

CHAPTER 1

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preamble

The language policy of South Africa is hailed as an epitome of meaningful change in language policies throughout the world and in South Africa in particular. The demise of apartheid and the subsequent change to democracy in South Africa in 1994 witnessed a radical shift in the language policy of South Africa. South Africa underwent many changes in various spheres of activity and, inevitably, languages could not escape these changes. The linguistic situation which was characterised by the dominance of English and Afrikaans as official languages for decades could not be immune to the process of change. The other languages, African languages, which were previously marginalised were brought into the linguistic scenario. Apart from the sign language, the constitution itself enshrines eleven official languages which are in table 1 below.

Table 1 The eleven official languages and L1 speakers as a % population.

(The percentage is based on the 1996 census)

Language	L1 speakers %
isi Zulu	21,96
isiXhosa	17.03
Afrikaans	15,03
Sesotho sa Lebowa	9.64
English	9.01
Setswana	8,59
Sesotho	6.73
Xitsonga	4.35
siSwati	2.57
Tshivenda	2.22
SiNdebele	1.55

Section 6 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa states that:

- (1) The official languages of the Republic are Sesotho sa Lebowa, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, Afrikaans, English, isiNdebele, isiXhosa and isiZulu.
- (2) Recognising the historically diminished use and status of the indigenous languages of our people, the state must take practical and positive measures to elevate the status and advance the use of these languages.
- (3)
 - (a) The national and provincial governments may use any particular official languages for the purposes of government, taking into account usage, practicality, expense, regional circumstances and balance of the needs and preferences of the population as a whole or in the province concerned; but the national government and each provincial government must use at least two official languages.
 - (b) Municipalities must take into account the language usage and preferences of their residents.
- (4) The national government and provincial governments, by legislative and other measures, must regulate and monitor their use of official languages. Without detracting from the provisions of subsection (2), all official languages must enjoy parity of esteem and must be treated equitably.
- (5) A Pan South African Language Board established by national legislation must -
 - (a) promote and create conditions for the development and use of -
 - (i) all official languages;
 - (ii) the Khoi, Nama and San languages; and
 - (iii) sign language; and
 - (b) promote and ensure respect for-

- (i) all languages commonly used by communities in South Africa, including German, Greek, Gujarati, Hindi, Portuguese, Tamil, Telegu and Urdu; and
- (ii) Arabic, Hebrew, Sanskrit and other languages used for religious purposes in South Africa.

This language policy is also included in the Bill of Rights in Chapter 2, with regard to education. The most important and relevant section to the discussion is Section 29 (2) which states that

Everyone has the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice in public educational institutions where that education is reasonably practicable.

(The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996)

In devising and enacting a language policy, South Africa made strides in as far as establishing a sense of national identity or common identity and a soul is concerned. This is in line with what the President of Malaysia said at Independence, "A nation without a language policy is a nation without a soul and a life (Gill, A keynote address to IAWE 2002).

This language policy is considered by scholars as one of the most progressive language policies in the world. In recognizing eleven languages, South Africa adhered to The 1986 Organisation of African Unity Language Plan of Action for Africa whose aims and objectives *inter alia* are:

- # To encourage each and every Member State to have a clearly defined language policy;
- # To ensure that all languages within the boundaries of Member States are recognized and accepted as a source of mutual enrichment;

- # To liberate the African peoples from undue reliance on the utilization of non-indigenous languages as the dominant, and official languages of the State in favour of the gradual take over of the appropriate and carefully selected indigenous African languages in this domain;
- # To ensure that African languages, by appropriate provision and practical promotions, assume their rightful role as the means of official communication in the public affairs of each Member State in replacement of the European languages which have hitherto played this role; and
- # To encourage the increased use of African languages as vehicles of instruction at all educational levels.

(Organization of African Unity (OAU) Draft: Language Plan Of Action For Africa. 1986)

The language policy is also in line with some of the stipulations in the Harare Declaration (1997) which encourage Member States to 'aspire for', among other things:

- # in broader terms, Africa that acknowledges its ethno-linguistic pluralism and accepts this as a normal way of life and as rich resource for development and progress;
- # Africa where democratisation in a pluralistic context seeks to produce through sound and explicit language policies Africans who are able to operate effectively at local levels as well as at regional and international levels.
- # a democratic Africa that seeks to promote peaceful coexistence of people in a society where pluralism does not entail replacement of one language or identity by another, but promotes complementarity of functions as well as

cooperation and a sense of common identity.

- # Africa where scientific and technological discourse is conducted in the national languages as part of our cognitive preparation for facing the challenges of the next millennium.

(Intergovernmental Conference of Ministers on Language Policies in Africa, Harare, 20 - 21 March 1997, (Harare Declaration))

The language policy is also in line with the resolutions of the Asmara Declaration which state, *inter alia*;

- # African languages' vitality and equality must be recognized.....

- # All African children have the... right to attend school and learn in their mother tongues.

- # The effective and rapid development of science and technology in Africa depends on the use of African languages.

(The Asmara Declaration on African Languages and Literatures, January 11 - 17, 2000).

Some of the stipulations in these declarations are reflected in the Mission and Vision of the Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB) which aims to promote multilingualism by among other things, creating conditions for the development and the equal use of all official languages.

Thus, South Africa adhered to and is in line with some of the aims of the Declarations and resolutions which induce member states to recognize all languages within their boundaries. Needless to say, the policy provides the best solution to a society in which language differences had continued to be preserved, and the languages had been regarded as separate languages each in its own right, each as the most distinguishing feature and a symbol of a group which wanted to continue to be regarded as such.

The recognition and promotion of these languages are the most tangible manifestation of language revival leading to survival. This is because the policy itself provides for the monitoring of the continued existence and cultivation of different languages on a reasonable and equitable basis. Viewed from this perspective, the importance of a language cannot be ignored. Language is one of the most enigmatic possessions and a quintessence of our humanity. It is the principal factor enabling individuals to become fully functioning members of the group into which they are born. Nations are able to develop because language provides an important link between the individual and his/her social environment. In addition to this, it acts as a link to social equity.

A policy of this nature also demonstrates that the government has the linguistic interests of all the people at heart for it depicts total commitment to granting all citizens an equal opportunity to take their rightful place in the state and in the world. Thus, this choice is a way of democratising a language policy as it responds to the needs and interests of all segments of the population. Thus, the rise and development of African nationalism and its concomitant desire to symbolise it with language has been fulfilled in that African languages would be the basis for the standard national languages.

After according all eleven languages official status South Africa was, is and will be expected to fulfill its constitutional obligation by implementing its language policy. The recognition of the African languages as official on the national level may be the declared goal of the policy but from observation, most linguistic communication in domains of national significance remains English and to a lesser extent Afrikaans. The people do not see much value in African languages as depicted by questions such as 'What is the value of African languages these days?' Authorities seem to be reluctant to ensure that African languages, by appropriate legal provisions, assume their rightful role as of official communication in public affairs, administrative and educational domains. No one seems to take African languages seriously. They seem to have nothing to offer except in everyday communication between members of families and informal conversation with friends and colleagues. For example, in most job advertisements knowledge of English is emphasized and if one were to go for an interview for a post to teach an African language, the whole

process is conducted in English. Even if one is proficient in the African language, being able to communicate using all its idioms and proverbs, if he/she cannot communicate his/her ideas effectively in English, he/she does not get the job.

Another observation is that in spite of the fact that the country is intending to promote all the languages at the official level, people continue to relegate African languages to second class status. Now and again, Black African celebrities such as boxers, musicians, soccer players and athletes use English during interviews on television and radio even if they are not fluent in English. They grope for words and struggle to construct good sentences. One wonders if this is necessary considering the fact that musicians, especially, became famous through singing in African languages. Why do television (TV) and radio presenters allow such embarrassing moments when the African language is at their disposal?

In another observation some SABC TV 1 presenters use English or many English words, that is, code mixing and code switching at will, when they present the programme line up to an audience that understands African languages, even where it would be advantageous to use an African language. In the same vein some African language speakers in leadership positions use English when addressing at rallies or meetings even when they are addressing rural people who do not understand English.

It was also observed that some educators still use English to teach African languages because they do not have the academic jargon or register for the concepts they teach. Why is this shortcoming allowed to persist? Is it insurmountable to overcome?

Thus, objective observation was carried out. According to Adler and Adler (1994:381) "Observation consists of gathering impressions of the surrounding world through relevant human faculties" and it has an advantage of not interfering with the subjects. In other words the hallmark of observation is non-interventionism. However, observation has its own shortcomings in terms of its validity. In observational research observers are forced to rely more exclusively on their own perceptions. According to Denzin (1989) quoted by Adler and Adler (1994:381) Observation is "more susceptible to bias from their (researchers')

subjective interpretations of situations". Thus, in order to make an objective analysis of the language situation a research project was carried out.

1.2. Aims of the Research

The research takes a hard look into the perception or attitudes of speakers of African languages towards the new language policy, the adopted eleven-official-language policy. This is in line with the question which forms part of the title of this research which reads, What do people say? The research is geared at eliciting information and the actual understanding of the new language policy by the general public and other stakeholders who did not contribute anything to the actual formulation of the language policy. Although language issues are outside their domain, it does not mean that they cannot have a role to play in the general issue. It is with this view or understanding that speakers of the language are stakeholders, too, that the research redirects at the public's perception or attitudes and outpourings. The researcher surmises that their attitudes are momentous in the implementation of the new language policy.

Attitudes are very important in any studies since they, among other things, protect people's self-esteem and allow people to express their fundamental values. Failure to accommodate and interpret them correctly on any important decisions that affect the people's lives has dire consequences or repercussions. Attitudes or perceptions play an important part when it comes to language and language planning, too.

A research on the people's perception on the language policy cannot be carried out without an awareness campaign on language policy issues as a prerequisite. As emphasized explicitly by Alexander, in a personal interview, one cannot interview people objectively on a subject that has not been properly explained to them. Thus, the would be limitation of the research was subverted indirectly. The research is executed at the most opportune moment, that is, after the government had embarked on a year long multilingualism awareness campaign which was aimed at *inter alia*:

- (a) promoting multilingualism so that South Africans will view multilingualism as a valuable resource;
- (b) bringing about an appreciation that, in a multilingual society, knowledge of more than one language is an asset both in an immediate economic sense and in the larger social sense:
- (c) breaking down the legacy of apartheid by means of promotion of African languages. The elaboration, modernization and development of these languages are important requirements for the attainment of social and economic equality and justice for the majority of the South Africans.

(Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, 1998:20).

Thus, after this language awareness campaign there is a dire need to establish the people's perception and what transpires with regard to language practice in public institutions and every aspect of the people's life.

The research also hopes to establish strategies to implement in order for African languages to carry philosophical and scientific discourse to unprecedented heights. It is now the duty of a researcher to establish the degree to which the language policy can be realised because there are already indicators that the language policy is not what it appears to be on paper. The research aims to establish the extent to which African languages can be economically, scientifically and educationally viable. In this regard the research aims at how African languages can be used in business and trade. The research also aims at establishing the degree to which African languages can be introduced in the educational domain as languages of teaching and learning. It is argued that the present scenario in education deprives many talented Africans of access to higher learning institutions and indeed to the development of human resource potential. The research will explore and highlight the attitudes of students, teachers, lecturers and parents towards the use of African languages in learning and teaching and how they view the role of African languages, given the new dispensation. The research also focusses on establishing and

highlighting some strategies aimed at subverting negative attitudes and revolutionizing the people's perception.

The research strives to reawaken and draw the attention of all stakeholders including the governments, central and regional, to language issues. As Maseko (1995:4) observed , "Politicians appear to have abandoned the language question and now concentrate on 'more important matters' such as the economic and party issues."

Central objectives to the research are:

1. To establish how the Blacks perceive the language policy of South Africa;
2. To highlight some of the limitations or constraints in the use of African languages in the economic and educational domains;
3. To address the importance of mother tongue tuition among Africans; and
4. To highlight possibilities in the implementation of African languages in major domains.

1.3. Review of related literature

Many scholars have written on the language policy of South Africa. Indeed, the language policy of South Africa has attracted so much attention because it is history in the making. In a personal conversation Bokamba, a professor at the University of Illinois, equated the language policy of South to a 'World Experiment' that has, is and will continue to provoke responses in the form of research papers, scientific articles, books and further research for quite some time.

Many scholars have researched on the attitudes of students and university lecturers on the implementation of mother tongue education and use of African languages in other domains. A few scholars, among them, Madiba (2000) have taken a hard look into the strategies that can be employed in modernizing African languages.

Gamede (1996) investigated the attitudes of High school pupils towards the use of African languages as languages of learning and teaching. Her focus was on three different types of schools, namely, Model C, rural and township schools. Her question of interest was whether the new dispensation had cast a positive view towards African languages or consolidated former attitudes. She established a complex situation in which Model C school pupils were more positive towards African languages than their counterparts in the rural areas. This is definitely contrary to the expectations of the majority of the researchers which makes the whole question of attitudes a complex phenomenon to deal with. Her findings project that the rural pupils regard African languages as useless and hence, they should be done away with. It is ironical that pupils who use African languages more often than not do not value their languages. Sadly, her research indicates that whatever linguistic ingenuity and resilience the speakers of African languages display, African languages will always be a few steps behind. In this regard, equality of languages cannot be achieved.

A similar research was carried out by Rima Vesely. Her focus was on how English impacted on the Xhosa speaking students of Cape town. Vesely established that the change to democracy after the demise of apartheid was cherished by the students but unfortunately, the students did not exude similar sentiments with respect to African languages and/or mother tongue education. Vesely (2000:71) contends that, “the more ... accessible African languages are in the public environment, the higher their status will become, and the negative impact of the hegemony of English will be minimized”. She views that, “... only when a commitment towards language inclusiveness is made, will attitudes change and policy manifests, will education and employment become accessible to African language speakers, and transformation truly will be underway” (Vesely, 2000:71). Thus, Vesely, like Alexander, is an exponent of mother tongue and use of African languages in more important domains, which would certainly benefit the majority of speakers of African languages.

Similar research was carried out by de Wet, Niemann and Matsela (2001) who contrasted the attitudes of students against those of lecturers. They established that the majority of learners rejected the use of African languages as languages of learning and teaching. On

the contrary university and college lecturers were positive about the use of African languages as languages of teaching and learning. The lecturers' reasons are pedagogical in nature.

The majority of the students investigated "... see the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice as the right to receive education through the medium of English" (de Wet, *et al*, 2001:55).

Phaswana (1994), who restricts his research to the University of Venda's language policies observed that students preferred English to African languages as medium of instruction because it is perceived as a language of success in the economy, politics and education. He affirms that African languages continue to be marginalised. "They will only serve as subjects that the students choose for completion of their curricula" (Phaswana, (1994:44). Phaswana advocates that indigenous African languages should be promoted as official languages of government, economy and education in the true sense of the word. To Phaswana, "without such affirmative action, the new language policy will fail to achieve its goal of ensuring the equality and democratisation of all languages" (Phaswana, 1994: 45).

Maseko (1995), by contrast, advocates that the official language of South Africa should be English. He argues that by adopting English as the official language, there would be more advantages than disadvantages in terms of economic gains. To him, the growing demand for English over Swahili in Tanzania serves as indicators. He concurs with Heine who regards countries with language policies such as South Africa, "some problematic cases" (Heine in Maseko (1995:68). To Maseko, the choice of eleven languages is political in the sense that the government wanted to avert confrontation which stems up if some languages belonging to Great Traditions are left out.

Alexander (2000) acknowledges the dominance of English as a language and medium of instruction. He proposes that in the multilingual South Africa, the country "... adopts an additive bilingualism approach, as the new language policy in education prescribes"

(Alexander, 2000:23). Alexander contends that if such a strategy is implemented systematically but flexibly, it will ensure high levels of literacy in at least an African language and at least some fluency in English.

Unlike Maseko and other scholars who view the policy as impractical, Madiba (1999), who is positive, takes a hard look into the advantages of multilingualism. He views multilingualism as a central component in geo-political, racial or ethnic and socio-economic integration (Madiba, 1999:78). He contends that by implementing or, in other words, using multilingualism the government can redress the imbalances of the past, that is, linguistic and socio-economic inequalities.

Webb (1999) focussed on the general implementation of the new language policy, the 11 - language decision which he views as a bold and a unique initiative to address the manifold challenges of a complexly multilingual and culturally diverse country. He carried out a research in 1997 and arrived at the conclusion that language policy and language practice is a mismatch. However, Webb is negative in his perception. Hence, he argues that despite, the constitution, the good decisions and the establishment of supporting structures, very little has changed in the language behaviour of the South African communities. In his contention, South Africa is regressing to where it was before the apartheid era, and that it is becoming more and more monolingual (Webb 1999:66). Webb views the major constraint as the sociolinguistic complexity of South Africa, the main aspects being, among others, the linguistic diversity of the country; the politicisation of languages; the social position of English vis-a-vis that of African languages and lack of clearly defined language-in-education policies. He proposes, *inter alia*, that the government adopts explicit policies and plans with regard to medium models; establish strong government structures and institutions and give financial support. Undoubtedly, the government has made strides by establishing the Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB).

Chiwome and Thondhlana (1992) also investigated the teaching and learning of Shona through the medium of Shona and English at high school and university levels. Their

premise is that using English as the language of learning and teaching puts non-English speaking students at a disadvantage. They support Macnamara's (1996) view that learning takes longer in a foreign language than in the mother tongue (Chiwome and Tondlana 1992:248). They established that although the students have African languages at heart, they preferred to be taught in English, especially at the university

Chiwome and Thondhlana contend that implementing mother tongue is insurmountable because of numerous deficiencies such as the shortage of literary publications in Shona, lack of monolingual dictionaries, insufficient staff and the general lack of confidence in the language. They purport that it would be unrealistic to expect high standards in the face of so many obstacles (Chiwome and Thondlana, 1992:256). This intimates inadequacies in African languages. Unfortunately, it impacts on the attitudes of the people towards the use of African languages. To Chiwome and Thondlana, employing both English and Shona in one lesson, that is, code switching, would definitely undermine the image of a language.

What is discussed in this review are opinions which are indicators to problems that exist with regard to the language policy issues of South Africa. The review places the research proposal in its proper historical context. The research that has been conducted by the researchers restricts itself to students and lecturers only which leaves a lot to be desired. Thus, apart from students and lecturers this research is administered and conducted among parents, teachers and the general public. Teachers work with students and so they have untapped information with regard to their experience with the problems students encounter as a result of the language-in-education policies implemented in schools. In addition to this, minority language groups' linguistic problems are not adequately addressed. Thus, the research focusses on the attitudes of different sections of the South African community and on the problems and possibilities with regard to the implementation of the new language policy.

1.4. Research Methodology

The dimension taken as the methodological expression in this research enterprise is

triangulation. Triangulation is a type of research which entails gathering data in many different ways and from as many diverse sources as possible. According to Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999: 128) triangulation “helps the researcher to ‘home in’ on a correct understanding of a phenomenon by approaching it from several different angles”. Mouton and Marais (1988:91) see triangulation as a type of research that encompasses multiple sources of data collection in a single research project to increase the reliability of the results, and to compensate for the limitations of each method. Thus, triangulation is not a dichotomy but a qualitative-quantitative continuum. This means that it includes the two types of research, qualitative and quantitative. Leedy (1993:139) distinguishes the two, qualitative and quantitative, in the sense that qualitative research data is verbal and quantitative research data is numerical, which simply means that it focuses on how often something occurs.

Qualitative approaches are justified on the grounds that researchers are more interested in the quality of a particular activity and not its numerical occurrence. According to Hendry (1996:13) “The approach investigates the qualitatively different ways in which people experience or think about phenomena”. What this intimates is that what respondents think and believe to be true is more important than any objective reality. The fundamental premise is that people’s actions depend on what their convictions are. Convictions lead to consequences of action. Fetterman (1988:6) contends that qualitative enquiry is concerned with deciphering a phenomenon from respondents’ perceptions. In other words the understanding with which the qualitative investigation is concerned is conveyed by the description of the participants’ feelings, ideals, beliefs, thoughts and actions; with the objective of generalizing results to other situations.

Qualitative research is descriptive, analytic and interpretive. It focuses on depth of information, as opposed to breadth, representativeness and measurability. It attempts to examine phenomenon in a holistic manner. Interpretive approach which is a hallmark of qualitative research is seen as a means to an end, that is, in trying to find out how people really feel about particular things.

Quantitative research as the name suggests is based on the measurement of quantity or amount. It places emphasis on how often an event or activity occurs which makes it inadequate in this research. However, numerical representations will be used in the quantification and analysis of findings.

Since triangulation includes the two types of research, it is the most appropriate methodology for the research. The research methods are diverse and include in depth interviews, newspaper articles, and so on.

1.4.1. Interviews

Interviews involve conversations which are highly skilled performances. It is a quite extensive technique used in field research, which can be described as a conversation with an objective. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994:353), interview is the most favourite methodological tool of the qualitative research or in other words the most popular way of collecting data in interpretive research. Interview exists in three forms: structured, unstructured and open-ended. The interview is a conversation, the art of asking and listening. The interview produces situated understandings grounded in specific episodes. According to Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999:128), "Conducting an interview is a more natural form of interacting with people than make them fill the questionnaire". The interview gives one the opportunity to know intimately what people think and feel. It is the most common and powerful way we use to understand fellow human beings. It is an encounter in which both parties behave as though they are of equal status for its duration. Interviews have an advantage of providing a wealth of detail and provide more accurate responses on sensitive issues, precisely, because the interviewer can follow up motives and feelings which a questionnaire can never do. The interview technique has its own limitations. This is the reason why people resort to other methods of data collection.

The most common type of interviewing is individual, face to face interchange, but it can also take the form of face to face group interviewing, panel discussions. **Structured interviewing:** refers to a situation in which an interviewer asks each respondent a series

of preestablished questions with limited set of response categories. Open-ended questions are used to give room for variation. **Group interviews** have the advantage of being inexpensive, data rich, flexible, stimulating respondents, recall aiding. **Unstructured interview** provides a greater breadth than the other types.

Structured interviews were carried out with university and college lecturers. The reason for choosing them is undebatable. Those are language practitioners and researchers *pe se* who contribute to language debates and research in a way difficult to quantify.

Due to the reasons spelt out above, unstructured interviews were carried out with parents and teachers in urban and rural areas. Parents were selected for this purpose because they decide on the schools they want their children to attend and the medium of instruction they want. Although the rights to choice of language of instruction in Section 29 (2) of the constitution is vested in the individual, the children cannot make a choice. Children are not miniature adults.

Unstructured interviews were also carried out with teachers in urban and rural schools. Teachers were interviewed because they are directly involved in disseminating knowledge to children. These have depths of experiences with regard to children's problems with media of instruction. The researcher surmised that teachers had untapped views on the implementation of the new language policy in schools. Needless to say, teachers' voices have not been heard in this regard. More so, teachers' attitudes to language play a major role in the use of that language as a medium of instruction.

Unstructured interviews were also carried out with university students. These are learners who also make a choice with regard to the medium of instruction. Such a choice is determined by their attitude. A language the people have an aversion to will never be easy to use or to learn through it. Students' attitudes would be important in establishing strategies to counter the problem of elitism.

1.4.2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire focusses on the issue of question wording as well as the important notions of validity and reliability. Of course, the questionnaire has its own demerits, that is, the potential ambiguity of statements or questions. The respondent may divert the question in order for him to include views exciting to himself not the interviewer. The questionnaire may not serve any purpose if the subject is not clear to the respondents.

For this research a questionnaire was used after being tested as an instrument in the initial research that was carried out and published in *The South African Journal of African Languages* and currently on a Website, *Litnet*. The questionnaire was administered to 1000 people in different regions of the country, namely: 1. The Northern Province which is now known as the Limpopo Province; 2. Mpumalanga; 3. KwaZulu-Natal; 4. Eastern Cape; 5. North-West and 6. Guateng. The provinces were found to be representative of perceptions of Blacks in other remaining provinces.

Out of the 1000 questionnaires 600 were received timely and analysed. Among the respondents were University and College lecturers who were grouped separately. As alluded to earlier, these are language practitioners and researchers. Their views would not be influenced by mere judgement but by their own research and experiences. Needless to say, the questionnaire was aimed at eliciting evaluative, conative, and analytic responses. Open-ended questions were aimed at eliciting the respondents' broader perspective to the new language policy and its implementation.

Sociolinguistic surveys such as interviews have their methodological limitations. The research may not be entirely objective for the interviewees may perceive the desired responses. Thus, to complement the questionnaire, it was therefore desirable to rely on the media, that is, the radio, television and articles published in newspapers.

1.4.3. The Media

The questionnaire was not sufficient enough to generate the information needed for this study, so to complement it television programme line-ups for November 2001 and

newspaper articles were analysed.

1.4.4. Literature Study

The study involved extensive reading on the subject. Literature study provides relevant background to language policy and language use and attitudes. Literature review is not exhaustive, being intended to provide only fundamental orientation to language planning and language policy.

The literature consulted includes the following:

- # relevant reading lists for research purposes for the degree.
- # government documents, that is, the constitution of the Republic of South Africa and reports published by the Pan South African Language Board.
- # journal articles
- # articles published on the internet
- # texts of spoken, recorded discussions and presentations at The Association of Languages of Southern African (ALASA).

Thus, the research study process involved going to the different provinces interviewing people; administering a questionnaire and gathering data from the media and related literature. The interviews and the questionnaire served as windows to the respondents' attitudes. The data gathered were analysed systematically and accurately so as to see perceptions, trends and patterns. After all this had been done, the researcher's final task was to complete the final write up.

1.4. Organization of The Study

The research is organized into six chapters. Chapters 1 and 2 are the context of the study. This includes an introduction to the study, the theoretical framework upon which the study is grounded to guide the interpretation of the findings, the regional context upon which the

study is conducted and the specific contexts in which the study was carried out. Chapter 3 presents the research findings. Chapter 4 presents the analysis of the research findings. Chapter 5 presents the discussion of the findings and chapter 6 is the summary, conclusion and recommendations derived from the results of the data analysis. It includes the proposed strategies that can be employed in order to achieve the goal of implementing the new language policy in education and other domains.

CHAPTER 2

2.0. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK : LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE PLANNING

2.1. Introduction

The chapter provides the theoretical framework on which the study is grounded to guide the analysis and interpretation of the findings of the research. The study deals with language policy issues. Language policy issues fall within the domain of language planning. The term language policy sometimes appears as a synonym for language planning but more often it refers to the goals of language planning (Cooper, 1989:29). In this study, it is a decision by a country to allocate specified role(s) to one language, or more than one within her borders. Since language policy falls within the realm of language planning, the framework provided for this study embraces the broader facet of language planning. Needless to say, the importance of language planning is based on the premise that normal and efficient means of communication is essential in a modern state.

2.2. The state of the art

The diversity and complexity of the phenomenon called language has necessitated numerous studies on what language is and how man exploits it for better or worse. One such study is language planning. According to Hornberger (1989:5), "Though language planning has been going on for centuries, it has been the subject of intensive study only since the 1960s." This implies that language planning is a relatively recent field of linguistic study which focusses on language issues, especially in developing nations. The term language planning was first used by Uriel Weinreich for a seminar which was held at Columbia University in 1957 (Haugen, 1965:188). Haugen himself introduced the term, 'language planning', in literature in 1959 to stand for collective efforts by a country (Norway) in the shaping of her national language. In his article' Haugen (1959:8) defined language planning as "the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogenous speech community". Later he referred to those activities as *outcomes* of language planning, a part of implementation of decisions made by language planners, rather than language planning as a whole (Haugen, 1966:52). The term language planning was later popularized by Rubin and Jernudd (1971) in the book, *Can Language Be Planned?* (Bambgose 2000:97).

Since the time the term was introduced into literature by Haugen numerous studies dealing with various cases throughout the world were carried out by scholars such as Fishman, Ferguson, Rubin, Das Gupta, Nahir, Kloss, Neustupny and Ruiz. According to Hornberger (1989:5) these scholars formulated their theoretical formulations on the basis of their cross-national studies of language planning. They “worked toward a unified description of language planning in terms of types, processes, goals and orientations” (ibid:5). However, in spite of working towards a unified description of language planning, there is no clear-cut or water-tight definition of language planning that is universally accepted. This is because the scope of language planning ranges from one specifying an activity that includes the broadest kind of human problem-solving or decision-making to a more limited one specifying an activity that is initiated and supported by some formal body (Rubin, 1971:477). Cooper (1989:29) noted that there is even disagreement as to what term should be used to denote the activity, language planning. The fact that there are more than twelve definitions of language planning which appeared after the publication of Haugen’s 1959 article is indicative of lack of consensus or a universally accepted definition of the concept. For the purposes of review the definitions by the different researchers cited by Cooper (1989:30 - 31) are listed below.

1. “As I define it, the term Language planning includes the normative work of language academies and committees, all forms of what is commonly known as cultivation and all proposals for language reform or standardization” (Haugen, 1969:701).
2. “[Language planning] occurs when one tries to apply the amalgamated knowledge of language to change the behaviour of a group of people” (Thornburn 1971:254).
3. “Language planning is *deliberate* language change; that is, changes in the systems of language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes. As such, language planning is focussed on problem - solving and is characterized by the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems to find the best (or optimal, most efficient) decision” (Rubin and Jernudd, 1971b:xvi).

4. “We do not define planning as an idealistic and exclusively linguistic activity but as a political and administrative activity for solving language problems in society” (Jernudd and Das Gupta, 1971:211).
5. “The term language planning is most appropriately used in my view to refer to coordinated measures taken to select, codify and, in some cases, to elaborate orthographic, grammatical, lexical, or semantic features of a language and to disseminate the corpus agreed upon” (Gorman, 1973:73).
6. “Language planning refers to a set of deliberate activities systematically designed to organize and develop the language resources of the community in an ordered schedule of time” (Das Gupta, 1973:157).
7. “The term *language planning* refers to “the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level” (Fishman, 1974b:79).
8. “Language planning is the methodical activity of regulating and improving existing languages or creating new common regional, national or international languages” (Tauli, 1974:56).
9. “The [language planning] terms reviewed refer to an activity which *attempts* to solve a language problem, usually on a national scale, and which focuses on either language form or language use or both” (Karam, 1974:105).
10. “[Language planning may be defined as] government authorized, long term sustained and conscious effort to alter a language itself or to change a language’s functions in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems” (Weinstein, 1980:55).
11. “Language planning refers to systematic, theory based, rational, and organized societal attention to language problems” (restatement of Neustupny (1983:2 cited

by Cooper 1989:31).

12. "Language policy - making involves decisions concerning the teaching and use of language, and their careful formulation by those empowered to do so, for the guidance of others" (Pastor in Cooper 1989:31).
13. "The term language planning applies to a wide range of processes involving planned change in the structure and the status of language varieties" (Telleson,1981:175).
14. Language planning is "a problem solving activity concerned with deliberate language change for specific aims, which may be social, political or educational (or a mixture of all three)" (Kennedy, 1983:1).
15. "Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes" (Cooper, 1989:45).

From the definitions given by Rubin and Jernudd, Das Gupta, Fishman, Karam, Neustupny and Kennedy, the bulk of the work of language planners and those who have written in the field of language planning has been focussed on identifying and resolving language problems. The definitions have been phrased in terms of efforts or attempts to solve language or communication problems. In this regard Karam (1974:108) concedes that, "Theoretically, wherever there is a communication problem concerning language, language planning is possible". Haugen (1966: 52) who concurs contends that "Language planning is called wherever there are language problems. If a linguistic situation for any reason is unsatisfactory, there is room for a program of LP". Basing on Neustupny's (1970) examples of language problems viz. code selection, standardization, literacy, orthography and so on, the emphasis on identification and resolution of language problems is to a greater extent reasonable. Needless to say, language problems are more prevalent in

multilingual societies: “the more languages there are to choose from, the more complex the problems tend to become” Mackey (1979:48).

Definitions by Rubin and Jernudd, Jernudd and Das Gupta, Weinstein and Pastor define language planning as activities undertaken by governments. They describe language planning as government-authorized agencies, or other authoritative bodies, that is, organizations with the mandate to undertake language planning activities. Any other organisations not commissioned by the government are excluded from language regulation. They also exclude the language planning efforts of individuals. The definitions are too restrictive therefore as they confine language planning to the work of government institutions only. Thus, the definitions intimate that it is the government that makes implicit and explicit decisions with regard to language planning. Thus, governments can be held responsible for failure to implement language policies.

Definitions by Thornburn, Rubin and Jernudd, and Kennedy used the word “change” for language planning activities. Contrary to this, Cooper (1989:45) prefers the word “influence” to the word “change”. The word “change”, in this regard, is prescriptive, and so, connotes coercion which, from the psychological point of view, is likely to meet with resistance from the target group. History has shown that human beings are, in most cases, unwilling to accept change. “Influence”, on the other hand, denotes subtle, yet visible strategic manipulation of the target group. Cooper contends that his own definition neither restricts the planners to government institutions nor restricts the target group nor specifies an ideal form of planning. And, as alluded to earlier, it is expressed in behavioural rather than problem-solving terms. In this regard the language planning activity focuses on language attitudes, the behaviours toward language and toward language users. Cooper contends that the purpose of language planning is to win over new speakers by influencing them which in most cases contributes to socio-political and economic development of more than just the target population. The approach is more progressive than coercive.

In this discussion, it is important to take cognisance of the fact that language situations are dynamic and so simply change, consistent with technological developments. This concurs

with Eastman's (1992:97) view that, "certain situations simply evolve". Thus, any language situation should be researched thoroughly taking into consideration the dynamism of language and societal factors, that is, the attitudes or perceptions of the target group which is what this research is all about. The role of authoritative agencies should be taken cognizance of for the government offers financial support and makes implicit and explicit decision with regard to the implementation of language plans in government institutions and education.

It is important to note that language planning does not take place in a vacuum. Karam (1974:108) contends that, "regardless of the language planning, in nearly all cases, the language problem is not a problem in isolation within the region, or nation but is directly associated with the political, economic, scientific, social, cultural, and/or religious situation." Thus, language issues must be considered and formulated within the fuller social context.

The definitions given above denote activities which are aimed at solving language problems, usually on a national scale, and which focus on either language form or language use or both and on acquisition. Thus, language planning as a concept identifies a language problem or problems, describes them and influences change with the aim of solving the language problems. Such a change involves decision-making with regard to functions and development of languages. The decision-making aims at establishing the roles each language should play and how best it can be developed so as to function in certain domains. The decision is government-authorized in the sense that it is the government that makes explicit and implicit decisions in language planning.

The definitions bring out the three-fold nature of language planning: the selection of a language for certain domains, which is the functional allocation of a language, termed status planning; the development of a language termed corpus planning and increasing the number of users of a language, termed acquisition planning. The three concepts are regarded as the different types in terms of which language planning is described.

2.2.1. Types and approaches to Language Planning

The types of language planning that have been christened are corpus planning, status planning and acquisition planning. Corpus planning and status planning were first introduced in literature by Kloss in 1969. Cooper (1989) introduced the third aspect of language planning, that is, acquisition planning. The types of language planning answer the question, what is planned about language, its function or its structure? Approaches to language planning refer to the level at which planning takes place, whether it is simply a decision made, that is, policy, or it is a long term process of extending and implementing the decision, that is, cultivation. Language cultivation as used by Neustupny (1970) implies that a language has a well defined domain.

2.2.1. 1. Corpus Planning

Corpus planning focuses on the nature of the language itself, that is, the form and structure of a language (Kloss 1969) and changes that affect the language itself such as developing a writing system for a language (Fishman, 1976:9). Fishman (1991:22) defines corpus planning as “the authoritative creation of new terms, at least for the purposes of daily life including daily technology”. According to Hornberger (1990:12) corpus planning involves standardization, lexical modernization, terminology unification, stylistic simplification, auxiliary code standardization, purification, reform and graphization. Thus, corpus planning involves the development of a language, that includes lexical development, the codification and standardization or harmonisation of a language, the creation and updating of terminology as well as the production of dictionaries and glossaries. In broad and general, it denotes planned changes to the structure of a language so that it may meet certain specified requirements, typically those of the standard language used in official domains and domains of higher education and in philosophical, scientific and technical discourse.

Codification of a language or variety involves graphization, lexication, grammatication as well as harmonization of language. Graphization involves transforming a language by developing writing systems. Lexication and grammatication are part of the process of

modernizing a language. Lexication deals with the development and selection of appropriate words for a language and grammatication involves the formulation of rules on how the language should be structured. Harmonization involves reconciling orthographies of sister languages or varieties. Terminology modernization is another aspect of corpus planning which concentrates on the expansion of a language's lexicon through the addition of new words, expressions as well as the styles of the written and spoken variants of a language. A language can never be stagnant since technological advancements and modernisation make it necessary to formulate new terms and to describe new ideas or entities. It also involves the development of registers and styles for specific subject fields, for example journalistic, computer science and economical terms through internationalism, using loanwords, compound words, and even creating new words.

It is inevitable that language will change for every language is capable of developing, consistent with technological developments. Hence, corpus planning is necessary to record all these lexical, grammatical and stylistic changes to create 'an intellectual variety of a language' (Gonzalez 1990:328).

Finally, as Fishman (1979:12) puts it, "Languages cannot be written without writing systems. They cannot be used as languages of technical instruction without technical terminologies. Thus, status planning without concomitant corpus planning runs into a blind alley. Conversely, corpus planning without status planning is a linguistic game, a technical exercise without social consequence." This intimates that the two types of planning are interdependent which and thus are implemented concomitantly.

2.2.1.2. Status Planning

According to Fishman (1976:9) status planning refers to the allocation of functions to a language or languages. Status planning is concerned with assigning roles to languages, and therefore, the term has administrative overtures. Thus, status planning is a strategy in language planning where on national level primarily the government, as well as on secondary level other interested parties, institutions and organisations determine the

functions a language or languages must fulfill in a country, region, institution or organisation. According to Erasmus (2002:6)' status planning mainly focuses on the creation of language policies, putting legislative measures into place to give a language or languages their official status and at the same time monitoring these regulations as well as the implementation thereof. The choice of a language for use in a particular domain is often more specifically referred to as cultivation status planning. Status planning, therefore, deals with the functional allocation of languages as official national language. Usually, it is the government that makes implicit and explicit decisions with regard to status planning. In this regard, language functions are rarely resolved by democratic means. Decisions are mainly political or authoritarian in nature. Hence, government officials and politicians are status language planners whose choice of a language as official or national is influenced by burning political, cultural and economic issues. According to Harlech-Jones (1990:11 in Marivate 1992:9), language policies mirror the values of "those who have power and access to decision-making, and which are formulated according to perceptions of how advantages and benefits may be obtained". This concurs with the stipulation recognized in the Harare Declaration (1997:138) which states that "language policy decisions are actually political decisions that can only be taken by national governments". Thus, status planning is not divorced from overall national planning processes or social policies of the state.

Considering the fact that the functions of a language are normally determined by the national government, it is possible that the functions and status of language can change from time to time. The status of a language might change with time depending on political and ideological reorientations or reinterpretation of the phenomenon by the ruling elite. A suitable example is the South African multilingual language policy, recognizing eleven official languages as compared to the old language policy that recognized Afrikaans and English only. The form of planning which includes decisions about declaring one or more languages as official is regarded as policy status planning.

According to Cobarrubias in Fishman and Cobarrubias (1983:51) "the status of a language is not to be identified with the actual functions fulfilled by such a language in a speech community". The status of a language is a "concept that is relative to language functions...it

is also relative to other languages and their suitability and eligibility to perform certain functions in a given speech community” (ibid:51). There are factors that determine the status that a language will assume in society. These are:

- i) the number of people using it,
- ii) their relative wealth,
- iii) the importance of what they produce and its dependence on language,
- iv) their social cohesiveness and the acceptance by others of their right to be different. (Mackey, 1962 in Marivate, 1992:9).

Language status activities which relate to the role of a language in a country at any level embraces:

Maintenance, expansion or restriction in the uses of a language for particular functions. These include whether a language should be used as a national, official, regional or local language or a medium of instruction in education; whether a language should be replaced by another and revival of a dead language.

2.2.1.3. Acquisition Planning

In addition to the two types of language planning discussed above, Cooper (1989:33) introduced the third focus of language planning which is termed acquisition planning. Acquisition planning is directed toward the increase of the number of users of a language, that is, speakers, writers, listeners, or readers. Cooper (1989:159) distinguishes three types of acquisitional planning on the basis of the overt language planning goal and the method employed to attain the goal. The three types of acquisitional planning with respect to overt goals are: (i) acquisition of a language as a second or foreign language; (ii) reacquisition of a language by people for whom it was a vernacular as in the case of Maori and Hebrew languages, and (iii) language maintenance as in efforts to stop the death of a language. In this study, what concerns us most is the acquisition of a second and/or third language.

There are strategies that can be implemented to attain acquisition goals, viz. (i) those designed primarily to create or improve the opportunity to learn; (ii) those designed primarily to create or improve the incentive to learn, and those designed to create or improve both opportunity and incentive simultaneously (Cooper, 1989:159).

There are direct and indirect methods that can be employed with respect to the opportunity to learn another language. Direct methods include classroom instruction, the provision of materials for self-instruction in the target language, and the production of literature, newspapers, and radio and television programs in simplified versions of target language. Indirect methods include efforts to shape the learners' mother tongue so that it will be more similar to the target language, which will be easier to learn.

With respect to the incentive to learn there are also methods that can be employed such as making a language a compulsory subject or prerequisite for employment or entry into higher institutions.

To cater for simultaneous opportunity and incentive to learn the strategy is to use the target language as the medium of instruction for contexts in which the learner either must enter or wants to enter. Examples are immersion or bilingual education.

2.2.2. Stages of language planning

Ever since the term language planning was introduced into literature by Haugen linguists such as Rubin, Fishman, Karam and Haugen have described the systematic stages which denote the systematic process of language planning. Karam (1974) describes three stages, namely, planning, implementation and evaluation. Haugen (1983) presents four stages, namely, selection, codification elaboration and implementation. Fishman (1979) presents five stages, namely, decision making, codification, elaboration, implementation and evaluation. Rubin (1971) describes four processes, namely, fact-finding, planning (goals, strategies and outcomes) implementation and feedback. Thus these stages vary from linguist to linguist. The general consensus in the literature is that the language planner

sets aims, implements the aims and evaluates both the aims and the implementation process as it relates to the achievement of the aims. Haugen's implementation stage includes evaluation. Karam's planning stage includes data collection, investigating the feasibility of the decision and finally making the decision itself which is followed by writing up the plan. His implementation stage includes identification, codification and dissemination, while evaluation includes monitoring and assessment. Rubin's planning stage includes planning of the goals to be achieved, the strategies to achieve the goals, and finally predicting the possible outcomes of the planned strategies. Feedback refers to evaluation of the first three stages.

According to Rubin (1971:218), language planning itself focuses on solutions to language problems through decisions about alternative goals, means, and outcomes to solve these problems. Rubin's stages provide the most viable approach to language planning. Kennedy (1983:6) also concurs with Rubin's stages of language planning which make the ideal model or more systematic process of language planning. The systematic process of language planning involves four steps in solving language problems, that is fact-finding, planning, implementation and evaluation. The four steps form the canonical model of language planning.

2.2.2.1. Fact-finding

The first step in the development and implementation of a language policy is to conduct an extensive research. The language planner must establish the language problems, tendencies and constraints within the existing situation. The planner must determine the rationales, the existing social, cultural, political and economic dimensions offer, (Rubin 1971:218). Surveys must be carried out to gather attitudinal and demographic information which enables language planners to deduce, to draft and establish the envisaged target language policy. In conclusion, there is a need to establish three types of basic data, attitudinal, demographic and situational, that determine the success of effective language planning. In modern language planning the complete collection of data is essential for formulating a feasible, objective and fair language plan.

2.2.2.2. Planning (goals, strategies, and outcomes)

The second phase is the actual planning. “The planner will formulate plans based on his knowledge of the constraints, (Rubin (1971:219). Planning forms a natural follow-up to fact-finding as it enables the language planner to determine goals, strategies and predict outcomes. Part of the planning process is to do a cost-benefit analysis of all linguistic and non-linguistic goals. After determining the goals, strategies are established. The final step in the planning stage involves prediction of the possible outcomes.

2.2.2.3. Implementation

The implementation phase of the language planning process involves putting strategies into operation, that is the process of effecting the actual language planning. This is where the cooperation of all stakeholders is required. This implies active involvement of language planners and governments in persuading and motivating the citizens to accept the proposed language plan. The process of implementation is, undoubtedly, the most challenging and difficult stage because strategies involve the entire population, and so, one cannot determine how people react to the policy. In any case language planners who set the goals of the language plan ensure the effective and efficient implementation of the plan by gaining consensus of the majority of the population.

2.2.2.4. Evaluation

The evaluation is the final step of the language planning process. According to Rubin (1971:220) this is the stage “the planner must see if the plan has in fact worked.” At this point the planner determines whether the actual outcomes match the predicted ones. This can be regarded as the most important stage as the successes or effectiveness and the limitations of the language plan are established. Reagan (1995:320) argues that both goals and resultant policies should be critically evaluated. Donna Kerr (1976) quoted by Reagan

(1995:320) suggests the following four 'tests' that a policy must pass, namely, "desirability, justness, effectiveness and tolerability." The planner gets the opportunity to evaluate his plan against these four tests to determine his level of success. Formal evaluation contributes greatly to the planning process because they help to isolate and assess alternative goals, strategies and predicted outcomes.

According to Marivate (1992:20) this step is viewed as valuable since the complexity of language planning problems makes it impossible to give optimal solutions. Hornberger has identified types of evaluation. These are as follows:

- (i) the one that ensures proper allocation of resources and appropriate guidelines to achieve the language planning goals intended by the decision-makers has been implemented;
- (ii) the second one that examines the extent to which language planning goals are consistent with the type of society sought, (1990:16).

In order to achieve the process of implementation a nation requires consensus of the majority of the population. According to Marivate (1992:22) consensus need to be cultivated and encouraged because language affects not individuals but the entire population. The executives should mobilize the cooperation of all stakeholders or groups upon which the successful implementation of the plans depends.

In conclusion, language planning without the four features discussed above would certainly be incomplete. Following this model will ensure that the end result is credible and well suited to the current language situation.

2.2.3. Goals of language planning

The processes of language planning discussed above are steps taken to achieve goals set. As alluded to earlier, the goals are set within the context of political, socio-cultural and economic spectrum. According to Hornberger (1990:21) it is these goals that determine the direction of change that is envisaged. Nahir identified five in 1977 and later wrote

eleven functions or goals in 1984. Hornberger (1989:7) identified five goals which makes sixteen the number of goals which language planning activities around the world seem to be aimed to fill. The following are the goals of language planning that were identified by the two, Nahir and Hornberger: “officialization, nationalization, status standardization, vernacularization, revival, spread, maintenance, and interlingual communication as goals with regard to language status planning; and purification, reform, corpus standardization, lexical modernization (or elaboration), terminology, unification, stylistic simplification, auxiliary code standardization and graphization as goals with regard to corpus planning” (Hornberger, 1989:7).

In developing and newly independent countries language planning is aimed at officialization of languages for the purposes of technological advancement and the nationalization of local languages for national unity necessary for development. Needless to say, three declarations, namely, The Organization of African Unity Language Plan of Action for Africa of 1986, The Harare Declaration of 1994 and The Asmara Declaration seek technological development and national unity through the officialization of all the languages within the borders of each and every African country. In this regard the language policy of South Africa is hailed as an epitome of meaningful change in language policies throughout the world and in South Africa in particular.

2.2.4. Orientations of language planning

Ruiz (1984:16) proposed the concept of orientations as a heuristic approach to the study of basic issues in language planning. He defines orientations as “ a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society.” Ruiz proposed three types of orientations, namely,

- (i) language-as-problem
- (ii) language-as-right
- (iii) language-as-resource

The three orientations toward language underlie language planning efforts in general and the setting of aims in particular. They are basic to language planning in that they delimit the

ways people talk about language and language issues, they determine the basic questions people ask, the conclusions that people draw from the data, and even the data themselves. These orientations are related to attitudes in that they constitute the framework in which attitudes are formed. Thus, they describe 'what is thinkable about language in society' (Ruiz, 1984:16). This, to a large extent, depicts the motivation behind the choice of a certain language policy.

2.2.4.1. Language-as-problem

According to Ruiz (1984:18) "the bulk of the work of language planners and those who have written in the field of language planning has been focussed on the identification and resolution of language problems". In other words the language-as-problem is concerned with the identification of language problems and establishing solutions for these problems. This concurs with Fishman's (1974a:79) view of language planning "as the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level". Under a language-as-problem orientation, language is seen as an obstacle standing in the way of the incorporation of members of linguistic minorities. Mackey (1979:48) contends that language problems are inherent in the multilingual situation: "the more languages there are to choose from, the more complex the problems tend to become." What this denotes is the problem of which language to choose for use for official purposes in a multilingual society. Thus, there is a connection between diversity and language problems. The more languages there are in a country the bigger the potential for language problems.

2.2.4.2. Language-as-right

Under a language-as-right orientation, the right of linguistic minority members to speak and maintain their languages is regarded as a linguistic human and civic right. This approach focuses on the sentimental aspects of language which deals with the individual and group emotions, beliefs, convictions and values for their language. Language is seen as the right of an individual. This is in line with the Barcelona Universal Declaration On Linguistic Rights (June 1996) which emphasizes non-discrimination, pluralism and community initiatives in

language use. According to Ruiz (1984:22) several researchers have given examples of what they regard as language rights. For del Valle (1981) in Mackey (1988:10 - 11), language rights denote the opportunity to “effective participation in governmental programs” which includes aspects such as bilingual unemployment benefit forms, bilingual voting materials and instructional pamphlets and interpreters. Hernandez-Chavez (1978:548n in Mackey, 1988:11) suggested “the right to the use of ethnic language in legal proceedings and the right to bilingual education”. Macias (1979:88-89) added two kinds of language rights: “the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language” and “the right to use your language(s) in the activities of communal life”, especially, the right of students to their own language. Zachariev (1978:271 in Mackey 1988:10) proposes the right to mother tongue instruction. Mother tongue instruction is viewed as an inalienable right.

However, it is of paramount importance to note that language rights cannot confine to language considerations only for it affects many aspects of social life by virtue of the pervasive nature of language itself. Thus, discrimination as to language has negative repercussions in other spheres of life as noted by McDougal, Lasswell, and Chen (1976:1555) who assert that:

Deprivations resulting from language discrimination may be devastating for skill acquisition. Language barriers have all too often worked to frustrate and stifle the full development of latent capabilities. When people are deprived of enlightenment and skill, their capabilities for effective participation in all other value processes are correspondingly diminished. (Mackey, 1988:11).

When minority linguistic rights are acknowledged the full participation of minority groups in all national activities such as judicial and administrative proceedings, civil service examinations, voting and public employment is guaranteed. If linguistic rights are not recognized it is well-nigh impossible for them to develop skill and participate in the social, economic and political life of their country. For these reasons language-as- right approach is valuable.

2.2.4.3. Language-as-resource

Under the language-as-resource orientation, the emphasis is on the importance of conserving and developing all of its linguistic resources. Language-as-resource approach values every language as a precious possession and a quintessential aspect of humanity for it opens the door to a multilingual language policy. Language planners are trying to recognize, promote and develop all languages so as to achieve equality which ensures achieving or fulfilling social, economic, governmental and educational objectives. Language-as-resource is the most appropriate strategy in resolving language problems in a multilingual society. This approach can enhance the status of subordinate languages which implies that minority language groups can contribute substantially to the development of a country through the use of their languages.

In conclusion, the three orientations are valuable in language planning. No one orientation could be used as a solution to language planning problems since all the three have their own limitations, and so, language planning can benefit from a variety of approaches, since in some circumstances some approaches are better than others.

It is with this framework in mind that the research is carried out. Theory concepts generated by language planning scholars will be employed to help articulate the many aspects of the language policy of South Africa. Does the language plan or policy entertain the wishes of all the people within the borders of South Africa? Does it really take into consideration the linguistic human rights of minority language groups? These questions are raised with the nature of language planning in Africa in mind, too. Language planning in Africa is characterized by declaration without implementation. Thus, the research attempts to measure the degree of success of language-as-right and language-as-resource approaches in resolving South African language problems. With respect to this, the next chapter, chapter 3 is based on interviewees' opinion with regard to the language policy of South Africa. It is important to mention at this point that the research was carried out in the year 2001 such that any changes adopted with regard to the implementation of the language policy after 2001 do not form part of this research or study.

