAL, addresses critique on the role of higher education institutions, and DHET in developing African languages and establishing a stronger linkage between basic and higher education. The policy starts to move towards the realisation of African languages as academic languages, providing specific requirements for corpus planning while elevating the status planning aspect through both recognising African languages as intellectual languages and requiring them to be used for ordinary communication. The recognition of both the lack of will and resources seems to be well placed and the creation of a fund for this may be expected to address this limitation at least from the side of DHET.

When considering Maitland (1995)'s implementation framework of Conflict and ambiguity (Matland, 1995). the three policies fall into three of the four categories. A discussion of this is provided below.

Table 5: Conflict and ambiguity framework in language policies South Africa

		Policy ambiguity	
		Low	High
Level conflict	Low	Administrative implementation (planning and resources) **Constitution of South Africa National Education Policy Act South African Schools Act Language Compensation policy in the National Senior Certificate National Curriculum Statements Grade 1 to 3 Provision and Management of Learning and Teaching Support Material (LTSM)**	Experimental implementation (context, variation, learning)
	High	Political implementation (power and feedback) **Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools/ Language in Education Policy (LIEP) Basic Education Laws Act (BELA) Incremental Introduction of African Languages (IIAL) Revised Language Policy for Higher Education**	Symbolic implementation (local coalitions) **National Curriculum Statements Grade 4 to 12**

Source: Matland 1995 adapted

As with the curriculum for Grade 1 to 3, the LTSM policy falls into *administrative implementation,* as it explicitly states the purpose and process for LTSM development, procurement, use and monitoring. This may be expected, as aspects of the policy such as the national textbook catalogue have been previously implemented and this policy, therefore, serves as an update and a consolidation rather than a completely new articulation. The policy is in alignment with the curriculum and areas of conflict would be resolved through the BELA Bill amendment. There are therefore overall low levels of ambiguity or conflict. The remaining critique or concerns on the quality of state textbooks apply to any development process and is not unique to government. In addition, the policy makes allowance for commissioning of development and use of open-source materials over and above parameters being set by the NCS curriculum, which has been assessed

to be of high quality. The second concern, the negative economic effect on the publishing sector, is worth noting overall. However, the mandate of the DBE is providing high-quality education in the most efficient manner and not economic development primarily through publishing.

The BELA Bill, IIAL and Revised Language Policy for Higher Education policies are similar to the LiEP policy due to their low ambiguity, but high conflict distinction. The expectation is, therefore, *political implementation* determined by the most powerful actors in terms of influence and resources. The public debates on language determination and the politics and power associated with primary schooling and higher education reflect the lack of consensus which may be resolved by political action. All three policies are largely a revision of previous policies where other actors have not fulfilled or responded willingly and thus coercion started to emerge, noting that this is one of the characteristics of political implementation. The high number of higher education language court cases discussed earlier are a case in point. Although coercion is an option, it is only an effective mechanism through continuous and easy monitoring. In the BELA Bill the review of the school's language policy by the HoD every three years presents such as an opportunity. Similarly, in the higher education policy there is ongoing annual reporting. However, this is not clear for IIAL. In fact, the reduced implementation of IIAL already reflects a compromise, although in this model there is an acknowledgement that segments of the policy that are unresolved may then be included through ambiguous writing for later resolution within a context of coalitions and there may well be staggered implementation.

Overall the language in education policy development has seen substantial shifts over the three periods with clear developments and implications for language planning, understanding policy and framing implementation.

5. Language and Power

So far this paper has discussed the history of language development, contrasting Afrikaans and African languages, the status of literacy and language as well as the policy development process to date. This final section attempts to grapple with why the language policy dilemma persists. Two main points are discussed to explain the status quo and propose levers of change. The first is on the economic returns to language, and the second is on multilingualim in the South African context.

5.1 The Economic Domination of English

The use of English, starting in the church, followed by missionary education and then in employment by the colonial state resulted in the emergence of a small black middle-class that could read and write in English (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1997; Hermanson, 2004; Alexander, 1989). This point was made earlier in this paper. What was not adequately discussed, however, is the generative nature of language and culture which meant that this was not only an acquisition of language but of English culture as well as elite status (Alexander, 1989; Heugh, 2009). This cultural change was both incidental and deliberate, as the version of Christianity preached frowned upon several aspects of African practices, promoting instead the adoption of Western culture (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986; Maluleke, 2005).

In current times, role modelling by the middle class has maintained the high status of English and contributes to the notion that what is to be known is knowable only in English and that South Africa is part of Anglophone Africa (Mesthrie, 2002b; Pennycook, 2005). This sentiment has been confirmed through the South African Social Attitudes Survey, based on a nationally representative sample. When asked which language should be the main language of instruction responses have increasingly favoured English. In 2003 the response was 55% in favour of English while 41% chose African languages; this had increased to 65% in favour of English in 2018 (Human Sciences Research Council, 2019). This outcome should not be entirely surprising for two reasons. Firstly, the negative association with African languages resulting from the Bantu education system under Apartheid means most African people have been willing to maintain their first language in primary contexts of family but have not experienced the capacity of African languages developing into languages of power. Secondly, according to Bourdieu (2009), a language is only worth what its speakers are worth. When one language dominates the market, it becomes the norm against which the 'prices' of other languages are determined and how competency is defined. The power and authority in economic and cultural relations correspond with social value. Internationally and in South Africa, there is a sizably larger economic value for English. English is used in the formal economy and the indigenous South African languages are used in the informal economy. Being literate in English is therefore far more significant and meaningful for the majority of South Africans than mastery of Home Language (Alexander, 2005; Klapwijk & Van der Walt, 2016). There is a direct relationship between English proficiency and earnings in South Africa. The earnings of African men reporting literate proficiency in reading and writing English was 55% higher than

those who did not. These findings by Casale & Posel (2011) are based on an analysis of the 2008 first wave of the National Income Dynamics Study (NIDS), the only nationally representative longitudinal study in South Africa. Participants that were proficient in English and had a post-schooling qualification, signalling higher levels of English literacy, had an even higher advantage of an additional 97% in earnings. To further demonstrate the perceived upward mobility of English and inequality of languages, there were hardly any returns to African language proficiency (Casale & Posel, 2011).

Using the same 2008 NIDS data, McKenzie & Muller (2017) find that, firstly, English proficiency significantly affected labour participation and employment for African women, reflecting that poor English language proficiency among working-age African women acted as a barrier to economic participation; and secondly, that individuals with higher English proficiency occupied higher-level positions than those who were not proficient. Kahn et al.(2019) provided evidence of the persistence of this trend from 2008 to 2017. In their paper, using NIDS data over five waves, English proficiency had a positive effect on employment probabilities and wages of non-English speaking males. Those who were English proficient were 22 percentage points more likely to be employed and English proficiency was associated with a wage premium of 33 percent.

Based on these empirical findings that have a real bearing on the livelihoods and future outcome of African people, it is unsurprising then that while there may be an appreciation for African languages, parents and young people continue to value English over African languages because there is an economic return for English. English then serves an economic purpose (Wright, 2002), where English proficiency seems to be the only bridge for transitioning from the informal to the formal, from unemployment to employment and for better earning and positions. The economic value of English mastery is indisputable. A major question facing South Africa today, however, is how to make multilingualism 'profitable', such that the value is not only based on ideology and identity but that there is material value. The next section of this chapter addresses this question of multilingualism in the South African context.

5.2 Multilingual Policy Development

Internationally, language diversity is a norm with more than 7000 languages spoken across the world in 2020. Although there are some monolingual countries, most countries and regions have multiple languages (Alexander, 1989; *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 2020; UNESCO,

2003). In Africa there are up to 2500 languages spoken with no monolingual states and languages are spread across borders and even regions, making it the continent with the second largest indigenous languages at 30% after Asia with 32% (*Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 2020; Ouane & Glanz, 2010).

In South Africa, multilingualism has increased. An analysis of the 2016 Census shows an increase from 12% in 1996 to almost 50% in 2011. This is mostly due to significant growth in African people speaking English as a second language and acquiring other second languages. Overall, Africans are becoming more multilingual with second language growth seen mostly in English, followed by isiZulu (Posel & Zeller, 2016).

The implications of multilingualism have historically been complex and in some cases controversial, starting primarily with ideological differences, language dominance involving privileging some languages overs others and encompassing communication dilemmas (Heugh, 2013). To some extent, this fractured multilingualism framing has resulted in the dominance of colonial languages, as discussed above for both South Africa and the rest of the continent. African countries are still referred to as Anglophone, Francophone or Lusophone based on the languages of their colonisers, as opposed to being Afrophone even with its multilingual resources (Brock-Utne, 2007). An international language survey commissioned by the UNESCO showed that only 176 African languages out of 2500 are used in African education systems (Ouane & Glanz, 2010).

Although multilingualism is complex, scholars reject the idea that multilingualism is overwhelmingly problematic by interrogating monolingualism. What makes monolingualism problematic is its implicit exclusivity in a context where other languages exist (Alexander, 1989; Ouane & Glanz, 2010; UNESCO, 2003). The case of South Africa and the elevated status of Afrikaans as explained throughout this paper gives context to why monolingualism cannot be accepted as a national language planning position. This has been acknowledged in the Consitution of South Africa through officialising 11 languages (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, 1996; Ngcobo, 2009). Yet the question of how to maintain multilingualism and offer schooling in multiple languages at acceptable standards within limited resource and time constraints still requires careful consideration. Three main policy scenarios may be offered as a way of further establishing a multilingual perspective, as presented below.

Policy scenario 1:

Nhlapo (1944) and Alexander (1989) proposed the establishment of single Nguni and Sotho languages respectively as a response, arguing that similarities within these discretely distinct language groups are proof of their artificial separation. This argument recognizes the history of the flawed development of African languages, discussed earlier, and the significant role of language planning. These authors argue that new languages could be standardized for academic purposes and adopted as national official languages while the remaining African languages could be adopted as regional languages, depending on the dominant language groups within provinces. Learners would receive their education in one of these two African languages for the first five to six years of schooling with English as a subject. A full transition to learning in the English medium could then take place in Grade five or six, as articulated in the existing language in education policy.

This policy proposal by Nhlapo and Alexander indirectly ascribes power to the majority population in the country by consolidating the similarities and recognizing that a shared language has embedded power through consolidation. On the merits of dethroning English, or rather de-constructing and reconstructing the dominant language discourse, this proposal makes a considered argument. Secondly, they propose tangible ways of using language as an object of communication. The unification of languages within the Nguni and Sotho groups would dismantle the Colonial era classification and reimagine them based on different criteria. To this end, the development of Kiswahili and its growth as a regional language may provide valuable lessons and a relatively successful case study of a similar endeavour. The proposal is silent, however, on how xiTsonga and Tshivenda would be accommodated. Thirdly, the proposal potentially creates an enabling environment for development by implying a pooling of resources. This, in turn, starts to undo the dialectical relationship between English and the indigenous languages by allowing prioritization.

The major critique of their proposal, however, is that it presents diversity and multilingualism as a problem and does not celebrate the complexity which has come to define South Africa. This is particularly the case currently as ethnic identities, however flawed they are in authenticity, have been established from 1955 (Heugh, 2016). This exercise is even more unfeasible now than then. The standardization process would be a near-impossible feat; standardization has been problematic even within a single language with varying dialects. It is difficult to imagine that the process within a language group rather than a single language would be any easier. More

practical difficulties, should this be adopted as a policy option, would be how the final languages within these groups would be selected, whether the required expertise to merge these exists, and finally, whether the South African society would be accepting of this.

Policy scenario 2:

An alternative response is based on recognising the significance of mother tongue education. Internationally, education theory promotes mother-tongue instruction, recommending that schooling should begin in the language the child knows best, often their mother tongue (Brock-Utne, 2007; Heugh, 2005; Mackenzie & Walker, Not dated; Ouane & Glanz, 2010; UNESCO, 2003). Even within the limited empirical studies in Africa, the findings are also applicable having been shown in Botswana, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Kenya (Heugh, 2000; Ouane & Glanz, 2010; Piper et al., 2016). In South Africa the work of Taylor and Von Fintel (2016) cited earlier makes the same case. Using longitudinal national assessment data, they found that learners receiving their education in their mother tongue in the first three years of schooling outperformed learners from the same background who received their first three years of schooling in English. This positive impact was significant in both English and Home Language outcomes. This is further supported by the study cited earlier (Eriksson, 2014) examining the effect of the 1955 Bantu Education Act which mandated an increase of Home Language learning from four years to six years. There was a positive impact of the increased Home Language literacy on long-term educational outcomes and earnings. This was a return measured in terms of later English proficiency.

These studies highlight an often understated or misunderstood outcome, that home language literacy in African languages is a particularly useful tool for future learning outcomes in both African languages and English. The application of this for broader stakeholders, including parents, is that learning an African Home Language well is the best pathway towards earning returns in English within a multilingual context such as South Africa, where both Home Language and English as an Additional Language are offered. What is even more striking is that these positive and significant outcomes were applicable across all nine African languages. The main critique of this approach is that it does not address the dominance of English but rather endorses the status quo without proposing alternatives or critiquing the current policy.

Policy scenario 3:

A third alternative is a hybrid of these two scenarios, that is in line with the most recent language in education developments discussed earlier, i.e. the draft Basic Education Laws Act (BELA) bill, the draft National Policy for the Provision and Management of Learning and Teaching Support Material (LTSM), the Incremental Introduction of African Languages (IIAL) and the Revised Language Policy for Higher Education. The implementation scenario could be providing mother tongue education for the first six years within the existing language in education policies, serving as a way to recognise the success of the proven language policy while extending it. Secondly, implementing the full version of the Incremental Introduction of African Languages policy, by making English compulsory a First Additional Language while also specifically introducing an African First Additional Language. This would be a recognition of the role and significance of English while also affirming the increasing multilingualism of African learners and ensuring that all learners in South Africa learn an African language at the First Additional Language level. This may even address the idea of regional languages. The additional African language could be selected based on the largest regional languages within the province. The SGB role ascribed to through the BELA Bill, namely selecting languages that reflect the school population and broader schooling context and national priorities with routine approval by the Provincial Head of Department, would also ensure that the language selection remains relevant. Finally, the Revised Language Policy for Higher Education implemented alongside these policies would develop the corpus required to offer African languages as academic languages beyond Grade 6 and ultimately, at the university level. Through these efforts the economic returns for African language alongside English may start to be realised.

6 Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated the long history of overlaps between power, identity and language. The practice of language planning examined from colonial times to date clearly demonstrated this, with better alignment in desirability and tolerability for Afrikaans at the expense of African language development. The recent legal cases cited to confirm that this remains a current issue, and the persistent language dilemma provide a theoretical lens to understand the continued undercurrent of this intersectionality.

Firstly, there is a clear language disadvantage for learners receiving their education in African languages in the Foundation Phase. Secondly, there is also a literacy disadvantage resulting from poor schooling quality for the majority of African language speaking learners. Thirdly, there is a sustained distinction in the literacy and language skills and knowledge of learners receiving their schooling in English or Afrikaans and those that are not. This does not, however, dismiss the educational benefit of Home Language education in African languages in the Foundation Phase, but rather highlights the need for quality language and literacy teaching and learning in African languages. The inequality in both literacy and language and their interaction cannot be denied.

A further conclusion emerging from the paper is the sparse availability of large-scale empirical data that may be used to estimate the impact of language, specifically African languages, or for African learners' English proficiency. The limited understanding of the meaning of this data for Home Language literacy, even as a pathway to English, requires careful consideration as it is an underappreciated empirical source to guide future policy and to assist parents in their language choices. Secondly, the availability of such data and research would enable the debate to move beyond the broader language question to more detailed systematic questions of how exactly the language in education policies should be enacted? What are the appropriate Learning and Teaching Support Materials (LTSMs)? What is the optimal time allocation? What should the content of teaching in these be?

The paper has also provided a summary of the language in education policies, illustrating that changes in the official status and use of languages do not happen naturally but require deliberate language planning. In critiquing the policies there are clear omissions and a lack of specificity in definitions, and incorrect underlying assumptions, for instance, that SGBs would be adequately equipped to determine the appropriate language policy for the school, make concerted efforts to

promote multilingualism and voluntarily opt for provisioning in African languages where English and Afrikaans previously dominated. It is also clear that pronouncing on the development of African languages in policy has not yielded much beyond the basic implementation of the curriculum. However, the developments of the third phase of policies show important shifts in the policy landscape, especially through the BELA Bill, IIAL, LTSM policy and the language in higher education policy. These policies increasingly address the specifications of language planning, such as the gap of corpus planning in addition to status planning. Furthermore, the interpretation of language policies against the policy as text and discourse framework initially, and the policy ambiguity and conflict framework lend a helpful interpretation and appreciation to policy development in South Africa.

A harsh interpretation of the scant existence of academic scholarly articles and substantive commentary on these matters may be that there is a disjuncture between the lived experiences of those excluded by language and the custodians of academic knowledge and literature, or that this fundamental issue is seen as peripheral in academia. A more generous view may be that there is a limited understanding of the significance of language and literacy disadvantage. This along with limited human and financial resources may be key contributors to the limited body of work. Political will is still required to clarify the responsibility for the implied standards and guidelines from the policies; make provisioning possible through specific resourcing and develop clear implementation details; and respond to known and documented policy design and implementation shortcomings. This includes reviewing the functionality of PANSALB concerning its mandate as well as a more systematic approach to language policies and development in universities.

The final section makes it clear that systematically addressing the persistent dilemma of the mother-tongue or straight-for-English question requires broad consideration about the implications of the current inequalities. One of the biggest realities parents, learners and broader stakeholders face is the high economic returns to English and even Afrikaans, in contrast to no commercial return for African languages. The call to commercialize multilingualism so that the majority of South Africans may earn returns on their language proficiency warrants some thought and has a direct bearing on education policy. However, as this paper has shown, successful implementation of language policies is complex and requires political, technical and social collaboration from a range of stakeholders. The model followed for Afrikaans is an important example of this.

It is clear that language matters and why it matters historically as well as in the current educational and societal experience of South Africa. To respond comprehensively to this current reality requires the deliberate and careful development of indigenous South African languages foregrounded in education resourcing and prioritization.

7. References

AfriForum and Another v University of the Free State, Case CCT 101/17 (Constitutional Court of South Africa 29
   December 2017).

Alexander, N. (1989). *Language policy and national unity in South Africa/Azania: An essay*. Buchu Books.

Alexander, N. (2005). Language, class and power in post-apartheid South Africa. *Harold Wolpe Memorial Trust
   Open Dialogue Event*.

Alexander, N. (2009). *Afrikaans as a language of reconciliation, restitution and nation building*. 8.

Antonissen, C. (2017). Reshaping Remembrance-English. *Rozenberg Quarterly*.

Ball, S. J. (1993). WHAT IS POLICY? TEXTS, TRAJECTORIES AND TOOLBOXES. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural
   Politics of Education*, *13*(2), 10–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203

Bond, P. (2003). *The Comparative Apologetics of Racially Regressive Laws in the Confederate States of America and
   the South African Republic, or How Did They Live with Themselves?* 21.

Botha, C. (2017, May 23). Universities' language policies at a crossroads? The interpretation of Administrative
   action. *Politicsweb*. https://www.politicsweb.co.za/opinion/universities-language-policies-at-a-crossroads

Bourdieu, P. (2009). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.;
   Reprint). Polity Press.

Bowe, R., Ball, S. J., & Gold, A. (1992). *Reforming Education and Changing Schools. Case studies in policy sociology*
   (Vol. 10).

Brock-Utne, B. (2007). Language of instruction and student performance: New insights from research in Tanzania
   and South Africa. *International Review of Education*, *53*(5–6), 509–530. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-
   007-9065-9

Bua-Lit collective. (2018). *How are we failing our children? Reconceptualising language and literacy education*.
   https://bua-lit.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/bua-lit-FINAL051218-2.pdf

Casale, D., & Posel, D. (2011). English language proficiency and earnings in a developing country: The case of South
   Africa. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, *40*(4), 385–393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2011.04.009

Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. (1986). Christianity and colonialism in South Africa. *American Ethnologist*, *13*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1986.13.1.02a00010

Comaroff, J. L., & Comaroff, J. (1997). *Of Revelation and Revolution, Volume Two: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*. University of Chicago Press.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, (1996), As adopted on 8 May 1996 and amended on 11 October 1996 by the Constituent Assembly.

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

Council of Higher Education. (2001). *Language Policy Framework for South African Higher Education.pdf*. http://www.dhet.gov.za/HED%20Policies/Language%20Policy%20Framework%20for%20South%20African%20Higher%20Education.pdf

Dangor, S. E. (2003). *The establishment and consolidation of Islam in South Africa: From the Dutch colonisation of the Cape to the present*. 18.

Davenport, T. R. H. (1966). *The Afrikaner Bond: The history of a South African political party, 1880-1911*. Oxford University Press.

Davids, A. (2011). *The Afrikaans of the Cape Muslims from 1815 to 1915* (H. Willemse & S. E. Dangor, Eds.; 1st ed). Protea Book House.

Dearlove, J. (1974). Review of Implementation [Review of *Review of Implementation*, by J. L. Pressman & A. B. Wildavsky]. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne de Science Politique*, *7*(2), 369–370. JSTOR.

Department of Basic Education. (2013). *The Incremental Introduction of African Language in South African Schools. Draft Policy*.

Department of Basic Education. (2014). *National policy for the provision and management of Learning and Teaching Support Material (LTSM)*.

Department of Basic Education. (2015). *Regulations Pertaining to the National Curriculum Statement Grade R to 12*.

Basic Education Laws Amendment (BELA) Bill, Government Gazette 41178, Cabinet, 155 34620 (2017).

Department of Basic Education. (2019a). *2017 School Monitoring Survey: Quantitative Survey Main Report*.

Department of Basic Education. (2019b). *A 25 Year Review of progress in the basic education sector*. Unpublished.

Department of Basic Education. (2019c). *Head of Education Committee (HEDCOM) Subcommittee on Planning,
Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Building Report*.

Department of Basic Education, & Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation. (2016). *Socio-Economic
Impact Assessment System (SEIAS) Final Impact Assessment*.

Department of Basic Education, & Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation. (2017). *Report on the
Implementation Evaluation of the National Curriculum Statement Grade R to 12 Focusing on the
Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS)*.
https://www.education.gov.za/Portals/0/Documents/Reports/CAPS%20Eval%20Summary%20Report.pdf?
ver=2018-03-29-124747-330

Department of Basic Education, Taylor, S., Cilliers, J., Fleisch, Brahm, & Reddy, Vijay. (2017). *Early Grade Reading
Study Technical Report* (p. 140).

Department of Education. (2003). *Development of Indigenous Languages as Mediums of Instruction in Higher
Education: Report compiled by the Ministerial Committee appointed by the Ministry of Education*.
Government Printers.

Doke, C. M. (1958). Scripture translation into Bantu languages. *African Studies*, *17*(2), 82–99.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00020185808707049

Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (Twenty-third
edition). SIL International.

Eriksson, K. (2014). Does the language of instruction in primary school affect later labour market outcomes?
Evidence from South Africa. *Economic History of Developing Regions*, *29*(2), 311–335.
https://doi.org/10.1080/20780389.2014.955272

Eulau, H. (1980). *Harold Lasswell Memorial*. Political Science & Politics, 13(4), 412-415. https://www-cambridge-
org.ez.sun.ac.za/core/services/aop-cambridge-
core/content/view/E7185DB62A1957D109F6998BA6D3A976/S1049096500008210a.pdf/harold_d_lasswe
ll.pdf

Farr, J., Hacker, J. S., & Kazee, N. (2006). The Policy Scientist of Democracy: The Discipline of Harold D. Lasswell. *American Political Science Review*, *100*(04), 579. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055406062459

Fischer, F., Miller, G., & Sidney, M. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics, and methods*. CRC/Taylor & Francis.

Geffen, N. (2003). *Review of Terreblanches Inequality book*. Economics Department, University of Stellenbosch. https://www.ekon.sun.ac.za/sampieterreblanche/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Nathan-Geffen-n.d.-c2003.-Review-of-Terreblanches-Inequality-book.pdf

Giliomee, H. (2004). THE RISE AND POSSIBLE DEMISE OF AFRIKAANS AS PUBLIC LANGUAGE. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, *10*(1), 25–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110490450764

Giliomee, H. (2009). A NOTE ON BANTU EDUCATION, 1953 TO 1970. *South African Journal of Economics*, *77*(1), 190–198. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1813-6982.2009.01193.x

Giliomee, H. (2012). *Bantu Education: Destructive intervention or part reform? 65*, 20.

Greaves, L. B. (1955). BANTU EDUCATION. *International Review of Mission*, *44*(175), 339–343. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-6631.1955.tb02807.x

Grundlingh, A. M., & Huigen, S. (2011). *Reshaping remembrance: Critical essays on Afrikaans places of memory*.

Hans, N. (2012). *Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203816493

Herbert, R., K., & Bailey, R. (2002). The Bantu languages: Sociohistorical perspectives. In *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Herbert, R., K., & Huffman, T. (1993). A new perspective on Bantu expansion and classification. Lingusitic and archaeological evidence fifty years after Doyle. *African Studies*.

Hermanson, E. A. (2004). A brief overview of Bible translation in South Africa. *Acta Theologica*, *22*(1), 6–18. https://doi.org/10.4314/actat.v22i1.5451

Heugh, K. (2000). The Case Against Bilingual and Multilingual Education in South Africa. *PRAESA*, *6*, 22.

Heugh, K. (2005). Mother Tongue is Best. *Human Sciences Research Council Review*, *3*(3), 6–7.

Heugh, K. (2009). Heugh 2009 Contesting the monolingual practices of a bilingual to multilingual policy .pdf. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *8*(2), 96–113.

Heugh, K. (2013). Multilingual Education Policy in South Africa Constrained by Theoretical and Historical

    Disconnections. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *33*, 215–237.

    https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000135

Hoadley, U. (2012). What do we know about teaching and learning in South African primary schools? *Education as*

    Change, *16*(2), 187–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2012.745725

Hoërskool Ermelo v The Head of Department of Education: Mpumalanga, 219/2008 (The Supreme Court of Appeal

    27 March 2009).

Howie, S., Combrinck, C., Roux, K., Tshele, M., Mokoena, G., & Palane, N. M. (2017). *Progress in International*

    Reading Literacy Study 2016 (p. 220). Centre for Evaluation and Assessment, Faculty of Education,

    University of Pretoria.

Human Sciences Research Council. (2019). *South African Social Attitudes Survey (SASAS)*.

Kahn, A., Branson, N., & Leibbrandt, M. (2019). Returns to English skills in the South African labour market. *SALDRU*

    Working Paper, *251*, 46.

Klapwijk, N., & Van der Walt, C. (2016). English-Plus Multilingualism as the New Linguistic Capital? Implications of

    University Students' Attitudes Towards Languages of Instruction in a Multilingual Environment. *Journal of*

    Language, Identity & Education, *15*(2), 67–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2015.1137475

Lasswell, H. D. (1956). The Political Science of Science: An Inquiry into the Possible Reconciliation of Mastery and

    Freedom. *The American Political Science Review*, *50*(4), 961–979. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/1951330

Maake, N., P. (1993). C.M Doke and the development of Bantu literature. *African Studies*.

Mackenzie, P. J., & Walker, J. (Not dated). *Global Campaign for Education Policy Brief Mother-tongue education:*

    Policy lessons for quality and inclusion. Global Campaign for Education.

    http://www.campaignforeducation.org/docs/reports/GCE%20Mother%20Tongue_EN.pdf

Malherbe, E. (1925). *Education in South Africa: Vols 1 1652-1922*. Juta and Co.

    https://ia902300.us.archive.org/30/items/educationinsouth00egma/educationinsouth00egma.pdf

Malherbe, E. (1977). *Education in South Africa: Vols 2 1923-1975*. Juta.

Maluleke, T. (2005). The next phase in the vernacular Bible discourse:Echoes from Hammanskraal. *Missionalia*,

    33(2), 355–374.

Marjorie, L. (1982). Language Policy and Oppression in South Africa. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, *1*(6).

    https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/language-policy-and-

    oppression-south-africa

Marks, S. (1972). Khoisan resistance to the Dutch in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *The Journal of*

    African History, *13*(1), 55–80. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021853700000268

Matland, R. (1995). Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy

    Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

    https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a037242

McKenzie, T., & Muller, C. (2017). English language proficiency and labour market participation in South Africa.

    Interdisciplinary Journal of Economics and Business Law, *6*(2), 49–76.

Mesthrie, R. (Ed.). (2002a). *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Mesthrie, R. (Ed.). (2002b). *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Murray, S. (2002). Language issues in South African education: An overview. In *Language in South Africa*.

    Cambridge University Press.

National Language Service Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology. (2011). *UNESCO world languages*

    report. https://web.archive.org/web/20110821055504/http://salanguages.com/unesco/afrikaans.htm

Ndlovu, S. M. (2011). The Soweto Uprising. In *The Road to Democracy in South Africa, Volume 2, 1970-1980* (1st

    edition, Vol. 2, pp. 317–378). Unisa Press.

Ngcobo, M. (2009). The politics of compromise and language planning: The case of South Africa. *Language*

    Matters, *40*(2), 205–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/10228190903188575

Nida, E., Newmark, P., & Neubert, A. (n.d.). *Linguistic Approaches to Translation*. 13.

Oakes, D. (1994). Reader's Digest Illustrated History of South African: The Real Story. *Reader's Digest Association*.

O'Toole, L. J. (1986). Policy Recommendations for Multi-Actor Implementation: An Assessment of the Field. *Journal*

    of Public Policy, *6*(2), 181–210. JSTOR.

O'Toole, L. J. (2000). Research on Policy Implementation: Assessment and Prospects. *Journal of Public*

    Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, *10*(2), 263–288. JSTOR.

O'Toole, L. J., & Montjoy, R. S. (1984). Interorganizational Policy Implementation: A Theoretical Perspective. *Public Administration Review*, *44*(6), 491–503. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/3110411

Ouane, A., & Glanz, C. (2010). *Why and how Africa should invest in African languages and multilingual education: An evidence- and practice-based policy advocacy brief*. Unesco Inst. for Lifelong Learning.

Pandor, N. (2006a, July). *Address by the Minister of Education,*. Language colloquium PANSALB, Cape Town.

Pandor, N. (2006b, October 5). *Language Policy Implementation in Higher Education Institutions (05_10_2006).pdf*. Language Policy Implementation in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) Conference, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

Piper, B., Zuilkowski, S. S., & Ong'ele, S. (2016). Implementing Mother Tongue Instruction in the Real World: Results from a Medium-Scale Randomized Controlled Trial in Kenya. *Comparative Education Review*, *60*(4), 776–807. https://doi.org/10.1086/688493

Posel, D., & Zeller, J. (2016). Language shift or increased bilingualism in South Africa: Evidence from census data. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *37*(4), 357–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1072206

Pretorius, E. (2018). *Reading in African languages An Annotated Bibliography*. Department of Linguistics and Modern Languages, UNISA.

Pretorius, F. P. (2014). *A History of South Africa: From the Distant Past to the Present Day*. Protea Book House.

Reagan, T. G. (2002). Language planning and language policy: Past, present and future. In *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Norms and Standards for Language Policy in Public Schools, Pub. L. No. Government Gazette 18546 Government Notice 1701, Government Gazette 18546 of 5 (1998), of 19 December 1997 and amended by GN 665 in Government Gazette 18887 of 15 May 1998.

General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Amendment Act, Pub. L. No. No. 31785, 50 Government Gazette No. 31785 (2008). https://www.umalusi.org.za/docs/legislation/2009/act50_2008.pdf

Government Notice Revised Language Policy for Higher Education.pdf, Pub. L. No. 41463 (2018).

http://www.dhet.gov.za/Policy%20and%20Development%20Support/Government%20Notice%20Revised

%20Language%20Policy%20for%20Higher%20Education.pdf

Roberge, P. T. (2002). Afrikaans: Considering origins. In *Language in South Africa* (pp. 79–103). Cambridge

University Press.

Seroto, J. (2013). *A revisionist view of the contribution of Dr Eiselen to South African education: New perspectives*.

9, 18.

Silva, P. (1997). South African English: Oppressor or Liberator? *MAVEN*, *The Major Varieties of English*, 8.

Silverstein, R. O. (1968). A note on the term "Bantu" as first used by W. H. I. Bleek. *African Studies*, *27*(4), 211–212.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00020186808707298

Somerville, K. (1990). Review of The Mind of South Africa: The Story of the Rise and Fall of Apartheid, ; My Traitor's

Heart [Review of *Review of The Mind of South Africa: The Story of the Rise and Fall of Apartheid, ; My

Traitor's Heart*, by A. Sparks & R. Malan]. *African Affairs*, *89*(357), 610–611.

South Africa, & Department of Basic Education. (2011). *National Curriculum Statement (NCS): Curriculum and

assessment policy statement : senior phase, grades 7-9*. Department of Basic Education.

Spaull, N. (2016). Disentangling the language effect in South African schools: Measuring the impact of 'language of

assessment' in grade 3 literacy and numeracy. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, *6*(1), 20.

https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v6i1.475

Statistics South Africa. (2012). *Census 2011: Census in Brief*. Statistics South Africa.

Statistics South Africa. (2018). *Statistical release*. 26.

Taylor, N., Van der Berg, S., & Mabogoane, T. (2013). Context, theory, design. In *Creating Effective Schools: Report

of South Africa's National Schools Effectiveness Study*. Pearson.

Taylor, S., & von Fintel, M. (2016). Estimating the impact of language of instruction in South African primary

schools: A fixed effects approach. *Economics of Education Review*, *50*, 75–89.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.01.003

Terreblanche, S. (2002). *A history of inequality in South Africa, 1652-2002*. University of Kwazulu Natal Press.

Traill, A. (2002). The Khoesan languages. In *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Umalusi Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training. (2016). *Umalusi retains language compensation for matric learners*. https://www.umalusi.org.za/docs/pr/2016/pr1206.pdf

UNESCO. (2003). *Education in a multilingual world: UNESCO education position paper* (p. 35). UNESCO.

University of Free State. (2016). *University of the Free State Language Policy*. University of Free State.

University of Pretoria. (2016). *LANGUAGE POLICY*. UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA.

University of Stellenbosch. (2016). *Language Policy of Stellenbosch University*. University of Stellenbosch.

Vorster, C., Mayet, A., & Taylor, S. (2013). Learner performance in the NSES. In *Creating Effective Schools* (pp. 135–156). Pearson.

Wright, L. (2002). Language as a 'resource' in South Africa: The economic life of language in a globalising society. *English Academy Review*, *19*(1), 2–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/10131750285310031