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Despite the official status accorded the indigenous languages by South Africa’s new Constitution, the Government and others associated with the higher domains of language use in society are tending towards an ever-increasing reliance on English. This is especially evident in Parliament, Education, Commerce, Technology and the Media. According to current theory in both the fields of Language Planning and Bilingualism, the dominance of one language in these domains, in a multilingual society, is likely to have a seriously detrimental effect on the indigenous languages on two levels. Within the society, failure on the part of the Government and others to extend and promote the use of the indigenous languages in the higher domains will entrench the lack of status that already exists within and without the indigenous language communities. This in turn will mean that the corpuses of these languages will never be developed to cope as tools of the higher functions. Should this happen, the later generations of the indigenous language communities may turn towards establishing English as a first language in their communities, because they view their own first language as disadvantageous. The language policies in the education system will play a major role in this.

There is a severe discrepancy between language policy and practice in South Africa. The aim of this dissertation is to establish the extent of the discrepancy, and to place it in context by examining, in historical and present-day terms, the main trends leading to language contact and conflict (Chapter II). This situation will be further examined in the light of current theory in the fields of language planning and bilingualism; and the South African situation will be compared with the pertinent case studies of Ireland and Kenya. These two language planning situations were chosen because they represent two of the main options facing South Africa: the promotion and extension of the indigenous languages (Ireland), and the
establishment of a national language, or national lingua franca, other than English. With the theoretical background established, the crux of the dissertation will be the presentation and analysis of data from an original research study (Chapter IV).

The goal of the empirical part of this study is to investigate the correlation between the dominance of English over the high domains of language use and the linguistic behaviour/ language choice of people whose first language (henceforth L1) is an indigenous language, and for whom English is a (necessary) second language. Since the survey will be conducted in the Western Cape, the focus will be on Xhosa L1 speakers.

The study is primarily a questionnaire survey of people whose L1 is Xhosa or another indigenous language, but who are compelled, by circumstance or legislation, to use English exclusively or extensively in the workplace. The respondents were asked about their language use/ choice in various domains (i.e. high and low domains), as well as their attitudes towards these languages. Of particular interest will be the choices they make or would like to make for their children. Some respondents gave more detail during discussions of the questionnaire.

The study is presented against the background of the actual extent of the dominance of English in the higher domains. This was established by a comparative survey of the degree of language use in each of these domains, and the theoretical implications of the different domains in which South African languages are used (Chapter II).

The concluding chapter attempts to synthesise the studies and the theory, and establish some sort of prognosis for the future. I also investigate, through the case studies and theory presented in Chapters III and IV, some viable alternatives for South African language policy.
CHAPTER I

LANGUAGE CONTACT AND CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA:

AN INTRODUCTION

South Africa has a long history of linguistic and ethnic contact and conflict, which continues to this day. Little is known, however, of the extent of contact between ethnic and linguistic groups before the advent of the Europeans in the late 15th century, and subsequent colonialism; and only speculative reconstruction from archaeological evidence is possible for this period of South African history (Wilson & Thompson 1986:10). Thus, I have limited the historical context to the colonial era and beyond.

The earliest recorded contact between an indigenous group (the Khoikhoi) and European explorers (the Portuguese) shows an unsuccessful attempt to communicate:

'And since they had no language which could be understood, we could have no speech with them; but rather they drove off their cattle inland, as if terrified at such new matter...' (Raven-Hart 1967:1, citing the Portuguese historian Barros, 1496-1570)

On this voyage there also occurred the first recorded conflict between the indigenous people and the Europeans. Raven-Hart (1967:1), again citing Barros, tells of a confrontation between the Portuguese crew who were attacked while stopped at a watering place at Mossel Bay. The Khoi herdsmen, defending the watering place, pelted the explorers with stones from the top of a hillock. In retaliation, Dias fired a crossbow at them, killing a herdsman.

The subsequent history of contact between the Khoi and the Portuguese is one of alternating cooperation and conflict. It is recorded that the Portuguese and the Khoi established a system of communication using gestures and signs, while some of the
visiting British record having used onomatopoeia (Raven-Hart 1967:11). Since the Portuguese established no permanent settlement, however, their exploration of the Cape tailed off by the end of the 16th century, there was no sustained contact between the Portuguese and Khoikhoi.

The Dutch colony at the Cape
Although the Portuguese opened the sea route to India via the Cape of Good Hope, it was the Dutch and British who later vied for control of it, and this conflict was to shape much of South Africa’s linguistic and cultural history. In 1652, the Dutch established a refreshment station at the Cape of Good Hope for ships en route to the East. This was soon upgraded into a fort with a permanent settlement, which necessitated a more sustained contact between the settlers and the Khoikhoi tribes. The European settlement consisted of a small group of Dutch 'nobles', the ships' transient crews, and many slaves, mostly from Madagascar and Guinea (Raidt 1985:83, 96). However, although the Dutch settlement was heavily mixed, and there are signs that a Dutch based pidgin was in effect amongst the slaves, the official policy was that only Dutch was to be spoken to the slaves (Raidt 1985:96ff).

The dominance of colonial European languages over indigenous Southern African languages started very early on in the colonial era. When the Europeans first arrived at the Cape of Good Hope in the late 15th century, it had already been occupied in the north and east for centuries by the Khoikhoi, and for millennia by the Bushmen (Elphick & Giliomee 1989:4-5). By the time of the Dutch settlement of the Cape of Good Hope, the Khoikhoi people’s perceived ‘gift’ for the mastery of foreign tongues had already become legendary (Raven-Hart 1967:3). This perception

1 Raven-Hart cites the use of "Moath" for cattle, and "Blaa" for sheep.
2 The word 'Khoisan' is often used as an umbrella term for all the inhabitants of the Cape at the time of the first European contacts. However, there were two distinct groups: a pastoral tribe, known as the Khoikhoi, and a hunter-gatherer tribe, known as the San, or Bushmen.
had come about through the use of Khoikhoi people as interpreters by earlier European travelers. However, the Dutch were quite unable to gain even a rudimentary command of the Khoi language. Thus, by capturing and 'training' some herdsmen as interpreters, communication between the two groups was greatly facilitated. However, in all the time of the Dutch colonisation, there was little integration between the Dutch and the Khoikhoi; the only Khoi allowed into the Dutch camp were interpreters, messengers and servants (Raidt 1985:96). The two groups ranged between antagonism and cooperation, frequently raiding and counter-raiding each other's stock.

The Dutch were faced with a problem. More and more ships were using the Cape route to the East, and the demand for food, especially meat, at the Cape increased dramatically. This in turn increased the demands of the Khoikhoi, from whose stock most of the supplies came. With cooperation being so tenuous, the Dutch went on the offensive. Some large Khoikhoi tribes were subdued by van Riebeeck's forces, with the aid of rival Khoikhoi tribes (Raven-Hart 1967:218). Raven-Hart further explains the decline of the Khoi with the advance of the Europeans:

- the Khoisan political and economic structures were severely eroded under the influence of European trade and ways;
- due to the migrant culture of some of the indigenous inhabitants, the settlers were able to take over land when it was temporarily deserted;
- the strongest Khoikhoi tribe had been defeated by the Dutch, with the cooperation of other, rival Khoi tribes. (Raven Hart 1967:221ff)

Two natural disasters caused the final devastation for the Cape Khoi people. In 1713, a smallpox epidemic, carried by a ship, decimated the Khoi population. This was closely followed by a
two year drought, which halved the livestock complement of both the Khoi and the Europeans. The Khoi population never regenerated, and those surviving gradually assimilated into the prevailing culture.

The British Influence
Although the Dutch settlements at the Cape were also severely ravaged by the disasters, they were able to recover and regenerate. The decline of the Khoisan population and political structures meant that they were no longer perceived as a threat. Thus, the Cape colony expanded gradually along both the west and east coasts, and northwards into the interior. The eastward expansion was somewhat slowed by increasing contact with Xhosa tribes; but by the late 18th century, the boundary of the Cape colony had been fixed between the Buffels and Great Fish rivers (see Map 1.1). (Reader's Digest Atlas of Southern Africa 1995:29)

The British were regular visitors to the Cape for trade purposes. After the French Revolution of 1789-1791, however, the new French Republic overran the weakened Netherlands monarchy, and laid claim to all Dutch territories, including the Cape colony. Britain saw this as a threat to its trade interests at the Cape, as well as its sea route to India, and determined to claim the colony for itself. In 1795, the British landed a fleet at Muizenberg, drove back the Dutch defenders, and claimed the Cape. Soon after this, the British were able to relax as the Netherlands (reestablished as the Batavian Republic) was given back her sovereignty and all her territories (Burgers 1997:19).

Thus, by the end of the 18th century, the population of the Cape Colony was as follows:

- 21,746 Europeans (mainly Dutch);
- c. 25,000 slaves (mainly Malay, but also Indian, Madagascan, Angolan and Mozambican);
- c. 15,000 Khoi. (Raidt 1985:96ff)
The Europeans spoke a 'variety of Dutch that was to evolve into Afrikaans', and the slaves and those Khoi who mingled with the servant community spoke a Dutch-based creole (Raidt 1985:98).

The rise of Napoleon saw the Netherlands once again subjugated by France; and the British forced another occupation of the Cape, this time at Blaauwberg (present-day Blouberg), in 1806 (Atlas of Southern Africa 1995:29f). The Dutch defenders were again defeated, and this time Britain installed a Governor, Earl Caledon, almost immediately. In 1814, the Netherlands formally surrendered the Cape colony to Britain; and the British set about establishing their colony (Atlas of Southern Africa 1995:29f). Thus 4500 settlers were brought across from England in 1820-1821, most of whom settled in and near Cape Town and Algoa Bay.

The establishment of a 'large' British settlement caused a split in the European population at the Cape: they were split along linguistic (Dutch vs English), religious (Calvinist vs Established) and cultural lines. Moreover, British rule meant that the Dutch settlers were governed by a minority with very different political ambitions and policies. British rule also meant a change in language policy, and schooling was established in the English medium for all children. Political tensions grew, ultimately leading to the Great Trek of 1834-1836, as several thousand Dutch/Afrikaans people (Voortrekkers) fled the now British colony.

As the Voortrekkers moved north and eastwards, they and the 'frontier' farmers (those whose farms were situated on the boundaries of the colony) came into ever more frequent contact with Xhosa tribes who already occupied that land (Wilson & Thompson 1986:252). These were generally bloody conflicts, as both groups claimed the same land. The Xhosa were eventually defeated, and the land they had occupied annexed to the Cape Colony (Raven-Hart 1967:16; Burgers 1997:18).
Meanwhile, with their way blocked at the eastward frontier by Xhosa settlements, the Trekkers pushed northwards, where they encountered, bargained and battled with various indigenous tribes, most notably the Matabele and the Zulu. European relations with the Zulu under King Chaka had been characterised by a spirit of cooperation (Wilson & Thompson 1986:361f.). However, Chaka was murdered and succeeded by his half brother Dingane in 1828, who initially cooperated with the Voortrekkers. In an apparent attempt to protect Zulu territory, Dingane turned against the Voortrekkers, and murdered hundreds of them, including Piet Retief and his party. This set the Voortrekkers on the offensive under Pretorius, and the Zulu were eventually defeated at the Battle of Blood River in 1838 (Wilson & Thompson 1986:361). In the meanwhile, the Matabele, who had attacked and decimated Trigart's Trekker party, were subdued and driven back by Potgieter in 1837 (Wilson & Thompson 1986:355).

With the indigenous tribes beaten back and temporarily subdued, the Voortrekkers took the opportunity to establish their own 'Boer Republics' within the territory previously occupied by the Zulu and the Matabele. The first of these was the Republic of Natalia (which occupied most of present day KwaZulu-Natal). The government of the Cape Colony viewed this move as a threat, and marched on the fledgling republic in 1843 (Keppel-Jones n.d.:73). War broke out, in which the British prevailed, and the Republic of Natalia was annexed to the Cape Colony, and granted Crown Colony status shortly afterwards. This led to an influx of English-speaking people to Natalia, and once again there was a colony whose European community was divided on linguistic, religious and cultural lines.

Two other Boer republics had been established at this time: the Orange River Sovereignty (ORS), and the Transvaal, which were meant to 'establish the independence of all Boers north of the Orange River' (Keppel-Jones n.d.:76). The ORS was annexed to the Crown in 1848 as a Cape Dependency; but was 'abandoned' again to
the Boers in 1854 (Wilson & Thompson 1986:417,424). The citizens, or burghers, of the ORS immediately elected a President and established themselves as an independent republic, renamed as the Orange Free State. Two years later, the burghers of the Transvaal, renamed as the South African Republic (SAR) did the same (Burgers 1997:20). Thus, by 1860, South Africa as we know it today was partitioned into four areas, all divided along European linguistic and cultural lines (Map 1.2). The Cape Colony and Natal were British-administered, English-speaking colonies, while the SAR and OFS were independent Boer republics, administered in the Dutch medium and with the Dutch Reformed Church established.

All four of these territories battled continually with the indigenous peoples for land, for both farming and settlement, as the establishment of European settlements and frontiers greatly impeded the indigenous people's mobility. Therefore, there was constant friction and skirmishing between the Europeans and the Xhosa in the Cape Colony; the Zulu in Natal; the Griqua and the Basotho in OFS; and the Swazi and the Matabele in SAR (Burgers 1997:22).

The discovery of gold and diamonds in the OFS and the SAR in the late 19th century sounded the death knell for the Boer Republics. The gold and diamond rushes brought an influx of fortune-seekers from all over the world (Wilson & Thompson 1986:533). Together with the Griquas (under Adam Kok III), the digging community asked Britain for protection; and Griqualand, also known as the Diggers' Republic, was promptly annexed to the Cape Colony (Burgers 1997: 23). The diamond and gold rushes also significantly swelled the English-speaking population of the Boer republics.

---

3 This figure excludes the 'minor' Boer republics, such as Stellaland and the territories governed from Winberg and Potchefstroom.
Map 1.2: The four main regions of South Africa (which were consolidated to form the Union of South Africa). (Readers' Digest Atlas of Southern Africa 1995)
The gold and diamond rushes in Southern Africa also coincided with the Industrial Revolution in Europe, and Cecil Rhodes's dream of a Cape to Cairo railway; and so industrialisation began in Southern Africa. In addition to this, many of the diamond and gold interests in South Africa were in the hands of British companies and entrepreneurs. Jobs in mining, railway building and the urban development required to house the workers and establish businesses began to open up everywhere, and the OFS was beginning to find itself overrun. The indigenous people were also finding themselves overrun, as the Europeans encroached further into their territories. They resisted and became a serious threat to European interests. In order to build a stronger defence against the perceived threat to their gold and diamond holdings from the indigenous people, Britain eventually annexed both the OFS and the SAR (Burgers 1997:25).

The OFS was relieved by its annexation, but the annexation of the SAR was not accepted by its Boer population. This led to the outbreak of the first Anglo-Boer war, in which the Boers prevailed, in 1880 (Keppel-Jones n.d.:110). The SAR reclaimed its independence, reconstituting itself as the Transvaal Republic. However, the British wanted the mines and railways brought back under their control. After a British attempt to seize the Transvaal capital in 1896, the Boers prepared for war, and the second Anglo-Boer war broke out in 1899, ending in defeat for the Boers in 1902. British rule in South Africa was absolute.

In the aftermath of the second Anglo-Boer war, it was decided to build a cooperative union (Burgers 1997:28f). After years of negotiations, the act of Union was signed in 1910, and the Union of South Africa was formed. Colony status was withdrawn from all

---

1 Also known as the South African War.
four territories, and they were given the status of Provinces. Thus South Africa was first 'unified' after four centuries of conflict between and among indigenous people and settlers alike.

In the negotiations leading up to the Union, the language question was very prominent, with the focus being on 'reconciling the conflicting interests of...English and Dutch' (Hartshorne 1995:307). However, the role of African languages was not even considered. Nowhere is this more prominent than in Education: while every attempt was being made at finding an equitable language policy solution for European schools, the established tradition in African schools 'was allowed to continue by default'. This meant that English was to be the medium of instruction in all African schools, except in Natal, which had 'definitively prescribed' the teaching of Zulu in all African schools since 1885 (Hartshorne 1995:308).

Apartheid

The Rise of Apartheid

The foundation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 made segregationist practice the official policy for the first time, when parliamentary membership was reserved for Europeans only. Until this time, there had been no official colour bar on membership of the Cape Colony parliament (Brookes 1968:xxiii). This was followed, in 1913, by the imposition of the Natives' Land Act (Act 27 of 1913)\(^5\), which forbade non-Europeans to purchase land outside of the Native Reserves, which constituted only 13% of the country. This year also saw the creation of the

---

\(^5\) Henceforth, where Acts of Parliament are referred to, I shall use the standard convention nn/yy, where nn is the number of the Act, and yy are the last two digits of the year.
'liberalist' United Party (UP), which made some tentative moves toward reform of the Pass Laws in order to ease relations between Africans and Europeans before the outbreak of World War II (Keppel-Jones n.d.:123).

Any chance of reform was squashed in 1948 when the National Party (NP) came to power under D.F. Malan. It was this party that made apartheid official policy and signed it into law, with its infamous Group Areas Act (41/50), which segregated the four recognised racial groups into their own areas, and forbade mixed marriages and settlements, and the Bantu Education Act (47/53) which finally and completely separated 'Bantu' education from that of the Europeans. This act will be discussed in more detail below. South Africans lived and laboured under these laws and others of their kind until 1994. In 1961, the NP broke irrevocably with British rule, to form the Republic of South Africa, and apartheid rule was consolidated.

The language policies of the Republic differed little from those of the Union, though the predominance of Afrikaners in the government elevated Afrikaans to a slightly higher status position (see Ch. II). Officially, English and Afrikaans enjoyed joint status as the two official languages of the Republic, and were equally represented in all high functions. All government publications, coins, signposting, schoolbooks, etc. were brought out (usually separately) in English and Afrikaans. As far as the European sector of the population was concerned, South Africa was a bilingual country.

The Homelands Policy
Not only did the apartheid government wish to segregate the races, but also the ethnolinguistic groups among the indigenous population. To this end, various African 'homelands' were created, and offered 'independence' or self-government. The plan

---

6 The Pass Laws were initiated in 1939 by Native Affairs Minister H.A. Fagan to 'keep the Africans out of the [Europeans'] towns'.
1. Venda
2. Bophutatswana
3. Transkei
4. Ciskei
5. KwaZulu
6. KaNgwane
7. Gazankulu
8. Lebowa
9. KwaNdebele
10. Qwaqwa

Map 1.3: The location within the Republic of South Africa of the tribal 'homelands'. (Reader's Digest Atlas of Southern Africa 1995)
was ostensibly for a 'cooperative system of small states under the guidance of white South Africa' (Burgers 1997:22). Two Xhosa states were created along the Kei River (see map 1.2), with Transkei to the North and Ciskei to the south. Bophuthatswana was created for the Tswana-speaking people, and consisted of patches of rather arid land scattered to the north and north west of the country. Venda was created near the Mozambican border for the Venda speaking people. These four states were granted 'independence' from South Africa. Another six states were created and granted self-governance, all along linguistic lines:

- kwaZulu, for the Zulu-speaking people;
- Lebowa, for the Pedi-speaking people;
- Qwa Qwa for the Sotho-speaking people;
- kaNgwane for the Swati-speaking people;
- kwaNdebele for the Ndebele-speaking people, and
- Gazankulu for the Tsonga-speaking people.

Adapted from Grobler et al (1990:26-31)

In terms of this plan, the Republic of South Africa was a 'European-only' state, and the indigenous people were confined to their 'traditional' tribal territories. They were given no real residential status within the republic; even those who were totally dependent on the Republic for their work and housing were considered to be migrants from one of the homelands (Ballinger 1969:16ff). Indeed, the remoteness of many of the homelands from jobs and other resources meant that up to 40% of the indigenous population were housed in South Africa (in hostels and townships), and not in a homeland at all (Malan & Hattingh 1976:19f).

Each homeland administered its own affairs to some degree, and was given control over education, health, justice, etc. (Malan & Hattingh 1976:11). The homelands each had their own language policies, too, all based on a standard practice: the dominant or
numerical majority language of the homeland, plus English and Afrikaans (Msimang 1993:30). Within the republic, however, the indigenous languages were given no official status at all, and the education system was used to perpetuate this.

Language and Education under Apartheid

While language policy, especially in education, was one of the main focuses of the negotiations leading up to the Union, it was then only concerned with the Europeans. The status quo as established in the Boer and English colonies was allowed to continue. Thus, while every attempt was made to establish separate English- and Afrikaans-medium schools, African children continued to be taught in English, except in Natal, as discussed above (pp. 9-10). However, the NP government, with Verwoerd as Education Minister, took a more serious view of African education.

In 1953, the Bantu Education Act was passed (47/53). This Act passed control from the Dept of Education's provincial authorities to the Ministry of Native Affairs; and forbade the establishment of private schools for Africans (Brookes 1968:47f). In his speech moving for a second reading of the Act in Parliament, the Minister of Native Affairs outlined a comprehensive move away from European-based education for African school children, as well as an education that teaches them not to expect equality with the European (cited in Brookes 1968:49ff). Thus, a new curriculum was developed for African schools. Following the recommendations of the Eiselen Report, set up to investigate the feasibility of Bantu Education, it was resolved to use the mother tongue as much as possible in the lower grades, as 'the [adoption of the new] medium of instruction [i.e. English/ Afrikaans] is to impose a very heavy burden on both pupil and teacher'. The language policy that resulted was as follows:

- The first eight years of education would use the mother tongue as medium of instruction;
• One of the republic's two official languages (i.e. English or Afrikaans) would be taught from first year, depending on the predominant language of the whites in the vicinity of the school;
• The last four years of instruction would use a dual English-Afrikaans medium of instruction.

(From King & van den Berg 1993:6)

However, this policy met with a lot of resistance from both teachers and pupils. For the pupils, the new policy meant that during their schooling, they would have to cope with three languages as media of instruction. For in-service and student teachers, it meant that they would have to undergo a crash course in a language (i.e. Afrikaans, for most of them) that they had never learnt, and were now expected to use as a medium of instruction! Teachers' associations and school boards persistently bombarded the government with memoranda and requests to do away with the dual medium policy, and to limit the number of years of mother tongue instruction as well (Hartshorne 1995:311f).

In 1972, the Bantu Education Advisory Board led an investigation into the medium of instruction issue, and recommended the following:
• The limitation of mother tongue instruction to six years instead of eight;
• That the dual medium system be abolished because its practice was 'strongly rejected as uneducational';
• That teacher training be bilingual (in English and Afrikaans), and
• That the official language not used as a medium in a particular school be allocated more time to be taught as a subject.

(Hartshorne 1995:311f)
The latter two points were introduced in order to give equal treatment to the two official languages, in place of the dual medium system. The government heeded the recommendations that teachers be bilingually trained, and that the use of mother tongue instruction be limited. However, due to a fear that English would simply take over again in dominance if the dual medium policy were abolished, the dual medium policy was left in place. Thus, the Bantu Education system was restructured in 1972 as follows:

- The mother tongue was to be used as m.o.i. up to and including Std 4, instead of Std 6;
- Std 5 was to be a 'bridging year', in which English and Afrikaans were to be introduced as media of instruction, alongside the vernacular;
- The dual medium policy was to be maintained from Stds 6 to 10. (King & van den Berg 1993:7)

In addition to this policy, the State decreed that the Std 5 examination, which functioned as a High School entrance exam, would thenceforth be written in both English and Afrikaans. This was the final straw, and teachers, pupils and parents took their protests to the streets, culminating in the Soweto riots of June 1976. In the aftermath of these events, the State was forced to reconsider its position, and the following amendments to the law were enacted in 1979, under the Education and Training Act (90/79)\(^7\):

- The dual medium approach was officially abolished;
- Either English or Afrikaans could be used as medium of instruction, depending on the school's preference;
- The use of the mother tongue as m.o.i. was further limited: it was compulsory up to and including Std 2; thereafter the wishes of the parents were to be taken

\(^7\) In addition to language policy changes, this Act also meant the abolition of the Department of Bantu Education, which was resurrected as the Department of Education and Training.
While the Education and Training Act of 1979 may have been a victory in itself, it did not do away with the harmful medium of instruction switch, which still persists. The discontinuation of the mother tongue at the end of Std 2, and its replacement with a choice of English or Afrikaans⁴ meant that pupils were still being forced to undergo their education in a language in which they were simply not competent enough (cf. Luckett 1993:40). The poor performance of African pupils, especially in the Matric exam, is a testament to this (Dept of Education website: 1999 Senior Certificate Examination report). It is also the most likely reason why African parents still push for English as a medium of instruction to be introduced into predominately black schools at an even earlier stage. Implications of this will be discussed further in Ch. II.

Language and the Media under Colonial and Apartheid Rule

Radio
When the South African Broadcasting Corporation's (SABC) radio service was inaugurated in 1938, it catered only for English and Afrikaans, and then not without conflict between the two linguistic groups (Tomaselli et al. 1989:39). During World War II, however, a service in Zulu, Xhosa and Sotho was operated three mornings a week, for about half an hour per morning, 'according to the linguistic needs of the territory served' (ibid.). This service was terminated when the war ended in 1945, when the post-war government pointed out that the Broadcasting Act of 1938 made no provision for such a service (Tomaselli et al. 1989:39ff).

⁴ After Act 90 of 1979, some 98.5% of African schools opted for instruction in English; and almost all the rest opted for a parallel English/ Afrikaans medium. (Hartshorne, in King & van den Berg: 9.)
The reasons given for not implementing an indigenous language service were chiefly financial: the transmitter and cable networks were too expensive to install and maintain, and would necessitate a fee that the subscribers could not afford (Tomaselli et al. 1989:39.). Meanwhile, the conflict between the English and Afrikaans linguistic groups flared up again after the war. Tomaselli et al. state that the difficulties were not only linguistic, but also cultural: the English-speaking population were oriented towards the liberal, humanist policies of the USA and Britain, while the Afrikaans-speaking population were oriented towards the nationalistic and fascist policies of Germany and Italy. Indeed, this was the ideological clash at the centre of the war in Europe (i.e. World War II, 1939-1945). The upshot of this difference was that two separate services had to be implemented to cater for the European population, which consisted mainly of two small, widely dispersed communities. These services were heavily subsidised by the State, leaving no money over even to consider a service for the many linguistic groups among the indigenous population.

When the National Party came to power in 1948, they saw a need to introduce an indigenous language service for the African population; and the war had ensured that technology was advancing fast enough for them to consider this. The Reith Commission was sent out to investigate possibilities. At first, they gave sound reasons for implementing indigenous language broadcasting: to educate and inform a largely uneducated population; and to keep an otherwise bored (and potentially troublesome) youth entertained (Tomaselli et al. 1989:45). However, the Reith report continued:

'Others [government officials] again who are concerned about the developing trend of political, sociological and economic thought among the Natives...have urged the desirability of a
broadcasting service for Natives in order to counteract the warped and dangerous doctrines which are being propagated assiduously by agitators throughout the country..." (Tomaselli et al. 1989:46.)

Thus, an African language radio broadcast service, initially in Zulu, Xhosa and Sotho, was set up, but it had two main flaws: firstly, few African households could afford the subscription fee\(^9\), and the government used it largely as a medium through which to convey its ideologies (Tomaselli et al. 1989:46).

By 1960, Radio Bantu (as the new service was called) had three language channels: Zulu, stationed in Durban; Sotho, stationed in Johannesburg, and Xhosa, stationed in Grahamstown. Each channel served its own area. The number of indigenous language channels had grown to 9 by 1969, with the addition of Tswana, Swati, Pedi, Northern Sotho, Venda and Tsonga. When the homelands system was set up, the service was maintained by the homeland government. All of these stations still exist in some form today.

**Television**

Television came relatively late to South Africa, as the NP government did not wish the population to be exposed to liberal Western influences. Eventually, however, they became convinced that television could be used effectively as a State tool (Tomaselli et al. 1989:73). In 1976, the television branch of the SABC was opened. Broadcasts consisted of 5 hours a day of equally divided English and Afrikaans programming. A parallel service for Africans was introduced in 1982, comprising of two channels: TV2, which catered for the Nguni languages (Cape and Natal), and TV3, which catered for the Sotho and Tswana languages.

---

\(^9\) The radio service was free in hostels.
(OFS and Transvaal). Broadcast times were extended for English and Afrikaans TV in the early 1980s; with extra English programming on the TV2/3 receiver when the indigenous language broadcasts shut down at 9pm.

Thus, by 1990, the situation was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Radio (h/wk)</th>
<th>TV (h/wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English\textsuperscript{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 or 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 or 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa (Radio Xhosa; TV2)</td>
<td>129:30'</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu (Radio Zulu; TV3)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedi (Radio Lebowa; TV3)</td>
<td>129:30'</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho (Radio Sesotho; TV3)</td>
<td>129:30'</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana (Radio Setswana; TV3; Bop TV)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>10 + 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda (Radio Venda)</td>
<td>115:30'</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga (Radio Tsonga)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swazi (Radio Swazi)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele (Radio Ndebele)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Airtime given each SA language by 1990.
(Compiled from Grobler et al (eds) 1990:26-31)

The Print Media
Most of the large-circulation English and Afrikaans newspapers have been established for several decades, and generally serve a wide (usually provincial) region (Mesthrie 1994:4070f; my parenthesis). The Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal both have established large-circulation weekly newspapers (Eg Imvo Zabatsundu and Ilanga lase Natal) which use Xhosa and Zulu respectively alongside English; and there are also some English medium newspapers aimed at an African audience (e.g. City Press).

\textsuperscript{10} There were several English radio stations by this time (eg Springbok, Radio 5, + regional stations).
There has recently been an increase in periodicals written in one of the (larger) indigenous languages, the best known of which is Bona, available in several (separate) language editions, and English. Some popular magazines are published in English, for a predominantly African readership (e.g. True Love, Thandi).

The New South Africa and a new language dispensation

In 1994, the African National Congress (ANC) replaced the NP in government, and a new Constitution was adopted. Chapter One, Section Six of the new Constitution increases the number of official languages in South Africa from two to eleven; thus nine indigenous languages have been added to the original English and Afrikaans. In alphabetical order, the official languages of South Africa are: Afrikaans, English, Ndebele, Pedi, Sotho, Swati, Tsonga, Tswana, Venda, Xhosa and Zulu\(^{11}\) (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996:§6.1).

This Constitution was signed into law as Act 108 of 1996, and provides for the promotion and status elevation of the indigenous languages as follows:

\(^{11}\) I have used the English names for these languages. In the same order I have listed them, their own-language names are: Afrikaans, English, isiNdebele, Sepedi, Sesotho, siSwati, Xitsonga, Setswana, Tshivenda, isiXhosa, 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.

3a) The national government and provincial governments may use any particular official languages for the purposes of government, taking into account usage, practicality, expense, regional circumstances and the 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.

3b) Municipalities must take into account the language use 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.'

In addition to these provisions, the Constitution requires that all other languages in South Africa be promoted and respected. (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa: Ch1, §§6.2–6.6.)

Language distribution in South Africa

The current distribution of South Africa's official languages and their first language speech communities is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>WCA</th>
<th>ECA</th>
<th>NCA</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>KZN</th>
<th>GAU</th>
<th>MPU</th>
<th>NPR</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedi</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swazi</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.2:** % L1 by Province. Thus, 20.3% of all people in the Western Cape claim English as their L1.

*(Population Census 1996:11)*

---

**South Africa**

*MAP 1.4 South Africa since 1994 (Stats SA 2000)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>WCA</th>
<th>ECA</th>
<th>NCA</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>KZN</th>
<th>GAU</th>
<th>MPU</th>
<th>NPR</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedi</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swazi</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.3:** % of total speakers of a given language resident in each province. Thus, 72.4% of all Zulu L1 speakers in SA reside in KwaZulu-Natal. (Population Census 1996:15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedi</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swazi</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.4:** Total number of L1 speakers in South Africa (Population Census 1996:14)
These tables show that there is no clear overall majority language in South Africa. Rather, the population consists of many fairly small linguistic groups. However, most of our official languages have a clear regional majority in one or more areas; which areas are generally linked to a former homeland. The language with most L1 speakers is Zulu, but this is heavily concentrated in KwaZulu-Natal. Table 1 shows that more than three quarters of all KwaZulu-Natal residents claim Zulu for their home language, with very significant minorities in Gauteng and Mpumalanga. By contrast, 4 provinces, including the whole of the former Cape province, have ratios of less than 1% Zulu L1 speakers.

Other languages displaying a clear regional majority are:

Xhosa in the Eastern Cape (tied to the former homelands of Transkei and Ciskei);
Afrikaans in the Western Cape and Northern Cape;
Sotho in the Free State (linked to former Qwa Qwa);
Tswana in North West (linked to former Boputhatswana); Pedi in Northern Province (linked to former Lebowa).

Besides its large majority in KwaZulu-Natal, Zulu also has a smaller (<50%) majority in Gauteng, particularly in the mining regions. Swati holds a small (30%) majority over Zulu in Mpumalanga, and is linked with Swaziland and the former kaNgwane homeland. (Population Census 1996:11; Grobler et al 1990: 27)

Despite its high status, English is not the numerical majority language of any one of the nine provinces in South Africa. Indeed, it has a first language ratio of above 5% in only 4 provinces. However, Table 1.3 shows that the English L1 speakers (which number roughly 2 500 000) are mainly distributed among the Western Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng.
Gauteng and Mpumalanga have no real numerical majority language; rather, they have several fairly equally distributed language groups. Gauteng also claims significant numbers of speakers of all language groups (Table 1.3) in South Africa, and is the most linguistically diverse province.

From these statistics it is evident that the most effective language policy for South Africa would be a regional one, and the Constitution of 1996 recognises this. However, it is also evident that, in addition to the regional policies, an accessible lingua franca\(^\text{12}\) is required for communication on a national level. This will not only facilitate communication for the State, but also the general public in the more linguistically diverse areas. However, it appears that people, especially in government, are becoming increasingly reliant on the lingua franca, to the detriment of the use, status and development of the indigenous languages. Perhaps the two most salient areas where there is a sharp discrepancy between language policy and practice are the Media and Education.

**Language and Education in the 'New' South Africa**

Although there is no longer any legal racial segregation in schools, the concentration of the various racial groups in their 'own' areas under colonial and apartheid rule has ensured that there is still a very large racial imbalance between these areas today. There still persist schools that are predominately (or totally) black in historically black areas, white in historically white areas, etc.

So far, however, there does not seem to have been any significant change in language policy in the schools. Schools whose home language base is either English or Afrikaans have remained much the same; the only difference being that students no longer have to take either English or Afrikaans as a subject if it is not

---

\(^{12}\) A lingua franca is a language used to facilitate communication among people whose first or home languages differ.
their m.o.i., but a regional indigenous language if they prefer; and they have only to pass one language subject to qualify for promotion, instead of two. (Curriculum 2005 website). The situation in African schools also remains the same: junior primary instruction continues to be offered in the predominant language of the region, switching to English from the senior primary phase onward. Thus, the detrimental medium of instruction switch remains in place, and it seems unlikely that this will change any time soon. Indeed, the post 1994 government's policy on medium of instruction (Languages of Learning and Teaching) reads simply: 

'The language(s) of Teaching and Learning must be (an) official language(s)', which merely clears the way for the continuation of the status quo. (Language in Education Policy Document, 14 July 1997:6; cited in Desai 1998:4)

However, in mid 1997, the Minister of Education, Sibusisu Bengu, unveiled his plan for a new education system, called Curriculum 2005. This makes provision for a multilingual approach, but unfortunately only superficially so, leaving the choice of medium largely to the schools themselves, as long as it is an official language (Curriculum 2005, on the internet website devoted to Government documents). In reality, the status quo has continued.

The Chisholm Report on Curriculum 200513, submitted to Minister of Education Kader Asmal on 31 May 2000, deals briefly with this issue. It cites criticisms (from submissions from Neville Alexander and PRAESA) levelled at Curriculum 2005 for its being based on a 'unilingual...i.e., for all practical purposes, English-medium system of education' (The Chisholm Report on Curriculum 2005, Appendix 2, from the Department of Education's Internet Website).

13 The Chisholm Report on Curriculum 2005 is a review of Bengu's national schools' curriculum, and was commissioned by incumbent Minister of Education Kader Asmal to correct the flaws of Curriculum 2005.
The submissions cited argue that Curriculum 2005 is in fact 'at odds with the official language-in-education policy which is based on a bilingual or multilingual system of education' (ibid.). The Chisholm Report notes that this policy is controversial, because of the following obstacles:

- there is often a wide variety of 'main languages' in urban classrooms;
- the teachers' capacity to teach in more than one language is often limited;
- parental wishes and ambitions promote English above all other languages (see also the empirical study in Ch. IV of this dissertation).

Moreover, the Report states that the Minister of Education has called for a review of the present language-in-education policy for the revised version of Curriculum 2005.14

At the present time, there remains no decisive legislation aimed at promoting the use of the indigenous languages as media of instruction. This, according to Desai (1998:5), is probably because people perceive the promotion of African languages as media of instruction to be an attempt at segregation and ghettoisation. Indeed, this is how the homelands policy worked. As long as such attitudes persist, people are going to choose to be educated in English, thereby marginalising their own languages. Therefore, it is up to the state to implement legislation if they are serious about promoting and developing the indigenous languages. This is a difficult issue, and its implications in terms of South African society and language planning theory will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

**Language Policy and Practice in the new SABC**

South Africa's policy of 11 official languages is proving very difficult to implement fairly, and even a cursory glance at an SABC TV schedule shows a preponderance of English programming on

14 The revised version of Curriculum 2005 is known as Curriculum 21.
all stations. However, the SABC faces two major challenges as far as language is concerned: the diversity of the language groups, and their relative distribution; and the enormous cost of producing local programming as opposed to the relatively cheap imports of English programmes from overseas.\(^{15}\)

The new, restructured SABC television department consists of three public access channels. SABC1 caters mainly for the Nguni language group (mainly Xhosa and Zulu, with some Ndebele), with supplementary\(^{16}\) programming in English. SABC 2 caters for the indigenous languages of the non-Nguni language groups, especially Sotho, Pedi and Tswana, and Afrikaans, but also with supplementary English programmes. SABC 3 is devoted entirely to English, and the new, free public access channel, e-TV is devoted largely to English, with some indigenous programme content.

The SABC's radio service has changed little, and still offers programming in all 11 official languages, with each language on a separate channel, and largely broadcast to its own region. (http://www.sabc.co.za)

**The dominance of English**

Thus, the history of South Africa has entrenched English in a highly dominant position. The indigenous languages remain relatively underdeveloped, having been left entirely out of high functions by the colonial and apartheid, and even some of the homelands', governments. This has resulted in the indigenous languages having very low status, even in their own L1 communities, and to an increasing demand for access to English. The extent of the indigenous language speech communities is also limited by the power of English, which is a language of wider communication globally.

\(^{15}\) According to an advertisement on SABC TV, a local programme costs upto R8000/min to produce, as opposed to an imported programme, which only costs about R400/min.

\(^{16}\) In practice, however, English programming makes up the majority of all programming on all SABC television channels (see p65).
As far as language policy is concerned, little has changed in the five years since the end of the apartheid era. English remains the truly dominant language of South Africa; it is the language of education and economic power; the language of parliament (indigenous languages are seldom heard in Parliament) and international popular culture. The indigenous languages continue to be marginalised, even by the State. The following chapter will examine this situation in greater detail, and look at some inroads being made into the fulfillment of the Constitutional provisions. My main concern is the impact language policies and practices are having on ordinary people, and on their linguistic use; and especially whether the current situation is likely to lead to massive language shift in certain communities if left unchecked. All this will be scrutinised in the light of contemporary language planning theory and relevant case studies.
CHAPTER II: LANGUAGE PLANNING AND SOUTH AFRICA

Some fundamentals of language planning

The South African language question presents a variety of problems for language planners. There is an especial difficulty in trying to reconcile what the people want with what is deemed desirable in the professional field of language planning, and with the legislation that would be required to effect this. Strenuous legislative steps would be necessary to ensure the 'promotion and use' of the indigenous languages, as required by the Constitution (108/96: §6). This chapter outlines contemporary language planning theory, and relates it to past, current and some likely future developments in language planning in the South African context. Issues of particular interest are:

- the degree to which the segregationist policies of the colonial and apartheid eras (ironically) contributed to the maintenance of the indigenous languages, while at the same time depriving them of the development necessary for them to cope as the official languages of an industrialised state;

- the extent to which English dominates the indigenous languages of South Africa;

- the relative development and status of South Africa's languages;

- the degree to which rigorous maintenance policies may entrench, or be perceived to entrench segregation.

I also draw from language planning experiences and maintenance attempts in other countries, concentrating on reasons for success or failure, and relating them to the South African context.
Language, and particularly the home language or L1, is one of a person's main badges of identity. It is the primary means through which people express themselves; and the Soweto riots of 1976 are but one reminder that measures to regulate language use should not be taken lightly. As yet, there is no clear-cut definition as to what language planning is, as it can be (and is) undertaken for a variety of reasons. For example:

- to unify a diverse population, as in the USA\(^{17}\)
- to revive a 'dying' or diminishing language, as in Ireland (Ó Baoill 1988)
- to reinforce a national identity, as in Israel (Spolsky 1991:142ff)
- to modernise a language perceived as outdated, as in Turkey (Wardhaugh 1992:354)

The above are (ostensibly) benign objectives of language planning, and all have relevance to the South African situation. However, language can also be planned in order to disenfranchise, or even assimilate, other linguistic communities. Indeed, the USA's 'unitary' English-only policy has often been criticised for this.

Cooper (1989:30-31) alone offers thirteen definitions, gleaned from various works in the field, of what language planning is and does. His own definition is based on the common points of these:

*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.*

\(^{17}\) Although the USA has no official language policy, Phillipson (1993:21) points out that an 'English-only, English-preferred policy has been institutionalised, but not legalised.
Within this definition, three different types of language planning can be identified:

- **Acquisition Planning**
  This involves deliberate attempts (by the government, a language academy, or similarly powered organisation) to influence the whole or sectors of the population to learn and use a particular language. For example, the Hebrew revival in Palestine called upon Jewish immigrants to speak Hebrew; and they responded by building and maintaining all-Hebrew schools, and effectively creating a new generation of native Hebrew speakers (Spolsky 1991:142). The enforcement of English and Afrikaans as media of instruction can also be seen as a more sinister form of acquisition planning.

- **Corpus Planning**
  This involves deliberate efforts on the part of the government, language academy or similarly powered organisation to change aspects of the structure of a language itself (Cooper 1989:30,31)- e.g. its lexicon, grammatical structures, writing system, etc. Examples of this type of language planning include the redevelopment of Hebrew terminology to create modern Hebrew (Spolsky 1991:145; the imposition of a Roman script on Turkish, previously written in Arabic script (Wardhaugh 1992:354); and the deliberate francisation of English terminology in Quebec (Dauost-Blais 1983:226f).

- **Status Planning**
  This form of language planning involves the reallocation of languages to other domains of language use, from which they have been previously excluded. Status can be improved or lowered. For example, nine of South Africa’s indigenous languages have been 'promoted' to official status. This form of language planning is the one most relevant to the South African situation.
Contemporary language planning theory identifies two basic approaches to language planning: **top down** and **bottom up** (Harlech-Jones 1990:18ff). The top-down approach is based on heavy intervention in language policy by the state or similar organ: language policy is decided upon at top level, and imposed on the speech community or communities concerned. By contrast, the bottom-up approach involves rigorous consultation with the speech community/ies concerned, and their will becomes legislation. (Harlech-Jones 1990).

The language policies of the colonial and apartheid regimes were patently top-down in their approach, as far as the African language speech communities were concerned. The government decided on a language policy without consultation with the communities that would be affected. Indeed, the language policies were designed to keep these communities in a particular position, as Verwoerd argued in maintaining the Bantu Education Act (47/53). The 'Bantu', according to Verwoerd, had to be made to realise, through state education, that equality with the Europeans '[was] not for them'. And, in keeping with the government's policy of segregation, Verwoerd declared that 'Africans who speak different languages must live in different quarters (quoted, with emphasis, in Alexander 1989:21). Any dissatisfaction among the people had to be expressed after implementation of the policy, as witnessed by the Soweto riots, which were a protest against the government's imposition of the dual medium language policy. Although the new government has adopted more of a bottom-up approach, in that it does take the will of the parents and students (or the government's perception thereof) into some account, nothing concrete or effective has been done about putting their policies into practice. Herein lies a major dilemma, which will be discussed in more detail below.
Status Planning and Development

The Constitution commits the Government to promoting the indigenous languages, and extending their use (108/96: §6.2). Certainly, the best way to do this would be to elevate them and promote them in government and the education system. It is in the education system, however, that legislation aimed at extending and promoting the indigenous languages is likely to meet, and has historically met, with most resistance (see Alexander 1989:21ff). These languages were emphasised by the apartheid government to segregate 'tribal' groups from each other (Maake 1994:113). Their exclusion from virtually all the higher domains has also led to their being perceived as having inferior status. In practice, they do indeed have inferior status, as the indigenous languages have been and continue to be left out of many of the higher functions of language use.

The domains or functions in which a language is used determine its status, not only within its own speech community, but also to those from other language communities. Thus, if a language suffers low status, its own speakers are more likely to abandon it for another, higher status language, and there is little incentive for speakers of another language to learn it. Domains are simply the functions or purposes for which a particular language is used, and are divided into two broad categories: High Domains, and Low Domains (Romaine 1995:30ff)\(^\text{18}\). High domains are generally official, involving communication of some kind of authority, and on a countrywide scale: e.g. Government, Parliament, Media, Education, Religion, etc. Low domains involve communication on a more personal/interpersonal level, such as communication between friends, relatives, neighbours, etc.;

---

\(^{18}\) The terms 'function' and 'domain' are used interchangeably in the literature, and in this dissertation. Schmied (1991) provides an alternative terminology, pointing out that the 'High' functions are in fact those used for European/Western spheres of life, which historically have no bearing on the indigenous languages (and from which the colonials excluded them!)
generally, all communication that is not carried out in an official capacity. A language acquires and maintains high status when it is extensively used in the higher domains of language use. If a language is used mainly or exclusively for lower domains, and is poorly or not at all represented in the higher domains, it has low status.

Although the indigenous languages were extensively used for the high domains in their tribal communities (as languages of tribal affairs and oratory), they were excluded entirely from the higher functions of the State under both the colonial and apartheid governments. Indeed, the latter passed laws which deliberately excluded entire language groups from participation in the higher domains. Moreover, the NP segregated the various linguistic groups as far as possible into their 'own' tribal territories, effectively reducing the amount of inter-indigenous language contact in these areas. Laitin (1992:136) suggests that this artificial state construction (i.e., along forced, colonial rather than 'natural' lines) is one reason why there is no larger African language in South Africa. Entire speech communities were subjected to lifestyles in which participation in the higher domains was 'not for them' (47/53), and today their languages suffer low status because of this.

When the homelands and 'self-governing' states were set up in the late 1950s and early 1960s, each one was established as a tribal homeland, and adopted the dominant language of that 'tribe' as an official language, alongside English. However, the homelands' education systems, which were made 'independent' of the South African government, failed to take advantage and introduce more education in the indigenous languages. Indeed, it was in the homelands that the duration of mother tongue instruction was first limited (Hartshorne 1995:311).

This situation proves problematic for a vast number of South Africans. Their home languages, which they speak fluently, are
limited (and therefore limit their speakers) to low domain usage only. They are effectively excluded from above-menial jobs in Government, education, technology and business; and they are also excluded from much of the media; particularly the entertainment media. One very serious factor is the educational disadvantage of the medium of instruction switch which takes place between Stds 2 and 3 (Grades 4 and 5). The results from (formerly) African schools in South Africa have indicated this for a long time; but studies conducted worldwide offer conclusive proof. The past (and current!) education system in SA has left people with a L1 in which they are communicatively fluent, but have few academic skills, as the language has not been used to teach content subjects. Along with this, the education system has endowed them with an L2 in which they have only been taught content subjects, but have not acquired sufficiently. Thus, their basic communicative skills are limited in L2 and they are unable to express themselves in English. It therefore becomes necessary, for facility of learning, to use the L1 in the classroom; usually code-switching with English (Kunene 1996:12f).

When English is introduced as the sole medium of instruction, the pupils are inadequately equipped to cope with it, as they have never been exposed to it in an academic environment, and have no exposure to it outside of the classroom. The repercussions of this are best illustrated in the work of Jim Cummins. He identifies two different types of language study situation: the basic communicative context, in which the context provides 'cues' to further the interaction; and the 'academic' context, in which the topic of the interaction is removed from the immediate situation of the interaction. Cummins (1984:139) illustrates this point as follows:
Diagram 2.1: The BICS/ CALP continuum

A task requiring an individual to operate in the first quadrant (A) would be cognitively undemanding (i.e., would utilise basic, automised language skills) and supported by, or embedded in, the context. An ordinary conversation between two people is an example of such a task. Only basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) are required, as meaning can be negotiated face-to-face, between two participants.

A task requiring an individual to operate in the fourth quadrant (D) would be cognitively demanding (i.e., would require language skills that have not been automised, like reading or writing), and context reduced (meaning cannot be negotiated in face-to-face participation). Writing an essay or report is an example of such a task, and requires the use of cognitive academic language proficiency skills (CALP).

If a task requires an individual to use cognitively demanding language skills (such as persuasion), but is context embedded (i.e., meaning can be negotiated in face-to-face participation), the skills required are in the B quadrant of Cummins’s diagram. Presenting an idea or an argument would be an example of this.
Finally, a task that is reduced from contextual cues, but is
cognitively undemanding would utilise linguistic skills in the
third quadrant. An example of this would be listening to a taped
report. (Adapted from Cummins (1984:138-139)).

In the context of the South African medium of instruction
question, this diagram helps to identify crucial problems.
Pupils undergo their (junior) primary schooling through the
medium of the mother tongue, or L1. Their L1 acquisition has
support in the home environment, via basic communication, and so
basic communicative skills in L1 are acquired. However, once
they reach the 5th or 7th grade, the medium of instruction
switches to English. The pupils do not acquire basic
communication skills in English, as it is used only in the
classroom, and not in the home environment. Moreover, since they
only use English for academic purposes (skills in Quadrant D),
they do not get much practice in utilising their L1 for academic
purposes, and skills in this region will not develop. Therefore,
they use two languages, but in mutually exclusive contexts19, and
their linguistic proficiencies are imbalanced:-- i.e., they do not
have the appropriate proficiency in English to operate in
Quadrant A, or the appropriate proficiency in L1 to operate in
Quadrant D.

Goals of Status Planning
Cooper (1989:100ff) identifies eleven potential goals of language
planning endeavours aimed at improving the status of a language.
There are a number of roles into which a language can be
established via language planning:

---

19 This is accurate in theory; in practice, however, L1 is used via
code-switching in the classroom when the students’ English proficiency
does not allow them to understand certain concepts. This is, however, a
one-way relationship, and English is never used in a similar way to
supplement L1. Moreover, this causes an additional problem, as tests
and exams-- both entirely reduced from context--must be written in
English.
• A language can be established as an **official** language. However, this term needs further clarification. Official languages, in Cooper’s terms, can fall into any or all of the following categories:

**STATUTORY:** A statutory official language is a unitary official language for the whole country\(^{20}\), used for all ‘politically and culturally representative purposes on a nationwide [countrywide] basis’.


**WORKING:** A working official language is one that is used by the government to conduct its business, but is not necessarily used by, or accessible to, the whole population.

Eg.: English in Nigeria, Singapore

**SYMBOLIC:** A symbolic official language is one that is used as a symbol of a state (usually, it is an historical, cultural language), but not as a statutory or working language. As such, it is not in general use either by the government or the population.

Eg.: the current statuses of Irish in Ireland (Hindley 1990:37), or Latin in the Vatican (http://www.vatican.va).

• A language can be established as official within part of a country, rather than across the whole country. Such a language is confined to a particular region where it is dominant (usually, it is the numerical majority of that region). This is a **provincial** or regional language.

Eg.: French in Quebec, Canada; Flemish in Flanders, Belgium; Breton in Brittany, France.

\(^{20}\) I use the term ‘country’ to signify a sovereign state, thus avoiding any confusion with terms like ‘nation’, or the word ‘state’ itself.
• Sometimes, a language may be required to cross linguistic boundaries within a linguistically diverse country, so that the general business of that country can be conducted countrywide. In this case, a language will be established as a lingua franca for this purpose, but won’t necessarily be the majority L1, or anybody’s L1. This is termed a language of wider communication (LWC). Most linguistically diverse, colonised countries have adopted the colonial language as the LWC in the post colonial era.

Eg.: English in Zimbabwe; Swahili in Kenya; English as the LWC of Europe, or the European Union.

• A country may require a language code to better enable it to conduct its international affairs. It would adopt a LWC for this purpose, but specifically for the government’s liaisons with the international community. Such a language is termed an international language.

Eg.: Member nations of the European Union use English as their international language, as do many Asian countries.

• Most of a country’s dealings (and hence, most of the higher domains of language use) are located in and around its capital city/cities. Some countries adopt a language for especial use in and around its capital(s).

Eg.: Marathi has been legislated for use in and around Bombay (Mumbai) (Cooper 1989:107).

• A particular ethnolinguistic or cultural group may require a language to express its group identity. This can cross linguistic and international boundaries; or it may be confined to a particular territory within one country.

E.g.: Zulu in the KwaZulu ‘kingdom’ within the province of KwaZulu-Natal; the small, expatriate Afrikaans community in Argentina. Other prime examples are the ghetto system in US cities, whereby ethnolinguistic communities tend to gather
together in particular neighbourhoods (e.g. Little Italy, Chinatown, etc.) and the homelands system set up by the apartheid government in South Africa.

- A linguistically diverse country may require (or want) a single medium of instruction for all its schools. Generally, this would be a LWC, and not necessarily the L1 of (all) the pupils. Such a system is, I think, largely responsible for the language crisis facing South Africa today.

- A LWC, or a regional or international language may be implemented in the schools as an educational subject, rather than as a medium of instruction. Ostensibly, this is for the benefit or interest of the pupils themselves. This is known as an educational subject language. An educational subject language may or may not be compulsory.

  Eg.: Until recently, Afrikaans was a compulsory subject in South African schools, and a pass in it was required for promotion to the next standard. Non-compulsory subject languages in South African schools include the (regional) indigenous languages, French, German, Latin and, since 1984, Indian languages (Mesthrie 1995:120).

- Countries or territories that are linguistically diverse may require a LWC, or a standard form of one of their own languages to be adopted as a literary or scholarly language.

  Eg.: In South Africa, English is the major language of higher learning and scholarship, to the exclusion of the indigenous languages. Also, many languages, such as Arabic and German use a specialised form, called the literary standard, for literature and academic writing.

- Like ethnolinguistic groups, some religious groups adopt a language as a badge of identity, or as a ritual and canonical language. This is termed a religious language.
Eq.: Islam and Judaism use Arabic and Hebrew respectively as ritual and canonical languages. Until 1968, Latin was the ritual and canonical language of the Roman Catholic Church.

All of the above are possible goals of status planning. The question is, what influences the goals of a particular language planning exercise? The language planner must examine the context in which the exercise is to take place, in order to determine what the goals will be. The speech community that will be affected must be considered: what are their needs and desires, and why is language planning deemed necessary at all? Generally, language planning (in particular, status planning) is carried out to maintain a language: i.e., to prevent the speech community from shifting to another language, and so causing the eventual death of their own.

Ways in which status can be planned for

A language's status depends primarily on the domains or functions in which it is used. The main way in which status can be planned for, therefore, is through functional reallocation: i.e. certain languages are allocated through legislation to higher functions from which they have previously been excluded (Cooper 1989). In South Africa, for example, the indigenous languages have been deliberately excluded from most of the higher domains, and consequently have lower status than English and Afrikaans, which were the previous official languages.

Nine indigenous languages have been upgraded to joint official status with English and Afrikaans, yet in practice they remain excluded from extensive use in Parliament, sectors of the Media, and especially from Education\(^\text{21}\). In Education, the indigenous languages are still excluded as media of instruction from senior

\(^{21}\) The use of capitals stresses that a particular activity is being discussed as a domain of language use.
primary, secondary and tertiary education, and this is only helping to keep them below the level of English and Afrikaans.

Kathy Luckett and later, PRAESA (Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa, based at UCT) have put forward a proposal of 'National Additive Bilingualism'. This has as its basis the full acquisition of English as a language of international and wider communication, together with the indigenous languages (Luckett 1993). This would be done provincially or regionally, according to the languages predominant in that area. In the Western Cape, for example, all children would be required to undergo their education in the media of English and the dominant language of the region they live in, or their mother tongue: for the most part, Afrikaans or Xhosa. Also, children whose L1 is English, would be required to acquire and undergo education through the medium of Afrikaans or Xhosa, alongside English (Luckett 1993:48ff). This would, in theory, help to overcome the highly dominant position of English.

The report of the Working Group on Values in Education (Values, Education and Democracy) underlines the importance of this policy. It points to the fact that, although it is Government's official policy that all children have the right to be educated 'by way of their most familiar language' and English, 'this is a right enjoyed in practice today by English and Afrikaans [L1] children alone'. In order to overcome this inequity, and counteract the implicit disadvantages of this practice, the report puts forward an important recommendation:

that all learners acquire at least one African [to be determined at a provincial level] language as a subject throughout their schooling (Values, Education and Democracy Ch. 4 (my emphasis)).

---

22 The Working Group was headed by Prof. Wilmot James, and the report was submitted to Minister of Education Prof. Kader Asmal on 9 May 2000.
It further recommends that this policy be supported in the wider society, by the following initiatives:

- the public sector as a major employer needs to give preference to citizens who are at least trilingual;
- promotion in the civil service should depend on mastering accredited courses in at least one African language appropriate to the province or region;
- private sector companies that are multilingual need to be affirmed [by being] given preferential treatment when it comes to major government contracts.

If this is not achieved, South Africa is laying the groundwork for radical language shift, and the eventual loss of the indigenous languages in many communities (see Ch. IV-V). To elaborate this point, I shall discuss some factors affecting language shift, and some typical processes involved in language shift.

**Dominance and Language Shift**

Just as an excessively dominant animal or plant species can threaten the natural existence of another, so a highly dominant language can threaten the very existence of the language(s) it dominates. There is no question that, in South Africa, English is the dominant language. This has little to do with the numerical strength of its first language speech community (although this is an ethical question in the SA context), but rather the societal roles or functions fulfilled by that language, relative to the others.

---

23 For the purposes of this section, I have used the following abbreviations:
- LD: Dominant Language
- Ld: Dominated Language
- LM: Majority Language
- Lm: Minority Language
A language becomes dominant over others when it fulfills higher functions which are not also fulfilled by the other languages. As a result, its speech community has access to ‘wider and favourable social contexts’ (Harlech-Jones 1990:107). If people from other speech communities wish to participate in those functions, they will have to acquire a suitable competence in the dominant language, as they will be unable to participate in their L1. Once this happens, speakers may acquire a new social network, in which they use the dominant language more extensively (see below, pp. 50-51), and the L2 begins to intrude into domains previously reserved for L1. Eventually, the dominant language may replace the L1 altogether, and language shift occurs.

Language shift is essentially the replacement of one language by another, with a period of (non-additive) bilingualism or diglossia (Romaine 1995:39). There are a number of causes, such as economic reasons, genocide, cultural assimilation, etc., and a number of causes may apply to any one case. Giles et al, cited in Appel and Muysken (1993:32ff), provide a number of factors influencing both the cause and course of language shift. I consider the following the most important and relevant to the South African context:

The ECONOMIC STATUS of a language is the most salient factor. When a linguistic community of relatively low economic status comes into contact with one of relatively high economic status, there is a tendency to shift towards the language of relatively high economic status, as their language acquires the stigma of being the language of poorer people. Appel and Muysken (1993:33) give the example of Spanish-speaking communities in the southern USA, who tend to come from the lower income groups. Although Spanish per se is not the cause of their poor economic conditions, they associate wealth with English speakers (and English is indeed the language of commerce, education,

24 'Economic status' refers to socioeconomic position of members of the linguistic community, rather than the language itself.
government, etc. in the United States), to the exclusion of any other (Phillipson 1993:21). Therefore, if one cannot speak English, one has no access to these domains. Economic changes, such as urbanisation and industrialisation play a role, too, if one linguistic group advances faster than another. Appel & Muysken (1993:33f) cite Schjerve's article on Sardinia, which showed that mainland Italian had a far greater economic status on the traditional rural island than the Sardinian variety. In this case, mainland Italian was associated with technology and advancement, while Sardinian Italian was associated with backwardness.

Another factor, closely linked with economic status, is SOCIAL STATUS. Social status is dependent on economic status, as one's social network is largely dependent on one's economic position. Thus, according to Giles et al's model, a linguistic group of lower economic status may shift to a language associated with relatively higher economic status, if only to be perceived as belonging with the higher status group. However, Giles et al, along with Appel and Muysken, appear to neglect the fact that people may be driven to acquire a more socially powerful language through sheer lack of opportunity to participate in certain domains in their own language. If somebody's L1 is excluded from a domain in which he would like to participate, s/he will have little choice but to acquire a language that will enable him/her to participate. This is discussed further in Chapter IV.

SOCIOHISTORICAL STATUS is another factor in the Giles et al model, as explained in Appel & Muysken. This factor has much to do with national pride and language loyalty, and is a more positive factor in that it is a key contributor to language maintenance, in that it influences the trend of a group away from the dominant language. Appel and Muysken put forward the example of the Flemish-speaking community of Flanders in Belgium, who draw their inspiration from their battle against the dominance of French. The result of this battle for cultural and linguistic
maintenance is that Belgium is officially a bilingual country, but is divided into two ethnolinguistic groups: the Flemish-speaking Flanders region, and the French-speaking Walloon region (1993:34). Likewise, for the Quechua-speaking communities in Peru, the Quechua language is a symbol of the glorious days of the Inca empire, which was effectively destroyed by the Spanish. Spanish, which is the dominant language of Peru, is therefore a negative influence for these people, and these sociohistorical factors are a force against language shift (Appel & Muysken 1993:34).

LANGUAGE STATUS (aka PRESTIGE) is the perception of a language's status from outside its own speech community (Appel & Muysken 1993:34). Languages like English, French and Spanish, for example, are regarded as languages of wider and global communication, and are sought after by speakers of smaller languages who want to participate in a more international setting. Also, the global status of French makes it easier to preserve French in Quebec than it is to preserve, for example, Welsh in Wales; for Welsh is spoken only in (parts of) Wales, and nowhere else. Similarly, French does not have the stigma of oppression and domination in Quebec as it does in Flanders, as discussed above. Indeed, the case of Flemish in Belgium shows that a global language such as French will not necessarily be chosen by a 'small language' group if it carries such a stigma.

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS, being numerical strength and geographical distribution, are also important in the Giles et al model. Appel & Muysken (1993:35), quoting Clyne (1982), say that there is 'no general correspondence between numerical strength and language maintenance'. I would argue, however, that numerical strength could play a crucial role in determining whether legislation aimed at ensuring language maintenance would be successful, particularly where a majority vote is required. However, geographical distribution plays a greater part in the actual process of language shift or maintenance. A Ld speech community
on the border of or mixed with a LD community is far more likely to undergo shift to the LD than one that is isolated and homogenous. Appel & Muysken (1993:36) cite Li's 1982 research on language shift among Chinese L1 residents living inside and outside New York's Chinatown, which showed a greater tendency towards shift among those living outside their own linguistic community of Chinatown. The urban-rural difference is an important contributor as well: Appel & Muysken (1993:36) cite various studies showing that Ld communities living in rural areas (and therefore with less exposure to the LD and other outside influences) are far more resistant to language shift than their urban counterparts.

Giles et al. (as explained in Appel & Muysken) conclude their summary of factors influencing shift and maintenance with INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FACTORS. These are the extent to which a Ld community is represented, relative to the LD, in the various institutions of a government or region. The most important institutional support factors are:

- **The Mass Media**: the extent to which a Lm or Ld is represented in the print media, radio and television. This is also important as it largely determines the extent to which other language groups will be exposed to the Ld in question.

- **Religion**: Religion can be a strong force in the maintenance of a language, particularly where the language in question is the language of the religion's ritual or liturgy. Eg. Hebrew in Orthodox Judaism, Greek in the Greek Orthodox Church, Arabic in Islam, etc. (One disadvantage of this type of language maintenance [or even an advantage for purists and scholars] is that it is often a classical, largely changeless form of the language that is used for this function. This can be fatal if the language is widespread: liberalist forces in the Roman Catholic church displaced Latin from its last real domain in favour of the regional vernacular.) In other cases, though,
religion can contribute to language maintenance through division: e.g., in Hungary, Calvinists would tend to favour Magyar over German, as for them German was associated with Lutheranism (Gal 1979:43ff).

- The provision of governmental and administrative services: Where these services are provided for Ld communities, this can be a contributing force for language maintenance. If people have access to these domains in their own language, they will not be forced to acquire another language in order to participate in these domains.

- Education: Medium of instruction is particularly important to this factor. If mother tongue education is provided for Ld speakers, language maintenance will be strengthened, as there will be no need for these speakers to acquire another language in order to get an education. It will also help the language's status; as will the provision of language learning opportunities in the Ld for speakers of other languages.

The factors outlined above are instrumental in the cause of language shift. However, the course of language shift must also be examined. Each language shift case is unique; but sociolinguists have gathered enough data over the years to be able to show that there are certain basic similarities in the course that language shift may take. The general process may be illustrated as follows:\(^\text{25}\)

- A linguistic community L comes into contact with another language (usually via immigration or conquest), which is dominant for some reason (see above).

\(^{25}\) This illustration is a synthesis of the description of language shift from various sources.
• In the course of prolonged contact with LD, the L loses status to LD, losing various higher functions to it. L is spoken only in lower domains.

• L speakers seek to acquire LD in order to participate in the higher domains from which L is excluded. This brings them into contact with more LD speakers, who infiltrate the L speakers' social networks. Intermarriage may also occur.

• LD begins to intrude into the L speakers' lower domains, through friends, and the perceived need for the new generation to have more exposure to LD.

• The younger generation seeks to acquire LD at the expense of their mother tongue, L.

• They transmit LD to their children, instead of L.

• L is no longer used by the speech community, and so dies out in that community.

If we apply the Giles et al model to South Africa, along with the model of the course of language shift illustrated above, we find an interesting, if rather serious, situation developing. The industrialisation of South Africa, coupled with the legacy of colonialism and apartheid has certainly left the indigenous languages of South Africa in a position of low economic status. The balance of wealth in South Africa is a very marked one, and is still very much a racial imbalance (Population Census 1996: 2.37). Also, as I have shown, the indigenous languages are still largely excluded from the higher domains, which give access to economic power. Thus, the indigenous languages are associated, even in the minds of their own speakers, with poor socioeconomic conditions. English, on the other hand, is South Africa's (and fast becoming the world's) language of access to socioeconomic
power, and is used virtually exclusively in the corporate domain. Thus, if indigenous L1 speakers wish to gain access to the domains of economic and political power, they are forced to acquire English under the current conditions. During the industrial revolution in Europe and the Americas, the colonial powers had close contact with Europe, and easily adopted the process. Moreover, there was a great influx of fortune seekers from Europe in the mid to late 1800s, when diamonds and gold were discovered in South Africa. Under the colonial government, they were able to profit from this. The indigenous inhabitants, on the other hand, historically had an exclusively rural or pastoral economy. As mining and other industrialisation took place, they lost more and more of their land (see p9), making the continuation of this lifestyle very difficult for some of them. Many of these people had to seek work in the European dominated areas of the country, but could only be employed as labourers. This master-servant relationship that had sprung up between Europeans and Africans respectively continued and was strengthened under apartheid rule, with the result that Africans, along with their languages, were excluded from the higher domains, and remained so (officially) until 1994. Thus, for people wishing to gain access to these higher domains, the acquisition of English is a necessity rather than a choice. This state of affairs is an incentive to language shift; and, if there is no incentive for people to keep their L1, the shift, for some people at least, will soon be complete.

The exclusion of the indigenous languages from the corporate and other high domains naturally means that they are also excluded from the relatively higher social domains and networks associated with them. Under the present conditions in South Africa, an indigenous language L1 speaker would have to be proficient in English if s/he wished to associate with prominent businessmen, for example. And, if s/he wishes his children to mix in this society, s/he will have to ensure that their education provides them with a sound ability to communicate in English. This is
surely an incentive for him/her to practice communicating in English in the home; and so English will begin to intrude into the domains normally reserved for L1.

Sociohistorical Factors in South Africa

One factor that may contribute to the maintenance of the indigenous languages in South Africa is their sociohistorical status. Most of the indigenous languages are associated with a particular southern African tribe, with its own culture and history. This was certainly the theory behind the colonial and apartheid governments' 'homelands' system. Thus, Zulu L1 speakers who hearken back to the glorious days of the Zulu empire of Chaka, for example, are likely (in theory) to embrace the language and culture of the Zulu tribe (cf. Appel & Muysken 1993:34), and so maintain their language and culture. (This notion proved too optimistic for the Irish: see Ch. III, § ii)

However, during the 'liberation struggle', the liberation movements strove towards an ideal of African unity, rather than the tribalism espoused by the apartheid rulers. Indeed, for many of them, the perpetuation of tribalism was seen as an attempt by the government to divide the African people (Alexander 1989:21). Those who accepted and played a role in the homelands system were not viewed with favour by these organisations (ibid.:22). Since there were many mutually unintelligible language groups in South Africa, a lingua franca was required for widespread communication, especially on a national level. The language chosen for this purpose was English (Alexander 1989:Ch.3). By choosing English, no faction could be seen to be favoured over another, and many Africans had had some access to it through their schooling. Thus, whereas Afrikaans has acquired the stigma of being the language of the oppressor, English was the de

---

26 This was true in theory only: Statistics in Brief 1997 §§6.8-6.9 show that, on average, an African person aged 25+ in 1991 had had 5.3 years of schooling. Thus, for most, the period of extensive exposure to English was little over one year.
facto language of the liberation struggle (see Alexander 1989: Ch.3), and has gained acceptance as such. Despite the fact that English was also a language of colonial oppression, it is also the language through which democratic concepts reached the oppressed people (Mazrui & Mazrui 1998:114). Owing to this history, it is not stigmatised in the same way as Afrikaans, and so there is unlikely to be any widespread rejection of its dominance. This puts English into a strongly hegemonic position. Combined with its overwhelming dominance over the higher domains of language use in South Africa, this makes it an attractive language to shift to for people who find it difficult to progress in their own language.

Language prestige in South Africa
Language prestige is an interesting factor in the South African context. The legislation of the colonial and apartheid governments leaves no doubt as to their perception of the indigenous languages. Their speech communities were deliberately excluded from the higher domains, and generally disregarded in favour of English and Afrikaans. In general, it was the indigenous L1 speakers who had to learn the 'world view' and language of the bosses; indeed, this was one of the reasons cited for the promulgation of Christian National Education! (quoted by Hartshorne 1995:309-310). There appears not to have been any attempt to ensure that the bosses learnt the languages of their workers. English became compulsory (and still is) in African schools even before the Union, while the indigenous languages were only offered as subjects in the white schools in the middle to late 1980s.

With the possible exception of some rural areas, there appears to be little incentive, other than interest or ideology, from the point of view of an English L1 speaker in South Africa, to acquire an indigenous language. No tertiary (or secondary!) educational institutions offer the indigenous languages as media of instruction, and they are not required for many jobs, except-
and this is a positive trend— in the public service, where the languages of a region are fast becoming prerequisites for employment. This will provide incentive to other people to learn these languages, as they will be perceived as useful. However, if there is no apparent reason to make the effort to learn an indigenous language, it is unlikely that many people will; especially not if they already have access to a language that will enable them to enter any domain they choose.

The situation is the opposite for an indigenous L1 speaker. If s/he does not acquire English, s/he will be unable to enter many of the domains that would otherwise be open to him/her. For these people, there is a definite incentive to learning English, as it will give them opportunities currently denied them. In the current situation, then, English is a language with very high prestige. It is not only the major language of commerce, technology and higher education in South Africa, but also a global lingua franca in these contexts. By contrast, the indigenous languages hold sway only over the lower domains, and are not really widely used anywhere else except on the radio. However, they are for the most part confined to particular regions (except in the Gauteng province), which makes them relatively inaccessible to people living outside those areas.

**Demography and Language in South Africa**

Demography has an important role to play in South Africa’s language question. Despite Giles’s et al. claim that ‘there is no general correspondence between numerical strength and language maintenance’, I would argue that numerical strength is a crucial point in SA. Under the new dispensation, political parties are at pains to be seen to take the will of the people into account. Hence, SA now has 11 official languages instead of two, and the mass media must make an effort to cater equitably for them. However, it is in the demographic sphere that socioeconomic factors impact most. As I have already discussed, it is extremely expensive to cater for so many languages; and, with so
many mutually unintelligible languages having official status, the cheaper option of falling back on the LWCs is often taken. Moreover, the majority of indigenous L1 speakers still fall into the lower socioeconomic brackets, which means they do not have the resources themselves to cater effectively for their own languages, but have to rely on the government (Population Census 1996: 2.37).

**Geography and Language in South Africa**

Geographic factors have played a vital part in the maintenance of the indigenous languages. There are two major contributors in this sphere: the relative homogeneity of the indigenous language groups, and the rural-urban difference.

Ironically, it was the apartheid government that played the greatest role in ensuring the maintenance of the indigenous languages, by confining them to their own historical ‘territories’, thereby limiting their access not only to the then official languages, but to other indigenous languages as well. Thus, the official languages of KwaZulu were Zulu and English; the official languages of Transkei, Xhosa and English, and so forth. English was the lingua franca for foreign relations, as well as the medium of instruction for all schools beyond the junior primary phase (Hartshorne 1995:311).

However, the need for labour in the Republic meant that many Africans were not confined to a particular homeland, and for all intents and purposes, resided in the Republic (Atlas of Southern Africa 1995). This led to a certain amount of mixing of ethnolinguistic groups in the urban areas; but, rather than reliance on English, multilingualism was their trend. It was this sort of mixing that the apartheid government’s policy of grouping black African populations together according to ethnicity (based on language) sought to eradicate (Maake 1994:113). Thus, in a place like present day Gauteng, where
there is a lot of intercultural contact and mixing, it is quite usual for people to be able to speak Zulu, English and Sotho, for example. But it is apparent that political leaders do not follow this example, particularly when they appear on the media.

The urban-rural difference is another important factor in the South African situation. In the rural areas, there is little contact outside of a particular, cohesive L1 settlement, except with farmers. There is therefore little need, social or economic, for the inhabitants to communicate in a language other than that used in their settlement. Moreover, statistics (Statistics in Brief 1997:Ch.6) show that children in rural areas receive little schooling, and therefore receive little or no exposure to English, either as a school subject or medium of instruction. In the urban areas, on the other hand, there is a great deal more contact among cultures, and the higher domains of language use are more prevalent. Most of the more lucrative jobs are located in urban and suburban areas; as are the higher educational institutions. Thus, in order for an urban dweller to advance on his or her socioeconomic scale, s/he will want (or need) to get a lucrative job. For this s/he will require access to higher education, and therefore access to, and competence in, English. There is, therefore, more social and economic incentive for non-English L1 speakers in urban areas to acquire English than for those in rural areas, where it simply may not be necessary.

**Institutional support factors in South Africa**

These are essentially the degree to which the indigenous languages are provided for in the higher domains of language use. The most important of these, according to the Giles et al. model, are *mass media, government services* and *education*. All three of these are receiving attention in the SA context.

I have already discussed language and the mass media in Chapter I. The data shows that, while the indigenous languages are well
catered for on the radio services (though without the variety and choice available to English listeners), they remain vastly underrepresented in the television services (see Table 1.1, p20) and the print media. There is also a tendency for material that is provided in the indigenous languages to be multilingual; both as a cost-saving device, and to ensure access to a wider audience.

Language, Culture and Religion

Cultural tradition, rather than religion per se, is a factor that may contribute towards linguistic and cultural maintenance in South Africa. This is because the ritual and ceremony of a particular indigenous culture, as well as the tribal authority structures, (such as tribal courts) are conducted in the language associated with that group (Msimang 1993:30,38). Shift to another language is likely to entail a certain amount of loss of culture, as well as assimilation into another. But on how large a scale would this occur? The extent to which language and culture are linked, and whether or not this link is inextricable, is crucial to the question of whether culture can be maintained even in the face of the loss of its associated language.

This point necessarily brings us back to the question of the persistent L2 schooling of indigenous language L1 speakers in South Africa. Apartheid has ensured that most people who speak a particular indigenous language still live together in a largely homogenous community. However, after the junior primary phase, all schooling for these children is conducted through the medium of English, with resources (where they exist) designed for use in Western societies. Content and cultural subjects, such as history and geography, have been taught from a European perspective, rather than from an African one. This can cause problems, particularly if aspects of one's own culture are taught from the point of view of an alien-- or even rival-- culture.

Yet, in the South African situation, although the colonial and apartheid powers strove for domination over non-European
communities, they certainly did not attempt to assimilate them culturally into their own communities. This has only strengthened the stigma of poor socioeconomic conditions associated with the language and culture of the indigenous people, and increases their drive to acquire a language that will enable them to better their conditions.

But will the abolition of the segregationist policies of the past mean the assimilation of the indigenous linguistic and cultural communities into the more global, western society of the better-off population, or even into each other? The ruling party of SA, which is supported at the polls by about 66.4% of the population (up to 90% in some provinces) (Elections 1999 website), is adamant that it intends to create a non-racial, fully integrated society, wherein one is free to practice one's own culture. However, full integration can be read to imply the elimination of potentially divisive differences. Certainly, people cannot and must not be told by the state where they may or may not live, and to which ethnolinguistic group they belong. Herein lies the difficulty: not one of SA's nine provinces can be said to realise homogeneity of language or culture (Population Census 1996:§§2.7-2.11). Yet, within each province there exist ethnolinguistic divisions which show little sign of disintegration. Full integration under these circumstances seems impossible, and segregation has already shown itself to be a social, economic and moral failure.

The difficulty is threefold: to maintain the indigenous (and non-indigenous) languages and cultures; to do this without creating segregation and elitism; and at the same time, to ensure access to the socioeconomic, political and educational spheres long denied so many people on the basis of their ethnicity and language. Stringent measures will have to be taken to confer real, rather than token official, status on the indigenous languages. The solution, I think, lies in legislating the use of the indigenous languages in the higher domains-- i.e., enforcing
duality. This option poses many difficulties, and will require extensive language planning, as I’ll discuss in Chapter III.

**Government and administrative services**

One of the most visible signs of change in South Africa, besides the new flag, must surely be the public signage; particularly on landmarks and government buildings. For decades, the standard practice in SA was an Afrikaans/English signboard or plaque, such as BIBLIOTEK . LIBRARY. In the Cape Town area, for instance, the new order is now apparent in the form of 'trilingual' signage, such as BIBLIOTEK . LIBRARY . ILAYIBRARI. While this is undoubtedly useful for the indigenous language speakers, it is essential that people are also able to access these services—i.e., to be able to demand service in their own L1, if, reasonably, that language is an official one of that region. There is a developing trend in this area: Telkom, for instance, now offers a free 'Yellow Pages' and information service in every one of the official languages.

**Synthesis: a review of the language situation in South Africa**

It is clear from the application of the Giles et al model to the South African situation that indigenous language L1 communities are in a position ripe for radical language shift— if only so that these communities can have access to better socioeconomic conditions and escape domination. This was the reason for the liberation struggle in the first place! In terms of linguistic status and prestige, it is immediately apparent in the SA context that the indigenous languages are thoroughly dominated by English in the higher domains. Indeed, the indigenous languages remain excluded from some of these.

English holds supreme sway over education beyond the junior primary phase in South Africa; but junior primary education is still offered in the mother tongue or L1 for all South Africans, as is Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET). English is also the language through which the courts conduct their business,
though interpreters are available for non-English speakers. Parliamentary debates are, for convenience, conducted largely through the medium of English, though there is some use of Afrikaans and the indigenous languages in the House. In my experience\textsuperscript{27}, however, most parliamentarians who opt for an indigenous language switch between that language and English for the duration of the speech. The language of commerce and banking in South Africa is English, with little participation by African languages. In the media, as Table 2.1 (below, p. 63) shows, English remains strongly dominant, especially in television, with indigenous language programming being somewhat scattered. This is further dealt with in Chapter IV (see pp. 128ff).

A cursory glance at the numerical strength statistics for the indigenous languages relative to English shows that they hold an apparently unassailable dominance over English. However, one must take the following facts into account:

- Some indigenous languages are still limited to a particular region of SA, and are spoken nowhere else;
- The indigenous languages remain largely excluded from the higher domains of language use;
- The indigenous languages do not, \textit{per se}, offer their speakers access to more global participation.

These, I believe, are the core reasons why English, despite its small numerical community, continues to dominate the other languages of South Africa.

There are still some very strong indigenous linguistic and cultural communities in the rural areas, which are as yet unaffected by the factors influencing language shift, discussed in this chapter. They may well offer some hope for the

\textsuperscript{27}I.e., watching the debates broadcast live on TV, in 1998 and 1999.
preservation of these languages and cultures; but if the economy begins to rely increasingly on industrialisation, these communities could be in danger. (Cf. the Irish situation, Ch.III.ii.)

The position of English, which is the L1 of only 8.6% of SA's population, faces little or no threat from the numerically stronger indigenous language groups. The size of its L1 community, however, continues to shrink, as many (up to 3000/a) of its (relatively wealthier) members flee the disadvantageous socioeconomic conditions of post-apartheid South Africa, taking with them the new generation. But it is clear from other postcolonial situations around the world that size does not matter in this context. The colonial language remains the official high status language in many African countries²⁸, long after the colonisers have left. Despite the fact that it is a numerical minority language, with a small speech community (c.335000 L1 speakers [Ethnologue: 1995 figure])²⁹, English remains Zimbabwe's official and high domain language. The status of the indigenous languages, Afrikaans and English can be summarised in table form as follows:

²⁸ Eg English in Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Namibia, etc.; French in Gabon, Senegal, Ivory Coast, etc.; Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique, etc.
²⁹ In 1995, approximately 90000 of these were of European (mainly English/ British) descent; the rest represents a shift from an indigenous African language to English L1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>AFRIKAANS</th>
<th>XHOSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARLIAMENT (debates)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV'T PUBLICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SIGNAGE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION: JUNIOR PRI.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION: SENIOR PRI.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION: SECONDARY PRI.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION: TERTIARY PRI.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA: RADIO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA: TV NEWS &amp; INFO.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA: TV RECREATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA: NEWSPAPERS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA: MAGAZINES</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERATURE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINEMA &amp; FILM</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

+ Extensive use of language in relevant domain
  • Some use of language in relevant domain
  - Minimal use of language in relevant domain
  X No use of language in relevant domain

**TABLE 2.1: RELATIVE USE OF ENGLISH, AFRIKAANS AND XHOSA IN THE HIGHER DOMAINS OF LANGUAGE USE**

The above table shows how the language statuses have changed since the end of apartheid government in 1994. Some visible progress has been made insofar as official functions are
concerned. For example, 'low level' government documents, such as health pamphlets and primary education circulars are now available in the indigenous languages. But, little else has changed; except, where all government communications were bilingual (in English and Afrikaans) in the past, there is now a 'discernible trend towards unilingual practice' (National Language Service report\textsuperscript{30}, from the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology website). This is despite the Constitutional requirement that 11 languages be afforded official status. This illustrates a drawback to the official Government policy on language, which states that 'the national government and each provincial government must use at least two official languages' (Language Policy in South Africa, from the National Language Service (on the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology website)); which makes it lawful to default to the pre-1994 policy of English and Afrikaans.

And little has changed in the domains of education and the mass media; and the changes that have occurred do not bode well for the future of the indigenous languages in South Africa. At first glance, it looks as though there have been positive steps taken in the mass media. All the official languages are represented in the radio media, and some community radio stations are still being set up (SABC Annual Report 1997/1998:22ff). It is, however, in the Television services that things look most bleak.

Four of South Africa's official languages remain entirely excluded from the television services: Swati, Ndebele, Tsonga and Venda. Of the three state channels, two devote some of their airtime exclusively to the indigenous languages, as follows:\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30} Towards a National Language Plan for South Africa: final report of the Language Plan Task Group. Chapter 6: 'Language in the Public Service'.

\textsuperscript{31} These figures are taken only from the analysis of the Prime Time schedule, as set forth in the SABC's Annual Report for 1997. This is the guaranteed airtime, and the rest of the schedule is too variable to be conclusive. The SABC's quota for language programming applies only to the Prime Time time slot, 18:00-21:30.
SABC 1: 12.24% of Prime Time for Zulu  
12.24% of Prime Time for Xhosa  
SABC 2: 4.43% of Prime Time for Pedi  
4.43% of Prime Time for Sotho  
4.43% of Prime Time for Tswana.

TABLE 2.2: Guaranteed airtime for South Africa’s indigenous languages

This means that, in the Prime Time slot on television, Xhosa and Zulu are each guaranteed a total of 26 minutes out of the 210 minute window. They are therefore guaranteed an airtime of 3:03' a week, compared to the guaranteed 15 hours a week under the previous structure.\(^\text{32}\)

The situation is somewhat worse for Pedi, Sotho and Tswana. Their allocation of 4.43% of the Prime Time slot gives them each a guaranteed airtime of 10 ½ minutes of the 210 minute Prime Time window, adding up to 1:13’ a week, as compared to the guaranteed 10 hrs per week under the old structure.

The indigenous languages may also be represented in the SABC’s multilingual quota, which must occupy 22.45% (47') of Prime Time on SABC 1, and 23.45% (49') of Prime Time on SABC 2. Thus, in addition to their guaranteed allocations, Zulu and Xhosa get a further share, with English, of a further 5 ½ hours a week; which

\(^{32}\) The programme schedules for 22 January to 11 February show additional indigenous language airtime as follows:  
22-28 Jan.: 3 ¼ hrs  
29 Jan - 4 Feb. : 6 1/2 hrs  
5-11 Feb. : 7 hrs  
This is an average of about 6 additional hours a week, shared among all indigenous languages, and consisting mainly of religious and children’s programmes, and sports commentaries.
still brings them nowhere near the guaranteed airtime enjoyed before 1994. Pedi, Sotho and Tswana have a share, together with Afrikaans and English, of a further 5:50' of prime time each week.

These figures, when compared to those of English, show the extent of the dominance of English over the television medium. 53.06% of prime time airtime is guaranteed to English programming, which amounts to 111' out of the 210' window, or almost 13 hours per week. English also claims 42.96% of SABC 2's prime time slot, totalling 90' a day, or 10 ½ hours per week. Most of the non-prime airtime is given over to English on SABC 1 and 2; and all airtime on SABC 3 is devoted to English programming (SABC Annual Report 1997/1998:20).

English also retains its dominance over the domain of education in South Africa. This factor has already been discussed in some detail, but the position can be summarised as follows:

The indigenous languages are used (in their 'own' communities) as media of instruction until the Grade 4 level (except in KwaZulu-Natal, where mother tongue instruction is sometimes offered to Grade 6). Thereafter, almost all speakers of an African language undergo their education through the medium of English; though a small proportion opts for Afrikaans. Tertiary education is not available in the indigenous languages, but only in English and Afrikaans. However, Afrikaans as a medium of instruction at tertiary level is on the decline (see below, p67).

This means that the indigenous languages remain excluded from the domain of education, after 5 years of democracy; and Afrikaans is dwindling in all higher domains of language use.

---

This is an average of about 6 additional hours a week, shared among all indigenous languages, and consisting mainly of religious and children's programmes, and sports commentaries.

33 The figures for multilingual programming are included in the data of footnote 32.
The Position of Afrikaans

Table 2.1 above shows the changes in status and high domain usage in English, Afrikaans and Xhosa. English has moved from being a joint official language, sharing its status with Afrikaans, into a strongly dominant language; and the indigenous languages are acquiring more functions in official domains. However, the changing position of Afrikaans is also of great interest.

Successive National Party governments, and the determination of the Afrikaner even before the NP came to power, built Afrikaans into a very strong position by enforcing its use as an official language, alongside English. Thus, Afrikaans came to be extensively used in Parliament, all Government publications, in the mass media (print, radio and television), in education and in commerce. Indeed, Afrikaans was the de facto language of the ruling party, while English was associated with the more liberal opposition. Before 1994, South Africa was an officially bilingual state; and steps were taken to ensure its use in all the high domains. South Africa’s isolation from the world during the apartheid era helped rather than hindered the position of Afrikaans, as it reduced the effect of outside influence.

Since 1994, the decline of Afrikaans in the higher functions has been remarkable. It is no longer the official language of parliament; rather, it is associated with a small opposition. According to official government policy, outlined on p.64, Afrikaans is no longer a prerequisite for jobs in the civil service in all provinces, or the legal profession in SA. It is no longer officially required in (former white) schools for promotion to the next grade; and even predominately Afrikaans educational institutions, such as RAU and Stellenbosch, are under pressure to switch to an English or parallel English/Afrikaans medium of instruction. Whereas Afrikaans used to dominate the TV channels, it is now confined to only one channel, SABC 2, with a guaranteed airtime of only 5:10' per week. In terms of its status and prestige, Afrikaans has declined a great deal.
However, it has given up most of its ground to English, rather than the indigenous languages.

Afrikaans remains one of only two languages in South Africa to be offered as a medium of instruction at secondary and tertiary level. Afrikaans is the numerical majority language of two provinces (Western Cape and Northern Cape), and the third largest first language community in South Africa. Despite this seemingly strong position, Afrikaans is stigmatised in the South African context as the language of the oppressor. This is likely to prove to be a very difficult stigma to lose, and may well prove fatal for the language.

**The Position of the Indigenous Languages**

I have established that the indigenous languages are at a disadvantage because of the prestige and status imbalance that exists between them and English. In order for the indigenous languages to improve their status and prestige levels, it is imperative that they be used in the higher domains of language use, rather than be restricted to the lower domains.

South Africa is an industrialised country that has to compete on the global market in order to develop and provide for its citizens. In order to cope, its infrastructure must contain well developed governmental, commercial, technological and educational sectors, and its people must have access to these. At the present time, the only way for people to access these domains is through the medium of English.

This presents a twofold problem. The first of these lies within the South African educational system. It has already been established beyond doubt (by Cummins, Skutnabb-Kangas, Swain and others) that that education through a medium other than a child’s first language (or mother tongue), particularly when the child’s command of the other medium is insufficient, is disadvantageous. Yet, the medium of instruction shift persists, and indigenous Ll
speakers' mother tongues are pushed aside in favour of what is essentially a foreign language. The second part of the problem lies in the (history of) the indigenous languages themselves. South Africa was already under colonial rule when gold and diamonds were discovered, and when industrialisation began (see p.9). Thus, the indigenous languages have always been excluded from the (western style) government of South Africa, and from commerce and technology, being instead confined to rurality. The result of this is that the indigenous languages are simply not sufficiently developed to cope with these fields. They do not have the terminology either to name or describe the concepts involved—i.e., their corpuses (lexicon and structure of the language) are underdeveloped. Moreover, the indigenous languages have been consistently excluded from those phases of education (i.e., secondary and tertiary) which deal with commercial and technonological concepts. Therefore, before the indigenous languages can cope with being a meaningful part of commerce, technology or even education, there is an urgent need for corpus development.

**Corpus Development**

In order to be able to fulfill its role as an official language in a modern or modernising country, a language must be able to cope with the higher domains of language use; and, if it cannot, it must be equipped to do so. In South Africa, the indigenous languages have long been excluded from these domains, especially higher education, commerce and technology. One of the hallmarks of these modern times is the rapid advancement of these spheres of life. Rapid advancement in any field necessarily brings about changes in the vocabulary, and hence the corpus, of the languages used to define and describe it. As new concepts are introduced, so the corpus of the language must be augmented in order to keep up with them.

However, when a language is excluded from a domain, particularly an advancing one, its corpus does not keep up with the advances.
If this persists for some time, as is the case with the indigenous languages of South Africa, the natural result will be an underdeveloped corpus—in short, a corpus that is unable to cope with a function in that domain. Therefore, if the indigenous languages are ever to achieve more than token official status (or gain any prestige), there is an urgent need for corpus development. As Luckett (1993:54) points out, this will take 'great political will.' However, she also points out that South Africa already boasts an example of a language that was developed through sheer political will; and that language is Afrikaans.

Corpus planning involves the deliberate restructuring of the corpus of a language, involving the coining of new words, spelling reform, etc. (Cooper 1989:31). Further to Cooper's definition, this restructuring should take place under the auspices of the government or similar body with a vested interest in or responsibility for the language. The most likely way of achieving any success through corpus planning would be in the establishment of a language board or academy, which would take responsibility for restructuring the language in a way that is beneficial for and acceptable to the speakers of that language. This would necessitate consultation with the community involved.

Cooper (1989) identifies three phases or stages in corpus planning:

- graphisation: the development of a writing system
- standardisation: the codification of a particular variety of a language as the literary and educational norm
- modernisation: the development of new structures and/or terminology to enable the language to cope with modern functions

All of South Africa's (official) indigenous languages have already undergone graphisation. Their writing systems were developed by missionaries in an attempt to bring formal education
and a knowledge of Christianity to the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa. For many of the indigenous languages, a writing system was first developed so that the Bible could be translated into and written in that language. From these, grammars were developed for educational purposes; not only to teach the natives literacy, but also to teach missionaries the language (Grobler et al. (eds)1990:passim). However, competing missionary societies and political differences, as well as a great deal of dialectal variation within the languages themselves, have resulted in a lack of any standard form in some of the languages.

Attempts to standardise/ harmonise language groups in South Africa, such as Nguni and Sotho, have never been implemented, if only because it was easier in the context of apartheid resistance to establish English as the lingua franca (Alexander 1989:Ch.3). The purpose of standardisation is, according to Wardhaugh 1992:31 (citing Mathiot & Garvin 1975) to unify individuals and groups within a community, at the same time separating them from other communities; to reflect an identity; to add prestige to the speakers. Standardisation has also been undertaken by some language groups to show their independence from another language group, and to make it serve a complete set of functions, as was the case for establishing standard Finnish (Wardhaugh 1992:32).

Thus, the desirability of standardisation of the indigenous languages may be questionable. On the one hand, it will provide a medium for education, and commercial and technological, not to mention literary, expression. However, it will also entrench their separation from other African languages, which was the very characteristic the apartheid government used in their segregationist policies!

Victor Webb (1994:192) argues that standardisation of the indigenous languages is necessary to ensure their development to cope with the higher functions of language use. Further, this
will enable indigenous African languages to 'give adequate expression to the modern, urban culture of Africa.'

Standardisation can be done relatively rapidly, requiring the political will of the speakers. However, a number of arguments are made against it (adapted from Webb 1994:194ff):

- Lack of resources and high cost factor
- Use of indigenous languages may lead to isolation of that language's community
- The diversity of indigenous languages is a source of division among the people
- English already exists as an entrenched lingua franca.

Webb has no difficulty refuting the first two points. He says that modern reproductive techniques may well reduce the cost factor, and South Africa could cooperate with its neighbours in some areas (Webb 1994:195). Moreover, it would take little time or money for pupils and teachers to develop their own resources. As to the isolation factor, Webb cites the examples of small European language communities such as Danish and Greek (1994:195), whose languages continue to thrive, and serve all high functions, but do not isolate them in any way from the international community.

The third point seems a little more difficult to refute. During the apartheid era, the government preyed upon ethnic differences and created and exacerbated tensions between ethnolinguistic groups. This makes it difficult to create the climate of 'unity in diversity' advocated by Webb, at least in the present time. A lingua franca such as English will not offend anybody, but the selection of a standardised form of a language group probably will.

This leads to the fourth point against the standardisation and promotion of the indigenous languages: English is already thoroughly entrenched as the lingua franca. It dominates all the
higher domains of language use in South Africa (and therefore all other languages and their communities), and this seems unlikely to change in the near future. Thus, it may appear easier and cheaper to let the status quo remain. However, as long as English remains in its position, the indigenous languages are going to remain in their position of lower status, and will be kept out of the higher domains. Thus, if people want access to the lifestyle provided by these domains, they will have to acquire English proficiency. And, if they want their children to have an advantage, they will ensure that they are proficient in English before they reach the medium of instruction switch in Grade 4 (Standard 2). This is an incentive to shift from their L1 to English.

The more that status and corpus planning measures for the extension and promotion of the indigenous languages are delayed, the more risk there is of perpetuating a vicious cycle. If a language is not developed to cope with particular domains, it remains excluded from those domains. And, as long as it is not used in those domains, its corpus will not develop in keeping with them.

If we are to prevent further loss of status for the indigenous languages (I shall discuss the desirability or not of preventing a shift in the next chapter), then positive and rigorous language planning steps are needed. The problem is how these steps should be implemented, and in what way. Chapter III deals with the problems of implementing language planning steps and legislation, and models of successful and unsuccessful language planning endeavours from abroad will be examined.
CHAPTER III

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE PLANNING MEASURES: SOME LESSONS FROM ABROAD

One of the greatest difficulties facing language planners is the effective implementation of new policy. It is often difficult to reconcile language planning theory with what happens in practice. For instance, if a new language policy is aimed at improving the status of an historically disadvantaged language (i.e., one that has been excluded from the higher domains of language use), it may be difficult to implement among people for whom the dominant language represents progress and a better lifestyle. In such a case, the stigma that has become attached to the dominated language may be so strong that even its own L1 community has difficulty in accepting it as a medium for the higher domains (Phillipson 1993:78ff).

This chapter deals with the techniques and problems involved in the implementation of new language policy. Therefore, it treats the following questions:

• Why is there a perceived need for a change to the status quo?
• For whom is the new language policy to be implemented?
• By whom should it be implemented, and at what levels or domains?
• How strong should the legislation behind the new policy be?
• What should the ultimate goal of a new language policy be if it is to be effective and viable in the linguistic culture of the community?
• When (i.e., in what time frame) should the new policy be implemented?
I examine, in some detail, two case studies from abroad (Ireland and Kenya), especially the methods used and the problems encountered, and the reasons behind their success or failure. From this, some valuable lessons for South Africa can be drawn.

III.i Language Planning and Linguistic Culture

Any attempt at language planning takes place within the linguistic culture\(^3\) of a (sector of) society. Linguistic culture is essentially constituted by all the language practices (i.e., the conditions surrounding the use of a particular language or variety which have become established over a long period of time) of that society. According to Schiffman (1996:7-12), these include:

- the belief and value systems of the society using a particular language;
- the cultural traditions of the society;
- the status and prestige, or domains of use, of the language in question.

Thus, any new language policy, or changes to an existing one, must take the existing linguistic culture into account.

South African linguistic culture

Language policy in South Africa has changed radically, at least on paper, since the removal of apartheid in 1994. But what effect has this had on the linguistic culture of South African society? The linguistic culture of South Africa can be briefly sketched as follows:

- English dominates all the higher domains (see Ch.2), thus English L1 speakers have a distinct advantage over non-English speakers in these domains.
- English therefore has high status and prestige, relative to the other languages.

\(^3\) From Schiffman 1996.
English is viewed as a language of unity in South Africa, so its continued use in high domains as a *lingua franca* has not been forcefully challenged.

Afrikaans retains some vestiges of its former prestige in the corporate sector, but has been entirely removed from government domains in some provinces, where the Afrikaans speaking population is very small. It has also lost some ground in education, particularly secondary and tertiary education. Its high domain usage has become largely a regional matter.

The indigenous languages remain largely confined to community and family domains, but still hold a strong position in high domains associated with traditional culture, such as 'tribal courts' and traditional ceremonies (Msimang 1993:30).

The above treats only the prestige and status aspects of linguistic culture, which in the case of the indigenous languages are also linked to traditional culture. However, one must also consider the belief or ideological system in which this linguistic culture arose, and in which status and prestige perceptions are rooted. It is evident that English is highly dominant, and I expect it will remain so as long as it is the medium for secondary and higher education, to the exclusion of the indigenous languages. This culture arose in the ideological systems of colonialism and apartheid. South Africa's ideological system is now one based on unity and indeed, on redress. Yet, the linguistic culture for much of South African society remains very similar to that under apartheid, with English acting as the 'unifying' language. The result, however, in terms of the languages, remains much the same.

Just as traditional culture is influenced by a number of factors, so is linguistic culture. Indeed, linguistic culture is influenced by, and influences, most aspects of everyday life, and all our social interactions. Thus, our linguistic culture is
shaped by our interactions with friends, family and neighbours in the domestic environment, teachers and fellow students in the educational environment, colleagues, superiors and subordinates in the work environment, and so forth. If any of these environments are grounded in a particular language policy, there will be a cultural association between that environment, or domain, and a particular language or variety. And, once more it is necessary to note that, if a person is not proficient in the language(s) associated in their linguistic culture to a particular domain, s/he is effectively excluded from that domain.

With the collapse of apartheid, the higher domains are becoming more accessible to indigenous language speakers, particularly under equal-opportunity legislation. However, if the language policies are not amended to allow for their language proficiencies (generally, a result of past and present language policies in the education system), a new problem will be created. For example, if somebody is employed in a domain which 'runs' on an English medium, and his/her proficiency in English is limited, his/her ability to do the job adequately will be impaired. In such a case, the L1 may be perceived to be a hindrance to advancement, as will also be the case if a firm or company requires a certain base level of proficiency in English (see Ch. IV).

The question, then, is what kind of language policy (and therefore, what kind of language planning) is desirable for South Africa? Any proposed language planning measures must be viable and implementable to avoid wasting time, money and resources. In other words, there must be a good chance that the proposed measures will work within the existing linguistic culture, or that any changes made to the linguistic culture will be acceptable to the society. According to Reagan (1995:320), citing Kerr (1976), a language planning initiative must pass the following 'tests' if it is going to have a chance of success.
• The desirability test. This tests the community/society’s attitude towards the measures involved. Naturally, this should be positive in order for the measures to succeed.

• The justness test. This test demands that all who are going to be affected by the language planning measures are being treated equally, or fairly; i.e., that no linguistic community is being favoured over another.

• The effectiveness test. This tests whether the new policy achieves or is likely to achieve its stated goals. As I show later, a policy may be effective without being just or beneficial.

• The tolerability test. This tests the pragmatic viability of a language policy, especially in terms of resources available (and can allow loopholes for weak legislation.)

It is somewhat simplistic to think that language policy can be so easily tested. However, I think that they are important evaluation criteria for a language policy in humanitarian terms. Before going on to explore the difference between policy and practice, I demonstrate this point by evaluating South Africa’s language planning history in terms of Kerr’s four tests.

Firstly, South Africa’s English/ Afrikaans official language policy:

DESIRABILITY TEST: For the European sector of the population, the policy passes this test, if only as a compromise. For the country as a whole, it fails, as the needs and ‘desires’ of 4% of the population are not even considered.
JUSTNESS TEST: As the policy sought to treat English and Afrikaans equally, it passes this test for the European community in isolation. On a wider scale, it fails as it unjustly excludes all other languages.

EFFECTIVENESS TEST: In terms of the policy achieving its stated goals (a degree of bilingualism was achieved among white South Africans), this test was passed with distinction. The policy was effective if not beneficial.

TOLERABILITY TEST: Pragmatically, this test is passed through (to use Luckett's (1993:54) characterisation) 'the sheer political will' of the Afrikaner community.35

The attempt to force Afrikaans on African school pupils as a medium of instruction alongside English can be evaluated as follows:

DESIRABILITY TEST: The community's reaction, culminating in the tragic Soweto riots of 1976 shows that the community did not desire this policy; therefore, it fails.

JUSTNESS TEST: To force another 'foreign' medium of instruction upon pupils already taught through a language other than their Li, and in which their proficiency was not adequately developed, cannot be considered just.

EFFECTIVENESS TEST: Insofar as the policy was never really practised (Hartshorne 1995:312) this test is failed.

---

35 The fact that the Afrikaners were able to develop their language so thoroughly in terms of both status and corpus, and so quickly, leads one to wonder whether this test is often abused, or used as an excuse not to change the status quo.
TOLERABILITY TEST: In terms of pragmatic viability, there probably were adequate resources; but the pupils themselves were not equipped to undergo instruction in Afrikaans, so this test is also failed.

The implementation of the eleven official languages would fare as follows:

DESIRABILITY TEST: The policy has apparently been welcomed in principle by most people, so this test is passed.

JUSTNESS TEST: The policy aims to treat all 11 languages equally, thus this test is passed.

EFFECTIVENESS TEST: The stated goal of the policy is to 'promote and extend' the use of the 'historically disadvantaged' languages (Constitution of South Africa, 108/96:$6.2). English still dominates, especially in Education, so this test has not been passed so far.

TOLERABILITY TEST: It will be far more cost effective (or, as Reagan (1995:326) puts it, 'cost sensitive'), to retain English instead of developing the indigenous languages. So far, this test has not been passed.

Policies, including language policies, are often put forward in recognition of an ideal. However, the stated policy is by no means always the same as what is practised. Schiffman (1996:30) distinguishes 'two types of policy': that which is put forward in law or a mission statement, for example (de jure 'by law'); and that which is practised by a community (de facto 'by [what is] done').

Thus, while the de jure policy may treat all languages in a society equally, the situation in practice may be somewhat different. In South Africa, for example, the Constitution
accords equal status to all eleven official languages
(108/96:§§6.1, 6.4). This seeks to redress the past imbalance in
language rights, wherein only the two colonial languages were
recognised and treated as official. In practice, however,
English is given far more weight than the indigenous languages,
or Afrikaans (see p.67). This has much to do with the historical
use of English in the higher domains, its relative state of
development to function in these domains, and its position as a
global language of wider communication (Ch. II). The danger with
this situation is that the status given the indigenous languages
in the Constitution will remain merely symbolic, and that English
will become the sole de facto official language, or will continue
to be used in many more and higher domains than the other
official languages.

Corrective language policy for South Africa?
South Africa’s stated language policy (108/96: §6) is a very
progressive one. However, the envisaged promotion and extension
of the indigenous languages has to take place in the shadow of
English, a very powerful language in the South African context
and globally. As I have already shown in the previous chapter,
English is firmly entrenched in the higher domains of language
use in South Africa, and this forms part of our linguistic
culture. As long as this position is maintained, it will be
difficult for the indigenous languages to find a place in the
higher domains. But the relative state of development of the
indigenous languages must be taken into account, especially in
the short term. This is not to provide loopholes for their
exclusion from these domains, but rather to gauge exactly what
their state of development is, and what needs to be done to
enable them to cope as high domain media. This will take
tremendous time and effort, as the success of such a corpus
planning measure will depend on its being accepted by its own
speech community. Indeed, Kerr’s language policy tests (outlined
on pp77-78) are equally as applicable to corpus planning as to
status planning.
Another factor influencing the success of language policy implementation is South Africa's linguistic diversity. This is more applicable to some provinces/regions than to others (see pp21ff). If the indigenous languages are to participate fully in the higher domains, it is clear that they will have to become media of instruction and discussion, preferably from school level. But as long as they remain excluded from secondary and higher educational spheres, this is unlikely to happen.

A third, and crucial factor influencing the implementation of language policy is what the people actually want. From an academic point of view, linguists and language planners know through study that e.g. multilingualism and mother tongue education (if properly implemented!) are beneficial (in the long term) not only for the languages themselves, but also for the people who use them36. Therefore, linguists and language planners would advocate an approach placing all languages on an equal plane, in all domains. It may, however, be difficult to convince the speech communities involved of the benefits, especially if there has been conflict between ethnolinguistic groups, or if they suffer from a stigma attached to their linguistic group. People's attitudes, outside as well as inside the speech community, are of vital importance to the question of whether or not they will accept any changes to the established linguistic culture.

Democratic language policies are designed, and should be implemented, with a particular, achievable objective in mind. Practical and acceptable steps must be taken to ensure that the stated objectives are met, provided they have community approval. The question for South Africa is what exactly a new and redressive language policy should set out to achieve. According to the Constitution, the desired result of our current policy is

36 For a full treatment of this topic, see e.g. Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1989).
'to elevate the status and advance the use of [the indigenous] languages' (108/96: §6.2; and the 'State must take practical and positive measures' to ensure that this objective is attained.

Chapters I and II have shown that, while there are some positive trends, English continues to dominate the higher domains, especially in Parliament, Education, Commerce and the Media. A language policy that extends the use of the indigenous languages would have the effect of protecting those languages from being completely overrun by English, which is a danger if the communities are increasingly exposed to the higher domains without an increase in their own languages' status. Their prestige and status will be boosted, as proficiency in their own language will equip people to gain access to the higher domains; and this will provide an acquisition incentive to speakers of other languages.

The framework for a new language policy for South Africa, as set out in the Constitution, needs to be redressive. As such, it should aim to develop the indigenous languages for their new role as organs of the state and of other high domains. Any attempt to implement such a policy will undoubtedly be met with some hostility, especially in the domains in which English is firmly entrenched. Some objections will be based on pragmatism: the cost of implementing a new policy will be high; existing personnel will have to be retrained, as will new recruits, and so forth. How, then, will language planners overcome such objections? I now shift attention to areas which have recently undergone a tremendous change in language policy, the causes of these changes, and what has led to their success or failure. From this, some valuable lessons for South Africa can be drawn.
III.ii SUCCESSES AND FAILURES IN LANGUAGE PLANNING: TWO CASE STUDIES

1. Linguistic Decline and Revival in Ireland

Causes of Decline: Contact, conflict and conquest

A cursory glance at the linguistic map of Ireland for 1800 shows Irish to be a living, functional language. If one looks towards the east, however, there is evidence of an erosion of the solid Irish-speaking community, particularly in the north. 120 years later, the language had literally been decimated, and the solid Irish speaking community has become scattered and fragmented, remaining only as a few pockets in the extreme south and west of the island (from Hindley 1990:vi, Ch.3).

(Refer to Maps 3.1-3.3).

Irish has been eroded by the encroachment of English language and culture. The Celtic territories were colonised and conquered in mediaeval times, eventually being brought under the same crown in 1801 (Foster 1989:317). It would not be correct, however, to say that the victory of English was complete. Ireland has struggled to maintain its separate national and cultural identity, which has led to some conflict over the centuries. A major characteristic of the struggle for an 'own' national identity in Ireland was the recognition of the erosion of the national language, and a desire to reverse it. Thus, the Irish language has undergone attempts at revival, with mixed and limited successes. Like those who wish to promote the indigenous languages in South Africa, proponents of an Irish revival face a formidable opponent: the English language, and, to some extent, the associated culture or way of life.

---

37 These small, scattered areas where Irish is still in everyday, intergenerational use, is known as the Gaeltacht.
Map 3.1: The Gaeltacht in 1987. (Hindley 1990:vi)
Causes and Pattern of the Decline

Population
A chronological examination of linguistic decline for Irish would show a rapid, steady erosion of the Irish speaking population from the north and east (see map). This is the coast nearer Greater Britain\(^{38}\), and the point of first English occupation, and first language contact between English and Irish. The underlying cause of the decline of Irish is the sustained contact with the colonial people and their language.

Ireland saw an influx of English and Scottish people from colonial times. When England colonised Ireland, it effectively took over the governmental and legislative functions, as well as control of education. Moreover, land was 'bought' or annexed by the British Crown, and sold or given to aristocrats, with a view to founding and expanding the English colony (Simms 1989:52ff). The native population was either relocated or kept on as working tenants of the land they occupied. This eventually destroyed the tribal/clannish land system that had previously been the norm, and the indigenous people were brought under the control of the English-speaking colonisers.

With higher domain jobs in Ireland largely restricted to the English gentry, who now 'owned' the land, Ireland and neighbouring Wales became an attractive alternative to England. This led to an influx of English-speaking people, especially to northern Ireland, where they were eventually to dominate numerically as well as politically. Resistance to the colonisers took the form of several civil wars, outside the scope of this dissertation; but Ireland was thoroughly subjugated by the end of the 17\(^{th}\) century.

\(^{38}\) I use this term to denote the island containing England, Scotland and Wales; i.e., the United Kingdom excluding(present day) Ireland and Northern Ireland.
Ireland is rich in farmland, which is what made it so attractive to would-be landowners from Greater Britain. Apart from subsistence farming, most of the commercial produce of Ireland was in the hands of the landed elite. These farms were leased to the indigenous inhabitants, who 'rented' the farm, worked it, and bought its produce (Foster 1989:165f). This agrarian economy was in part responsible for the near death of the Irish language in the mid-19th century. The principal crop in Ireland in the 19th century was potatoes, and constituted the staple for most of the indigenous people, who farmed for subsistence. In 1845, the Irish potato crop was ravaged by a fungal disease which rendered almost the entire crop inedible (Foster 1989:166ff). The fungus persisted for five years thereafter. Subsistence farmers had no chance; and commercial potato farm landlords could not cope with the plight of their tenants (ibid.). Many poor subsistence farmers literally starved to death, and millions more emigrated, mainly to the USA, Canada and Australia to escape that fate. Their departure meant the departure of most of the native Irish speakers from Ireland. Thus, the outflow of Irish speakers had more to do with the decline of Irish than the inflow of English speakers. 39

Geographical Distribution
As seen in Ch. 2, numerical strength is only one factor in determining whether a language thrives or declines. The geographical distribution of a language's speech community also plays a major role. The erosion of Irish-speaking communities, whether by the outflow of Irish speakers, or the inflow of English speakers, has left the Gaeltacht as a series of small, scattered pockets of Irish L1 speakers, in most instances surrounded by English speakers. The Gaeltacht itself is, for the

39 Compare this situation with that of Wales, which was so swamped by incoming English speakers that Welsh became a numerical minority language (Jenkins 1992).
most part, confined to rural areas; and each little 'pocket' is cut off from other Irish-speaking strongholds by surrounding urban or suburban areas, which are dominated by English (Hindley 1990:189).

This means that the strongholds of Irish are not continuous, or contiguous—i.e., there is no cohesion between them. Thus, one stronghold may be remote from another, and therefore not in direct contact. The only speech communities they are in direct contact with are English-speaking, which does nothing to strengthen the position of the dominated language.

The economic weakness of the Gaeltacht: industrialisation and modernisation

The earlier industrialisation of Ireland took place almost exclusively through the colonisers, mainly to the detriment of the indigenous population. As in South Africa, the coming of the industrial age to Ireland caused a dramatic change in the livelihood and lifestyle of the people. Factories in need of a large (and cheap) labour force were built, and urbanisation took place on a massive scale. But industrialisation came slowly to Ireland in the wake of the depopulation following the Famine; and the discovery of minerals in nearby Wales made Wales a far more attractive investment opportunity (Jenkins 1992: Ch. 12). Thus, it wasn't until after the Second World War (1939-1945) that modernisation/industrialisation played a significant role in the Irish economy (Foster 1989). Yet, the shift towards English continued unabated, especially in the education system (see below).

Medium of instruction and linguistic decline

The Irish education system has played an enormous role in both the decline and attempted revival of the national language. This is not only because of the use of English as sole m.o.i., but
also because of the relatively low level of education attained by (or attainable for) children in the Gaeltacht areas.

English officially became the medium of instruction in Irish colleges in 1782 (Kiberd 1989:252). The English government left education for Irish natives, who were almost exclusively Catholic, to the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church adopted English as its language of mission in Ireland in the late 18th century, trading Irish language education for freedom of religion and Catholic emancipation (Foster 1989:150, Kiberd 1989:251). Thus, the medium of instruction in Ireland became overwhelmingly English. Irish remained the language of the fields and the home environment (i.e., the lower domains); but outside of these domains, their world was, and still is, dominated by English.

The role of religion
Although it is generally accepted that religion has little to do with language maintenance or shift in modern times, the role of religion in Ireland was not small. In Irish education, and in many spheres of Irish life, the role of the Catholic Church was quite decisive. The compromise between the Church and Crown in the late 1700s ensured not only the survival of Catholicism in Ireland, but the disappearance of Irish from most aspects of education and, indeed, public life (Ó Baoill 1988).

Language Planning for revival: corpus planning
An integral part of the newly independent Irish Government's plans was the promotion of their fast-dwindling national language. At the time of independence in 1922, it was spoken on an everyday basis only in small, scattered and mostly rural parts of Ireland. In order to improve the status of the language, the new government found it necessary to extend the use of Irish into the higher domains, especially Education, Administration, Law and Publication, from which it had previously been excluded. However,
the Irish language was split into three regional dialects, without any one being more prestigious than another. Thus, the government decided to embark on a programme of standardisation, to make Irish a united, national language.

The standardisation of Irish had three particular focuses: the standardisation of spelling, terminology and grammar (see Ó Baoíll 1988).

**Standardisation of spelling**

In the first instance, the old Gaelic script was dropped in favour of the more modern Roman script. This necessitating the replacement of certain diacritics with digraphs (E.g. /x/ was represented by <c> in the Gaelic script, and replaced by <ch> in the Roman script). Spellings considered too long, redundant or not representative of the phonetic pronunciation were altered to more systematically represent the phonetic quality.

In 1935, the government ordered a standardised dictionary of Irish to be developed and published, using the Roman script. Soon after, however, a new government came to power, and demanded that the Gaelic script be reinstated. Since 1945, all reforms to the spelling system have been developed to cater for both script styles.

**Standardisation of terminology and new terminology**

As the use of Irish was extended into domains from which it had previously been excluded, or into which it was being promoted, the need arose for development of new terminology to cater for these domains. Furthermore, there was some contrast among the dialects, which used the same word to represent different concepts, or different words to represent the same concept. It was decided that Irish should be modernised on the 'one word for one concept basis' (Greene 1972:28-29).
For the most part, new terms were borrowed from English, and given a standardised Irish spelling and pronunciation, and any innovations were to be developed using the relevant Irish morphemes. Ó Baoill (1988: 116) gives the example of the creation of an Irish term for 'lithograph':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English term</th>
<th>English derivational morphemes</th>
<th>Standardised Irish borrowing</th>
<th>Irish derivational morphemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td>-er</td>
<td>liteagraf</td>
<td>-áí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-y</td>
<td></td>
<td>-áiocht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grammar**

There was minimal intervention with Irish grammar, though some simplification took place, which Greene says had the result of making Irish more like English. The declension system is slowly eroding, along with the case system. This is not a result of language planning per se, but also a natural process. Rather than taking the literary language as a standard, modernised Irish used spoken dialectal forms; thus, ablative and dative cases have been merged in some versions of the new standard (Greene 1972: passim).

Ó Baioll (1988:119ff) outlines some of the simplifications:

- The nominative noun form can now be substituted for the genitive
- One first person pronominal form has been developed for all verbs
- Before standardisation, only adjectives inflected for plural after numbers higher than one; now, both nouns and adjectives inflect for plural after numbers higher than one.
Language Planning for revival: status planning

By the turn of the 20th century, the Irish language community was a shadow of what it had been 200 years before. The dominance of English language and culture was overwhelming, and (perceived as) exploitative. Nationalist and religious conflicts seethed, and the divide between rich and poor matched the divide between English (Protestant) and Irish (Catholic) closely (Hindley 1990:11f; Ch.2). This led to nationalistic stirrings, and the desire to restore Irish things to Ireland.

The first real attempt at preserving Irish as a spoken language was the founding in 1876 of the Society for the preservation of the Irish Language (SPIL). The SPIL campaigned successfully for the acceptance of Irish as a subject recognised for study and examination in Irish schools; this was approved in 1878. (Ó Baoill 1988:110). However, it was the establishment in 1893 of the Gaelic League that popularised the Irish language among the Irish people, by appealing to nationalist and separatist aspirations. It achieved this by organising language classes on a countrywide scale, and also generated, through political activity, popular enthusiasm for the language. The Gaelic League's political campaigning for the Irish language led to its recognition by the (English-controlled) universities as a matriculation subject in 1913.

The move to maintain and revive the Irish language was spearheaded by pro-independence forces, and later, by the post-independence Irish government (Ó Riagáin 1988). In 1937, the Irish Constitution gave Irish statutory recognition as the first official language, despite its being the numerical minority. English was made the second official language. Ireland has undergone many social and economic changes since the initial formulation of this policy, which has strengthened the de facto, if not the de jure position of English. The industrialisation of the Irish economy, and especially the Gaeltacht, has led to the
emergence of more social contexts for which English is the everyday medium.

With the Irish language still dwindling despite its first official language status, the Irish government set up the Bord na Gaeilge (Irish Language Board) in 1975. The Bord is an agency whose task it was (and is) to promote the Irish language by ‘extending its use by the public as a living language’, and as ‘an ordinary means of communication’ (Tovey 1988:57). Thus, the Bord’s task is to promote the use of Irish in both the higher and lower domains of language use in Ireland. The Bord was initially set up with five operational divisions, covering various domains, as briefly illustrated below:

- Education: deals with schools’ language policies, and facilitates the use of Irish as m.o.i.
- State: deals with linguistic and other policies at State level, which affect the position of Irish, and monitors progress relating to the use of Irish in State departments.
- Community: works with the voluntary language movements to encourage more everyday use of Irish (especially in the lower domains); cooperates with the commercial sector to facilitate the use of Irish in the business world.
- Communications: deals with PR within the Bord itself; works with journalists and programming staff in radio and television to ensure media coverage of the Bord’s work; provides an Irish-English translation service for Ireland’s public sector.
- Publishing: organises and assists with the commercial production, distribution and marketing of all types of books, excepting textbooks, in Irish40.

---

40 The publication and distribution of textbooks in Irish is catered for by the Education Department (Tovey 1988:64).
Having been so organised, the Bord embarked upon a massive advertising campaign aimed at improving public attitude towards the use of the Irish language, and tied the Irish language closely with Irish national identity (Tovey 1988). Rather than promoting Irish as a sole language, the Bord promoted its use alongside English. This immediately led to conflict about what the Bord's role should be, and doubts about its seriousness in promoting Irish as the first official language of Ireland.

In order to encourage more everyday use of Irish by the general public, the Bord set up a plan of community schemes (sceimeanna pobail). These were pilot schemes aimed at testing public attitudes towards the use of Irish, and their response to language planning from below strategies. Certain communities were selected by the Bord to be areas for 'sustained language change'—the communities involved were encouraged to use their own initiative to promote the more extensive use of Irish in all domains, and particularly among themselves. However, apathy, lack of resources and political infighting soon eclipsed initial successes, and the Bord ultimately had to admit the failure of the community schemes, and adopt a new strategy.

The Bord's new strategy was one of 'Action Planning' (Tovey 1988), and divided the country into four target areas, whose development in terms of language policy was deemed as crucial for the survival and revival of the Irish language. These were:
- The Gaeltacht (predominately Irish-speaking, but dwindling)
- Education
- The State
- The Community (including Youth, voluntary language movements, the business sector, etc.)

The Bord's new plan of action had a somewhat narrower focus than before. Instead of 'restoration' or 'revival' of the Irish

---

I.e., among advocates of Irish-only and Irish-English bilingualism.
language being its stated aim, its new goal was simply to 'ensure the survival of Irish into the 21\textsuperscript{st} century' [my emphasis] (Tovey 1988:64). Moreover, the Bord sees the survival of Irish as 'located within a specific conception of bilingualism, one explained as "functioning within an integrated community"' (Tovey 1988:64, citing Action Plan 1983:2). Thus, rather than promoting the Gaeltacht as an Irish-speaking, or even predominately Irish-speaking region, the Bord now promoted it as an English-speaking region (if one is to be honest in terminology) in which, 'in certain contexts, or within certain social networks, some people may choose to speak Irish' (ibid.).

The relative weakness of the new policy's terminology indicates the general failure of status planning in the Irish context. When the Bord was constituted in 1975, it proclaimed Irish as the national language, and as an integral part of Irish national identity. It would appear that the people did not agree. By the end of 1983, Irish was portrayed as a language at the brink of death, not able to survive as a living language into the 21\textsuperscript{st} century without sustained intervention. The question is whether such intervention, weak as it is, and without any legislative authority, will have any positive impact.
2. Language Planning in Kenya: Swahili as a national language

Like South Africa, Ireland and many other independent states today, the East African region of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda has a long history of colonisation: and therefore language contact and conflict. For the purposes of this section, I have concentrated on Swahili as a language of national unity in Kenya.

The spread of Swahili

Around the middle of the first millennium AD, Arab traders first made contact with the Bantu people of East Africa, and began trading with them. This led to sustained contact between the Arabs and the indigenous people of East Africa, and extensive borrowing took place. This produced the substantially Arabised Swahili dialects along the coast, some time after 500AD (Mazrui & Mazrui 1995:35). Extensive colonisation and settlement took place along the East African coast, and in time, the East African region was ruled by Arabs from the Sultanate of Muscat, and later, Zanzibar. Later, at the peak of Europe's Age of Discovery, the Arabs vied with Portugal, Germany and eventually Britain, for control of the region, which was a valuable part of the Arab trade route, as well as the source of slaves. In 1887, Britain gained control of most of the region, and seized German interests in Tanganyika after World War One. Britain retained control over Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania until the early 1960s, when the countries of the East African region gained their independence.

---

42 Tanganyika became independent in 1961. Zanzibar became an independent Sultanate in 1963; but the Sultan was overthrown in 1964. Later that year, Zanzibar united with Tanganyika to form Tanzania (Elting & Folsam 1970:130f).

Map 3.4: The geographical location and distribution of the major languages of Kenya.
The Linguistic Culture of Kenya

REFER TO MAP OF EAST AFRICAN REGION

As it is in most African states, the linguistic culture of Kenya is diverse, with at least 54 indigenous linguistic entities represented. (Sim 1994:1840). Two languages are used for the higher domains: Swahili, which is the national language of Kenya, and English, which is the official, and former colonial, language. In the higher domains, such as government, law, education and formal business, English is the official medium; but some Swahili is also used in these functions.

Swahili is widely spoken along the East African coast, from Somalia to Mozambique. Its Bantu roots and structure give it acceptance across a far wider range of Africa, and the use of Swahili for trade purposes extends westward into the Central African Republic and Congo (Kinshasa). Moreover, Swahili is the national language of Kenya and the official language of Tanzania, as well as being used widely in Uganda (Mazrui & Mazrui 1995). Due to the proximity of East Africa to the Arab trade route, and especially to the once prosperous Sultanate of Zanzibar, Swahili is well known outside of Africa, particularly in the Middle East. Indeed, the people of East Africa were once colonised from the Sultanate of Zanzibar by Arabs, and Arabic varieties have therefore had a strong influence on Swahili.

Except in Uganda, Swahili lacks the political sensitivity that is attached to most of the smaller ethnic/tribal languages (Mazrui & Mazrui 1995), as it has been used as a lingua franca for a long time, and as such is no longer associated with a particular tribe or ethnic group. Swahili has a well-established literature, and, because of its historic use as a lingua franca across eastern central Africa, is equipped to cope in the higher domains. This
makes it an ideal candidate for official and public use, rather than reliance on a colonial language. Despite its links to, and influence from, Arabic, the language of past colonisation, Swahili is an African language, and is therefore not perceived as foreign in the same way as English is. Whereas in South Africa, Afrikaans was perceived as the language of the oppressors, and English as the language of liberation (Benjamin 1994:104), in Kenya English is seen as the language of colonial oppression, and Swahili as the language of liberation.

Competition with English
Although English is the language of the colonisers, it still retains high status in Kenya, and is extensively used in the higher domains. Indeed, the entrenchment of Swahili as a high domain language in Kenya did not take place without struggle; it required stringent language planning and the political will of its proponents (e.g. Pres. Mzee Jomo Kenyatta and his supporters) to achieve the status it has. However, Kenyatta's vision of Swahili as the most dominant language in Kenya has never been fully realised. There was strong opposition to his plans to impose Swahili upon the Kenyan parliament. His original plan was as follows, expressed as a motion moved by Kamwithi Munyi, MP (cited in Mazrui & Mazrui 1995: 16-17):

...that in view of the fact that his Excellency the President, Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, has always been appealing and encouraging the people of Kenya to be proud of their own culture and their traditional richness, this House calls upon the government to make immediate plans to declare Swahili as an official language which will be used not only in office, but, subject to suitable amendment of the constitution of Kenya, our parliament as well.

The House substantially amended the motion, which was eventually passed in this form:
... that in view of the fact that his Excellency the President, Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, has always been appealing and encouraging the people of Kenya to be proud of their own culture and traditional richness, this House calls upon the government as soon as it is practicable to declare Swahili along with English as an official language which will be used not only in offices (sic), but, subject to suitable amendment of the constitution of Kenya, in our parliament as well. (my emphasis)

Since his Swahilisation plans were opposed in parliament, Kenyatta used the ruling party's (Kenya African National Union) advocacy of Swahili as the official language of Kenya to pass a resolution to fully adopt Swahili as the official language by 1974 (Mazrui & Mazrui 1995:17). When nothing had been done to implement these measures by this target date, Kenyatta declared Swahili as the sole language of parliament. This meant that the higher domains were split between Swahili and English: parliamentary debates and the legislature operated in Swahili; but the courts and the judicial system operated in English. (Mazrui & Mazrui 1995:17f)

In 1978, Daniel Arap Moi became President of Kenya. By 1979, he had reestablished English alongside Swahili as a medium of parliamentary debate; with the proviso that a question posed in Swahili could not be answered in English and vice versa. Thus, candidates nominated for parliament had to prove on nomination that they were suitably proficient in both Swahili and English (written and spoken) (Mazrui & Mazrui 1995:18f).

**Education**

Vernacular education is encouraged in Kenya for the first three years of schooling, with Swahili taught as a compulsory subject from the earlier primary phase. (Sim 1994; Laitin 1992). However, English remains the sole medium of instruction for the senior primary and secondary phase, and for all tertiary education.
Thus, the m.o.i. problem in Kenya is much the same as that in South Africa: education is begun in the vernacular (for most children), but suddenly (and traumatically) switches to English during the primary phase. Even though the national language, Swahili, is regarded as an 'important subject', compulsory and examinable in all Kenyan primary and secondary schools (Mazrui & Mazrui 1995:59), recommendations to adopt it as a m.o.i. beyond the primary phase have been disregarded.

Kenya's neighbour, Tanzania, has had considerably more success (mainly thanks to Julius Nyerere's efforts) in implementing Swahili in the higher domains. Swahili is truly a national language in Tanzania, and has managed to displace English entirely in some domains.

Table 3.2 shows how effectively Swahili has been implemented in Kenya and Tanzania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>KENYA</th>
<th>TANZANIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH COURT</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL COURT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARLIAMENT</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSPAPER</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL NOVELS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL RECORDS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PLAYS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILMS (NOT DUBBED)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC &amp; VEHICLE SIGNS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3.2: Domain usage of Swahili in Kenya and Tanzania
However, even in Tanzania, English remains exclusively entrenched in some of the highest domains, most notably secondary and tertiary education. As long as this remains the case, it is unlikely that the Swahilisation of East Africa will go much further. Although some inroads have been made into introducing Swahili as a medium of instruction in secondary and tertiary education, they have not been sustained. But, according to Blommaert (1999:95, Ch3 passim), a recent relaxation of attitudes toward both English and Swahili has led to a more ready acceptance of Swahili for high domain roles.

The influence of religion

East Africa's sustained contact with the Arabs necessarily meant sustained contact with the Islam religion, and the associated Arab/Islam culture. The realisation of the Bantu-rooted Swahili language made it a useful medium/lingua franca for the spread of Islamic doctrine. Moreover, it provided a vehicle for communication among Muslims of various ethnolinguistic origin, who had settled along the East African coast.

Having already become a regional lingua franca by the time of the European colonisation, Swahili proved to be an excellent medium for Christian civilisation. Due to the Arabic/Islamic influence, Swahili had already developed a vocabulary which could effectively cope with monotheistic religious discourse. Thus, both the spread and status of Swahili were aided by its use as a language of Christian mission (Whitely 1969).
Success or Failure?
The successes of the language planning programmes in both Ireland and Kenya have been somewhat limited. In both cases, the chief problem has been with implementing the new policy effectively, and sustaining it. Although there appears to be widespread public support for the high domain usage of Irish and Swahili in their respective situations, there is a great deal less commitment from that same public when it comes to practising the new policy.
III.iii: MOTIVE, IMPLEMENTATION AND PRACTICE

Implementing language planning measures
Implementation is the final and most crucial stage in the language planning process⁴⁴, as it depends entirely on the people for whom the new policy is intended to adopt and practice it. Unless the government or other statutory body actively enforces a new language policy (which would be rather unfortunate in a democracy), it is up to the public, through their linguistic behaviour, to accept or reject it. However, the tyrannical enforcement of a new language policy cannot be used as a token of its success or failure. Thus, both the new policy itself, and the methods used to implement it, can be used to judge the success or failure of a new policy.

The reasons behind the language planning that has taken place in Ireland, Kenya and South Africa have one common feature: the domination of (a) local/indigenous language(s) by English. There are some crucial differences, too, which are as important as the similarities in determining whether a language planning measure used successfully in one situation could reasonably be expected to work in another; and, conversely, whether a measure that has failed in one situation would necessarily fail in another. Thus, it is important to consider the following aspects of language planning when evaluating the success or failure of a language planning programme:

- The reason why language planning has been undertaken: e.g. because some language(s) is (are) disadvantaged, etc.
- The purpose behind a particular language planning measure: e.g. to redress linguistic discrimination, etc.
- By whom the language planning measures are devised and implemented
- For whom the language planning measures are intended
- The methods used to implement the new policy
- The consequences of the new policy being implemented, or any problems with its implementation
- The long term effects/public response to the new language policy, and/or the way it has been implemented.

I now compare these aspects of the language planning activities which have been carried out in Ireland, Kenya and South Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE(S)</th>
<th>IRELAND</th>
<th>KENYA</th>
<th>SOUTH AFRICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The steady erosion of the Irish language under the influence of English; concern that Irish would not survive into the 21st century</td>
<td>Colonial rule over Kenya by England meant that local Kenyan languages were excluded from the higher domains; the perception that English was the language of the oppressors, and the need for a language of national unity.</td>
<td>Exclusion of SA indigenous languages from the higher/public domains by the colonial and apartheid language policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE(S)</th>
<th>IRELAND</th>
<th>KENYA</th>
<th>SOUTH AFRICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To reestablish Irish as an 'everyday' language, and so boost its status and prestige</td>
<td>To establish a national language that could be used as a lingua franca throughout the country, without offending tribal affiliations</td>
<td>To promote and extend the use of the indigenous languages, thus allowing for more participation by their speakers in all spheres of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure the survival of Irish into the 21st century</td>
<td>Such a language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 Some authors, like Appel & Muysken (1987) say that implementation is not the final phase; evaluation is.
was viewed as both a replacement for the colonial language, and an instrument for the detribalisation of Kenya⁴⁵

**BY WHOM**

- Political parties
- NGOs and cultural bodies
- Government

- Government, particularly the ruling KANU
- Government, particularly the ruling ANC
- PANSALB, a language planning body set up by Government to foster multilingualism
- Cultural interest groups and NGOs

**FOR WHOM**

- Especially the Irish public
- The Kenyan public
- All government institutions
- The South Africa public

**METHODOLOGY**

- Awareness campaigns
- Political propaganda
- Government incentive schemes for Irish medium schools and Irish-speaking families
- Legislation (opposed both in Parliament and by the public)
- Legislation (extension and promotion of indigenous languages required by the constitution)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>PUBLIC RESPONSE/ LONG TERM EFFECTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recognition of Irish as an examinable subject in schools and universities</td>
<td>• Minimal. Irish remains a symbol of Irish culture, rather than a communication tool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in the number of Irish medium and Irish/ English dual medium schools (but these are declining again)</td>
<td>• All Kenyan schoolchildren must learn Swahili as a subject</td>
<td>Yet to be established; the pre-1994 status quo is still generally in force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in levels of Irish/ English bilingualism</td>
<td>• English continues to dominate most of the higher domains, but Swahili is used in national domains such as the lower law</td>
<td>Erosion of the power base of Afrikaans in man of the higher domains, with consequent loss of status and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in Irish language publications</td>
<td>• The establishment of Swahili as a compulsory subject in schools, but not as a medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The exclusive use of Swahili in the Kenyan parliament and government institutions, but only for a short while</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elevation of 9 indigenous languages to joint official status with English and Afrikaans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erosion of the status and high domain functions of Afrikaans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (Establishment of regional languages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ultimately, it cannot be said that language planning has met with lasting success in either Kenya or Ireland. The cause of this is that the measures proposed or imposed were simply not accepted in practice by the speech communities concerned. Although the language planning measures put forward in both cases sought to redress a linguistic injustice and include the languages in functions from which they had previously been excluded, the status quo was deemed more acceptable, or even developed upon, by the public. Some blame for this may well be placed upon those responsible for formulating and implementing the new policy, and it may be charged that things could have been done another, better way. It may also be contended, that more time (even generations) is needed for new policies to take full effect; that the linguistic culture of a country or community cannot be changed in a short time.

The areas of weakness in a new policy must be identified and scrutinised. If the policies put forward in Ireland and Kenya are examined in terms of Kerr's simple language policy tests, weaknesses can be identified in all areas.

In the case of language planning in Ireland:

Desirability: in principle, the Irish revival policy is desired: people say that Irish should be used more often, and in more domains (159, 208ff). However, in practice, they remain with English - which is the overwhelming majority (98%) first language in Ireland (Hindley 1990:185).
Justness: the policy seeks to redress the harm caused to the Irish language by English imperialist policies; and the language is in no way foisted upon the public. Thus, language planning in Ireland was just (and this may be one of the reasons why its implementation has failed!)

Effectiveness: the stated goals of the policy were never substantially achieved, so language planning in Ireland cannot be seen to have been effective.

Tolerability: in the final analysis, it is the Irish people who, by their actions, have rejected the reinstitution of Irish as the everyday medium of Ireland. Resources for the Irish language are available, and have been used (Irish was extensively standardised, published, etc), but it is difficult to say for certain whether this language planning for Irish has passed this test. The language resources are there, but it seems that the people are unwilling to learn/acquire a language for its own sake: they already have English, which proves sufficient for all necessary domains, and Irish remains merely symbolic.

The situation in Kenya is even more problematic. Language planning measures in Kenya have historically been undertaken by the government, particularly at the decision of the ruling party, and imposed upon the people. Thus, the approach has been strictly top-down. Let us examine Kenyatta's wish to replace English with Swahili in the higher domains; particularly, his imposition of Swahili on the parliament.

Desirability: because of Kenya's top - down approach, it is difficult to find material reflecting what the people want. However, the linguistic culture of the Kenyan people has historically been one of domain-specificity, which is reflected in their language policy. This is indeed the norm in most multilingual nations (Laitin 1992), and I return to this point on page 109. Thus, Kenyans use whatever language is necessary in a
particular domain. For example, somebody may use the vernacular in the home environment, Swahili at work (if the vernacular is not the common language), and English in circles where Swahili is not adequate—for example, amongst scientists who do not speak Swahili.

Desirability is also affected by (political) economy. If one language is upheld as the language of commerce, education, modernity etc, it is natural that people will wish to acquire that language, because they stand to gain from or improve their lives with knowledge of that language. This boils down to a question of access: if the vernacular or national language does not provide a person with access to a domain s/he wishes to infiltrate, s/he will desire to learn one that does. In a multilingual nation like Kenya then, "desirability" is a highly artificial construct.

Swahili is the first language of only 0.5% of Kenya's population, and the second language of nearly 47% (worked from Ethnologue website). It is an important lingua franca in the region, and it is very likely that (were they asked) the Kenyan people would desire access to Swahili; but they would probably desire access to English more as long as it is the language of education, commerce, technology etc. Kenyatta wished to replace English with Swahili in the higher domains. The only domain in which he succeeded in doing this was the national Parliament, and then by duress, and only for a short while. This indicates that the parliamentarians did not desire this policy, preferring English. But one can only speculate on what the results of this move might have been had he replaced English with Swahili in education first.

Justness: Insofar as Kenyatta et al. sought to redress a linguistic wrong (replace the colonial language, English, associated with years of oppression, with a politically neutral and widely known African language) his actions were just. His
autocratic implementation of the new policy is suspect, however: he imposed a new policy that was not desired.

Effectiveness: With the force of law behind them, his new policies were effectively implemented, but were not sustained.

Tolerability: Pragmatically, Kenyatta's intended language planning measures and policies were sound. Resources and competence were abundant. However, with English long established in education and other higher domains, Kenya has opted to retain the status quo for the most part in the higher domains, with Swahili functioning at a somewhat lower level.

Because all of Kenya's language policies are decided upon at the government level, and are rigidly enforced by law, it is difficult to state whether Kenya's language planning measures pass the tolerability test. However, there is no clamour among Kenyans for Swahili to replace English in the higher domains.

The success or failure of any language planning measures has much to do with people's perceptions of what a language is or does. For many people, the ability to speak a language is not just a communication tool, but an important personal asset (Coulmas 1992:23ff, inter alia). Thus, if a particular language will prove to be a personal asset to a certain individual, s/he will wish to acquire that language. In the case of Ireland, where one language, English, already fulfils the requirements for all domains, there is little reason beyond interest or patriotism (which are not regarded as commercial assets!) to acquire Irish. Thus, any attempt to get people to learn Irish voluntarily is doomed from the outset. In material terms, they do not need it; it will not help them to gain access to any particular domain.

The situation is quite different in Kenya. Historically, different languages are associated with different domains of language use—the vernacular with the home and immediate
community; Swahili with intranational and intergroup communication; and English with international and high or public domain communication. This leads to Laitin’s (1992) notion of the ‘linguistic repertoire’ of multilingual societies. The basic premise of this is that an individual will build up a repertoire of the languages/registers required for the domains in which s/he wishes to be active. Thus, it would (ideally) be up to the individual to acquire the language of any domain s/he wishes to infiltrate. This is the natural state of affairs, and any attempt to alter this is an interference, and will likely be perceived as such by the public.

Domain specificity and the notion of the linguistic repertoire leads to another problem facing language planners in multilingual societies: the question of whether to develop e.g. a vernacular language to cope with the higher domains, or to ensure that all have access to the language(s) associated with the higher domains. Despite the counsels of academics, many multilingual states, particularly ex-colonies, find the latter a more attractive option. If a country emerging from colonial rule finds itself cash-strapped or otherwise limited in resources, ensuring access to the high domain language will be a cheaper and ‘easier’ option, especially because:

i) Resources for the colonial language are still in place from the colonial administration

ii) Choosing this option will mean not having to expend resources on language development

iii) In a country with a history of tribal/ethnic conflict, the colonial LWC may be politically the most neutral.

This leaves language planners in a quandary. Certainly, it would be ‘fairer’ to develop the indigenous languages to fulfil the functions required of a modern, industrialised country’s.

46 It is doubtful whether this could be strictly called multilingualism, as the individual generally acquires only the register of his/her
language. However, with a language capable of doing this already in place, much time, effort and money can be saved to be expended on more pressing concerns. It would be exceedingly difficult to develop every one of Kenya's 54 indigenous languages to the level of a national language like Swahili. Swahili, a lingua franca that is also an African language, appears to be a good compromise solution. From my perspective, however, two important factors stand in the way of Swahili ever reaching the status of English in Kenya:

i) English is Kenya's international linking language

ii) English is already well established in the higher domains

The Swahili language may well benefit tremendously in terms of status and prestige if it were to replace English in Kenya. However, it would also mean enormous upheaval, especially in education. Not only would the curriculum have to be refashioned, but teachers would have to be retrained. Moreover, with English displaced as m.o.i. from the school system, business and others would have to cater for Swahili as a medium of transaction. Even in the Parliamentary domain, changes in language policy can have quite a dramatic effect. Mazrui & Mazrui (1995:17) recall the effect that Kenyatta's imposition of Swahili as the sole medium of debate had on the Kenyan Parliament:

...some members who had previous (sic) commanded high prestige as English orators were now cut down to size when performing in Kiswahili. On the other hand, other speakers that had previously been mediocre when using the English language now rose rapidly into major artists in rhetoric and eloquence in Kiswahili.

Apart from the positive connotations of developing an African language for the high functions, replacing English with Swahili would still be an instance of linguistic imperialism. With particular domain(s).
Swahili occupying the high domains, there is very little chance that Kenya's 54 indigenous languages will ever be developed to cope with anything more than home- and community-based, or low, functions. Is this really a problem? The question to be examined now is whether this is likely to have any effect on the indigenous languages. Data from Kenya is limited; however, there are signs that Swahili as L1 is growing rapidly at the expense of indigenous languages, especially at the coast; and that English as L1 is growing at the expense of the indigenous languages among the elite. However, unless one only mixes in elitist circles in Kenya, one's vernacular and Swahili are still vital components of one's linguistic repertoire.

**Implementing language planning in South Africa**

I now return to South Africa's linguistic situation. South Africa is not as linguistically diverse as Kenya, and its language groups are larger and more easily defined. English is, especially by virtue of being the m.o.i. of the vast majority of South African schools (beyond Std 4/Grade 6), the national and international language of wider communication. The other 10 languages are fairly well divided by region, except perhaps in Gauteng (see Tables 1.2 and 1.3, pp.23-24). Most provinces have a numerical majority language, and at least one significant minority language. However, there is no one indigenous South African language that has a clear numerical majority nationally, and the imposition of any one of them as a national language, after the fashion of Swahili, would be impractical and would likely cause offence.

Language planning in South Africa is expected to live up to the Constitution's promise to develop and extend the use of the nine indigenous African languages accorded official status. This will have to be done at the 'expense' of English, which will have to give up some of its territorial dominance over the higher domains of language use. This cannot be done on a national-language basis, as South Africa has no national language, and a national
unodecimal co-official system would be cumbersome and impractical. Even narrowing the number of official languages to the four or five largest groups, as has been suggested by Alexander (1989:53f) and others, would leave six or seven substantial linguistic communities out in the cold. There are two feasible options for South Africa:

- **English-only**: English is made the only official language (which, *de facto*, it practically is), and the government ensures that all have access to it; or
- **Regional bi- or trilingual official policy**

To opt for English only would be to maintain the *de facto* status quo. This would have two main effects on the indigenous languages:

- For the time being at least, they would remain domain specific for most of the South African population - that is, they would function only in the lower domains of language use.

- They would be open to shift, especially for people whose work is concentrated in the higher domains, and who would expect that their children be brought to this.

Adopting a bilingual or trilingual regional policy would require that drastic changes be made to South Africa's linguistic culture. This would impact on all spheres of life which are centred in the higher domains. Language in education would have to be altered to cater for the new language policy; school pupils (learners) would have to be proficient in the two or three languages of the region by the time they left school. The indigenous languages would have to be developed for this role. In determining the feasibility of the latter option, language planners in South Africa must assess the current situation very carefully, as well as the potential effects of any new policy.
Much can be gleaned from the effect the status quo has on people's lives, with respect to the following questions:

- How does the dominance of English over the higher domains of language use affect the respondents' use of Ll in these and the lower domains? I.e., is their linguistic behaviour domain-specific, or is one language intruding into domains usually reserved for the other? Or are there signs of a balanced use of both languages in all domains?

- Does the use of English only in the higher domains necessarily mean that English will intrude into the lower domains?

- If so, does the loss of a language necessarily mean the loss of its associated culture?

Chapter IV contains the methodology, analysis and results of a survey conducted at the various businesses/organisations in the Cape Town area. It assesses the respective roles of English and Ll in the lives of non-English Ll speakers who are active in the higher domains of language use. Specifically, the study targets indigenous language Ll speakers employed in the higher domains, and under a de facto English-only language policy. This is to investigate the thesis that people who are extensively exposed to the dominant language will tend to shift to that language, if their Ll is, and continues to be, excluded from the higher domains of language use. The respondents are surveyed about their choice of language in various higher and lower domains, and the results for the higher and lower domains are compared for any signs of domain intrusive or domain specific behaviour.
CHAPTER IV: THE LINGUISTIC BEHAVIOUR AND CHOICES OF L2 ENGLISH SPEAKERS EMPLOYED IN AN ENGLISH ENVIRONMENT

Background to the case study

As I have already stated, English dominates most of the higher domains of language use (e.g. Commerce, Technology, the Media, Government, etc.) in South Africa, despite the fact that English is a numerical minority L1. This means that most people in South Africa will have to acquire a certain level of English competence in order to participate in, or avail themselves of, activities in the higher domains. A further consequence of this is that the indigenous people of South Africa, who were excluded from the higher domains on the basis of race under apartheid, will continue to be excluded from these domains if they do not acquire English.

Most of the higher domains are in public spheres of life. Therefore, everybody is subject to the same 'choice' of code, depending on the language policy or practice in a particular domain. Linguistic imperialism plays a role when this choice is limited by a language policy or practice in a public domain (Phillipson 1993:78ff).

In order to determine the extent of the dominance of English in the lives of non-English L1 speakers in South Africa, it is necessary to target people who are active in the higher domains. Thus, I surveyed African language L1 speakers who are employed in the higher domains, and who use English extensively or exclusively in the workplace. This was achieved by approaching companies/organisations which use an English-only policy in the workplace, whether through formal policy, or through practice.
Aims and methodology

The aim of this chapter is to ascertain the impact, if any, of the dominance of English on the linguistic behaviour and choices of employees, whose L1 is not English, but an African language. It is especially important to note whether English is intruding not only into other higher domains, but into the lower domains as well. This is done by comparing the extent of English and L1 usage in the higher domains with the extent of English and L1 in the lower domains. Domain intrusion is a clear "warning" sign of language shift (Appel & Muysken 1989:38ff). If it is discovered that English is intruding into these domains, then it can be claimed that the foundation of language shift is in place. Further, we can claim that the dominance of English in the higher domains of these people's lives is largely responsible for this shift (see Questionnaire section).

The targets

In order to determine the extent to which English dominates the higher domains, and the role it plays in the lives of non-English L1 speakers who are active in these domains, the study targets employees at companies/organisations that have a de facto English-only policy in place. Moreover, because the higher domains are under scrutiny, I chose only formally established, and well known companies/organisations. As far as possible, clerical and administrative staff were chosen as respondents.

It is necessary that the study be representative of indigenous language L1 speakers who are, or aspire to be, active in (or aspire to be active in) the higher domains of language use. In order to obtain results from a fairly wide spectrum of people, the study targets various companies, in different domains within

47 This study does not claim to be representative of all indigenous language L1 speakers working in South Africa. Specifically, it targets those who have chosen employment in higher, public domains, and have had to attain a certain level of English competence in order to do so.
the higher domains. The three targets which finally returned a useful number of responses were Finance (Target A: a bank); Commerce (Target B: a large retail company) and Retail (Target C: another large retail company). The respondents from Target B were drawn exclusively from the clerical and administrative staff at the headquarters, while those from Target C were mostly drawn from in-store workers.

Most of the companies/organisations approached do not have a formal, 'written' language policy in place; i.e., there is no de jure statement. In practice, however, an English-only policy is in effect in the formal work situation. Colleagues who share the same (non-English) L1 do frequently converse with each other in this shared language. The 'public face' of all approached was English, and a certain degree of demonstrable English competence is required as a prerequisite for employment. In two cases, material is available in Afrikaans on request, but the cost of printing anything but the occasional advertisement in an indigenous African language is considered too high.

The targets were as follows:

**Target A**
A large, well known South African bank, with its headquarters in Cape Town. Its employees are drawn from all over South Africa. There is no formal, de jure language policy in place; but the bank's public language is exclusively English. African language speakers may occasionally be called in to interpret for a client if the situation demands, but all staff-related communication is undertaken in English. Prospective employees must demonstrate reasonable competence in both spoken and written English.

Target A yielded 11 respondents, all from the clerical/administrative staff within the headquarters.
**Target B**

This is a large, national, general retail company, with regional headquarters in Cape Town. Its target market is middle and upper class. Like Target A, Target B has no *de jure* language policy statement, but its public language is English, and prospective employees are examined on their spoken and written English competence. Employees are drawn from all over South Africa.

Target B yielded 10 respondents, all from clerical staff at the headquarters.

**Target C**

This is a large, national general retail company, targeting the middle income market. Its national headquarters are in the Cape Town area. Once again, there is no formal language policy; but employees are expected to demonstrate suitable competence in English (the level is dependent on the level at which they are employed). Most of the employees who answered the survey are from the Cape Town area.

Target C yielded 10 respondents: 2 clerical staff, and 3 floor managers and 5 tellers.

In addition to these targets, I also approached an insurance company, and another retail company. Neither had a formal language policy; but both were opposed to the idea of an English-only language policy, despite English being the public language and language of official communication of both. Since both denied that English was the *de facto* language policy (indeed, the insurance company claimed that the management fosters a multicultural and multilingual environment), I did not approach the staff.
Procedure
The distribution of questionnaires and/or the soliciting of interviews were obtained by telephonically contacting the human resources department or personnel division of the target concerned, and requesting permission for access to the staff. The initial telephone contact was also an opportunity to find out something about the target's profile and its language policies and practices (q.v.). The questionnaire was handed over to the head of this division, who sent or faxed it to Head Office or a superior before permission was granted.

HR personnel were reluctant to grant me direct access to their staff, for two (given) reasons: that the staff are busy, and for reasons of 'building security'. However, once the questionnaires had been completed, some staff were interested to know more, and were willing to discuss the document, and, with the exception of Target B, this was allowed. These extra 'interviews' took place informally, and on the spur of the moment, when I went to fetch the completed questionnaires. Some of the questionnaires were done orally: I asked the questions, and noted the responses. This method yielded far more information than the drop-and-collect method, as respondents are more willing to offer verbal than written information.

The questionnaire
Refer to Questionnaire, p.188 (Appendix A).

Although some of the questions (notably, QQ 7 and 9) were adapted from Gal's (1979) study of language shift in Oberwart, the motivation for asking them is slightly different. My aim is to establish the degree to which English dominates the respondents' higher domains, and/or is infiltrating their lower domains of language use, particularly in the home environment.

The first three questions solicit general information about the respondent's language use. Question 1 establishes the
respondent's first or home language (L1): it is a prerequisite for participation in the study that this be an African language, though 2 Afrikaans L1 speakers participated at their own request. Questions 2 and 3 establish a general overview of English usage inside and outside the workplace.

Questions 4 and 5 are complementary; they establish the respondent's attitude to the schools' language policy (see Ch. 1) and identify the language choice the respondent would make on his/ her children's behalf. Question 6 is aimed at those respondents who already have children at school, to find out the medium that is being used for their education.

Question 7 solicits information about the respondent's actual linguistic choices in their use of the Media domain. It is formulated to ascertain whether the respondent's language choice in this domain differs according to whether the function of a particular media item is in the higher domains (e.g. news) or the lower domains (e.g. entertainment). It is important to note that, as demonstrated in Chapter 2, some aspects of the media—particularly, television and the print media—are so heavily dominated by English that it is difficult to find quality content matter in the indigenous languages. However, the media is an important domain because of its dual function of providing information and entertainment, and also because all languages are catered for in some way in this domain. Thus, Question 8 invites the respondent to state whether s/he feels that there is a free choice in this domain.

Question 9 establishes the respondent's linguistic behaviour in a variety of high and low domain situations. This is to establish his or her degree of domain specificity; and also to see whether there are signs of domain intrusion in either direction. If the respondent's linguistic behaviour is domain specific, a clear delineation between the higher domains (exclusive use of English) and the lower domains (exclusive use of L1) would be evident. If
there are early signs of language shift, they would be evident in the use of English in the lower domains (q.v.); and signs of additive bilingualism, which were not expected from this survey, would be evident in the use of L1 in the higher domains. In order to prevent confusion, the question is phrased as 'Which language dominates interaction...?', to avoid personal conversations conducted in L1 being included here. Unfortunately, this means that work-related L1 conversations with colleagues are excluded as well; but it must be borne in mind that the companies/institutions targeted use a de facto English-only policy in the workplace.

Question 10 is included to establish the linguistic environment of the area in which the respondent lives. This would impact on the respondent's language behaviour or choices when interacting with neighbours, and, to some extent, strangers. Signs of potential language shift would be evident in the use of English among neighbours in a Xhosa dominated area, for example; while the use of English among neighbours in an English dominated area would be less significant\(^48\).

Question 11 is included only to provide some background information about the respondent's own medium of instruction, and to see how this compares with the linguistic choice s/he would make for his/her children.

Questions 12-14 ask the respondent to evaluate his/her own proficiency in English, and compare this with his/her proficiency in L1. Thus, the respondent rates his/her overall English proficiency (Q. 12), as well as his/her area of greatest proficiency in English (Q. 13). In Question 14, the respondent rates his/her English ability against his/her L1 ability in

\(^{48}\) Naturally, the role of the respondent's social network is important in his/her interactions with friends and neighbours. Even in a Xhosa dominated area, for example, a particular individual may prefer to interact with English-speaking neighbours; but, if this is a case, it could be evidence of language shift taking place within a whole region.
terms of basic communication skills (speaking and listening) and academic or cognitive skills (reading and writing). Given the educational background of almost all of the respondents (ex DET), and in accordance with current linguistic theory49, I expected that they would rate their English proficiency as better than L1 in academic/ cognitive skills, and as worse than L1 in basic communication skills.

Question 15 gives the respondent an opportunity to offer further information and opinion. Few gave written responses here, which is unfortunate, because this section can change the whole face of the questionnaire answers. For example, one respondent whose answers make it seem as though she approves of English dominance in the workplace, answered Q. 15 in block capitals: SOME OF THE SUPERVISORS CAN LEARN XHOSA.

Oral answers to this question were far easier to elicit, and are almost always significant.

The data

QUESTION 1: WHAT IS YOUR FIRST/ HOME LANGUAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XHOSA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZULU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTHO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSONGA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the prerequisite for participation, none of the respondents' home language/ L1 is English. By far, the majority of the respondents were L1 Xhosa speakers, with Sotho, Zulu, Tsonga and Afrikaans also represented.

QUESTION 2: TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU USE ENGLISH IN THE WORKPLACE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the targets chosen were organisations which employed a de facto English-only language policy, most of the respondents answered OFTEN or ALWAYS. One respondent, from Target C, answered NEVER. He is in charge of stocking, and of more menial workers who do not liase with the public and so do not require a high proficiency in English. This is a general question, and so could include interactions between colleagues who share a language other than English. Many respondents do find occasion to converse in a language other than English at work, though these occasions are somewhat limited by the language policy.

Some respondents claim that, while they have ample opportunity to converse in a language other than English at work, they are considered rude by colleagues who do not share that language if they do so. Due to a number of factors, especially the education system and the company's employment prerequisites, English is the shared language of all the employees, and so most conversations, particularly on work related matters, are carried out in English.
QUESTION 3: TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU USE ENGLISH OUTSIDE THE WORKPLACE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary aim of this question is to establish a general picture of the extent to which English is domain specific for the respondents. Thus, if a respondent claims to use English OFTEN in the workplace, but SELDOM or NEVER outside of it, then it is evident that English is only really associated with that aspect of the respondent's life, and is domain-specific for that person. If a language is domain-specific, then a person has no opportunity or reason to use it outside the workplace. If, however, a respondent also uses English OFTEN outside the workplace, it means that s/he has reason or need to use it in other domains as well.

A clear majority of the respondents indicate that they use English SOMETIMES outside the workplace. This suggests that, while their use of English is not confined to the workplace, it is not necessarily a widespread feature of their activities outside of the workplace, either. However, because the respondents work at a fairly high level in the company, it is likely that their work is only one of many high domain activities in their lives. This is borne out by the fact that a significant minority (over a third) of the respondents claim to use English OFTEN outside the workplace. For these respondents, extensive use of English is not limited to the workplace, but is also useful for many other domains outside of it. It is necessary to compare these results with those of Questions 7 and 9 (q.v.), to examine the extent of their English usage.
QUESTION 4: IN WHAT LANGUAGE WOULD YOU LIKE YOUR CHILDREN TO
LEARN IN SCHOOL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1°</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; L1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (would) choose English as the medium for their children's education. The most common reason given for this choice is that English is the international language of opportunity, business and computers. Moreover, it is the 'common language [for] all cultures'; one that can be understood by 'people who do not share my culture' and 'even illiterate people in rural areas' (Appendix B).

It is significant that English was chosen by such a large majority of respondents. Although a bilingual approach was not offered on the questionnaire, few people opted to suggest one, even those who had offered multiple answers to other questions. Indeed, when I suggested this to one of the respondents (A5), she said that Xhosa gets in the way of her child's English studies, 'and then it's hard to express in any language.' Certainly, there is little support for a mother tongue approach; and some respondents would even like to see the mother tongue phased out sooner than the current level of Grade 4.

°L1 here encompasses all the indigenous languages, excluding Afrikaans.
Only two respondents (C2 and C10) indicated that they were for L1 instruction in schools. Both of them expressed grievances at seeing their home language excluded from domains such as education (see Appendix B), and being dominated by English.

QUESTION 5: EXPLANATIONS FOR QUESTION 4: ‘PLEASE EXPLAIN BRIEFLY WHY’ (SEE APPENDIX B)

Of the 31 respondents, 30 answered this question. In sum, the respondents feel strongly that English is a beneficial language for their children to learn, for its widespread practicality both nationally and internationally. Most point to its application as an international lingua franca, and view it as a language essential to cope with the modern world. All the respondents' answers are summarised on p.154, and are contained separately in Appendix B.

QUESTION 6: IN WHAT LANGUAGE ARE YOUR CHILDREN BEING TAUGHT AT SCHOOL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; L1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question is academic, and intended for comparison with the answer to Question 4. Most of the respondents (who have children) are happy with the status quo, but would prefer to see English introduced at an earlier stage.

51 Interestingly, this child's L1 is not Afrikaans, but Xhosa.
52 This is the child's L1.
53 English and Afrikaans (respondent's L1 is Afrikaans).
Currently, a child's medium of instruction depends on two factors (see Ch. 2): the type of school attended; and the grade level the child studies at. Most private and former Model C schools offer English or Afrikaans as sole medium, while most former DET schools maintain the mother tongue policy to Grade 4, when the medium of instruction switches to English.

The children of both the parents of the children undergoing education in L1 are Xhosa-speaking. This suggests that they are still in primary school. Unfortunately, the respondents pooled are generally quite young, so only half of them have children (of school-going age).

**QUESTION 7: IN WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU READ/ LISTEN TO THE FOLLOWING [MEDIA]**

This question is divided into seven subquestions, each reflecting a different aspect of the media, and belonging to a relatively high or low domain of language use. The data for each subquestion is analysed separately. News (both on radio and TV, and in newspapers) and informational reading are regarded as belonging to relatively higher domains, and magazines, radio and TV entertainment and leisure reading are regarded as belonging to relatively lower domains of language use.
NEWS: RADIO/TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; L1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;54&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;55&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was some diversity of opinion here, but a significant number of respondents (1/3) opted to listen to the news in English on radio and TV. Even though the questionnaire does not give English and L1 together as an option, many of the respondents gave a multiple answer to this question. However, most of the respondents said that they would prefer to receive the news in L1, but choose English because it is more widely and regularly available than any other language, with longer and more informative broadcasts. Furthermore, CNN and BBC World, which are comprehensive foreign news channels, broadcast extensively outside of regular broadcast hours, and only in English.

Many respondents stipulated that they listen to the news in Xhosa (L1) on the radio, but listen to English broadcasts on TV. They point out that it is considerably more difficult to find news in Xhosa on the television. Indeed, there is only one broadcast every alternate day<sup>56</sup>. Xhosa news broadcasts alternate daily with Zulu, with the Sunday broadcast being shared by both (which could account for those who watch Xhosa and Zulu news!).

<sup>54</sup> Zulu; Xhosa and Zulu.
<sup>55</sup> Xhosa and Zulu.
<sup>56</sup> This excludes the short bulletin at 6pm on the show Cape at Six, which airs in Xhosa every Monday and Wednesday.
This contrasts with English news broadcasts, which occur five times daily (2 half hour broadcasts, and 3 headline bulletins of approximately 5 minutes each.) (TV Talk March 2000).

Thus, I doubt whether choices made for the medium in which the respondents receive the news are entirely free. Certainly, there is not an equal choice.

**NEWS: NEWSPAPERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; L1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of respondents choose English medium newspapers, with no respondents at all choosing to read newspapers only in L1. An interesting (and important) factor here is the 'shareability' of newspapers; several people read one newspaper, and do not have to buy their own. Availability is another key point; most of these respondents are in an English or Afrikaans dominated area during the time when shops are open, and, if they do buy or read a newspaper, it is almost invariably in English. Another respondent claims that 'Xhosa news sheets don't have enough news'.

There are no large-circulation daily newspapers catering for the indigenous language market. Two large-circulation weekly newspapers exist for the Xhosa and Zulu speaking markets: these are *Imvo Zabatsundu* and *Ilanga* respectively. These newspapers
have a somewhat lower readership than the large circulation English newspapers targeted specifically at the African population (e.g. *Sowetan, City Press*) (Fourie & Claasen 1995:339).

### MAGAZINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; L1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, most of the respondents choose to buy English language magazines; not only because of their wider availability, but also because of their content. As one respondent said, 'Xhosa magazines don't give all the news, but still cost extra.'

There are relatively few indigenous language magazines available; and, with the exception of *Bona*, which is published in different language editions (English, Xhosa, Zulu and Sotho), few are published in one particular language. Rather, a single publication utilises a variety of languages (Fourie & Claasen 1995:339).
### RADIO & TV ENTERTAINMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; L1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of respondents who watch television for entertainment in their L1 only is rather minimal, but to be expected, considering the relative unavailability of L1 programming. With the exception of respondents from target C, relatively few chose television entertainment in English only, indicating some desire to watch television in their L1. A significant number of respondents watch programmes in both English and L1. Once more, however, the choice is not equal-- see Ch. II for the relative programming details.

A common complaint among the respondents is that most of the Xhosa/ L1 programmes are children's programmes or educational documentaries; while dramas, etc. purported to be multilingual contain only a few words of Xhosa or Zulu. However, many feel that, since 'everybody can understand English' it is good to have English programmes, so that 'everybody can watch'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; L1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH &amp; AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This subquestion yields a similar result to the one before it. Few respondents listen to sports programmes/ commentaries in L1 alone, while nearly half of them opt for English only. A large number of the respondents choose to watch/ listen to sport in both English and L1. It must be pointed out, however, that commentary or presentation languages in South Africa are often sports-specific. Thus, while soccer commentary is widely available in the 'larger' indigenous official languages, rugby and cricket are largely restricted to English and sometimes Afrikaans. Indigenous language commentary is, however, restricted to 'home': i.e., matches between local teams, or in which the national team is a competitor. Otherwise, English tends to be the default choice for sports commentary.
Responses to this question show the usual pattern of English dominance, with L1 choices in the minority. There appears to be a similar problem to that experienced with radio and TV entertainment: novels and other leisure reading material are not very widely available (see Q. 8); and, when they are, they tend to be more concerned with children's books and basic education than with entertainment.

The great majority of respondents do their informational reading through the medium of English. Interestingly, almost everyone I spoke to connected informational reading with computer literacy.
and computer manuals, which they say are not available in any language but English. Many say that, with the exception of their Xhosa grammar texts, they have never even seen a textbook or manual in Xhosa. Moreover, the companies they work for have a de facto English only language policy, and only publish their pamphlets and other information in English.

QUESTION 8: DO YOU FEEL THAT THE ABOVE [I.E. QUESTION 7] RESOURCES IN YOUR HOME LANGUAGE ARE LIMITED IN ANY OF THE ABOVE DOMAINS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question yielded a somewhat surprising result. Although I expected most of the respondents to feel that media resources for the indigenous languages were in limited supply, I did not expect that so many would feel that L1 resources are not limited. Target B contrasts with the others: most of the respondents from target B felt that L1 resources were limited, as opposed to less than half from the others. There were a variety of comments on this issue, many of which dealt with the availability of resources. Others felt that certain domains are better served by English, and need not be resourced in Xhosa. This suggests that among this sample at least the dominance of English over the higher domains is hegemonic to some degree (see Appendix B, §2).

QUESTION 9: WHICH LANGUAGE DOMINATES INTERACTION IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF YOUR LIFE?

The degree to which somebody's linguistic behaviour or choices are domain specific can be ascertained by observing which language or code s/he chooses in a specific situation. A clear choice distinction between high and low functions would indicate that a person's linguistic behaviour is domain specific-- i.e., s/he uses one language for high domain situations, and another
for low domain situations. However, this may not be so much a matter of choice as of necessity. If one is unable to use one's L1/ home language in a particular domain, one will have to acquire a language for that domain in order to participate in it.

The questionnaire does not give respondents any direct scope to cite two languages (eg both English and L1) as dominating a particular domain. There are two reasons for this:

Firstly, to cite e.g. both English and L1 would imply an equal use of both languages; and I find this doubtful. Moreover, I am interested in the respondents' perception of which language is dominant in any particular domain.

Secondly, in a previous study in which I participated, I found that respondents tend to furnish responses which they think the interviewer wants or expects. In this case, the dominant language of teacher-pupil interaction outside the classroom situation was being examined. Teachers were given the option of English, Xhosa or English and Xhosa; and I received a blanket response of English and Xhosa, even though my own observations and conversations with teachers indicated that this was unlikely.

This does not mean that there are no cases in which a respondent may use English and another language in roughly equal proportion in a particular domain. However, by giving them a one-or-the-other choice, their perception of which language is used more often in a particular domain will be highlighted. The possibility of respondents answering that e.g. 'both English and L1' dominate a particular domain, when the truth is that one of them is used more often than the other, is excluded.

Some respondents who perceived their use of two languages to be equal in a particular domain gave a multiple response, circling both English and Xhosa. These have been included under OTHER here, and the fact indicated.
The first two subquestions deal with language use in the domain of religion. (Organised) religion has two aspects, one public (high domain), and one private (low domain). Thus, both aspects are considered.

### RELIGION: SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RELIGION: PRIVATE PRAYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of those who responded to this question indicated that they use their L1 for both the public and private aspects of religion—i.e., the language for both the high and low domain aspects of religion is the same. This can be accounted for by the fact that the public aspect of religion is organised in a way that the other high domains are not, so that they are able to cater for all languages, without reliance on a lingua franca. Thus, while some segregated communities had very few high domain activities (like businesses, banks, etc.), most had established churches. Moreover, some of the churches were segregated under apartheid-like laws, and de facto still retain much of this identity. There is little correlation between those who cite the predominant language of their neighbourhoods as English (Q10), and those who attend religious services in English. This suggests that there is a wider and freer language choice in this
domain than in other high domain activities. Among those who answered this question, private prayer is almost exclusively conducted through the medium of L1. Only two respondents claim to pray in English.

FAMILY: LANGUAGE DOMINATING INTERACTION WITH OLDER GENERATIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAMILY: LANGUAGE DOMINATING INTERACTION WITH SAME GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAMILY: LANGUAGE DOMINATING INTERACTION WITH YOUNGER GENERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses regarding linguistic behaviour or choices in interactions with family members show an interesting and largely expected pattern. None of the respondents claim to use English

57 Although I did not specify age on the questionnaire, I requested the HR personnel to confine the age of participants as far as possible to between 25 and 40. Most of the respondents were indeed of this age group, or even younger. Thus, 'older generation' implies >50 years of age, and 'younger generation' implies <20 years of age, approximately.
regularly in their interactions with older family members; the L1 is used. However, there are some among the respondents who use English regularly to communicate with family members around the same age as themselves, and this number increases significantly (to more than a third of the respondents) when it comes to communicating with family members of younger generations. This indicates that there is a significant increase in the degree to which the younger generation of indigenous language L1 speakers use English in low domain environments, relative to the same generation as the respondents. This is indirectly due to the dismantling of apartheid, and the opening up of higher domain participation (e.g., in commerce, government, etc.) to people of all races. Many older people have been denied the opportunity to participate in these domains, as well as access to good education and the English language. People also have a greater degree of choice in some of the lower domains.

The fact that many of the respondents cited L1 as the dominant medium of interaction with family members of all generations shows that there is a large amount of variation within families. The distribution among the target groups is quite even: roughly the same proportion of each group uses English when speaking with family members. It should be noted that the family's location and circumstance have a lot to do with this 'choice'. Family members from rural areas are less likely to have access to or need for English, and are therefore less likely to have competence in it. Urban family members, however, have more need for and access to English, and therefore are in a better position to acquire competence in English. Thus, much depends on the context, or the domains in which (particular) family members are active. For this reason, some of the respondents found this question a difficult one to answer, as the family is split between rural and urban settings, and by distance. One
respondent summed up the situation: 'Here it's English, always English. But in Transkei [where her parents and much of her family live] it's always Xhosa, because they don't have school, they don't know English' (C9).

FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents are Xhosa L1 speakers, working in an English-dominated environment. Thus, within the workplace alone, they have a choice of developing social networks with both an English and Xhosa competence. Responses to this question show that a significant number of respondents in two of the target groups use English as the dominant language in their interactions with friends. Indeed, the proportion of those who use English predominately with their friends is nearly equal to the proportion of those who claim L1 dominance in their interactions with friends. This is not to say that English or L1 is the exclusive language of this domain for the respondents. Rather, it is the respondent's perception of which language is most often used.

Respondents' answers to this question are constrained by the linguistic competence/ performance of his/ her social group. If all one's friends are, for example, Xhosa-speaking with limited competence in English, one has little choice but to use Xhosa in conversation with them. Likewise, it is possible that a respondent's group of friends is generally not competent in that respondent's L1, and so s/he is limited in the choice of language.
in which s/he can converse with them. There is no significant
correlation (for these respondents) between the dominant language
of the area in which they live (Q10) and the language which
dominates the Friends domain.

The respondents who answered 'Other' to this question fall into
two groups: those who claim English and Xhosa as both dominating
the 'Friends' domain; and those whose L1 is not Xhosa, and who
cite their L1 and English as dominating this domain.

I asked two of the respondents who cited both English and Xhosa
as dominating this domain whether their answer represented two
distinct groups of friends. One emphatically denied this, saying
she and her friends 'talk in Xhosa and English all the time'.
The other laughingly said that her friends wouldn't understand
each other, because one (group) speaks English and the other
speaks Xhosa.

Only one of the respondents whose L1 is not Xhosa cites Xhosa as
the dominant language of the Friends domain; all the rest cited
English and their L1. This is a micro demonstration of the
usefulness of English as a *lingua franca* in the higher domains of
language use in South Africa: somebody who does not know the
regional indigenous language can still operate in that region,
through the medium of English. Also, people whose L1 is not a
Nguni language may find it easier in the Western Cape to converse
through the medium of English. One respondent feels that 'people
don't judge harshly when your English is bad, but if your Xhosa
is bad, they don't want to like you' (C9).
### TEACHERS/ LECTURERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all the respondents reported that English is the dominant medium of interaction with teachers and lecturers. The question was intended to refer to their own education, but many respondents interpreted it as referring to their children's teachers. The result was expected, and indeed is consistent with the fact that the South African education system is heavily dominated by English. Even if a teacher's L1 is not English, it is very likely that s/he would have undergone his/ her training in English, and that s/he has to teach through the medium of English.

### SUPERIORS AT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHOSA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBORDINATES AT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1(^{55})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{58}\) Afrikaans.

\(^{59}\) Including Afrikaans, where this is the respondent's L1.
Because all of the targets chosen employ a de facto English only language policy, it was to be expected that most respondents would cite English for both questions. All work-related matters are dealt with in English, whether the interlocutor is superior or subordinate to an individual. Very few respondents cited a language other than English here, which is in keeping with the policy of their employers.

**POLICE/ GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHOSA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a certain degree of bilingual competence is still required by the civil service\(^{60}\), the governmental high domains remain under a de facto English-only policy. This is reflected in the responses to this subquestion: almost 4% of the respondents choose English as the medium in which to address police and government representatives. It should be noted, however, that many civil servants were employed under the previous government, which required only English and Afrikaans competency as prerequisites for employment, and not competency in any of the indigenous SA languages. Thus, an individual may well be constrained by the linguistic competence of the official s/he is dealing with.

\(^{60}\) Actually, the de facto truth of this is debatable. LANGTAG’s report on Language in the Public service (Ch. 6 of Language in South Africa, on the Dept of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology website) recommends that ‘multilingual staff should [be] utilised for ordinary purposes in the running of a public service agency’; which, along with the stated ‘trend towards unilingual practice’ implies that, at present, multilingualism in governmental domains is not a priority.
Interaction with neighbours is another low domain language activity. I expected the responses to this section to be more similar to those under the 'Family' subquestion. However, the respondents, particularly those from Target B show that there is a significantly greater use of English in their interactions with neighbours of all generations than with family. An important factor here is the dominant language of the area in which the respondent lives (see Question 10), as the choice of language in which to converse with neighbours is of course constrained by the linguistic repertoire of the neighbours. There is little indication that there is increased use of English (in Xhosa-dominated neighbourhoods) in interactions with neighbours of

### NEIGHBOURS: LANGUAGE DOMINATING INTERACTION WITH OLDER GENERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEIGHBOURS: LANGUAGE DOMINATING INTERACTION WITH SAME GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEIGHBOURS: LANGUAGE DOMINATING INTERACTION WITH YOUNGER GENERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
younger generations, as there is in interactions with friends and family. Overall, however, the proportion of English usage in interactions with neighbours of all generations corresponds closely with the proportion for interactions with family members of younger generations, and friends.

**STRANGERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This subquestion yields one of the most interesting results. It indicates that most of the respondents do not assume that a stranger has competence in L1; rather, they assume competence in English. It is considered more polite (in an urban setting) to address a stranger in English than in Xhosa, so that embarrassment is avoided if the stranger does not speak Xhosa. There are some other constraints on this subquestion, however. For example, a Xhosa-speaking person is unlikely to address a European- or Coloured-looking person in Xhosa, because it is unlikely that a non-Black person is able to speak Xhosa. Moreover, in most contexts, it is safe to assume that a Black person has some competence in English (C8).

**QUESTION 10: WHAT IS THE DOMINANT LANGUAGE OF THE AREA IN WHICH YOU LIVE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XHOSA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question was primarily included for comparison with the subquestions 'Religion', 'Family', 'Friends', 'Neighbours' and 'Strangers' under Question 9. With the exception of the 'Neighbours' subquestion (see above), correlation is minimal (indeed, the relationship between area language and the 'Friends' subquestion is inverse for Target B!). This indicates that the language dominating the area of residence does not play a large role in determining which language dominates various interactions, and shows the large role played by English, even in the lower domains of many of the respondents' lives.

QUESTION 11: WHAT LANGUAGE WERE YOU TAUGHT IN AT SCHOOL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER 61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question is academic, and was included to compare the respondents' own educational experience with what they (would) choose for their children. Most cited a combination of L1 (in the earlier grades) and English, which was the standard policy of the former DET and still persists, at least in practice, in most South African schools.

QUESTION 12: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR OVERALL ENGLISH ABILITY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLUENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUGGLE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61 Including mixes of English & L1, English & Afrikaans, and English, Afrikaans & L1.
This question requires the respondents to draw upon their own perceptions of their overall English competence, and to rate themselves on a scale. A significant number rated themselves 'fluent'; by which one expects that they consider their English competence to be near their L1 ability (this is corroborated by their responses to Q14). Relatively few respondents (less than 4) rated themselves below the level of 'good', with only one respondent claiming to 'struggle' with English.

Because the companies/organisations the respondents work for require a certain level of English ability, these results were not altogether unexpected. However, I did expect more people to have rated themselves good to fair. This expectation was based partly on my experience with the people I spoke to about the questionnaire, and some conversations I had with the supervisors about the level of English required by, and spoken at, the company/organisation (see p.117ff).

QUESTION 13: IN WHICH OF THESE AREAS IS YOUR ENGLISH ABILITY BEST?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTENING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was formulated with a specific expectation in mind: that the respondents' performance in reading and writing would generally be better--and perceived by themselves as better--than their performance in speaking and listening (cf p.37ff). Some respondents offered multiple answers to this question, which has skewed the results a little. They still show an interesting result, however. Overall, almost the same proportion of respondents claim that their English reading, writing and
speaking skills are best; while relatively few rated their listening skills as best. While it is to be expected, for reasons already given, that most of the respondents would rate their academic skills (reading and writing) as best, it is odd that so many rated their speaking skills (a basic communicative skill) as best.

This can perhaps be accounted for by the fact that many of the respondents are employed in jobs that require a lot of liaison with the public, by a company/organisation whose public language is English. In general, however, research shows that listening and speaking skills are linked (see p.35), so one would expect that ratings for listening and speaking skills would correspond more closely.

**QUESTION 14: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR ENGLISH ABILITY AGAINST YOUR HOME LANGUAGE ABILITY IN TERMS OF READING, WRITING, LISTENING, SPEAKING?**

**READING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETTER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRITING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETTER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question expands upon and qualifies Question 13, this time requesting respondents to evaluate their perceived English ability against their perceived home language ability in terms of their academic language skills (reading and writing), and their basic communicative language skills (speaking and listening). Again, this question was formulated with a clear expectation in mind: i.e., that the respondents would rate their academic language skills better for English than L1, and their basic communicative language skills better for L1 than for English.

Very few of the respondents rated their English performance in any skill as worse than their L1 performance in that skill. A large number of respondents rated all their language skills as the same for both English and L1. This suggests that they do not experience, or perceive, any difference between their linguistic performance in L1 and English.
QUESTION 15: OTHER COMMENTS

There were some significant comments to this section from the respondents. For the most part, these dealt with issues raised in the questionnaire, and have been mentioned under the question or subquestion involved. Another key issue raised is the perception that English is being promoted at the expense of the indigenous African languages of South Africa. One respondent from Target B (B5) expressed this as follows:

'I do love English, but I think it's time we promote our African languages, as we are starting to miss the link.'

However, some view the dominance of English over the indigenous languages as a necessary sacrifice: one respondent (C8) said that '[people] should not try to cling to their mother tongue, English can give us unity.'

One of the ways in which the dominance of English over the higher domains of language use impacts on the lower domains is in its effect on the L1 of some speakers. Most of the respondents spend a substantial part of the day (8 hours or more) in an English-speaking environment. Such an environment exercises all linguistic skills, and an individual may reach a point at which s/he uses English, the L2, more often than L1. This happens especially when English is also used in some of the lower domains.

Several of the respondents have experienced this: whereas their L1 used to be a dominant feature of their lives, they now find themselves using it less and less often. Respondent B6 sums this up succinctly in her answer to Q. 15:

'In terms of rating my home language against English. Having spent most of my life in a diversified (sic) environment, I would say I am finding it easy (sic) to communicate with English than with my language. My ability
to use [my] language in all respects, should it be reading, etc., has decreased.'

This demonstrates that some respondents are showing signs of undergoing language shift. Where their language repertoire used to be domain specific, they are starting to use one language (English) for all domains. However, only a few respondents showed such clear signs; whether or not there is a general trend among the respondents toward using English will only be ascertained by their future linguistic choices and behaviour. There is still a choice in the lower-domain environments between English and L1; it is evident, though, that where this choice exists (i.e., when both or all participants in an interaction are competent in L1 and in English, English is often the chosen code for that interaction.

**Synthesis**

The original aim of this study was to assess the difference (if any) between people's linguistic choices and behaviour in the higher and lower domains of language use in a South African context. However, it is evident that, in the South African situation, the language one uses in a particular domain often has little to do with choice. Within the higher domains, one's linguistic 'choice' is often constrained by the language policy, formal or not, effective in those domains. And, within the lower domains, there is a similar constraint on choice: in this case, it is dependent on the linguistic repertoire of the interlocutor.

The data clearly shows the extent to which English dominates the higher domains in which the respondents are active. In the first instance, the language of the workplace is English. This is not a choice: employees must be competent users of English, as this is the language of the company/organisation. The extent to
which the respondents use English in other higher domains can be summarised from the data as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN/ SUBDOMAIN</th>
<th>% ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO &amp; TV NEWS</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63.3)(^{63})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSPAPERS</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATIONAL READING</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGIOUS SERVICES</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTIONS:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS/ LECTURERS</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERIORS AT WORK</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBORDINATES AT WORK</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICE &amp; GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4.1: % ENGLISH USAGE IN HIGH DOMAIN ACTIVITIES**

This shows that most of the higher domains are thoroughly dominated by English. The question is, however, the extent to which this is a hegemonic domination-- i.e., do the respondents have a choice in the language which dominates these domains? To examine the selected domains and subdomains in more detail:

- As the data suggests, there is some choice in the language in which one can receive news via the radio and television (see p.128). However, news bulletins in English are much more extensive and widely available than in any of the other official languages. Overall, the respondents showed a preference for receiving the news in L1 if possible.

---

62 Although the media as a whole usually constitutes a high domain of language use, I consider the news and informational media to be a relatively higher domain than entertainment media.

63 The figure in brackets includes those who indicated a preference for both English and L1.
• The extremely high number of respondents who read newspapers in English is a likely reflection of the lack of availability of indigenous language newspapers. There is no wide-scale circulation Xhosa-medium newspaper in the Western Cape, of the calibre of the wide-scale English and Afrikaans medium newspapers. Thus, the respondents have little choice in this matter.

• According to the respondents (and my own efforts), there is virtually no informational reading material, apart from basic education, available in the indigenous languages. Thus, a free language choice cannot be claimed for this subdomain.

• Most of the established Churches are active in Xhosa-dominated areas, and offer religious services in Xhosa. There is some choice for this domain, and the respondents show a clear preference for L1.

• Almost all of the respondents cite English as the medium with which they communicate with teachers and/or lecturers. This 'choice' could be influenced by the fact that, because of the national education systems language policies, the subject material is highly likely to be in English; so, even if one's L1 is the same as the teacher's, any discussion of the subject will probably be in English.

• Because the language of the workplace is English, it is to be expected that the respondents converse with their superiors in English, particularly in an official capacity. This is not a free choice. Similarly, any (official) communication between a respondent and a subordinate will take place in English. It should be noted, however, that all the targets draw their employees from a variety of language backgrounds, and English serves a very useful purpose as a lingua franca.

• More than 2/3 of the respondents address police and government representatives in English; the remainder choose either Afrikaans or Xhosa. The availability of a choice of which

---

64 This fact would support the claim that 'language [is] a medium of culture' (Alexander 1989:37), as this is the only domain in which respondents consistently choose to use L1.
language one can use to address police or government representatives depends to some extent on the language dominating a particular area—i.e., one is more likely to find a police officer competent in Xhosa in an area in which Xhosa is the (numerically) dominant language. It appears from the data that most of the respondents prefer to use their English competency when addressing police and government representatives.

It is clear, then, that most of these respondents' high domain activities are dominated by English, and that, in most cases, there is little choice as to the language they can use in a particular domain. It is not only the respondents' actual linguistic behaviour that is important, though, but their attitudes towards English and their L1 as well.

Two of the questionnaire questions were included specifically to assess some of the respondents' attitudes to their language use, and the situations which bring this about. These were:

- Question 5: the respondents' attitude toward the language choice they would make for their children's education; and
- Question 8: the respondents' attitudes to the availability of L1 resources in the media subdomains.
- Question 15 also gives respondents a chance to express any other attitudes they may have towards their language use.

The full texts of these responses are contained in Appendix B. However, the main issues can be summarised as follows.

Question 5 gives respondents an opportunity to elaborate upon the language, particularly the medium of instruction, choices they would make for their children. This also reveals a great deal about their attitudes to the English language itself, and its position in our society. The main points raised by the respondents were:
• English is a cross-cultural medium (A2, A4, A6, B3, C3, C6) and a language of wider communication (A4, B4, B5, B6, B10, C5), and is therefore beneficial for their children, as they will be able to communicate with people of other races and L1 groups.

• English is an international language of communication (A6, A7, A9, A11, B1, B2, B7, B8, C5) and a universal language (A5, C4); and will benefit their children by allowing them to understand people from all over the world, and to live and work outside of South Africa as well.

• English is the language of business (A3, A8, C1), and will help their children to get good jobs and be able to communicate in the business world.

• English is the national medium of instruction (A4, B1, B9, C5); thus, in order for children to do well at school, they must be good at English.

This reflects a generally positive attitude towards English, which is further reflected by the responses to Question 8. This question allows respondents to say whether they feel that media resources are limited for their L1, and to elaborate upon their answer. The most prevalent attitude was that L1 media resources are simply not available (except on radio); or, where they are available, they are not adequate. However, there is no attack on the dominance of English; it appears that the respondents view it as a language that makes up for the apparent shortcomings of their L1. This is evident in the fact that, even among those who criticise the lack of L1 resources, the role of English as a widely usable medium is praised.

Only one respondent (B5) speaks of the dominance of English as a factor contributing to loss of culture. Indeed, surprisingly little was said about this point. English is the respondents' first choice for their children's education, and they acclaim

65 Numbers in brackets indicate numbers assigned to individual respondents.
English as a national and international language of wider communication. Yet, there still seems to be a preference for at least an acknowledgement of their identities as speakers of an indigenous African language, which is highly reminiscent of the Irish people's attitudes to their language.

It is established that English holds sway over the high domain activities of the respondents; and it is evident that competence in English is a skill necessary for participation in the higher domains. For this pool of respondents, English is an important part of their linguistic repertoires, and indeed, of their everyday lives. But is their language use compartmentalised according to situation—i.e., is it domain specific? In order to determine this, the respondents' use of English must be weighed against their use of L1 in lower domain activities. These are set out in Questions 7 and 9 of the questionnaire, and the data from these questions can be summarised as follows:
While it cannot be claimed that English plays a dominant role in the lower domains of the respondents' language use, there is certainly evidence of a significant role. There is a somewhat higher degree of English dominance over the lower media domains. As already mentioned, language in the media is subject to availability, and English is much more widespread in all the media subdomains than any of the other official languages. There is very little indigenous language programming, compared with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN/ SUBDOMAIN</th>
<th>% ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGAZINES</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO &amp; TV ENTERTAINMENT</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADIO &amp; TV SPORT</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEISURE READING</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION: PRIVATE PRAYER</td>
<td>07.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIONS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY: OLDER GENERATIONS</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY: SAME GENERATION</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY: YOUNGER GENERATIONS</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOURS: OLDER GENERATIONS</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOURS: SAME GENERATION</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOURS: YOUNGER GENERATIONS</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRANGERS</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.2: % ENGLISH USE IN LOW DOMAIN ACTIVITIES

66 The figure in brackets includes those who cited English and Ll together.
67 As for footnote 66, above.
English. This pertains especially to the field of entertainment, which can run for days without a single entertainment programme (aimed at adults) in Xhosa (TV Talk March 2000). See also pp.17-21 and 28-29 for a fuller treatment of media resources in South Africa.

The extent of English in the respondents' other lower domains is somewhat lower than it is in the media domain. English is, however, a significant feature of many of the respondents' interactions with friends, family and neighbours. The extent of English in the latter two subdomains appears to be ordered by age. In the 'Family' subdomain, none of the respondents cited any use of English at all, when the interlocutor is a family member from an older generation. There is some use of English with family members of roughly the same age group, and fairly extensive use of English in interactions with family members of younger generations: over 1/3 of all respondents cite the dominance of English over interactions with this group.

The respondents' interactions with neighbours also show an increasing instance of English dominance with younger interlocutors; although this is largely dependent on the dominant language of the area in which the respondent lives. If the respondents who live in areas that are predominantly English are excluded, the instance of English dominating interactions with neighbours is drastically reduced. Taking this into account, the figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBOURS:</th>
<th>% ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLDER GENERATIONS</td>
<td>09.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAME GENERATION</td>
<td>09.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNGER GENERATION</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is only when the neighbour interlocutors are of the younger generation that there is any significant spread of English
dominance over these interactions. Thus, the choice of language used for interaction with neighbours is closely related to (or is even constrained by) the dominant language of the area (see p.143f).

The respondents' interactions with friends show the most instances of English dominance, with close to half of all respondents reporting that English is the dominant language of this subdomain. The diverse makeup of the workplace environment leads to diversity of social networks, and the need for the use of a lingua franca among friends who do not share the same Ll. There is some choice here, though the choice of language could be constrained by the linguistic repertoire of the interlocutor(s).

For this pool of respondents, chosen from a variety of similar (and representative) middle class work situations, the higher domains of language use are heavily dominated by English, and the lower domains are dominated by L1, with significant penetration of English into some of the lower subdomains. If English continues to play such a dominant role, language shift from the indigenous languages to English is a likely result; and there are some early signs of this in the data, as English intrudes into the lower domains; particularly, the family subdomain. In South Africa, as Chapter III demonstrates, English is a necessary skill-- or commodity-- for participation in the higher domains. It is therefore also a necessary part of the linguistic repertoire of anybody who wishes to participate in the higher domains, rather than a choice.

Choice plays only a limited role in the South African language situation. If an individual wishes to participate in the higher domains, s/he has no option but to acquire English if it is not his/ her home language. Thus, a South African builds up a linguistic repertoire of, for example, L1 + English for a
specific purpose, and not so that s/he can choose when to use each. To a large extent, and particularly in the higher domains of language use, this choice is already made. The real choice is whether or not to participate in a particular domain.

This does not augur well for the Constitutional directive to promote and extend the indigenous languages of South Africa. The status quo shows no sign of changing in the near future, and there seems to be little concern about the language issue. Indeed, one of the respondents suggested that studies such as this make an issue out of it. What, then, is a desirable outcome for language planners and policy makers in South Africa? There appears to be no attempt to stop the advance of English; rather, it is being encouraged. Among the respondents, access to English is a rather more important issue than the extension and promotion of the indigenous languages (cf. Appendix B).

The question, then, is whether the language planner's priority should be to ensure that all South Africans have access to English, and maintain the status quo, or whether steps should be taken to try and bring the indigenous languages up to the level of English, in terms of corpus development, status and prestige. Ideally, language planners should push for both of these outcomes through a programme of 'national additive bilingualism' (Luckett 1993), wherein every South African gains competency in the national lingua franca (English), and a regional (indigenous) language. Before this can be realised, however, the status and development imbalances between the two must be decreased.

The imbalance could be relieved in part by following the recommendations of the Working Group on Values in Education (see pp44-45). However, even this report makes no provision for the use of the indigenous languages as media of instruction. Indeed, it refers only to the benefits of an initial grounding in L1, and
skirts the issue of a possible dual medium approach. The dual medium approach is left out of the Report's recommendations on multilingualism in education, which in fact seems to be geared towards non-indigenous language speakers.

Chapter V examines these problems in more detail, against the results of the study presented in this chapter. In particular, the question of which method would be fairer, more beneficial for, and more acceptable to the people of South Africa, assuming that this pool of respondents is representative, is examined. Other practical considerations, such as cost and logistics (e.g. training of staff, etc.) are taken into account.
CHAPTER V: THE UNASSAILABLE POSITION OF ENGLISH

It is an indisputable fact that English dominates South Africa's linguistic culture at the expense of the indigenous languages, and that measures are in place to ensure that this continues. For example, the medium of instruction in most South African secondary schools is still English. This is despite the fact that a new Language Policy in Education has passed through the legislative process. The new policy, promulgated in July 1997 by then Minister of Education, Prof. Sibusisu Bengu, is 'tasked to promote multilingualism [and] the development of the official languages' (Statement by Prof SME Bengu, Minister of Education, on a new language policy in general and further education, Department of Education website). The only legislative requirement, however, is that:

The language(s) of learning and teaching be (an) official language(s).

Clearly, this leaves the way open for the status quo to continue, and the medium of instruction choice is left to the parents and learners/pupils. In the light of South Africa's history, and indeed the responses to Q5 in Chapter IV, it is unlikely that many schools currently offering English as medium of instruction will change to an indigenous language m.o.i. This is particularly true in urban areas, where such a policy would likely result in racially segregated education again.

This is the very definition of linguistic imperialism, according to Phillipson (1993:47): 'the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continual reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages'. In South Africa, this is manifested by the

68 In this context, Phillipson (1993:47) defines 'structural' as referring 'broadly to material properties (for example, institutions, financial allocations) and cultural to immaterial or ideological properties (for example, attitudes, pedagogic principles)'.

dominance of English over high, nationally relevant\textsuperscript{69} domains such as business, the media, Parliament and, above all, the education system. It is a crucial question for South African language planners whether this situation should be changed, to bring equality for other language groups, or whether it should be extended, so that social equality can be brought about by ensuring access to English for everybody.

\textbf{Consequences of Linguistic Imperialism}

The consequences of linguistic imperialism impact on two levels: firstly, on a language itself, and secondly, on that language's speech community. In South Africa, the exclusion of the indigenous languages from most high domain activities has resulted in their current state of relative underdevelopment, in terms of both corpus and status (see Ch. 2). Because the indigenous languages were excluded from domains such as Commerce, and Science and Technology, terminology required to cope with these domains has never been developed (or seen to be needed). This in turn leads to their lack of prestige and status, because they are perceived as functionally deficient.

\textbf{The road ahead: policy alternatives for South Africa}

\textit{Status quo: retention of English for all higher domains of language use}

There are arguments for and against an English-only approach, just as there are for and against a maintenance-and-development approach for the indigenous languages. These range from the purely ideological to the purely pragmatic. Phillipson (1993: Ch. 9) details some of the major arguments for the promotion of

\textsuperscript{69} By which I mean, relevant for all South Africans.
English as a high domain language. These are interrelated, and involve the power of English according to what it is, has and does. In the South African context, these arguments have been (and indeed, are being) used as follows:

- **English is:** a language of modernity, commerce, industry, science and technology, a vehicle for upliftment, a global language of wider communication, and a politically neutral language of national unity and liberation (Benjamin 1994:104; Mazrui & Mazrui 1998:114)
- **English has:** a rich and well-established literature, a large body of resources for all the domains listed above (functional adequacy), and an enormous global English teaching enterprise
- **English does:** fulfill the role of sole medium for virtually all the higher domains in South Africa, and is used as a medium to communicate internationally (Cf. Hartshorne 1995:316-317).

When weighed against the 'is, has, and does' of the indigenous languages, arguments of this nature seem particularly strong. By mentioning the strong points of the colonial language (English) and saying nothing about the indigenous languages, the indigenous languages are made to appear inferior by implication (Phillipson 1993:283). However, this ignores the potential of the indigenous languages to fulfill almost all the above roles, as indeed Afrikaans did, having itself been subjected to linguistic imperialism by English, in the earlier half of the 20th century. Through a programme of development, the indigenous languages could be equipped to become media for the higher domains of language use.

Arguments for the extension and promotion of the indigenous languages, so that they can become adequate media in the higher domains, tend to be based more on ideology (or, to use Laitin's (1992:51) term, psychology) than pragmatics. Thus, the wrongs of
the dominant language's speech community are often invoked, as are socioeconomic imbalances between the dominant and dominated language communities. Here, language is usually a secondary issue in a larger conflict. In South Africa, for example, the wrongs historically perpetrated by the English-speaking community, and the current imbalances between English-speaking and indigenous language communities are based on the country's history of racial oppression; with linguistic oppression being a (natural) consequence. However, with the demise of apartheid, linguistic imperialism is playing a larger role than racial imperialism in maintaining and furthering imbalances. Ironically, the new reliance on English as the national and international link language of South Africa could play a role in maintaining racial imbalances if the indigenous languages and their speech communities continue to be left out of the higher domains.

It will be necessary in the South African context to achieve a balance between ideology and pragmatics. The maintenance of English as the high domain language probably would be the cheapest—i.e., most pragmatically viable in terms of available resources and costs—but would maintain disadvantages in indigenous language communities. On the other hand, a development programme for the indigenous languages would be very expensive, and would impact at all levels of an already overburdened society. Many would consider such a programme of development ideologically ideal, but pragmatically, resources do not extend that far.

This leads to the argument that, because multilingualism is the norm in Africa (Laitin 1992:ix; Fardon & Furniss (eds) 1994:ix, 3), a programme of functional bilingualism, wherein individuals must acquire whatever language(s) is (are) necessary for the domains they wish to participate in, is the best solution. Under this model, the home language is just that; a language for use in the home and lower domains, and the dominant language is
'selected' for use in the higher domains. This is the model that is claimed as Africa's norm: an individual carries a linguistic repertoire as if it were a bag of tools, using one for one purpose, and another for another purpose.

But, to what extent is this the case in South Africa, and to what extent is it likely to remain the norm for the rest of Africa? The respondents in Chapter IV have two main languages in their linguistic repertoires: L1, mainly for use in the lower domains, and English, for use in the higher domains. Thus, they do use their language capability like a set of tools, selecting the one appropriate for the job at hand. However, what will happen if it is discovered that one of these tools functions equally well for all jobs? Are people going to use a variety of tools if one will do? The likely answer to this question is negative. There are already signs of English intrusion into the lower, or home, domains of many of the respondents. Moreover, the near complete loss of Irish70 as a language of everyday communication as well as a high domain medium suggests that, if only one language is necessary in a particular society, then people are more likely to acquire that alone than add an unnecessary one (See Chapter III). The Kenyan situation, too (see Ch. III, pp.95ff) shows a trend (among the elite and aspirant elite; which form a small but influential minority) away from domain specificity, toward one language that will suffice for all domains.

The historical multilingual norm that Laitin and others claim for Africa is perhaps a more natural language contact situation than the one South Africa and many other ex-colonies find themselves in. Thus, the idea of an individual using one language in the home, another in the marketplace, another in the city, another in the courts, and so on, is not a reality for South Africa. With the possible exception of those who live and work in Gauteng, an

70 This is by no means the only example; Laitin (1992:17) cites also the failed revival attempts of the (other) Celtic languages of the UK, Alsatian and the oc languages in France, and the Maithili language of India.
individual in South Africa has a basic choice of two codes: L1 or English. The one s/he 'chooses' will depend largely on the domain s/he is participating in at the time. The upshot of this situation is that, in order to have equal opportunities in the South African economy and job market, any individual who does not speak English as L1 must acquire it to a sufficient standard to participate in the higher domains.

This means that a L1 English speaker has a distinct advantage over the L2 English speaker. The advantage is twofold: firstly, the English L1 speaker will acquire a higher degree of competence sooner; and, secondly, will acquire English at no extra personal cost (in terms of money or effort). Furthermore, his/her English competency will develop in the natural, home environment, and not in the rather less natural environment of the classroom. Thus, even a language policy that ensures access to English for everybody through the education system will, to some extent, maintain an imbalance between L1 and L2 speakers of English. This creates an incentive not only for individuals to acquire English, but to transmit it as L1 to their children. Indeed, Vivian de Klerk’s (2000) study of Xhosa L1 children entering English medium schools around Grahamstown, Eastern Cape, found that there is a distinct preference among wealthier/more privileged Xhosa parents for their children to be educated through, and to acquire English, rather than Xhosa.

The extension and promotion of the indigenous languages
For decades, the indigenous languages of South Africa were used as a divisive political force, aimed at entrenching racial and tribal segregation in South Africa (Benjamin 1994:99). An unfortunate consequence of this is the resistance, even among indigenous language communities, to the recognition and promotion of these languages outside of the lower domains (Maake 1994:115).

If the indigenous languages are to serve as media in the higher domains, they will have to be developed through stringent
language planning measures. Their corpuses will have to be developed to make them lexically adequate for this new role, and the new forms (and the languages themselves) will have to be acceptable to the speech community for which the measures are intended. These processes are discussed in some detail in Chapter II (pp. 69ff.). This will be a costly and time-consuming exercise, at a time when indigenous language communities are demanding immediate economic and social advancement. Moreover, the memory of the apartheid regime's use of the differences between indigenous languages to divide and rule the people are still fresh, and English is still viewed as the one language of national unity in South Africa.

The unification question

Alexander (1989:64) advanced the possibility of standardising the indigenous languages into two main groups: Nguni, comprising Xhosa, Zulu, Ndebele and Swati, and Sotho, comprising South Sotho, Pedi and Tswana. Under the new language dispensation, such a plan could substantially reduce the cumbersome load of eleven official languages. This would mean that the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Mpumalanga and the Western Cape would all have much the same regional language policy (Nguni + English)\(^1\). The Northern Cape, Free State, North West and Northern Province would also share much the same regional language policy under this plan (Sotho + English)\(^2\). However, Gauteng and Mpumalanga's language distribution is so diverse that there will be no clear majority even after the implementation of this plan! This plan of standardisation is a long-term solution, if it finds acceptance, as the linguistic behaviour of a community cannot be changed overnight. There is, however, considerable doubt as to the acceptance of such a plan: Home Affairs Minister, Mangosotho Buthelezi, in a speech advocating unity in diversity in the first

\(^1\) However, the Western Cape would include Afrikaans-- i.e., it would ideally have a three language regional policy.

\(^2\) The Northern Cape also has a majority Afrikaans L1 population, so this would be catered for, as would the Free State's substantial
sitting of Parliament this year, described (in English) some of the differences between Xhosa and Zulu. He used the example *amanyanya*, which in Xhosa means 'ancestors' and in Zulu means 'sperms'! Mutasa (1990:2, cited in Msimang 1993:34) echoes this sentiment:

...prescribing the vocabulary to the people would be a futile exercise. There are great odds against their success in that determining the vocabulary in areas where dialects are...distinct like in Zimbabwe arouses consciousness, disenchantment and hostility, which culminates in tribalism and regionalism.

Thus, as with the Irish dialects, a specific form for every such term will have to be chosen, and care must be taken not to offend any particular group by this choice. There is a high level of 'dialect loyalty'\(^3\) in South Africa, and these proposals have not gained much public support (LANGTAG Report 1996:77). The time scale involved in a harmonisation project would be huge. Msimang (1993:34) points out that Nhlapo (the pioneer of the harmonisation/standardisation idea, in the late 1940s) envisaged that it would take until the middle of the 21st century to complete.

The extension and promotion of the indigenous languages also causes some logistical problems. If a regional bilingual or trilingual policy were to be enforced in the higher domains, the impact would be severe and immediate. In the commercial sector, staff would have to be retrained to conform to the new language policy. Parliamentary debate would have to be regulated, possibly with the same effect on orators as happened in Kenyatta's parliament (see p. 111). The media would receive the greatest cost burden of all, as it would have to try to equalise

---

Afrikaans L1 population, and the Northern Province's substantial Tsonga L1 population.

\(^3\) Alexander (1989, 1995) and others suggest that the language separation in the Nguni and Sotho groups is not an entirely natural one, having been overemphasised by the colonial and apartheid governments' policies of separate development (LANGTAG Report 1996:76).
the proportions of indigenous languages and English. In the Educational sector, the medium of instruction would have to be changed, and so would the entire syllabus. Indigenous language resources would have to be created, as there are very few available. In-service teachers would have to be retrained, and many would have to acquire a new language from scratch. And, all of this would have to be done at the risk of the people not accepting it in the long term.

**Impact on the speech community**

If the sample of respondents in Chapter IV is held to be representative of Xhosa L1 speakers who are active in, or aspire to be active in, the higher domains, it is necessary to ascertain the probable impact of the policies outlined above on their linguistic behaviour and choices. The respondents' linguistic behaviour can be summarised simply as the use of L1 for the lower domains and the use of English for the higher domains, with some evidence of English use in lower domains, particularly in the Friends and Family domains. This will continue if English continues to be used and promoted in the higher domains, with a likely increase in the instances of English dominating particular low domains. Under this policy (the *de facto status quo*), the indigenous languages remain underdeveloped and speakers of other languages (i.e. other indigenous languages, English or Afrikaans) have no incentive to add it to their linguistic repertoires. With English being able to function as a medium in both high and low domains, the pursuit of this language policy will almost certainly lead to extensive language shift among today's indigenous language L1 speech communities.

**National Additive Bilingualism**

A programme of additive bilingualism, whereby the indigenous languages are used alongside English in higher domains (on a regional basis) would slow, if not stop, this trend. If the home language is an adequate vehicle for expression in the high
domains, the need to acquire a language such as English will not be quite as urgent as under the current policy. The attractiveness of the position of English as a strong international LWC will still be there; however, if English is not a prerequisite for activity in the higher domains, people will not be so eager to acquire it—indeed, they won't have to acquire it. This plan would involve the demotion of English in favour of the indigenous languages. However, the 'either-or' policy set out above is not really feasible, as it would mean that people of different languages would be working together, and with the public, and a lingua franca would become necessary. The only way (in my opinion) in which the indigenous languages can be promoted and extended is by their use with English. Thus, everybody would have to have a linguistic repertoire of at least two languages: English and the regional language(s).

Under this plan, indigenous language L1 speakers still have to acquire English, though perhaps to a relatively lower level of competence. However, English L1 speakers would have to acquire an indigenous language, thereby sharing the language burden more equally. Thus, everybody would have to use at least two languages in every higher domain. Such a system would be reminiscent of the bilingual policy of the National Party days, when all official documentation was strictly bilingual, paragraph by paragraph, and oral communication was carried out in English or Afrikaans, depending on the L1 of whoever initiated the conversation, or the rank of the interlocutor74!

The respondents to the study in Chapter IV are already quite proficient in English and their L1, so few of them would be adversely affected by an additive policy. English would be acquired and used in addition to the L1, whenever it was

74 Thanks to my father, Peter Bowerman, who laboured in a government department (Land Affairs) for many years, and who gave me an insight into the linguistic behaviour of workers under the bilingual policy of the previous system.
necessary or desirable. English L1 speakers would have to take steps to acquire an indigenous language as L2, in order to participate in the higher domains. An important point here is that the use of a particular code would be more of a choice, as almost everybody would have some proficiency in the same languages. In this case, the indigenous languages would have to be admitted to the higher domains through strong legislation, and sustained in this position by ensuring that existing staff are retrained and new staff are hired and trained according to the new policy.

However, there is some doubt as to whether this will be accepted or sustained. English will remain strong nationally, as the national lingua franca, and internationally as well. Everybody will have some proficiency in English, but not everybody will have (or need) native competency. From a more ideological point of view, the advantage the English L1 speakers have will be somewhat offset by a L2 competency requirement, but, I think, only if this is legislated. As the case of Irish and other failed language revival attempts have shown, people are not likely to acquire another language unless it is necessary or useful to them, or unless they want to. In South Africa at the present time, English is a necessary language for higher domain participation, and the indigenous languages are not. This would explain why indigenous language L1 speakers learn English, but (for the most part) English L1 speakers do not learn indigenous languages.

The additive programme described above seems desirable from an ideological point of view, in that it is fairer and more equal than the status quo. From a pragmatic perspective, however, it is fraught with difficulties. Firstly, the reasons given for instituting the indigenous languages into the higher domains are usually ideological. Few concerned with language planning invoke the cognitive benefits inherent in additive bilingual education, and in an additive bilingual society (see, for example, Cummins
1984; Cummins & Swain 1989). These benefits are not immediate, but take several years to develop in each individual. However, the gains that can be made from the acquisition of a high status language appear more immediate (perhaps because their current absence is more easily perceivable) than cognitive or social benefits, which are generally not the real reason an individual wishes or needs to acquire a language. If the high status language is promoted in this way—i.e., without any attempt to promote and elaborate lower status languages at the same time, the lower status languages will be regarded as inferior (see Phillipson 1993 Ch.9). This is one of the main foundations of language shift (see pp.50-51).

If the language question in South Africa should become a battle between ideology and pragmatism, current trends, as described in this dissertation, show that pragmatism is a much stronger force. There is no question that affordable access to a high standard of English competence must be available to all South Africans. In the absence of a neutral national language (such as Swahili in Kenya), the indigenous languages take second place on the national platform, as English can be used in every region. Internationally, English provides South Africa with a link language for international relations and trade. What role is left for the indigenous languages? It is unlikely that a national language will emerge in South Africa, even if standardised Nguni and Sotho varieties are achieved. Given South Africa's past, in which not only major racial groups but smaller ethnic and linguistic groups were played against each other, no government is likely to want to be seen to favour one ethnic or linguistic group above another.

Policy tests for SA's policy options
It is not always the best, or even the most feasible language policy that is eventually implemented. Changes in South Africa's language policy since 1994 have favoured a multilingual approach. In practice, however, there is minimal evidence of a multilingual
approach being concretely applied. In order to see where the balance between ideology and pragmatic viability lies in the South African context, I briefly discuss each of the policy options outlined above in terms of Kerr's policy tests (q.v. p.78):

ENGLISH ONLY IN HIGHER DOMAINS

DESIRABILITY: Pass. There is already an established desire for more and better access to English.

JUSTNESS: Pass, if there is sufficient access to English for everybody, and this is what they desire. It must be borne in mind, though, that the indigenous languages will never be developed under such a plan.

EFFECTIVENESS: Pass, assuming that the desired goal of this policy is the social and economic advancement of non-English L1 speakers.

TOLERABILITY: Pass, as this is the most pragmatically viable (i.e., cost effective) solution.

ENGLISH OR L1 IN HIGHER DOMAINS (AS A MEANS TO PROMOTE AND EXTEND THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES)

DESIRABILITY: Fail, because there is minimal desire for L1 in the higher domains, without English.

JUSTNESS: Pass, as all languages are treated equally.

EFFECTIVENESS: Fail, as the logistics of implementation would be extremely difficult; and, as this policy flouts the popular will, it would probably be ignored.

TOLERABILITY: Fail, because this method is expensive as well as being unfeasible.
NATIONAL ADDITIVE BILINGUALISM: ENGLISH + INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES ON A REGIONAL BASIS

DESIRABILITY: Pass. This would fulfill both the desire for access to English, and the desire to see an improvement in the position of the indigenous languages.

JUSTNESS: Pass. This is a fair, equitable treatment of all languages in South Africa, and takes the popular will into account.

EFFECTIVENESS: ? If started early enough, and soon enough, an additive bilingual programme can be effectively implemented. There are some doubts, though, as to the widespread acceptance of these measures, especially among those whose L1 already serves all functions, and who will have to acquire another language.

TOLERABILITY: ? An expensive development, promotion and acquisition programme will have to be undertaken to ensure the effective implementation of an additive bilingual programme. In addition, this will require extensive retraining of personnel, changes to education curricula, multilingual publication, etc.

Most multilingual models put forward advocate a regional language policy for South Africa, comprising English plus at least one regional language. On the regional level, English plays a smaller, though increasing, role. The vast majority of South Africans do not speak English as L1, and seven provinces have a clear numerical majority language (Population Census 1996:10-11). However, most of these provinces contain one or more substantial minority linguistic groups. For example, a policy of English plus Swati in the Free State would only serve 63.4% of the population—more than a third would be left out of the policy! Such a policy would mean that the rest of the population would
have to acquire two languages in addition to L1, in order to participate in the higher domains. This sort of legislation could well lead to minority resentment, as one group is perceived to be favoured over another. A similar situation would apply in the Northern Cape, North West and Northern Province. The language distribution in Gauteng and Mpumalanga is so diverse that it would require a cumbersome and expensive 4 or 5 language policy in each in order to be equitable. Only KwaZulu-Natal and the Western Cape have relatively little linguistic diversity, so that they could be comprehensively served (with under 5% left out) by a 2 and 3 language policy respectively (all figures worked from Population Census 1996:10-11).

Pragmatically, English-only is a relatively easy and cost-effective short-term solution for South Africa. It is not only cheaper to publish and conduct business in only one language, but also in terms of existing infrastructure. Moreover, it is perceived to eliminate any possibility of favouring one ethnic group over another, and causing offence and division in this way (Schmied 1991:100ff). Acquisition schemes would only have to be designed to cater for English; under a compulsory English + regional language(s) system, at least one other language will have to be developed through acquisition planning. However, a monolingual approach in favour of English will almost certainly advance the decline of the indigenous languages.

Conclusion
Successive governments in South Africa have built English into an extremely dominant and powerful position in our linguistic culture. By contrast, the indigenous languages are mostly restricted to positions of lesser power as low domain media. The study presented in Chapter IV shows the extent of the dominance

---

75 An English + Zulu policy would account for 95.6% of the KwaZulu-Natal population, and an English + Xhosa + Afrikaans policy would account for 98.6% of the Western Cape population (Population Census 1996:10-11).
76 In fact, this scheme would favour English L1 whites, unless some sort of Affirmative Action were applied.
of English in the lives of three groups of English L2/ indigenous language L1 speakers, and clear signs of the intrusion of English into the lower domains. The advantages and disadvantages inherent in the two main, feasible policy options for South Africa's future-- the retention of English as the high domain language nationwide, and the development, promotion and extension of the indigenous languages alongside English-- have been weighed. It appears as though English will retain its current position, or even strengthen it, should there be no moves to promote and extend the indigenous languages.

It is somewhat ironic that linguistic imperialism persists in South Africa today, now with the motive of improving the lives of the indigenous population. Whereas linguistic imperialism was practised in the colonial era with the express purpose of keeping the indigenous population outside of the higher domains of language use, today English is promoted at the expense of the indigenous languages in order to provide all people with access to these domains. While this may be to the (material) advantage of the indigenous population, it will not be good for the indigenous languages themselves; in fact, it may well hasten their demise.

There are two important factors instrumental in maintaining the hegemony of English in the postcolonial/ post-apartheid era. Firstly, the colonial inheritance in many third world countries means that it is cheaper (more 'tolerable', in Kerr's terms) for an already debt-ridden country to retain the status quo already built into the higher domains. A second point is the tendency toward globalisation. This is a desire to participate internationally, particularly in domains such as Commerce, Trade, Science and Technology. English is an important international language in these fields, along with French, German, Japanese and a few others.
This puts a developing country at a disadvantage with regard to promoting its own languages externally. McCullam (1990:54, cited in the LANGTAG Report (1996:100)) quotes a German Minister of Economics as having said: 'If you want to BUY from us, there is no need to speak German. But if you want to SELL...'

This attitude may work for a developed nation like Germany, but a developing country which needs to sell its produce rather more urgently than it needs to buy has no option but to subscribe to the foreign language; at least until it becomes a major player. German and French are two languages which were actively developed for their current role on the global market (Coulmas 1992:passim)

In this regard, there is a ray of hope for the indigenous languages' future, as some US interests are investing in acquisition programmes for some of the major SA indigenous languages (Mazrui & Mazrui 1998:201), with a view to establishing industries in this country.

Although I view the dominant position of English in South Africa as unassailable, I do not believe that the position of the indigenous languages is hopeless. There is still time, while they are still the L1 of the majority of all generations of South Africans to develop and extend their use. The question remains whether the government and the people of South Africa will have the political will to do this, and slow the trend of English intrusion into the lower domains. Indeed, this trend will have to be reversed, by creating a situation favouring indigenous language 'intrusion' into the higher domains. However, this leads back to the question of whether people will use a variety of tools for one job, if only one will do. Moreover, as Maake (1994:115) points out, the African population was caught in a dilemma during the apartheid era: either they could accept the State's Bantu Education (advocating mother tongue education) and ethnolinguistic homeland policies, and the subjugation this involved, or reject them, and, in doing so, reject their own languages and unite under a common one. They chose the latter option, and this has helped entrench English into their
linguistic culture. This situation is highly reminiscent of that of Ireland, when the Irish language (in the higher domains) was traded for religious freedom (p.88). Within 200 years of this historic trade-off, the Irish language was on its deathbed. In South Africa, it is not yet 50 years since the rejection of Bantu education, and the warning signs are already clear. Moreover, there is no neutral national language in South Africa, and attempts to work on establishing one meet with resistance.

Alexander (2000:13ff) points to another sinister side of linguistic imperialism. In South Africa and many other developing countries/ former colonies, English has attained a position of power such that it dominates the indigenous languages, but remains inaccessible to vast numbers of people\(^7\). Although this allows, to some extent, for the retention of the indigenous languages, it effectively excludes many from higher domain activities; and, at the same time, ensures that the indigenous languages do not become media of communication in these domains. In an industrialised (and industrialising) society, this can only lead to the abandonment of the indigenous languages in the future.

It appears that linguistic imperialism is a self-perpetuating force. When successful, it builds a language into such a powerful position that it becomes a necessity for everybody, even those for whom it is not a native language. This eliminates linguistic choice: an individual who does not have access to that language is disenfranchised from several spheres of life, to which access should be a fundamental human right. Ironically, access to the language so imposed on a community becomes a basic right for that community when it is liberated or democratised (UN Charter on Linguistic Human Rights 1951, Summary point 13), often

---

\(^7\) This is not to say that the language itself is responsible; but rather, the socioeconomic structure of which it is the primary medium.
at the expense of the L1. In South Africa, there is no way in the foreseeable future to escape the shadow of English dominance over our linguistic culture. However, there is still a chance to lessen the impact of that shadow in the long term, by the wilful development, promotion and extension of the indigenous languages, as required by the Constitution of South Africa.
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27/13: Native Lands Act

47/53: Group Areas Act

90/79: Education and Training Act
84/96: South African Schools Act

108/96: Constitution of the Republic of South Africa
APPENDIX A: THE QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE: SECOND LANGUAGE ENGLISH SPEAKERS WHO USE ENGLISH EXTENSIVELY OR EXCLUSIVELY IN THE WORKPLACE

Dear Respondent

Thank you very much for agreeing to respond to this questionnaire. The aim of my project is to investigate the impact of English in the workplace on people's language choices in other domains. This is to help determine the role of English and other languages in South Africa's future.

Please return this questionnaire by .................................. Any information you offer is treated in strict confidence, and you need not supply your name. Again, thank you very much for your cooperation. It is greatly appreciated.

Sean A. Bowerman

If any question is not applicable to you, please mark it n/a.

1. What is your first/ home language? ..............................................................

2. To what extent do you use English in the workplace?
   ALWAYS......OFTEN......SOMETIMES......SELDOM......NEVER

3. To what extent do you use English outside the workplace?
   ALWAYS......OFTEN......SOMETIMES......SELDOM......NEVER

4. In what language would you like your children to be taught at school? ......................

5. Please explain briefly why: ..............................................................................
   ..................................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................................
6. In what language medium are your children being taught at school? ..............................................

7. In what language medium do you read/listen to the following:

- News (Radio/TV): ..........................................................
- News (Newspapers): ......................................................
- Magazines: .................................................................
- Radio/TV (entertainment): ............................................
- Radio/TV (sport): .........................................................
- Leisure reading (novels, etc.): ..........................................
- Informational reading (textbooks/manuals, etc.): ..............

8. Do you feel that resources in your home language are limited in any of the above domains? (Please explain your answer briefly): ........................................................................................................................................................................

9. Which language dominates interaction in the following areas of your life (English/Xhosa/Other)? If Other, please indicate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion: services</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: private prayer</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: older generations</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: same generation</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family: younger generations</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/Lecturers</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors at work</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates at work</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policemen/government reps.</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours: older generations</td>
<td>E...X...O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What is the dominant language of the area in which you live? .............................................................

11. What language were you taught in at school? .........................................................................................

12. How would you rate your overall English ability? (Ring one)

   FLUENT.....GOOD.....FAIR.....STUGGLE

13. In which of these areas is your English ability best? (Ring one)

   READING.....WRITING.....SPEAKING.....LISTENING

14. How would you rate your English ability against your home language ability in terms of:

   • READING: BETTER.....SAME.....WORSE
   • WRITING: BETTER.....SAME.....WORSE
   • SPEAKING: BETTER.....SAME.....WORSE
   • LISTENING: BETTER.....SAME.....WORSE

15. If you have any more comments, please use the space below.
APPENDIX B: TEXTUAL RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

1. TEXTUAL ANSWERS TO QUESTION 5 (PLEASE REFER TO QUESTIONNAIRE, APPENDIX A)

A2:
English is a language I feel is easy to communicate with any race of people.

A3:
English is the business language and is the most commonly use language [at] school, tech or varsity, workplace.

A4:
English is the main language used globally. It is good for everyone to learn the language. Xhosa is our mother tongue, he/she must know how to communicate in our language.

A5:
Our country is moving to a one language set up. The universal language is English, it will prepare the children to cope in the working environment and to socialise.

A6:
It's very good to more than one language, easy to communicate with any other person speaking different language. It's an official language and it's easy to understand it.

A7:
If they're taught in English, they can communicate with everybody anywhere. Most of the people know and understand English. As long as they talk fluently I'm okay.

A8:
Because it will make things easier for them when they start working, not having bad pronunciation like I did and being shy because you fear you may say something wrong.

A9: Because English is the medium language and even in work is English, in Church's mostly English, even if you spoke with the foreign people is English. Is a communication language.

A10: They should be competent with the outside world and as well as not forgetting their roots.

A11: It's easy for anyone in the world to communicate with any tribe.

B1: Most subjects are offered in English internationally. This will enable the child to have more access to more sources of information.

B2: English is an international medium of communication. Globalisation and business communication in the global environment forces us to communicate in a neutral way. English therefore provides us with an opportunity to reach out to most people in the world.

B3: I want my child to be able to communicate with people from different cultures and races.

B4: Because I believe in using the English language as a communication language so I want my kids to have good communication skills.
To me our children are losing their own language due to Western styles and as a Black person I always see our children trying by all means to please others. For communication and work, English is benefit.

Because it would be easy for them to communicate with others.

It is used informationally/world wide.

English is seen as the international language. I.e., more nations can use English as a medium of communication. English is the language of compromise within the diversity of nations.

Because English is a medium of instructions.

I think [gap] is better for them.

I believe English is a business language of the world, in most part of the world it is understood.

My mother tongue also keep my customs and my nation high.

English is an easy language to communicate with pupils of other races.
It is universally used. You can speak to anyone who does not speak my language. Therefore it is advantageous for kids to be taught in English.

C5:
It's the medium language and it's spoken in many countries and people understand, even illiterate ones from rural areas.

C6:
Because it's the common language that used in South Africa for instant all cultures they prefer English.

C7:
Better understanding of day to day usage of computer literacy and to speak the international language.

C8:
English is the new world language and I want my children to have that.

C9:
English can be used in many many more places than Xhosa and it gives us a link with the rest of the world.

C10
Our language is left out of everything. Its always us who have to speak English. I think other people should speak our language.

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 8: PLEASE REFER TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE (APPENDIX A)

A1:
Yes.

A2:
No. I am comfortable with the languages that is used in the above resources.

A3:
Yes. Because most important documentation is in English and some individuals might not fully understand some of the terminology.

A4:
No. Because you can get them in library or buy them just like all languages.

A5:
No.

A6:
No, I like English as well as my home language, by reading, listening to English I find it exciting for me because I'm learning a lot and I become fluent in English.

A7:
Yes. Not everybody/ most of the people understand Xhosa.

A8:
No response

A9:
No.

A10:
No. We do get the above in my home language.

A11:
Yes. Most of these domains are English.

B1:
[Yes]. Most of the information is written in English and this is forcing people to listen and read in English. Not that we want to.

B2:
Yes, there are few publishers who are keen to publish literature in my home language, their view is that it is expensive and cannot be understood in the same way as books written in English.

B3:
Yes, I think this is so because not only Xhosa speaking people...

B4:
Yes, because most of the paper I written in English and there is less coverage in my language.

B5:
Yes. When it comes to novels you find nothing new. Information reading, textbooks, there is TOTAL nothing in Xhosa.

B6:
Yes, interesting magazines/ novels are written in English.

B7:
Yes, I am yet to see a play/ documentary or any form of entertainment on TV in my home language = Tsonga.

B8:
Yes. It is enough but does not help you to interact with other nations, since we are in a diversity country.

B9:
No. Most of the languages that they use is English.

B10:
No. Afrikaans is other domains. The future languages in South Africa Afrikaans English Xhosa is my future.

C1:
No.

C2:
Yes, capitalists they are seldom to help improve the blacks and give the skills in the sense of we are black.

C3:
No.

C4:
[Yes]. Many good books you can find are written in English. That leads to listening and even reading English most of the time.

C5:
No.

C6:
No.

C7:
No.

C8:
No, I don't feel that it is necessary to have Xhosa in all domains, English is enough. Most people can speak English if they want to.

C9:
No. English is international, and these domains are international.
C10:
Yes, there isn't anything in Xhosa. You must read in English all the time, there are only Xhosa books at school.

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 15: PLEASE REFER TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE (APPENDIX A).

A1:
I don't think this information will help because I've rated myself according to what other people are telling me

A?:
'I hope we will soon be able to use all our languages in the workplace. We can all understand each other with English but it would be nice to use my own language to express better'.

B5:
Yes, I do love English but I think it's time to promote the African languages as we are starting to miss the link.

B6:
I think English is the best language to be use whether in schools or workshops.

B8:
In terms of rating my home language against English. Having spent most of my life in a diversified environment, I would say I am finding it easy to communicate with English than with my home language. My ability to use language in all respects should it be reading, etc. has decreased.

C6:
Some of the supervisors can learn Xhosa.

C8:
'English is the future. Yes, it will be sad if the African languages die off, but I don't want my children to be poor because they can't speak English properly. In my life, English is more important, I use it more than Xhosa.'

C9:
'English is the language we use. There is nothing to do about it, and it has lots of benefits that we don't get from African languages.'

C10:
'There are 11 official languages in South Africa, but all you ever see is English. I think people must notice we are in Africa, and African languages must have their place.'