

IMPLEMENTING MULTILINGUAL POLICIES FOR QUALITY EDUCATION: THE AFRICAN LEADER'S DILEMMA

Lydia Nyati-Saleshando¹

Abstract

This theoretical paper aims to address three key questions with regards to the provision of multilingual education: Why is Africa slow to act; what cases exist around the world that offer Africa opportunities to learn from? And what new ways of knowing, thinking and acting can be explored to facilitate the adoption of multilingual education? Education programs operating in many countries indicate a shift from monolingual to multilingual education. The emerging trend in effective bilingual education programs, the use of technologies, new policy orientations, new partnerships and indigenous ways of thinking are explored in order to ascertain how to improve the learning experience of the African child. The paper concludes that Africa needs to employ her indigenous ways of knowing, thinking and acting to provide effective strategies for the acquisition of literacy and multi-literacies, which are critical to Africa's participation in the global economy. This calls for new pedagogical approaches with a focus on classroom processes that develop multilingualism in learners for global citizenship while, at the same time, preserving and revitalizing indigenous literacies for better education standards.

Keywords: Multilingual education, literacy, diverse communities, education, Africa

1. Introduction

The great controversy on how best to educate non-English speakers in a world dominated by English has been going on since time immemorial (Hornberger, 2005). Arguments for and against multilingual education are well researched and documented. The negative effects of foreign monolingual instruction are also well documented (Gandara, 2012; Piller, 2013, Pinnock & Vilayakuma, 2009). It is generally accepted that multilingual or bilingual education or mother tongue education, in which the home language plays a major role, is good (Benson, 2004; Dutcher, 1982; Fishman, 1976; Ukwuoma, 2015). However, UNESCO (2005) observed that in Africa, more than half of the continents' population learn in a language other than their home language. The quality of education in Africa is often described as poor because children get to grade 6 and proceed without basic reading and writing skills (Masalila, 2008; Spaul, 2011). These students lack critical thinking, analytical and problem-solving skills (Molosiwa, 2007; Nyati-Ramahobo, 1999; Tshireletso, 2000; Wright, 2002).

Literacy is the foundation for learning (Richmond, Robinson & Sachs-Israel, 2008). Research is conclusive that learning to read in a familiar

¹ Department of Primary Education, University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana.
Email: ramaholn@ub.ac.bw

language and culture develops literacy skills better than beginning to read in an unfamiliar language and culture (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2002; Rigaud, 2016). This is why developed cultures insist on using their own languages (Kamwangamalu, 2008). Learning to read and write in a familiar language in the early years promotes skills transfer to reading and writing in another language (Rigaud, 2016). This is a well-established and undisputed fact. Further, Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez & Hopkins (2010) observed that the arguments of those who are opposed to multilingual education are not empirically motivated, but, rather, are politically and economically based. Krashen (1999) is bold enough to describe the arguments as bogus.

The more Africa experiences the negative effects of monolingual English instruction in schools, the more policy makers on the continent seem to realise the need for multilingual education, not only for the sake of education, but also for political reasons such as nation-building. For instance, the African Union adopted the Languages Plan of Action in 1986; however, this was reviewed in 2006. The Plan outlines clear goals to be achieved by member states in the promotion and recognition of African languages (Nyati-Saleshando, 2016). Further, the Plan was aimed at the development and use of African languages in critical social domains such as education, trade, government and the media. A policy guide was also developed and adopted in 2010 to integrate African languages and cultures into the education systems of member states. Lately, Aspirations 3 and 5 on Agenda 2063 are evidence of good the intention to use African languages in education by African governments. The use of African languages in education is the catalyst for multilingual education in African classrooms.

Practice in most African countries, however, continues to show very little, if any, improvement in the development and use of African languages in education and other critical domains. Scholars have explored several reasons why African languages continue to have low socio-economic status (Bamgbose, 2011; Batibo, 2013; Chebanne, 2010). Globalization and urbanization are thought to be among the many factors responsible for this state of affairs. As Nyati-Saleshando (2016) has also argued, globalization and urbanization do facilitate diversity as people come together from different backgrounds. This requires multilingual classrooms, which is good for the economy and for better educational outcomes. Diverse classrooms mean more teachers, more material production, more schools, more children staying in school and better performance (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Others have argued that Africa is linguistically complex and too poor to implement multilingual education (Bamgbose, 2011). However, this politically motivated argument has been found to be lacking in academic merit (Krashen, 1999). In Africa, as in many other places in the world today, diversity of languages in a community is the norm, and, in most communities, individuals speak more than one language (Hasselbring, Segatlhe & Munch, 2001). In other words, multilingualism is not only limited to Africa; in fact, the United States has 325 languages which has necessitated the introduction of bilingual education (Nyati-Saleshando,

2018). Therefore, the presence of English should not necessarily dictate the exclusion of other languages; neither should the multilingual nature of Africa be an impediment to the use of her languages in education. The main reason for the non-use of African languages are foreign policies which regulate the languages that are recognised for use in important social domains, thereby creating linguistic hierarchies, social strata and stigmatization. This is what has led to the situation observed by UNESCO above.

In view of the foregoing, this paper aims to respond to three key questions on multilingual education in Africa:

1. Why is Africa so slow to act while the need for multilingual education is so well established?
2. What cases exist around the world that offer opportunities for Africa to learn from?
3. What new ways of knowing, thinking and acting can be explored to facilitate multilingual or bilingual education in Africa?

2. Why is Africa Slow in Adopting Multilingual Education?

Why is Africa slow to implement effective multilingual, intercultural and multicultural education programs? This question is important because it shows the magnitude of the problem faced by the African leadership regarding multilingual education. The question will, also, hopefully, present a clear vision of how the leadership can implement multilingual education. There are three factors which seem to impact the implementation of multilingual instruction in Africa.

First, colonialism did and still does play a role in preventing multilingual education. Ouedraogo (2000) has observed that economic imperialism and linguistic imperialism appear as two sides of the same coin. He states that “Economically powerful nations naturally wish to expand their languages as normal vehicles of their thought, their cultural values, and their ideologies that they want or even force other people to adopt” (p.1). Ricento and Hornberger (1996) state that “The principal English dominant powers – US and Great Britain have aggressively promoted the English language and western culture in all the areas of the world” (p. 412). They are doing so even in countries with long histories of using their indigenous languages at all levels of education, including higher education (Sabaté-Dalmau, 2016). The ideological tensions between assimilationists and pluralists (Hornberger, 2000) have, however, resulted in these powerful nations having to find ways to educate the diverse populations represented in their countries (McHugh & Sugarman, 2015).

Kamwangamalu (2008) observes that the model for colonialism in Africa was that of exploitation while in other parts of the world such as Latin America, the model that of settlement. In other words, the goal for Africa was to exploit her raw materials and human capital through slavery and other unwholesome practices. As a result, the development of the people of Africa was not the colonizers’ immediate goal. Today, the model of exploitation

continues to play a major role in the educational development of the African child. Where then does this place the African leader in deciding what is good for his or her people? When policies are handed over from the West in response to the request for development aid, the African leader is placed in a quandary. More often than not, they are informed that what is good for Africa is not achievable. Africa's linguistic diversity becomes a barrier which diverts the continent to monolingual English, French or Portuguese instruction. African cultures then become unfit for African children's classrooms. Consequently, African sources of knowledge and ways of knowing, thinking and acting are pushed away. A push for global uniformity of language and culture comes at the expense of diversity, even at the very micro level of the classroom. The driving factor for policies of exclusion is discrimination and exploitation and not necessarily impossibility of circumstances. Fuller (2011) puts it this way:

...negative attitudes about bilingual education are rooted in the negative attitudes about minority language speakers ... bilingualism is un-American ... until this ideology is challenged – we will continue to encounter resistance to bilingual education no matter how many studies prove that it is the most effective way to educate our youth (www.popularlinguistsonline.org/2011/bilingual-education).

Kim, Hutchison and Winsler (2013) observe that students with limited English Proficiency (LEP) live in poverty and that many of their parents have low education. They also observe that the students perform poorly in mathematics and reading compared to their English-speaking counterparts. Commenting on whether or not bilingual education is the answer to poor performance by LEP students, Gandara and Contreras (2009) conclude that neither English only nor bilingual education is the sole answer – but that both depend on well trained BE teachers, good curricula and programs that address poverty and marginalization. Thus, the underlying principle for the exclusion of African languages is marginalization, exploitation and poverty creation. Nyati-Ramahobo (1997) has concluded that when Africa accepted political independence and “agreed” to press the delete button on her own languages, she deleted her economic and socio-cultural independence.

The assimilationist ideology of Western superpowers, the underlying goal of exploitation and marginalization places the African leader, as already mentioned, in a precarious position. The impact has been a slowing of the action on the African program of language development for her people. Understanding the nature and magnitude of the non-implementation of Africa's educational dreams and the dilemma of the African leader would help African scholars to find theoretical frameworks and models that facilitate the adoption of multilingual education.

Second, we explore the nature of language and culture and their role in providing space for multilingual education in Africa. Language by its very nature occurs in an ecology of languages (Hornberger, 2008). In this co-

existence, competition or cooperation may evolve. African people have co-existed and learned one another's languages and become bi- or multilingual as a result. However, the emergence of English as a "global language" has engendered competition and reduced cooperation which is the African model of co-existence. Competition occurs in a power relationship and certain languages whose speakers have power are seen as more fitting for the new era of education than others. As already discussed, language occurs in a global context. All languages, local and foreign are used in different social domains. The more useful the domain of use or influence a certain language enjoys, the more attractive the language becomes. Language is also more than a tool for use in some domains of operation. It is the marker of the very existence of a people, their cultures, identities and experiences (Banham, 2014); it is embedded in their ontologies and epistemologies. Wolfson and Manes (1985) state that a rejection of someone's language is a rejection of that person's very existence. This rejection amounts to discrimination and leads to economic deprivation. The sustenance or loss of a language is influenced, to a great extent, by regulating policy frameworks which may include and exclude some languages from use in specific domains. This creates a diaglossic situation in which attitudes to speakers of different languages develop, depending on the role a particular language has been assigned. A social stratification that may lead to conflict then arises. This is the recipe that generates perpetual conflict in Africa and facilitates easy exploitation of the people. Thus, the ecology of language and the role policy frameworks play in regulating language use impact the use of African languages in education in meaningful ways. In short, the nature of language has been salted and garnished with regulatory frameworks to facilitate and sustain exploitation, the core model of development for Africa.

The third factor is lack of informed decision making by African communities, which is related to information control. Who controls what information goes to the majority of citizens? In what language does the information flow out? How is it packaged and for what purpose? Who determines what constitutes the knowledge and information that drive social change and for what purpose and for whose benefit? These are volatile yet real questions in which Africa plays a not so significant a role. African governments communicate information as handed down to them from their Western collaborators, and they do so in English or another foreign language which is only understood by the elite. For instance, when multinational corporations wanted to sell milk formulae, the information to African governments was that breast milk was not good for babies. Elite African women began to buy the formulae or the milk and breastfeeding in public became detestable. Much later, Africans discovered that breast milk was actually better than the formulae the West had been touting. This manipulation affects the quality of life of citizens. With regard to our subject of multilingual education, communities are told that when our children learn in our African languages, it delays their entry into the civilized world. Applied linguists began to know better through research. But how much of

our knowledge goes to our communities to influence our people's attitudes and actions?

These three interrelated factors affect the development of appropriate learning environments in African schools. The control over sources or determinants of knowledge, vehicles of knowledge and action on knowledge are critical factors in shaping Africa's experiences, attitudes and actions she needs to provide quality education for economic development for her people. The role of African leader is limited in determining or knowing the source of knowledge. It has been more that of a conduit of knowledge from the West to their people in the South. H, they are slow in acting on what has been established as good for her education system. The indigenization of sources or determinants of what counts as knowledge and the appropriate actions on knowledge to be transported to local communities could provide a solution.

3. Cases to Learn from

As African scholars desire to explore ontologies, epistemologies, technologies, cultural banks and arrive at new policy frameworks that will improve learning, they, first, need to see if there are cases in Africa and around the world to learn from. Importantly are contextualized lessons that can enrich our own ways of knowing, thinking and acting (Hornberger, De Korne & Weinberg, 2016). In her edited book, *Can schools save indigenous languages?*, Hornberger (2008) presents four case studies from four continents. These cases were meant to revitalize the endangered languages and facilitate learning by their speakers. The school was the main vehicle of this process.

The cases are examined here following Hornberger's (2005) theory on the creation of ideological and implementation spaces. A polity could have a closed or open ideological space. A closed ideological space is one in which a language policy framework prohibits the use of local languages. An open ideological space is one in which the language policy enables the use of other languages in education and other social domains. South Africa would be an example of an ideologically open space in which the policy allows eleven languages to be used in education. Botswana is an example of a closed ideological space since only English is used in schools from grade 2 upwards.

Implementation spaces are those opportunities in which grassroots or communities are able to implement programs that use local languages in education and other domains even in an ideologically closed space. California, in the United States, is an example of an open implementation space. While it was ideologically closed by the adoption of English only in 1988 (De Ross, 2006) and proposition 227 in 1998 (Cheung & Drabkin, 1999), bilingual education programs have been operating due to court orders. In 2016, the passage of proposition 58 (Sanchez, 2016), allowed the use of other languages in education if parents so desired.

The four case studies presented in the above-mentioned book are those of the Maori in New Zealand, the Sami in Norway and, to some extent, in Sweden, the Hnahno in Mexico and the Quechua and other communities in

Latin America. These cases are well known to most applied linguists. The key questions to be asked in analysing them are: 1) who are the determinants of knowledge, 2) what are the vehicles of knowledge and 3) who decides what actions are to be taken for the benefit of the people?

Hirvonen (2008) describes the Sami project in Norway, in which the Sami curriculum known as 0975 was approved. The curriculum was of equal status with the national curriculum and about 3,000 students in 30 schools were taught in Sami language. Hirvonen (1999) wrote the first PhD thesis in Sami in which she concludes that the program provided innovative pedagogy in the teaching of the Sami language and culture. The challenge was that Sami was not used in other subjects. Commenting on this case, Huss (2008) notes some challenges with Sami education in Sweden. Specifically, he observes that too few children were taking part in Sami medium instruction in Sweden and that only few Sami-speaking kids were in non-Sami schools. The Sami language remained endangered despite its success in other Nordic countries, especially in Norway. As the Sami left their communities in search for jobs, they lost touch with their language and culture. However, he concludes that the additive approach of bilingual education was good for Sami education. This is a case in which the ideological space was closed yet implementation space to use Sami in education opened it. It seems that the determinants of what counted as Sami culture suitable for the classroom were the Sami speakers and this was approved by government. The large number of enrolments in Norway indicates that the vehicles of knowledge and appropriate actions were executed by Sami people and government.

Lopez (2008) describes the challenges faced by various communities in Latin America as they initiate bilingual and intercultural education programs on their own in a closed ideological space. The goal of the program was to address racial discrimination against indigenous communities and the hegemony of Spanish and Portuguese. The communities engaged in developing and providing an educational experience in their own languages. This is a case in which grassroots efforts were in parallel with those of government. According to Lopez (2008), there were ideological and epistemological tensions which had to be resolved. These included top-down *vis-à-vis* bottom-up approach to programming, inclusivity *vis-à-vis* exclusivity, pedagogy *vis-à-vis* ethnic affirmation and economy *vis-à-vis* identity. The bottom-up approach from local communities was in sharp contrast with government's top-down approach. The study concludes that despite various challenges faced by the program there was a degree of success. Lopez (2008) points out that "indigenous leaders and intellectuals currently are challenging the ontology of knowledge, proposing relocation of western knowledge and relying on an indigenous view of the world" (p. 60). This is a clear case where government wanted to control what counted as knowledge to indigenous communities, the vehicles of communication (methodologies) and appropriate actions. Tensions between government and communities limited the degree to which the program could succeed compared to Sami in

Norway.

May and Hill (2008) present the Maori medium education in New Zealand after 25 years of successful implementation. The program began with a pre-school in 1982. All children speak Maori and therefore the program was a full immersion in Maori language and culture. However, majority of the children enrolled in Maori medium schools were speakers of English as a first language and Maori as a second language. The priority was to revitalize the language. The success of this program, specifically the Te Kohang Reo, has been described by several authors over time (Stiles, 1997; Ministry of Education, 2010). While it started in a closed ideological space, the implementation space created by the grass-root movement opened up the ideological space. Thus, the key elements of success were the government's support through funding and the Maori Language Act of 1987, as well as community support. This means that there was collaboration on what counted as knowledge for Maori language and culture, the vehicles communication (methodologies) and the appropriate actions on curriculum development, assessment and evaluation between government, and the communities. Worthy of mention is that May and Hill (2008) identified issues for further development, namely, the levels of immersion and how to bring more Maori first language speakers to be the majority beyond pre-school level. They also note that bilingual and biliteracy were not achieved to the desire standard.

Commenting on the case and his own experience in Maori, Navajo and Hebrew cases, Spolsky (2008) concludes that a school may pursue bilingual literacy in order to maintain a language. As research has demonstrated, the school would not only maintain the language but bring about a better learning experience for the children and, consequently, good performance for social mobility and economic emancipation. It was, and still is, Bantu education that maintained some of the languages in South Africa even though it was done for the wrong reasons during the apartheid era, resulting in the stigmatization of the languages (Webb, Lafon & Pare, 2010).

Kamwangamalu (2008) comments on these cases from an African and international perspective. He observes that vernacularizing education is a rare phenomenon in Africa. It was not necessarily a priority in African communities as it was in Latin America. In this context, future efforts are to aim at ensuring that indigenous knowledges and languages continue to be passed from one generation to another. Education plays a major role. He outlines success stories of language revitalization in Africa which include "Somali in Somalia, Amharic in Ethiopia, Arabic in North Africa, and to a limited extent, Swahili and Malagasy in Tanzania and Madagascar respectively" (p. 142). He reminds us of the revitalization efforts for Khoisan languages in South Africa, as provided for in the constitution. German in Kwazulu Natal has been maintained by grassroots efforts and funded by German businessmen and women. Like Lopez (2008), he notes tensions in ideology between the colonizer and the colonized. The former's arguments focus on political and economic advancement while the latter's focus on identity, language loss and

access to learning at the classroom level and achievement.

The pertinent issue to consider at this point is what we have learnt from these cases. The Sami in Norway, Maori in New Zealand, Hnahno in New Mexico are successful cases operating in open ideological spaces. This was achieved after strenuous efforts to open implementation spaces. The ideological spaces were used to address discrimination and marginalization and enhance economic participation. Opening up ideological spaces also resulted in financial and legal frameworks.

The cases are essentially motivated by the desire to achieve equality, equity and human dignity in the face of discrimination and economic marginalization. In other words, the underlying motivation is a quest for social justice. The goal is to save the languages, provide meaningful learning experiences, preserve indigenous ways of knowing, thinking and acting, and bring the language to the learning process for economic advancement. It is evident that successful cases have had a long standing and persistent struggle to achieve the use of minority languages in education. Communities, non-state actors and individuals have created the implementation spaces from which ideological spaces have originated. In others, limited ideological spaces were created but were not enough to reach the target mark in creating multilingual schooling or biliteracy (May & Hill, 2008). In most cases, the ideological spaces opened up did not include indigenous ways of knowing, of thinking and of acting in the school curricula (Lopez, 2008). This is the missing link in most African educational settings. The opening up of ideological spaces may not necessarily lead to a successful implementation space that provides quality education for African children. South Africa is a case in point. Studies by the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) have revealed the low literacy and numeracy skills of Grade 6 students in Botswana and South Africa (Spaull, 2011). It has also revealed the two-tier system in South Africa where certain regions are not performing well like others, based on race. Webb *et al.* (2010) observe that while local communities choose a foreign language due to historical stigma, practice indicates code-switching and, in some cases, complete use of local languages. This is an open implementation space on which the African leader needs to capitalize to open ideological space in terms of de-stigmatization of the local languages as languages of power.

It therefore seems appropriate to conclude that successful cases are those in which government supported legislation and/or provided sufficient resources to promote local effort. Thus, the local culture and language became the source and the vehicle of knowledge on which appropriate actions have been built. We have learned that while schools cannot save indigenous languages and cultures on their own, they remain crucial vehicles of quality education to local learners who remain contentious spaces for negotiating power and social movement.

4. What New Ways of Knowing, Thinking and Acting can Africa Explore to Move Forward?

The more African languages can insert themselves into contentious (education) spaces, the more their power will become pronounced. Multilingual education is good for political, economic as well as socio-cultural advancement of societies. Pressing for more African languages in education would preserve and perpetuate African epistemologies and create new ways of thinking about their use, as the case in the adaptation of Sami for use with new technologies in Norway. Similarly, African languages can be adapted to technologies to preserve African cultural banks in the learning process. Opening up ideological or implementation spaces or both stands a chance to bring good models of bilingual education to Africa.

Developing language plans of action, as described above, was the African leader's way of presenting his/her ways of knowing, thinking and acting for Africa's development. In Africa's histories and cultures are her knowledge banks in medicine, conservation, and production to mention a few. In her languages lie her ways of talking, thinking and acting that constitute her philosophies, values and models of cooperation and co-existence rather than competition and exclusion. While these are old, African leaders should work with scholars to renew and adapt them to new technologies for use from pre-school to higher education. Just as Western languages and cultures form the bases for literacy development and academic achievement, so too should African languages and cultures. There is need to bring to the learning process the African ways knowing and of thinking and to integrate them with new ways of acting.

There is hope that Africa will develop programs similar or better than those in the cases reviewed in this paper. This is evident in the multilingual education now the case in some of the Western countries that have become so multilingual. Frey (2018) and Nasser (2015) envisage that by 2050 more than half of the United States population would be minorities. Poor educational attainment by children from non-English speaking homes would reflect then reflect the failing education systems in the country. As McHugh and Sugarman (2015) observe, there is need for the super-powers to find ways to educate their majority as well as minority citizens. There is hope in that in the United States the dual language program (DLP) will grow due to its success in providing bi-literacy skills for academic performance, creating cultural literacy and tolerance for difference (Thomas & Collier, 2002). It also facilitates parental and community involvement through the integration of the Arts into the programme (Nyati-Saleshando, 2018, 2019). Currently, while 31 of the 51 states have adopted an English only policy, 46 of them provide dual language programs (United States Department of Education (USDOE) (2015). Of the 46, only seven (7) do not receive funding from the Federal government. "The number of schools adopting this model is rising quickly, particularly in response to concerns about the education of EL students" (USDOE, 2015, p.9). Indeed, the implementation of the

dual language programs opened up ideological spaces in California through proposition 58 of 2016.

African leaders could leverage the model above for the same reason, namely, the under-achievement of non-English speakers, and create implementation spaces for multilingual instruction in their own countries. They can bring in this new way of acting while maintaining their old ways of knowing and thinking, that is, their indigenous knowledge, epistemologies and value systems which benefit the African child in a global community. They should determine of what constitutes knowledge, utilize sources of knowledge, inclusive of indigenous cultural banks, and determine appropriate vehicles of knowledge that facilitate informed decision-making for the benefit of their citizens. Once the people understand the value of their languages will demand their use not only in education but also in other social domains. Parents who also understand the value of learning other languages in a dual education model will demand that their children not only learn in their mother tongue and in English, but also in an additional language (without subtracting from the previous ones). This is the case in the United States, and it has led to the high demand for dual language instruction (Kim, *et al.*, 2013; Jackson & Malone, 2009; Ramos, 2007). The African child does need English. The question is whether it should be at the expense of his or her indigenous language and culture. The people's language and culture are the foundation of knowledge and the vehicle of communication which can inform their ways of acting. The local communities need to know the stage at which English becomes appropriate.

5. Conclusion

Africa has over time developed Language Plans of Action with the desire to introduce local languages and improve the quality of her education systems. However, Africa has been slow to act due to several factors. The imposed English policies which promote Western cultures and ideologies have led to the underdevelopment of African languages. The replacement of the African cooperation model of language ecology by the competition model in which languages of power dominate key social domains has resulted in the systematic exclusion of African languages from the development process. Finally, lack of informed decision making by African communities has led to the preference of foreign languages over their own. Case studies around the World indicate that while implementation spaces are exploited, governments' support is necessary at both policy and implementation levels in terms of resource provision. The cases provide hope for the sustenance of local languages and the provision of quality education.

It is the role of the African scholar to create implementation spaces and advocate for well-meaning ideological spaces. The African leader and scholar need to work together to explore African ways of knowing, thinking and new ways of acting to improve the learning environment for the African child. The African leader must be the determinant of what constitutes knowledge

and not just a conduit of Western ideology. Leaders must also determine the vehicle of that knowledge, in the interest of the African child. Leaders and scholars should explore new technologies as vehicles of knowledge for decision making, the betterment of the education systems and the preservation of African indigenous cultural banks. The goal is to assist the African leader to implement her longstanding and well-meaning Language Plans which were developed in the 80s and revamped in recent times.

Works Cited

- Bamgbose A. (2011). African languages today: The challenge of and prospects for empowerment under globalization. In E. Bokamba, R. K. Shosted & B. T. Ayalew (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics* (pp. 1-14). Somerville, Massachusetts, USA. Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Retrieved 23 June 2020 from www.lingref.com.
- Banham, V. (2014). Language: An important social and cultural marker of identity. Paper presented at the Language and Social Justice Issues Conference, held on 26 November 2014, at Edith Conway University, Perth, Australia.
- Batibo H. M. (2013). Language shift as an outcome of expansive and integrative language contact in Africa. In I. U. Ithemere (Ed.), *Language contact: A multidimensional perspective* (pp. 129-139). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Benson, C. (2005). The importance of mother tongue-based schooling education: The quality imperative. Paper commissioned for EFA Global Monitoring Report. Retrieved 15 April 2016 from www.unesco.org.
- Chebanne A. (2010). The Khoisan in Botswana: Can multicultural discourse redeem them? *Journal of Multilingual Discourses*, 5 (2), 87-105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17447141003639801>.
- Cheung, C. & Drabkin, D. (1999). Bilingual education in California: Poverty and prejudice: Our schools, our children. *Ethics in Development in Global Environment (EDGE)*. Retrieved 20 June 2020 from www.stanford.edu/class/e297/poverty_prejudice. Stanford, California.
- De Ross, V. (2006). The English only movement in the United States. *IPERSTORIA*. Retrieved May 2016 from <http://iperstoria.it/vecchiosito/httpdocs>.
- Dutcher, N. (1982). The use of first and second language in primary education: Selected case studies. *World Bank and staff working paper no. 504*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Fishman, J. A. (1976). Bilingual education is good for education. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Bilingual education: An international sociological perspective* (pp.23-31). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Frey, W. (2018). The U. S. will become “minority white” in 2045. *Census projects*. Brookings Institution. Retrieved 23 July 2020 from

- www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/03/14/the-us-will-becomeminority-white-in-2045-census-projects.
- Fuller, J. M. (2011). Bilingual education: What it is, and why and how it works (or doesn't). Retrieved 20 June 2020 from www.popularlinguisticsonline.org/2012/bilingual-education.
- Gandara, P. (2012). Impact of English only instructional policies for English learners. Colorin Colorado. Retrieved 23 July 2020 from www.colorincolorado.org/article/50832.
- Gandara, P., Losen, D., August, D., Uriarte, M., Gomez, M. C. & Hopkins, M. (2010). Brief history of U.S. language policy. In P. Gandara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 20-32). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hasselbring, S., Segatlhe, T. & Munch, J. (2001). *A sociolinguistic survey of languages of Botswana*, Vol. 2. Mogoditshane: Tasalls Publishing & Books.
- Hirvonen, V. (1999). *Sameeatnama jienat-Sapmelas nissona balggis girjecallin* (The voices of Sapmi-Sami women's way to authorship). Guovdageaidnu, Norway: DAT.
- Hirvonen, V. (2008). Out on the fells, I feel like a Sami: Is there linguistic and cultural equality in the Sami school? In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can school save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents* (pp. 15-41). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2000). Bilingual education policy and practice in the Andes: Ideological paradox and intercultural possibility. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 31 (2), 173-201. Retrieved 16 April 2016 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2000.31.2.173>.
- Hornberger, N.H. (2005). Opening and filling up implementation and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 89 (4), 605-609.
- Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (2008). *Can Schools save indigenous languages: Policy and practice on four continents*. New York. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hornberger, N. H., De Korne, H. & Weinberg, M. (2016). Ways of talking (and acting) about language reclaim: An ethnographic perspective on learning in Lenape in Pennsylvania. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 15 (1), 44-58.
- Huss, L. (2008). Revitalization through indigenous education: A forlorn hope? In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can school save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents* (pp. 125-135). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jackson, F. H. & Malone, M. E. (2009). Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a comprehensive strategy for a national language framework. In K. Michell (Ed.), *Synthesis of research for advocacy* (pp. 178-195). Washington,

DC.: SIG, MATSOL.

- Kamangamalu, N. M. (2008) Commentary from an African and international perspective. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can school save indigenous languages? Policy and Practice on four continents* (pp.136-151). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kim, Y. K., Hutchison, L. & Winsler, A. (2013). Bilingual education in the United States: A historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Education Review*, 67 (2), 236-252. Retrieved 17 June 2020 from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.865593>.
- Krashen, S. (1999). *Condemned without trial: Bogus arguments about bilingual education*. Portsmouth, N. H: Heinemann.
- Lopez, L. E. (2008). Top down and bottom-up: Counterpoised visions of bilingual intercultural education in Latin America? In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can school save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents* (pp. 42-65). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marian, V., Shook, A. & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-way immersion programs benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36, 167-186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2013.818075> . Retrieved 16 April 2016 from www.comm.soc.northeastern.edu/bilingual-psychology/files.
- Masalila, T. (2008). *Towards a systematic framework for examining the congruence among reading objectives, tasks and competencies in Botswana primary schools*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris. Retrieved 11 May 2020 from <http://www.sacmeq.org/educationbotswana.htm#report>.
- May, S. & Hill, R. (2008). Maori-medium education: Current issues and challenges? In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can school save indigenous languages? Policy and Practice on four continents* (pp. 66-98). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McHugh, M. & Sugarman, J. (2015). *Transatlantic symposium report: Improving instruction for immigrant and refugee students in secondary school*. Washington, D. C: Migration Policy Institute's National Centre on Immigrant Integration Policy.
- Ministry of Education (2010). *Promoting success for Maori student schools' progress*. Teacher Review Office. Government of New Zealand. Retrieved 20 June 2020 from www.ero.govt.nz.
- Molosiwa, A. (2007). *Literacy instruction in an examination-oriented environment*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Michigan, Michigan.
- Nasser, H. E. (2015). Whites projected to become US minorities. Retrieved 16 April 2016 from America.aljazeera.com.
- Nyati-Ramahobo, L. (1999). *The national language - a resource or problem: The implementation of the language policy in Botswana*. Gaborone:

- Pula Press.
- Nyati-Ramahobo, L. (2002). The long road to multilingual schools in Botswana. In O. Garcia, T. Skutnabb-Kangas & M. Torres-Guzman (Eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Language in education* (pp.285-303). London: Multilingual Matters.
- Nyati-Saleshando,(2016). Cultural diversity in African education: The role of urbanization and globalization. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 6 (1), 1-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v6i1.8243>.
- Nyati-Saleshando, L. (2018). Managing linguistic diversity and academic performance through dual language program in California. *Marang: Journal of Language and Literature*, 30, 71-89. Retrieved 16 July 2020 from <http://168.167.8.131/ojs/index.php/Marang/article/view/1317/834>.
- Nyati-Saleshando, L. (2019). Shiyeyi language planning in Botswana: International connections and local imperatives. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 18 (3), 176-189. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2018.1552148.
- Ouedraogon, R. M. (2000). *Language planning and language policies in selected West African countries*. UNESCO. Retrieved 16 April 2016 from www.unesdoc.unesco.org.
- Piller, I. (2013). Monolingualism is bad for the economy: Language, migration, and social justice. Pandora: Australia. Retrieved 15 May 2020 from www.languageonthe move.com.
- Pinnock, H. & Vilayakumar, G. (2009). *Language and education: The missing link: How the language used in schools threatens the achievement of education for all*. Reading, UK.
- Ramos, F. (2007). What do parents think of two-way bilingual education? An analysis of responses. *Journal of Latino and Education*, 6 (2), 139-150. Retrieved 20 June 2020 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15348430701304807>.
- Ricento, T. K. & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT profession. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (3), 401-427.
- Richmond, M., Robinson, C. & Sachs-Israel, M. (2008). *The global literacy challenge: A profile of youth and adult literacy at mid-point of the United Nations literacy decade 2003-2012*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Rigaud, C. (2016). Children read better in mother tongue: Part 2. Global Partnership Education. Retrieved 20 June 2020 from www.globalpartnership.org.
- Sabaté-Dalmau, M. (2016). The Englishisation of higher education in Catalonia: A critical sociolinguistic ethnographic approach to the students' perspectives. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 29 (3), 263-285. DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2016.1153108.

- Sanchez, C. (2016). Bilingual education returns to California: Now what? Retrieved 16 April 2018 from www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016.
- Spaull, N. (2011). Primary school performance in Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia and South Africa. SACMEQ Working Paper. 8. www.sacmeq.org/sites/default/files/sacmeq/publication/o8-comparisons_final_18oct2011.pdf.
- Spolsky, B. (2008). Riding the tiger. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can school save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents* (pp. 152-160). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stiles, D. B. (1997). Four successful indigenous language programs. Retrieved 15 July 2020 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ed415079.pdf>.
- Thomas, W. P. & Collier, V. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Centre for Research on Education, Diversity (CREDE) and Excellence, University of California, Berkeley. Retrieved 15 July 2020 from www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html.
- Tshireletso, L. (2000, November). The significance of language and culture in classroom teaching and learning interaction for indigenous ethnic minority children in Botswana. Paper presented at the Conference on Education for Remote Area Dwellers in Botswana: Problems and Prospects, 21-23 November in Mogoditshane.
- Ukwuoma, U. (2015). Mother tongue education: Lessons for Botswana. *US-China Education Review*, A.5, 734-744.
- UNESCO. (2005). EFA global monitoring report. *Literacy for life*. Paris: UNESCO Institute for Education. Retrieved 20 June 2020 from www.unesco.org/education/GMR2006.
- US Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition (2015). *Dual language programs: Current state policies and practices*. US State Department. Washington DC. Retrieved 16 May 2016 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948>.
- Webb, V., Lafon, M. & Pare, P. (2010). Bantu language in education in South Africa: An overview. Ongekho akekho! The absentee owner. *Language and Learning Journal*, 38 (3), 273-292. DOI: 10.1080/09571730903208389.
- Wolfson, N. & Manes, J. (1985). *Language of inequality*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Wright, L. (2002). Critical thinking in the schools: Why doesn't much happen? A review of literature. *Informal Logic*, 22 (2), 137-154.