

Language attitudes in a primary school

a bottom-up approach to language education policy in Mozambique

Henriksen, Sarita Monjane

Publication date:
2010

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Henriksen, S. M. (2010). *Language attitudes in a primary school: a bottom-up approach to language education policy in Mozambique*. Roskilde Universitet.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Roskilde University
Department of Culture and Identity

**Language Attitudes in a Primary School: A
Bottom-Up Approach to Language
Education Policy in Mozambique**

Sarita Monjane Henriksen
31-08-2010

Roskilde University
Department of Culture and Identity

***Language Attitudes in a Primary School: A Bottom-Up
Approach to Language Education Policy in Mozambique***

Sarita Monjane Henriksen _____

A thesis submitted for the Degree of PhD
Department of Culture and Identity
Roskilde University

DEDICATION

To my FAMILY

To Thor, Kiona and Jesper

For all the time I was present, but also absent

For all the bedtime stories I did not read

For all the games we did not play

For the hugs we did not share

For all the quality time we did not spend

I hope we can still make it up

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like, first and foremost, to extend my profound gratitude to Anne Fabricius and Hartmut Haberland, my supervisors, for all the valuable support, advice, and guidance throughout this three-year period. Your prompt responses, your very critical and constructive feedback both in terms of content, form and methodology have been extremely illuminating, and they have certainly contributed to the materialisation of this project.

My gratitude also goes to the Department of Culture and Identity, for the conditions created and especially for the Friday Afternoon Seminars, whose inputs from the many different sessions have surely been a mind opener. To Bent Preisler, thank you for the very first introductory meeting and also for being there. To Marianne Hansen, a warm thank you for being available at all times. Thank you for your support regarding the administrative part and logistics of being a PhD student at RUC.

To Anne Holmen at the Danish Pedagogical University, for her willingness to assist, and unconditional feedback, for the conference and seminar invitations and for all; thank you!

My deepest appreciation also goes to the children, teachers, school directors and parents at Mudada and Mahubo primary schools in Boane Km 14 and Matutuine, and the children at 3 de Fevereiro School in Maputo City, for their patience, cooperation and willingness to complete the questionnaires and participate in the interview process.

In addition, I would particularly like to thank Dr. Rafael Sendela, the Coordinator for Bilingual Education at INDE, and Professor Gregório Firmino at Eduardo Mondlane University, for their rich and valuable comments concerning the Language Question in Mozambique, and especially Mother Tongue Education.

My gratitude also goes to Simone Doctors, for her initial feedback, prior to starting my PhD studies and finally I would like to acknowledge all those who directly or indirectly have contributed to this project.

ABSTRACT

The new Mozambican rural primary school is characterised by the co-existence between the Portuguese language, the Mozambican national languages, and the English language. In 1975, at the time of the country's independence from the colonial power, Portuguese was introduced as the only language of instruction. However, in mid nineties, with the purpose of reducing the drop-out and repetition rates and improving the quality of education through the use of the Mother Tongue in schooling, a pilot bilingual education project (the simultaneous teaching of Portuguese and one of the Mozambican national languages) was introduced in a number of rural schools in the country. There is in Mozambique today a dual language education policy; one for the schools in the urban area, and another one for the schools in the rural area. The language education policy being implemented in the urban schools is characterised by the exclusive use of Portuguese as the primary medium of instruction, while the language education policy in the rural schools is characterised by mother tongue-based bilingual education in Portuguese and one of the Mozambican national languages.

The present study, first of all, presents the results of an attitudes' survey of pupils, teachers, school administrators and parents, conducted primarily in two rural primary schools in the south of Mozambique, and one urban school in Maputo City, with the purpose of eliciting the perceptions and views of these actors in relation to the various languages in use in the Mozambican school context.

Secondly, based on the best international practices, and informed by research in the field, the study suggests what the author considers to be an inclusive approach to language education policy for the Mozambican multilingual context.

Four key research questions guided the study, namely:

1. What are the attitudes of pupils, teachers, school administrators and parents in Mahubo and Mudada Primary Schools, towards the Mozambican national languages, Portuguese, and English?
2. How are these attitudes distributed among different regional/social groups (urban/rural, and/or educated/illiterate)?
3. What do these attitudes tell us about the grassroots' preferences concerning the languages in Education?
4. What do these attitudes suggest to us in relation to what should be the most appropriate language in education policy in Mozambique?

In addition to questionnaires and interviews, the data for the study were also collected by means of a review of works on Language Attitudes, and Language Education Planning and Policy.

ABSTRAKT (Dansk)

Grundskolen i Mozambiques landdistrikter er karakteriseret ved sameksistens mellem portugisisk, Mozambiques nationale sprog og engelsk. I 1975, da landet blev uafhængigt af kolonimagten, blev portugisisk indført som det eneste undervisningssprog. Men i midten af halvfemserne blev der i en række landsbyskoler som et pilotprojekt indført undervisning på to sprog. Undervisningen foregik altså samtidigt på portugisisk og på et af nationalsprogene i Mozambique. Formålet var både at reducere frafald og antallet af elever, der måtte gå en klasse om og at forbedre kvaliteten af undervisningen gennem inddragelse af modersmålet som undervisningssprog. I det nuværende skolesystem i Mozambique er der 2 forskellige sprogpolitikker, én for skolerne i byerne, og en for skolerne i landdistrikterne. I grundskolen i byerne bliver der udelukkende anvendt portugisisk som undervisningssprog, mens undervisningen på landdistrikternes skoler er kendetegnet ved anvendelse af både modersmålet, et af Mozambiques nationale sprog, og portugisisk.

Nærværende afhandling præsenterer først og fremmest resultaterne af en undersøgelse af holdninger blandt elever, lærere, skoleforvaltninger og forældre, gennemført på to grundskoler i et landdistrikt i det sydlige Mozambique, og på en grundskole i Maputo City, med det formål at elicitere disse aktørers opfattelser og synspunkter i forhold til de forskellige sprog i brug i den mozambiquiske skolekontekst. For det andet giver undersøgelsen, baseret på bedst international praksis og forskning inden for området, et bud på, hvad forfatteren anser for at være en inkluderende tilgang til sprogpolitik inden for den multilinguale skole- og uddannelseskontekst i Mozambique.

Fire centrale forsknings spørgsmål har båret undersøgelsen:

1. Hvilke holdninger er der hos elever, lærere, skoleforvaltninger og forældre i Mahubo og Mudada grundskoler over for henholdsvis Mozambiques nationale sprog, portugisisk og engelsk?
2. Hvordan er disse holdninger distribueret mellem forskellige regionale og sociale grupper (by/land, og/ eller uddannede/ analfabeter)?
3. Hvad kan disse holdninger fortælle os om befolkningernes præferencer vedrørende sprogene i skolen/ uddannelserne?
4. Hvad fortæller disse holdninger os i forhold til, hvad der bør være det mest passende sprog i skole-/ og uddannelsespolitik i Mozambique?

Ud over spørgeskemaer og interviews, er data til undersøgelsen også indsamlet ved hjælp af en gennemgang af værker om sprogholdninger, sprogplanlægning og sprogpolitik.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION4

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS5

ABSTRACT6

ABSTRAKT (DANSK)7

ABBREVIATIONS12

TABLE OF FIGURES14

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION15

1.1 Background.....15

 1.1.1 A Bottom-Up Language Policy.....20

1.2 Purpose of the Study.....21

1.3 Problem Statement.....21

1.4 Research Questions23

1.5 Major Assumptions24

1.6 Methodology25

1.7 Theoretical Framework27

1.8 Delimitation of the Study30

1.9 Structure of the Dissertation31

CHAPTER TWO – MOZAMBIQUE – A BRIEF COUNTRY PROFILE.....33

2.1 Geography, History and Demography.....33

2.2 Ethnic Groups and Religions36

2.3 The Country’s Linguistic Profile40

 2.3.1 The Portuguese language45

 2.3.2 The National Languages of Mozambique49

 2.3.3 The English language52

2.4 The Mozambican Education System54

 2.4.1 Languages in the Curriculum57

2.5 Summary.....61

CHAPTER THREE – KEY TERMINOLOGY IN LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION
PLANNING.....63

3.1 The Language Garden Analogy 64

3.2 Linguistic Diversity and Multilingualism64

3.3 Monoethnic, Dyadic, Triadic and Mosaic Societies 67

3.4 Language Attitudes	69
3.5 Language Maintenance, Shift and/or Death	70
3.6 Minority vs. Majority Languages and Languages of Wider Communication (LWC).....	72
3.7 Linguistic Imperialism and Linguistic Genocide (Linguicism).....	76
3.8 Globalisation and Global English.....	80
3.9 Linguistic Human Rights in Education	82
3.10 Mother Tongue Education.....	84
3.11 Purposes and Models of Bilingual Education	86
3.12 Language Planning and Policy vs. Language Management.....	89
3.13 Types of Language Planning.....	92
3.14 The Main Actors and Institutions in the Language Planning and Policy Process	94
3.15 Major Components of the Language Planning and Policy Process	95
3.16 Economic Considerations in the Language Planning and Policy Process	96
3.17 Summary	97
 CHAPTER FOUR – LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION PLANNING AND POLICY IN A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA.....	 101
4.1 The Language Situation and Post-Independence Language Policy Trends in Southern Africa	101
4.2 The Language Education Policies in Southern Africa.....	105
4.3 The New Language Policy in South Africa.....	107
4.3.1 Challenges affecting the new South African Language Policy.....	111
4.4 Lessons to learn from the South African Language Policy Process.....	116
4.5 Summary	119
 CHAPTER FIVE – LANGUAGE ATTITUDES IN THREE PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN SOUTHERN MOZAMBIQUE.....	 122
5.1 Research Methodology and Procedures	122
5.1.1 Main Characteristics of the Schools in Rural and Urban Areas	127
5.1.2 The Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education Experience in Mozambique	129
5.1.3 Limitations	131
5.2 The Pupils’ Questionnaire	133
5.3 The Teachers’ Questionnaire	135
5.4 The School Directors’ Questionnaire	138
5.5 The Parents’ Interview	149
5.6 The Educational Experts’ Interview Guide.....	140
5.7 Main Findings	141
5.7.1 Pupils’ Responses (Rural Schools)	141
5.7.2 Pupils’ Responses (Urban Schools)	148

5.7.3 Teachers' Responses	153
5.7.4 School Directors' Responses	157
5.7.5 The Parents' Responses	158
5.7.6 The Responses of Educational Professionals	159
5.8 Discussion	160
5.9 Summary	163
CHAPTER SIX – TOWARDS A LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR MOZAMBIQUE	164
6.1 The Importance of a Multilingual Policy	166
6.2 Rationale for the Proposed Policy	168
6.2.1 Underlying Principles	170
6.2.2 Three Possible Language Education Scenarios for the Urban School Context	170
6.3 The Language Education Policy	174
6.4. The Question of Rights and Duties	175
6.5 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Stakeholders	176
6.5.1 The Role of the State	176
6.5.2. The Role of Teachers	177
6.5.3 The Role of the Community	178
6.5.4. Other Stakeholders	178
6.5.5 Policy Formulation, Implementation, Dissemination, Follow-up and Assessment	179
6.6 Summary	180
CHAPTER SEVEN – CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD	181
7.1 Conclusions	183
7.2 The Way Forward	184
7.3 Contribution of the Study	187
7.4 Implications of the Study	188
REFERENCES	190
APPENDICES	215
Appendix One - Map of Mozambique	215
Appendix Two - Map of Africa	216
Appendix Three – INE 2007 Update on Mozambicans of 5 years of age and older and their knowledge of Portuguese	217
Appendix Four – A Brief Linguistic Profile of Countries in the Southern African Region	220
Appendix Five - Description of the Language Education Policies in Countries in Southern Africa	223
Appendix Six - Sample Data Collection Tools	226

I.	Pupils Questionnaire (Rural).....	226
II.	Pupils Questionnaire (Urban)	228
III.	Teachers' Questionnaire	229
IV.	School Directors' Questionnaire.....	232
V.	Parents' Interview.....	233
VI.	Educational Professionals' Interview.....	234
Appendix Seven – Sample Data Collection Tools (in Portuguese)		235
Appendix Eight – Pictures of a Typical Rural Classroom		246
Appendix Nine – Examples of Non-Responses		250
Appendix Ten (I) – Teacher Profiles		252
Appendix Ten (II) – Basic Facts about the Schools and the Bilingual Education Program		254
Appendix Eleven – Additional Bibliography on Multilingualism.....		255

ABBREVIATIONS

ACALAN	African Academy of Languages
ARPAC	<i>Arquivo do Património Cultural</i> /Cultural Heritage Archive
AU	African Union
CFPP	<i>Centro de Formação de Professores Primários</i> /Centre for the Training of Primary School Teachers
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
EFA	Education for All
EP1	<i>Ensino Primário de Primeiro Grau</i> /First Cycle of Primary Education
EP2	<i>Ensino Primário de Segundo Grau</i> /Second Cycle of Primary Education
ESG	General Secondary Education
ESG1	General Secondary Education (Level 1)
ESG2	General Secondary Education (Level 2)
FINNIDA	Finnish International Development Cooperation Agency
FL	Foreign Language
GoM	Government of Mozambique
IAP	<i>Instituto de Aperfeiçoamento de Professores</i> /Teacher Development Institute
IFP	<i>Instituto de Formação de Professores</i> /Teacher Training Institute
IL	Institute of Languages
IMAP	<i>Instituto de Magistério Primário</i> /Primary Teacher Training Institute
INDE	National Institute for Educational Development
INE	National Statistics Institute
L1	First Language/Mother Tongue
L2	Second Language
LANGTAG	Language Plan Task Group
LHRs	Linguistic Human Rights
LiEP	Language in Education Policy

LPP	Language Planning and Policy
LP	Language Policy
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MEC	Ministry of Education and Culture
MOI	Medium of Instruction
MT	Mother Tongue
MTE	Mother Tongue Education
NELIMO	Nucleus/Centre for the Study of Mozambican Languages
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NUGL	New Updated Guthrie List
OAU	Organisation for African Unity
PANSALB	Pan South African Language Board
PEEC	<i>Plano Estratégico da Educação e Cultura</i> /Strategic Plan for Education and Culture
PRAESA	Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa
SIL	Summer Institute for Linguistics
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SNE	<i>Sistema Nacional de Educação</i> /National Education System
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TT	Teacher Training
UEM	<i>Universidade Eduardo Mondlane</i> /Eduardo Mondlane University
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UP	<i>Universidade Pedagógica</i> /Pedagogical University
WB	World Bank

TABLE OF FIGURES

TABLE 1: The 17 Linguistic Varieties and their Alternate Names	43
TABLE 2: Languages, Number of Speakers and Geographical Distribution	45
TABLE 3: Time-Load Allocated to Portuguese, the Mozambican National Languages and English at the EP1 Level – Monolingual (Portuguese) Classes	59
TABLE 4: Time-Load Allocated to Portuguese, the Mozambican National Languages and English at the EP1 Level – Bilingual Classes.....	60
TABLE 5: Occurrence of Non-responses	132
TABLE 6: Pupils’ Responses to Question 12 (Language Use).....	141
TABLE 7: Pupils’ Responses to Question 13 (Frequency of Use).....	142
TABLE 8: Pupils’ Responses to Questions 14-25 (Language Preference, Languages Liked/Disliked, Beautiful and Ugly Languages, Language Importance	147
TABLE 9: Urban School - Language Preference, Languages Liked/Disliked, Beautiful and Ugly Languages, Language Importance.....	152

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The present chapter introduces the major goals of the study, the problem statement, the main questions that have informed the study, the methodological tools used and ends by bringing forward the theoretical framework on which the study is based on. The chapter reviews a number of arguments for conducting attitude surveys prior to devising Language Education Policies; it looks at Language Education developments in Mozambique, from the time of independence to the present-day, compares implicit and explicit language policies, and briefly discusses the notion of *Bottom-Up* Language Policies. This chapter also presents the delimitation of the study. The issues introduced here, will be further discussed throughout the chapters of this dissertation. The aim of this introductory chapter is to present, in general terms, the background to the study.

1.1 Background

The present study constitutes a review of the current debate on Globalisation and Localisation, and attempts to bridge the gap between the two by suggesting the importance of formulating Language Education Policies combining the need to teach and learn both languages of wider communication such as Portuguese or English, and local and national languages.

First of all, the study looks at the various languages that are present in the Mozambican primary school curriculum. Secondly, it analyses how these languages are viewed and perceived by pupils in two rural primary schools and one urban primary school, in other words, what attitudes exist towards these

various languages. In addition, the study also attempts to find out about the views and opinions of other stakeholders in Mozambican society, concerning the language issue, among them, teachers and school administrators, parents, and education professionals. Thirdly and lastly, having as a point of departure, the expressed attitudes, and informed by the best international practices, the study suggests a sound and inclusive language education policy for the Mozambican context at large. This is a policy that is grounded on the discourse on Linguistic Human Rights (LHRs), which claims that every child has the basic and fundamental right to be educated in his or her mother tongue¹. It is a policy aimed at maintaining the country's linguistic diversity, while promoting its cultural and economic development, and at the same time fostering national integration, and helping the Mozambicans to keep abreast of world developments and participate actively in the so-called knowledge society. The question of Languages in the Curriculum will be covered with a certain detail in Chapter Two, when dealing with the Mozambican Education System. The issue of attitudes, perceptions and views constitute the core of Chapter Five; and finally, Chapter Six is focused on the new language education policy being proposed.

There is no doubt that a study on language attitudes is extremely important in language planning and policy and, as acknowledged by Baker (2006: 210), 'a survey of attitudes' works as a mirror of a 'community's thoughts, beliefs, preferences and desires' and will provide us with an indication of the likelihood of 'success of any policy implementation'. Such importance is best illustrated in the following quotation:

Any policy for language, especially in the system of education, has to take account of the attitude of those likely to be affected. In the long run, no policy will succeed which does not do one of three things: conform to the expressed attitudes of those involved; persuade those who express negative attitudes about the rightness of the policy; or seek to remove the causes of the disagreement. In any case, knowledge about attitudes is fundamental to the formulation of a policy as well as to success in its implementation.

(Lewis 1981: 262, cited by Baker 2006: 210)

Although highly relevant, the above citation seems to embody a number of contradictions that are

¹ The Linguistic Human Rights Paradigm will be further developed under the Theoretical Framework in this chapter, and will be revisited in various parts of the present dissertation, particularly in Chapter Three.

worth considering. One thing is to develop a language policy that *conforms* or is based on the *expressed attitudes of those involved* or, in other words, to formulate a policy that actually agrees with existing attitudes. Another thing is to *persuade* or convince people *who express negative attitudes* about the fact that a specific suggested policy is right and appropriate for them. A third thing is to *seek to remove the causes of disagreement*. By *persuading* people about the rightness or correctness of a policy or by trying to eliminate or *remove* the causes of disagreement, a policy is not necessarily conforming to the expressed attitudes of those involved. No matter the contradictions embodied in the above citation, what is important to underline here is the need to know people's attitudes and feelings prior to any policy formulation, because only in that way we should be able to predict the likelihood of success of policy implementation².

As briefly mentioned in the abstract, there are in Mozambique today two concurrent language education policies. One is characterised by the exclusive use of Portuguese as medium of instruction in urban schools, and the other characterised by mother tongue bilingual education in Portuguese and one of the indigenous vernacular languages, in rural schools. The concepts of *Indigenous and Vernacular Languages* are used interchangeably to refer to those languages that are natively and/or territorially spoken by Mozambicans. Throughout the present study, any reference to the L1 will be connected to these Mozambican Languages. It is worth mentioning that these are the languages that the government designates *National Languages*, even though none of them is widely spoken nationally. I will, however, use the term *national language*, instead of vernacular or indigenous, in order to avoid any political connotations. In fact, Roy-Campbell claims that terms such as vernacular are often highly stigmatized and refer to something less than a language (2003: 84). My use of the term National Language in referring to the languages spoken in the Mozambican territory is, of course, influenced by the fact that the Mozambican Constitution, Government, and State institutions refer officially to them as National

² Various scholars (Asfaha et al. 2008: 237) seem to agree on the need to assess prevailing attitudes, by conducting sociolinguistic investigations prior to the selection of languages to be introduced in education. For instance, two good examples of the need to consider socio-cultural forces when planning for language are given by Bratt Paulston (1986: 298) when commenting about the cases of the successful revival of Hebrew in Israel and the failure to officialise Quechua as a national language in Peru. In the first instance, because the "social conditions and religious attitudes towards Hebrew and the Promised Land" were favourable, it was possible to revive Hebrew and implement it as a national language. In the case of Peru, however, because speaking Quechua was associated with being Indian and thus stigmatized in socio-economic terms, the attempt was a failure. The author argues that "no policy is likely to be successful in the long run, if it goes counter to the existing sociocultural forces acting on the local contextual situations".

Languages, regardless of their geographical coverage, or the size of their speech community. Similarly to Mozambique, a number of other African countries have adopted the term National Language to refer to any language clearly spoken by the peoples or ‘nationalities’ inside their borders; national in this sense means territorial. According to Brann (1994: 130) by using the term national language to refer to the indigenous, autochthonous or vernacular languages of a country, there is “clearly an attempt of enhancing the value of the minority languages³ and to provide a basis of equality among all indigenous languages”.

Since 1975, the time of the country's independence from the colonial power, Portuguese has been the only language used both in the school system and in formal settings in Mozambican society⁴. However, in 1993, a pilot mother tongue-based bilingual education project was introduced in a number of rural schools in the country⁵. Various reasons are advanced for the introduction of bilingual education in Mozambique, and perhaps the most outstanding one, as stated by Benson (1998: 279), was to contribute to the improvement of the quality of basic education, considering that Portuguese is not the mother tongue for the majority of Mozambican students, and the fact that international research has shown the academic, cognitive, and pedagogical advantages of the use of the mother tongue in initial schooling.

According to Heugh (2008: 4), language policy is either explicit, and implemented through transparent means, or implicit, and implemented through default processes. Although the education system allows and recognises the use of the national languages in education, the language education policy in Mozambique appears to be an implicit one. By implicit I mean that, although a provision is made for the use of the mother tongue in schooling, especially in the rural areas, the policy fails to stipulate whether and how mother tongue-based bilingual education is to be implemented in heterogeneous

³ The term ‘minority language’ will be thoroughly reviewed in Chapter Three, under the discussion on ‘majority-minority languages’.

⁴ Although Portuguese was selected as the country’s official language on grounds of being neutral in the sense that it did not belong to any of the ethnic groups, and as such it would serve well the role of language of national unity, according to the results of the Census 2007, only 6.5% of the Mozambican population speak it as their mother-tongue (L1), and approximately 40% speak it as their L2.

⁵ The Bilingual project was first introduced as a pilot experience in Tete province (in the north) and Gaza province (in the south). The languages involved were Nyanja (in Tete) and Changana (in Gaza). The Mother Tongue Bilingual Education Experience in Mozambique will be treated comprehensively in Chapter Five.

contexts such as the schools in the cities.

Regarding the implicitness or explicitness of language policies, Spolsky (2004: 8) argues that language policies exist even in cases where they are not established by the authorities; they exist, even if they are not formally written; they may exist in society's or people's language practices or beliefs. There is no doubt that Portuguese is the official language in Mozambique⁶. However, the role and status of the national languages are not clearly articulated in the official discourse. Thus, in my opinion, the development of a clear, well-articulated and well-disseminated language policy constitutes a national imperative; and as Hornberger says,

For language planners and policy-makers in multilingual contexts, then, the question is not so much how to develop languages as which languages to develop for what purposes, and in particular, how and for what purposes to develop local, threatened languages in relation to global, spreading ones.

(Hornberger in Ricento (2006: 27))

I am not in any way suggesting that the Mozambican national languages are threatened, because that does not seem to be the case, as they are widely used as means of communication in informal contexts, and especially in the rural areas. What I am advocating is the need to have these languages used on a wider scale (both in rural and urban contexts) as medium of instruction or resources. Various scholars have acknowledged (Benson 1997, Lopes 1997, Patel 2005) that the Government's position regarding the status of the various languages used is quite vague. In Benson's view (1997: 56) what is really missing is a well defined and fully disseminated educational language policy. In my opinion, the fact that Mother Tongue Education applies only to the rural context and not to the urban constitutes a weakness of the current Language Education Policy, considering that urban contexts may also host a number of children for whom Portuguese is neither the first or the home language.

⁶ Article 10 of the Constitution of the Republic of Mozambique (2004) states that "*Na República de Moçambique a língua portuguesa é a língua oficial*", that is, in the Republic of Mozambique Portuguese is the official language. On the other hand, Article 9 postulates that "*O Estado valoriza as línguas nacionais como património cultural e educacional e promove o seu desenvolvimento e utilização crescente como línguas veiculares da nossa identidade*", or, the State values the national languages as cultural and educational heritage and promotes their development and increasing utilisation as vehicles of our identity. Nevertheless, there is no mention of the means, steps or procedures through which the national languages are valued and promoted.

Therefore, as earlier mentioned, the main goal of this study is to find out what those affected by the current language education policy, especially, those in the rural areas think about the various languages that gravitate around them, what their attitudes are, their beliefs concerning the advantages of developing literacy in such languages, etc. From an analysis of such attitudes and views, and informed by the best international practices and research, could we possibly infer what would be an optimal⁷ language education policy for Mozambique? Would we be able to predict what society's reaction to and acceptance would be of any such proposed policy?

1.1.1 A Bottom-Up Language Policy

The fact that the study starts from an investigation of language attitudes at the grassroots level, that is, at the community level, with the purpose of formulating a language education policy informed not only by such attitudes, but also by the community's linguistic practices and beliefs, constitutes, in my opinion, a bottom-up approach to policy formulation. It should be said, at this stage, that the present study was not commissioned by any governmental authority, university or research institution, but it results from the author's own interest. Although I have been an employee (or lecturer) at a State University – *Universidade Pedagógica* in Maputo City – since 1995, I see myself as an independent scholar, especially considering that the choice of the research subject was entirely mine.

I understand a bottom-up approach as being a process that is not initiated by the government, but one which begins at a lower level of the social or political hierarchy, and which usually involves a massive grassroots' consultation, or, in Cabau-Lampa's (2007: 352) words, a process that embraces a more global view and is supported by the majority or the public at large. My perception of a bottom-up approach is certainly also in line with Neville Alexander's view of "language planning from below", when commenting on the specific case of South Africa: a process "conducted semi-underground in NGOs and peoples' organizations, mobilizing constituencies around the language question consciously with a view to changing the status of the African languages"(2009: 12). It is important to underline at this stage that I consider my approach as bottom-up in the sense that it is data driven or, in other words, it is driven by my own empirical research, and it is not, in any way, supported by a grassroots'

⁷ As already mentioned optimal here refers to a feasible, a democratic and appropriate policy, one that maintains the country's language diversity, and national integration, and at the same time contributes to the country's economic development.

movement.

I acknowledge though that such a departure from the ground level is not always enough to ensure success; but at least, as Benson puts it (2004b: 7) “it is the most promising in terms of community commitment and sustainability”. According to Alexander (1989), cited by Benson (*ibid*), although “bottom-up practices are a good foundation for strong programs”, they should be “enabled by legislation at the official level”. I would also add that community participation and enabling legislation alone are not enough to guarantee success; factors such as political will and the availability of human and material resources are also highly relevant.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

As previously stated, the present study has the following major purposes:

- First and foremost, to investigate the different attitudes of pupils, teachers and school administrators, in two rural primary schools in Maputo Province, in relation to the languages in the primary school curriculum;
- Secondly, the study considers the attitudes of children in an urban school, with the main purpose of finding out whether they are similar or different from the attitudes expressed by the children in the two rural schools. The findings would likely constitute an indication of the reactions to mother tongue medium instruction in the urban context.
- In addition, the study looks at the views and perceptions of other actors in society (parents and educational professionals), regarding the various languages used as medium of instruction or subjects in the new Mozambican rural school;
- Lastly, on the basis of the findings of the empirical work and informed by international research and practice, the study suggests what the author considers to be a sound and feasible language education policy for multilingual Mozambique.

1.3 Problem Statement

I would like to start this section by quoting Christina Bratt Paulston (1986: 118), who argues that “Language Choice is one of the major language problems, whether it be choice of national language (as in Finland and Israel), choice of national alphabet (as in Somalia) or choice of medium of

instruction (as in Norway)". The introduction of the Bilingual Education Program is seen by some layers⁸ of Mozambican society (mainly educational planners), as a great achievement in the history of education in the country, considering that such an initiative not only serves to promote and value the Mozambican National Languages, but it will eventually also help to reduce the drop-out and repetition rates as well as improve academic success, particularly of those pupils who do not have Portuguese as their mother tongue. However, there are other people⁹ who still believe that the focus should be on improving the levels of Portuguese language Teaching and Learning, as Portuguese is an important functional and instrumental language in the country, due to its official role. The introduction of Bilingual Education constitutes a specific effort to modify the language practices of the Mozambican Society and therefore it influences people's linguistic beliefs and ideologies¹⁰.

On the basis of what is stated above, and if the question is put in terms of what should be the language or languages of instruction (either Portuguese or the Mozambican National Languages), then what is at stake in present-day Mozambique is language choice; that is, the choice of language for literacy purposes in the lower primary school.

In Mozambique, until 1993, the language practices had been characterized by the fact that Portuguese was the only medium of instruction and the use of the Mozambican languages was restricted to the family and informal context. One of the beliefs which still persists is that the schools should do all within their power to improve the standard of Portuguese language teaching and learning, instead of wasting the meagre resources on languages that are not going to lead anywhere in academic, professional and economic terms. The ideology is surely inspired by an assimilationist position, that is, the idea that everyone, regardless of his or her mother tongue should speak the official language of the country. However, if we read between the lines of Articles 9 and 10 of the Constitution of the Republic of Mozambique¹¹, we can infer that a pluralist ideology is being suggested, when stating that despite the fact that Portuguese is the country's only official language, the Mozambican State values the

⁸ As reported by Rafael Sendela, the National Coordinator of the Bilingual Education Program in Mozambique, based at INDE, during an interview held on May 5th, 2008.

⁹ See, for instance, the concerns voiced by Fátima Ribeiro (2005; 2007) regarding Bilingual Education in Mozambique.

¹⁰ Spolsky (2004) claims that the three major components of the Language Policy process are language practices, language beliefs or ideology and any specific efforts to modify or influence such practices; these will be reviewed in Chapter three

¹¹ See Footnote 6.

national languages and promotes their development and increasing utilisation as vehicles of communication and in the education of citizens.

One of the main goals of this study is to analyse the arguments supporting the introduction of the Mozambican national languages in education and compare or weight them with arguments against such a decision. Such an analysis is done under the light of ongoing globalisation¹². The question for me is not whether the Mozambican Language Education Policy should be based only on Mother Tongue Medium Education or on Languages of Wider Communication. The question for me is more in terms of the need to combine both ideologies when developing a suitable language education policy; a policy that is grounded on respect for Linguistic Human Rights, through the provision of education in one's mother tongue, and a policy which is also inspired by the ideology of globalisation or internationalisation, materialised by the provision of education in majority languages. As Bernard Spolsky says, 'Language Policy exists within a complex set of social, political, economic, religious, demographic, educational, and cultural factors that make up the full ecology of human life'. (2004: ix)

I fully agree with Spolsky's statement and I postulate that if we want to formulate a feasible Language Education Policy that works if not for all, but for the majority, we have to take into account the views of the people at the grassroots level, in the schools, the villages, the communities, and those of people at the medium and higher levels of the society, that is, the people in the political and economic arenas and many other stakeholders. This is one of the reasons why the present research study starts from an investigation of linguistic attitudes at the school and community level and moves on to listen to the views of educational planners and linguists, before suggesting a policy framework for the country as a whole.¹³ I postulate that a sound and well-balanced language education policy needs to be focussed both on local and national needs as well as on regional or international needs in such a way as to provide citizens with the right and proper linguistic tools to successfully function at these levels.

1.4 Research Questions

¹² Note that Chapter Three pays particular attention to globalisation, when discussing the issue of global English.

¹³ Fishman (1971) strongly argues that language choice, which in his opinion is the very core of language policy, should be, and, in fact, is best studied in the context of sociolinguistic domains or contexts, such as the home, the church, the neighbourhood, the school and the work. (In Spolsky 2004: 42).

In line with what is mentioned in the abstract, the present study is guided by and attempts to bring answers to the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of pupils, teachers, school administrators and parents in Mahubo and Mudada Primary Schools, towards the Mozambican national languages, Portuguese, and English?
2. How are these attitudes distributed among different regional/social groups (urban/rural and/or educated/illiterate)?
3. What do these attitudes tell us about the grassroots' preferences concerning the languages in Education?
4. What do these attitudes suggest to us in relation to what should be the most appropriate language in education policy in Mozambique?

1.5 Major Assumptions

This study is based on three major assumptions:

1. The English language is *positively viewed* by the Mozambicans because it represents the language of opportunities (mainly economic, professional and academic).
2. The Mozambican National Languages are *positively viewed* by the Mozambicans because they represent the languages of ethnic and cultural identity as well as the languages of group solidarity.
3. The Portuguese language is *positively viewed* by the Mozambicans because it is the country's official language and the *Lingua Franca* and as such the language of national unity¹⁴.

The importance of the English language here has to be seen both from a practical and an instrumental point of view; and obviously the same applies to Portuguese as well. A language such as English is not

¹⁴ This assumption is based on the fact that in the official discourse, Portuguese is portrayed as the language of national unity; a language that brings together and unites Mozambicans of all ethnolinguistic origins. In fact, in a multilingual country such as Mozambique, the official language has functions of a lingua franca, considering that no Mozambican National Language is commonly spoken by the majority. I shall return to the role played by the Portuguese language in Mozambique in Chapter Two.

just a token, but it is actually used on a daily basis and is a functional language, in Mozambican society, as will be discussed in Chapter Two. As for the Mozambican National Languages, their importance is certainly justified by the fact that they constitute a symbol of ethno-cultural group identity; these languages are used on a daily basis, informally and in the home context. In addition, the importance of the Mozambican National languages has to be considered in relation to the cognitive benefits of mother tongue education, particularly in terms of mental conceptual development. The cognitive benefits of mother tongue education will be covered in Chapter Three.

The question here is not so much about looking at the key dimensions of Globalisation and Mother-Tongue Education and decide on what is more important, but, instead, to look at how these dimensions relate to each other and look at the interplay between them.

1.6 Methodology

As will be described in detail in Chapter Five, the present study was based on a combined research approach that included the following primary and secondary research methods¹⁵:

1. A Literature Review of a number of works on Language Attitudes, Language Planning, Policy and Language in Education Trends, worldwide, and in Southern Africa in particular.
2. An Attitudes Survey through Questionnaires filled in by a total of 230 participants (pupils, teachers, and school administrators). The purpose of using this method was to gain an Emic view on the key questions under study; namely, the attitudes of teachers, pupils and parents towards the languages in use in the school context, as well as their level of awareness, their thoughts and beliefs regarding the usefulness of such languages in their present and future life, and whether such awareness would predispose them to react in a particular way.

¹⁵ The relevance of the use of various methods of data collection is best justified by the following quotation from Suresh Canagarajah in Ricento (2006: 156), which states that ‘Researchers may employ a range of data-gathering methods, the multiplicity in the means and types of data gathered is important, as it permits them to cross-check (i.e., triangulate) their findings by playing off one kind of data against the other’. In fact, as it will be seen throughout the dissertation, data obtained from the questionnaires, interviews and observations were analysed, compared and cross-checked.

3. Interviews with two scholars, one at Eduardo Mondlane University and another one at INDE, and with four parents in Mahubo and Mudada.
4. Indirect Methods of identifying attitudes, such as informal observations within the classroom and around the school area.
5. Content Analysis of official documents from the educational authorities in Mozambique.

It seems worth mentioning, at this stage, that three different questionnaires were devised; one for the pupils, a second one for the school directors, and a third one for the teachers. There were two different versions of the pupils' questionnaire. A first draft was used with the pupils in the two rural primary schools, and an adapted version was used with the pupils in the urban primary school. The main reason for these two different questionnaires was that some of the questions that had been used in the questionnaire in the rural schools were not relevant for the urban school, considering that Mother Tongue Education was or is still only confined to the rural areas. (See Appendix Six (I and II) for the sample questionnaires).

All the data collection tools were first designed in English and were afterwards translated into Portuguese¹⁶ in order to allow understanding, from the pupils, teachers and parents. When administering the pupils' questionnaires in the rural schools, I thought it relevant to be present in order to guide the pupils through the questionnaires and clarify any possible doubts or misunderstandings. As I read through the pupils' questionnaire, question by question, the teachers in both schools had to intervene and translate or interpret into Xirhonga so that the pupils could understand, as not all of them were able to understand Portuguese, even though it had been taught as a subject from Grade 1 and by the time they reached Grade 5 and 6, they would have had at least five or six years of classroom exposure to the language. I shall return to this issue in Chapter Five, where I discuss in details the field work.

The interview with the parents was conducted in Xirhonga, due to the fact that the parents were not fluent enough in Portuguese. Because I am not a speaker of Xirhonga, I had my mother with me to perform the role of interpreter. I thought that because she was a native Xirhonga herself, and easily

¹⁶ The Portuguese version of the data collection tools is presented in Appendix Seven.

recognisable as coming from the south of Mozambique, that would be an added value to my study, in the way that I was not going to be seen as an outsider who comes to do a study on them, but I would contrarily be seen as one of them. My expectation was that somehow the community would look at me as someone who was there to work with them, and not for them, in their best interest. Judging by the participants' very positive response, I maintain that such an expectation was met. They were very open and willing to collaborate. I ended having not only my mother as an interpreter, but also teachers from both rural schools, who volunteered.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

In attempting to formulate an optimal and inclusive language education policy for the Mozambican multilingual context, the study is grounded, first and foremost, on the view of Language as a Resource, a view supported by many scholars, among them Pennycook (2008: xii), who sees Language as a Commodity, François Grin (2001, 2006), who claims that Languages have an Economic Value, and Nkonko Kamwangamalu (2008) who defends the need for a Market-Oriented Approach to Language Policy. For Pennycook, for example, there is a need to look at language in “instrumental, pragmatic and commercial terms, which is precisely the dominant discourse on language in many contemporary contexts”. Kamwangamalu, on the other hand, defends the position that so that the African languages, for example, are valued and viewed in the same way as the European languages, people need to see these languages being used in formal and high contexts such as education, the labour market, and others.

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas's views provide a useful conceptual tool in understanding the need for a Language Education Policy that promotes Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education. Her perspective of Language as a Human Right, which is actually strongly supported by UNESCO (1953, 2003) and a number of scholars¹⁷ has, to a great deal, influenced the present study. The Linguistic Human Rights approach, as advocated by Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson, claims that “an individual's right to use and learn his or her native language is as basic a human right as that to the free exercise of religion, or the right of ethnic groups to maintain their cultures and beliefs” (Ricento, 2006: 17). In

¹⁷ See, for instance, the volume entitled *Imagining Multilingual Schools*, edited by García, Skutnabb-Kangas and Torres-Guzmán, for a number of scholars who are passionately aware of the advantages of this approach.

agreement with this position, Szépe (1984: 69), for instance, argues that “the right to use one’s mother tongue happens to be a fundamental, socially expressed human right applying equally to children”. For him, what is at stake is not *whether* but *how* mother tongue education should be promoted. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1995: 7-8), Linguistic Human Rights should be respected at two levels, namely: the individual and the collective. At the first level, what it entails is an individual’s positive identification with his/her mother tongue, and the acceptance and respect on the part of others. In her view, “it means the right to learn the mother tongue, orally and in writing and to receive at least basic education through the medium of the mother tongue, and the right to use it in many (official) contexts. It means the right to learn at least one of the official languages in one’s country of residence”. On the other hand, Skutnabb-Kangas claims that respect for Linguistic Human Rights at a collective level implies, among others, the minority groups’ right to exist, to be different, to enjoy and develop their languages, to “establish and maintain schools and other training and educational institutions, with control of curricula and teaching in their own languages”.

When analysing the issue of Language and Globalisation, the study also draws upon Robert Phillipson’s views. The Linguistic Imperialism Theory also known as the ‘Diffusion of English Paradigm’ argues that the spread of English throughout the world should be seen not as a natural phenomenon, but the result of a conscious effort on the part of the American and British Governments. Consequently, such a spread may have disastrous consequences on the ‘smaller’, local or minority languages that are not able to compete at the same level and therefore are eliminated. It is in this context that the concepts of *Linguicism* and *Linguistic Genocide* are discussed. *Linguicism*, according to Skutnabb-Kangas, refers to the intentional destruction of a powerless language by a dominant one. *Linguistic Genocide*, in its turn, is defined by the United Nations International Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) as “Prohibiting the use of the language of the group in daily intercourse or in schools, or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group”.

Phillipson (2003: 162) argues that “Linguistic imperialism builds on an assumption that one language is preferable to others, and its dominance is structurally entrenched through the allocation of more resources to it. The dominance of English in contemporary Europe [for example] can constitute

linguistic imperialism if other languages are disadvantaged, and are being learned or used in subtractive ways. There is clear evidence of language teaching being encumbered by an Anglo-American set of values and norms in southern Europe, and in the post-communist world”. Although the study draws on Phillipson, I should, however, underline here that I do not share the belief that languages of wider communication such as English need necessarily to be detrimental to the local languages, a view sometimes attributed to Phillipson’s Linguistic Imperialism perspective. It is not always that English acts as a *Lingua Diabolica* or a *killer language*. In the Mozambican context, I certainly look at English more as a *lingua economica*, a *lingua emotiva* and a *lingua academica*¹⁸, and speaking specifically about the Mozambican national languages, I do not think in any way that English constitutes any threat to them, as they are still very present in the day-to-day of the Mozambicans. It is in these languages that most of the daily activities are conducted not only in the rural areas, but also in certain circles in the urban centres, such as market places and others. Thus, and as Phillipson (2009) argues, what we have to consider is whether English language Teaching and Learning in any given context is additive or subtractive,¹⁹ that is, whether the English language is learned in addition to another language or whether it replaces the person’s other languages (first or second).

Obviously, the study also explores the issue of language education policy from the perspective advanced by Bernard Spolsky (1986, 2004). Among other issues, he underlines that a “responsible and feasible policy for language and education is attained by considering two basic principles, namely, the rights of individual members of a society to equality of educational opportunity and the rights of individuals and groups in a multilingual community to maintain, if they choose, their own linguistic varieties” (1986: 188). Along the same line, Smolicz (1986: 111-115) argues that “an Enlightened National Language Policy must encourage all groups to be open to other languages and cultures, in order to dispel any assumption of superiority or exploitation, whether in the economic, cultural or linguistic fields of national policy”. He adds that “it is only the denial of diversity [that leads to separatism and] undermines cohesion, which is guaranteed by the free acceptance of the overarching

¹⁸ Phillipson (2003: 4-5) argues that among the purposes that English serves in key societal domains are *lingua economica* (used in business and advertising, the language of corporate neoliberalism), a *lingua emotiva* (the imaginary of Hollywood, popular music, consumerism and hedonism) and *lingua academica* (in research publications, at international conferences, and as medium for content learning at university level).

¹⁹ The concepts of additive and subtractive bilingualism are going to be discussed in Chapter Three, when reviewing relevant terminology in the field of Language Planning and Policy.

framework of values by all the ethnic groups in society". In Chapter Three, when reviewing key terminology in Language Planning and Policy, reference will be made to some of Spolsky's major contributions to the field.

I postulate that Mozambique has a lot to gain from its condition as multilingual, multicultural and multiethnic. The country's diversity should be seen as a resource likely to benefit not only each individual, but also the country at large. There is a possibility to develop a language education policy that is based on both the ecology-of-language paradigm²⁰ and the diffusion of English paradigm²¹. These two paradigms do not necessarily have to exclude each other; as will be discussed throughout the present study; there is a possibility for a compromise between the two. Because globalisation and internationalisation processes seem to be linked to the English language²², the promotion of English language education appears to be in the agenda of language planners in many countries of the world. This is done with a view to enhance people's equal participation in the globalisation process, although differences in terms of linguistic skills will always exist and in this way limit a person's participation. The promotion of Foreign Language Teaching or Learning and particularly English language learning does not, in my view, have to equate neglect and endangerment of the local or national languages.

My major argument is that while it is important to respect the linguistic human rights of children in Mozambique, by providing access to Mother Tongue Education, and because of all the benefits indicated in academic, cognitive and pedagogical terms, it is equally important to provide access to the languages of wider communication because in today's world people cease to be just national citizens, and become transnational and global citizens.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The present qualitative study was mainly focussed on two rural schools in Maputo Province, in southern Mozambique. These two rural primary schools are treated as case studies for the investigation

²⁰ Hornberger (2002: 35), quoting Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996: 429) claims that this is a paradigm that involves a tolerance of linguistic diversity, the promotion of multilingualism and foreign language learning, as well as the granting of linguistic human rights to speakers of all languages.

²¹ A paradigm claimed to be monolingual in its view of modernization and internationalization (Hornberger 2002, Phillipson 1996).

²² See Risager (2009), for example.

of language attitudes. The findings constitute only an indication of existing opinions and attitudes and are used to provide information aimed at illuminating the issue of language education. The main reason for concentrating in rural schools relies on the fact that mother tongue-based bilingual education has not yet been extended to the urban areas, particularly because it appears that most pupils in the urban areas are able to communicate in Portuguese before they initiate schooling, and therefore they do not seem to face any major problems in access to education in Portuguese or, at least, not the same ones as those faced by pupils in rural areas. In addition to the two rural schools, responses from a primary school in the urban context were also included for comparison purposes, that is, in order to verify whether the attitudes would be similar or different in a city context.

I maintain that the findings of the present study would be relevant to schools with the same features as the schools considered here. As for the language education policy being proposed, I postulate that it would be possible to apply to or replicate in most linguistically heterogeneous contexts such as the schools in Maputo city. Obviously, there would be a need for adjustments or modifications in order to make the policy suitable to each situation.

1.9 Structure of the Dissertation

The present dissertation is divided into seven chapters, as follows:

The present chapter, Chapter *One*, consists of a general introduction, which gives the rationale for the study. This part also introduces the major purpose of the study, the research questions, the problem statement, the methodology, the theoretical framework, as well as the delimitation of the study.

Chapter *Two* introduces the Republic of Mozambique, by presenting a brief history of the country, its geography, people, and cultures. The Chapter's major focus is the Country's Linguistic Profile, with its language varieties, language names and numbers of speakers, and the reasons for the choice of Portuguese as the official language, at the expense of the Mozambican varieties at the time of independence. It also discusses the role and status of the Mozambican national languages, as well as language attitudes. Finally, the chapter introduces Mozambique's national education system and briefly looks at the issue of the languages in the Mozambican school curriculum.

Chapter *Three* reviews a number of key terms, issues and terminology present in current research and literature in the field of Language Planning and Policy, which are highly relevant for the purposes of this study. It discusses the importance and the need for language planning, ideologies motivating language planning, types, components, as well as actors and institutions intervening in language policy decisions.

Chapter *Four* briefly looks at the linguistic situation and language education policies in various countries in Southern Africa. The chapter examines the language education policy choices made by the newly-independent countries in Southern Africa, in the 1960's and 1970's, and considers recent trends towards the use of the African Mother Tongues in education. The chapter pays particular attention to the new South African Language Policy, as a large number of issues pertaining to the country's new language policy would be highly relevant in informing language policy making in Mozambique.

Chapter *Five*, which includes the bulk of my primary research, looks at two schools in which Mother Tongue Education has already been introduced. The chapter reviews the PEBIMO Project, that is, the first pilot Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Education Project in Mozambique, and afterwards, reports on the results of the investigation of attitudes of Grade 5 and 6 pupils (aged between 9 to 15 years), teachers, school administrators and parents, in relation to the languages in the curriculum in the two rural primary schools. For comparison purposes, the chapter also looks at the attitudes of Grade 6 pupils in an urban Primary School in Maputo City. The research results are then analysed and thoroughly considered with a view to exploring how the discourses of Globalisation and Mother Tongue Education are articulated in the Mozambican school context.

After an analysis of the findings concerning language attitudes, and following a careful consideration of the experiences from other countries, and informed by research results in the field, Chapter *Six* suggests a sound and inclusive language education policy for the Mozambican multilingual context.

Chapter *Seven* presents the major conclusions and recommendations of the study. In addition, the chapter looks at a number of areas that deserve further research and gives indications of the way forward.

CHAPTER TWO

MOZAMBIQUE – A BRIEF COUNTRY PROFILE

The major purpose of this Chapter is to introduce the Republic of Mozambique. The chapter starts by briefly describing the country's geography, history, people, and cultures, and then concentrates on the country's linguistic profile, with its language varieties, language names and numbers, and the reasons for the choice of Portuguese as the official language, at the expense of the Mozambican national varieties at the time of independence. It also discusses the role and status of the Mozambican national languages, as well as language attitudes. Finally, the chapter introduces Mozambique's national education system and briefly looks at the issue of language education.

2.1 Geography, History and Demography

Mozambique, with a total area of 801,590 square kilometres²³, and stretching itself 2,500 km along the Indian Ocean, is a country that is geographically located in Southern Africa. The country is bordered by the Indian Ocean to the East, the Republic of Tanzania to the North, Malawi and Zambia to the Northwest, Zimbabwe to the West and the Republics of Swaziland and South Africa to the Southwest²⁴.

Maputo, located in the far south of Mozambique, and with a total of 1.094.315 inhabitants, is the capital of the country. Maputo is nearly 2000 km from the northern-most area of Mozambique. The second major capital city is Beira, located in the centre of the country, with 436.240 inhabitants.

²³ Slightly over double the size of Germany (357,114 km²).

²⁴ The Map of Mozambique, with its main provincial capital cities, and the surrounding countries is presented in Appendix I. See also Appendix II (Map of Africa), for an overview of Mozambique's geographical position in the African continent.

Nampula, in the north of the country, is the third largest capital city, with 477.900 inhabitants (Census 2007, INE).

Mozambique is administratively divided into eleven provinces that are located in the three main regions, north, centre and south. In the north, we find the provinces of Cabo Delgado, Niassa, Nampula, Zambézia and Tete. In the centre, we find the provinces of Manica and Sofala, and in the south, we have Inhambane, Gaza, Maputo Province and Maputo City.

Crossing the country from west to east, into the Indian Ocean, and separating the northern region from the centre, is the Zambeze River, with 820 km. The Zambeze River, which is the fourth longest river in Africa, has its source in Zambia, and it also flows through Zimbabwe²⁵.

According to the National Census 2007, the total population of the country is estimated in 20,530,714 people, of whom 9,787,135 are men and 10,743,579 are women. The population density is 25/km². The majority of the population (99.66%) is of Bantu²⁶ origin. Literacy is estimated at about 50 %. Nearly two-thirds of the population of Mozambique live in rural areas.

Mozambique, now a multi-party democracy, was a Portuguese Colony for five centuries, and gained its independence from Portugal on June 25, 1975, after a ten-year armed struggle (1964-1974). From 1975 to 1986, the country was a Socialist and a single-party state, under Samora Machel and FRELIMO²⁷. It had a Marxist and Communist political orientation, and a strong alliance with the Soviet Union. The country was hit by a civil war in the period 1976 to 1992, involving RENAMO²⁸, strongly fuelled by the white Rhodesian regime (in present-day Zimbabwe), and also by the Apartheid regime of South Africa. The civil war seriously affected Mozambique's general progress and development in many areas, as it destroyed a large part of the country's economic and social infrastructures. The civil war

²⁵ The Map of Mozambique, in Appendix I, also shows the Zambezi River.

²⁶ The term Bantu refers to a group of approximately 500 languages spoken in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is a term that is also used to refer to the ethnic groups who speak one of the Bantu languages. According to Guthrie (1948), the Bantu languages have Proto-Bantu as the proto-language and they belong to the Niger-Congo language family. For a detailed classification of the Bantu Language Family, see Malcolm Guthrie 1948 and 1971.

²⁷ FRELIMO stands for *Frente de Libertação Nacional*, which was the Front for the National Liberation of Mozambique. Samora Machel was the first President of independent Mozambique.

²⁸ RENAMO stands for the National Resistance of Mozambique, an antigovernment guerrilla movement.

ended in 1992, with the signing of the Rome Peace Agreement.

In the period 1986-1989, the country went through a number of political, economic and constitutional reforms, under Joaquim Chissano,²⁹ who paved the way for a multi-party democracy, and a free market economy. The first free and democratic elections were held in 1994. In spite of being one of the poorest countries in the world, Mozambique has lately achieved an impressive economic growth, and the poverty rate has reduced from 69% in 1997 to 54% in 2003, as a result of a strong foreign investment, and megaprojects such as MOZAL (the aluminium smelter) and SASOL (the gas pipeline to South Africa).

The Republic of Mozambique is a member of SADC - the Southern African Development Community, which is composed of thirteen (13) other member states, namely, Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Among SADC's main aims are the creation of an integrated regional trade and economy, and the promotion of more coordination and cooperation between the member states in the areas of peace and security.

In addition, Mozambique is a member of the African Union (AU)³⁰, a continent-wide organisation, with 53 member states. Among the main objectives of the AU is the acceleration of the process of continental integration, so that Africa can be an active player in the global economy, while simultaneously addressing a variety of social, economic and political issues. In 1995, Mozambique became the first non-former British colony to join the British Commonwealth of Nations. According to

²⁹ Samora Machel's successor; Samora Machel died on October 19, 1986 in a plane crash in Mbuzini, South Africa.

³⁰ The African Union (AU) replaces the Organisation for African Unity (OAU), which had been established in 1963 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, with the objectives, among others, of promoting understanding among African peoples and unity, solidarity and cooperation among African states. Although a number of the underlying objectives of the AU are still quite similar to those of the OAU, a few of the innovations brought by the new AU is the need to unify the continent and improve the living standards of the people in Africa, through the establishment of a common parliament (the Pan-African Parliament), aimed at giving Africans a greater say in continental leadership; the Central Bank, with a view of running an Africa-wide economy; and the Court of Justice, established with the purpose of making those responsible for human rights abuses accountable for their actions. For further details on the African Union organisation (AU) and its structures, see the Pan-African Parliament website – <http://www.pan-africanparliament.org/> and/or the Constitutive Act of the African Union, presented at the following site: http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key_oau/au_act.htm.

Manuel Tomé (1999),³¹ the decision to join the Commonwealth was mainly dictated by regional reasons, and by the need to diversify Mozambique's cooperation, and expand its businesses and trade partners to the region.

In addition, it should be stated that Mozambique has adopted and ratified several important UN conventions, treaties, and protocols, among them, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Jomtien Declaration³², CONFITEA³³, the Millennium Development Goals, the World Declaration on Education for All and the World Declaration on Population and Development.

2.2 Ethnic Groups and Religions

Mozambique is a multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual country. The country's ethno-linguistic and cultural heritage is a blend of the influence of the Islamic Coastal traders, European colonizers, and the Indigenous peoples.

It is important to recall that the partition of Africa in the 1880s was done at random, not taking into consideration the various existing ethnic or tribal groups at the time. As Mazrui (1998: 5) indicates, the "national boundaries of most African States lack the underpinning of any national linguistic identity"; in the same token, Kashoki (2003: 186) argues that

The largely arbitrary nature of the manner in which present-day African countries came into being as sovereign nation states is directly responsible for their present highly multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual 'national' character – sometimes, as in the case of Tanzania and Nigeria, containing as many as

³¹ FRELIMO's General Secretary, in an interview with the Expresso newspaper, on November 13, 1999.

³² The Jomtien Declaration emerged as a result of deliberations made by national Ministers of Education, representatives from international organizations, as well as UNESCO and the World Bank, in Thailand, in 1990. After having evaluated the state of education in the world, the participants concluded that African Education, in particular, was in crisis, its curriculum was irrelevant, there were serious issues regarding the medium of instruction and finally, that the education structures were highly centralized. It makes an appeal for investment and reforms, which consider the socio-economic and cultural backgrounds of Africans. Major pledges were made by the developed countries for increasing financial and technical support, while African governments drafted policy papers showing their commitment in undertaking curricular reforms aimed at making education more relevant to the local reality and needs (Alidou 2003: 105).

³³ Confitea is an international discussion platform on adult education, involving governments, civil society, international donors, and academics, and it focuses on such issues as the critical importance of adult learning, the right of adults to learn, the need to exchange experiences and promote international co-operation, as well as recommend future policy actions, and adopt a Declaration on Adult Learning and an Agenda for the Future.

100 or more 'languages' or 'dialects' within their borders.

While both Mazrui and Kashoki defend the view that the current linguistic diversity of many African countries results from the manner in which their borders were conceived by the colonial powers, Makoni, on the other hand, seems to put the blame for what he calls an 'exaggerated multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, and multi-tribal picture of African colonies' over the missionaries who worked on the African languages; he argues:

Different languages were invented out of what was one language through a process marred by 'faulty transcriptions and mishearings', mediated through partial competence in African languages, and motivated by an overly sharp separation between language structure and language use (Campbell-Makini 2000) reinforced by the use of different orthographic systems. Initiatives for rendering African speech ("languages") in written form resulted in 'an exaggerated multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, and multi-tribal picture of African colonies [that] has been painted through misinterpretation and inadequate study on the part of early missionaries and manipulation for administrative convenience on the part of colonial governments'... For example, the speech of the Sotho and Tswana, whose languages are productively conceptualized as a continuum, were defined as separate languages. The Xhosa and Zulu peoples, whose languages are closely related, were defined as speaking different languages because of the rivalry between the different missionaries working with these two groups. In some cases even the names given to some of the African speech forms were invented by Europeans. Prior to European colonialism, the Shona peoples did not have a collective term to refer to themselves. In 1931, the name 'Shona' was used for the purpose of facilitating administrative classification. [The recommendation came] from a committee of missionaries, who subsequently commissioned a language expert to design an orthographic system for Shona – in spite of his lack of knowledge about the language'. (2003:135)

Interestingly enough and common to Mazrui, Makoni and Kashoki is the claim that the extensive linguistic diversity of African states is in part an artificial outcome of the colonisation process³⁴, that is, of the process leading to the establishment of the geographical borders of African states and also the result of the work of early missionaries. Furthermore, what Makoni writes about the languages of South

³⁴ See Makoni and Mashiri (2006) who make a strong case for the need to 'deconstruct' and 'reconstruct' the concept of language in the African context. In their view, if "conceptualizations of African languages are to change, we have to *disinvent* the discourses of African languages. For *disinvention* to take place, it is necessary to intervene at a level of discourse, at the level of representations, and by implication at a level of conceptualization. The ultimate objective of *disinvention* is to facilitate alternative ways of framing and conceptualizing African languages" (pp.64)

Africa (Xhosa, Zulu, etc.), seems to apply to the Mozambican situation, as further discussed under Mozambique's Linguistic Profile.

As presented later on in this chapter, quite a number of the ethno-linguistic groups present in Mozambique are also present in the neighbouring countries. Particular examples are the Changana or XiChangana people and language, which are both present and spoken in southern Mozambique and in the Republic of South Africa.

Sixteen (16) main ethnic groups or tribes are recognised in Mozambique, and the main ones are the Makhuwa, the Tsonga (or Shangaan), Chokwe, Manyika, and Sena. The Makhuwa or Makua-Lomwé is the largest ethnic group in the country, accounting for 37% of the population. The Makhuwa are mainly concentrated in the northern region of the country, and North of the Zambezi River, particularly in Nampula and Zambézia provinces³⁵. Other ethnic groups found in the northern region are the Yao (Ajawa), in Niassa Province, and the Makonde, who live along the Rovuma River. In addition, other African ethnic groups based in the north are the Nguni and the Maravi.

The main group residing south of the Zambezi River is Tsonga, corresponding to about 23% of the total population. In addition, we also find the Chopi, living in the coast of Inhambane Province and the Shona or Karanga (about 9%), residing in the central region. In addition to populations of African descent, we also find population groups of European descent (0.06%), mixed Euro-Africans (0.2%), Indians (0.08%) and Chinese.

Although there are a number of common features between the different ethnic groups or tribes of Mozambique, such as, for example, the belief in the spirit of the ancestors, it is important to highlight that one of the main distinctive features of some of the groups north of the Zambeze, particularly the Makhuwa, is that they are mostly matrilineal. On the other hand, the groups south of the Zambeze, such as the Changana, are mainly patrilineal. It is equally relevant to highlight at this stage that each and various ethnic groups or tribes are very much aware of their distinctiveness from the other ethnic

³⁵ See the Map of Mozambique in Appendix I.

groups³⁶.

The main religions are the Roman Catholic Church, spread throughout the country, Islam, particularly in the north, and Protestants. Roman Catholics account for 23.8%, Muslims correspond to 17.8%, people with other beliefs (including protestant) correspond to 17.8%, Zionist Christians³⁷ account for 17.5%, and 23.1% do not have any religious beliefs (1997 Census). It should be noted that the African Traditional Religion, which is characterised by a belief in the spirits of the ancestors, is still very strong in most people's lives. Even people who are officially rated as Roman Catholics or Anglicans, and who go to church on a regular basis, would still resort to the African Traditional Religion, and consult the spirits for any important step or decision in their life, such as, for example, in order to get a job, a promotion or to have a happy marriage³⁸. In this way, it could be argued, that people do not look at the different religions as being mutually exclusive, but rather as complementary.

Having briefly looked at the ethnic groups and the main religions present in Mozambique, the next section will focus on the languages spoken in the territory and the number of speakers. It is important to notice that most of the language names coincide with the designation given for the ethnic groups; in other words, the Makhuwa ethnic group, for example, speaks the Emakhuwa or Makhuwa language; the Makonde people speak the Makonde language, and so on.

Another issue to retain is that for many of the languages mentioned, there are often different designations or variant names. In other words, the language known as Makhuwa, for example, is sometimes referred to as Emakhuwa or Makua. In fact, in the NUGL Online (2009), under the Makhuwa Group (P30), three different variant names are presented for Makhuwa: Makhuwa, Emakhuwa and Makua. Under the Tswa-Rhonga Group (S50), the following variants appear for Changana: Changana, Xichangana and Tsonga. According to Maho (2009: 6-7), a possible explanation for the existence of many variant names for one particular language results from the fact that “the

³⁶ A very interesting review of the issue of the ethnic identities of the members of the FRELIMO movement, during the armed struggle for the liberation of Mozambique, is presented by Robinson (2006) in his PhD thesis, where he refers to claims made by the members of the guerrilla movement, that the southerners were marginalising those from the north.

³⁷ An African independent church, very much influenced by traditional beliefs.

³⁸ A description of the important role played by traditional healers (or *curandeiros*), spirit mediums and witchdoctors can be found at http://www.questconnect.org/africa_Mozambique.htm

literature is not always clear about what is a variant name, a dialect name, a place name, or whatever, so sometimes a string of names may signify a set of related dialects (hyponyms)". This may also constitute a result of the fact that the standardization and modernization of the orthography of those languages is still ongoing.

2.3 The Country's Linguistic Profile

There is no agreement on the exact number of languages spoken in the Republic of Mozambique. The Ethnologue mentions 43 and NELIMO³⁹ cites 20. This lack of agreement is probably a result of the fact that, so far, no thorough sociolinguistic or dialectological study has been conducted on the linguistic varieties spoken in the country⁴⁰. Adding to this is the fact that the work done by the missionaries, although of inestimable value in contributing to bringing the Mozambican National Languages into written form, probably also resulted in an exaggerated listing of the languages spoken in Mozambique.

Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that Mozambique is a highly linguistically diverse country. Lopes (1998: 446), drawing on Robinson (1993)⁴¹ and Grimes (1992)⁴², claims that Mozambique is ranked "among the 15 most linguistically diverse countries in Africa", meaning that in numerical terms, no language "can claim majority language status at a national level". In addition to Portuguese, and the Mozambican National Languages of Bantu origin, English is spoken in the country, as well as Arabic, which is also used and spoken on a daily basis, particularly for religious purposes, and as medium of instruction in the Islamic schools.

The country's only official language is Portuguese. It is estimated that approximately 40% of the Mozambicans speak Portuguese as their second language and only about 6.5% speak it as their first language. In the case of Mozambicans who have been through the national education system, their

³⁹ NELIMO is the Centre for the Study of Mozambican Languages, based at Eduardo Mondlane University in Maputo.

⁴⁰ There is no doubt that this type of studies is extremely important; as Guus Extra (2008: 7) points out, language surveys are extremely relevant, as they can "offer valuable insights into both the distribution and vitality of languages across different population groups" In addition, these kinds of data are also crucial for devising comprehensive educational policies that consider the teaching of both national majority and home minority languages (Extra and Yagmur 2004: 69)

⁴¹ For whom high linguistic diversity refers to "a situation where no more than fifty percent of the population speak the same language", and who argues that "a ranking of degree of linguistic diversity should not be based on the absolute number of languages in a country, but rather on the percentage of the population speaking any single language" (pp. 52-5)

⁴² Whose "data on countries of Africa where no single language group exceeds 50 % of the population show that 25 of the total number of African countries (58) fall into this category" (pp.91).

command of Portuguese would be reasonably good, for Mozambican standards⁴³. It should be highlighted that the literature refers to an emergence of a Mozambican Portuguese, which borrows quite extensively from the Mozambican national languages⁴⁴ and presents a number of neologisms. I will, however, refrain from discussing the issue further within the present work.

For the purposes of the present research, and informed by NELIMO's 2000 report⁴⁵, the study will, first and foremost, work with the seventeen (17) Bantu languages that have been subject of the standardization of the orthography, jointly conducted by NELIMO, INDE, and ARPAC experts. They are, respectively: (1) Cibalke, (2) Cicopi, (3) Cimonyika, (4) Cindau, (5) Cinyanja, (6) Cinyungwe, (7) Cisena, (8) Citshwa, (9) Ciutee, (10) Ciyao, (11) Echuwabu, (12) Emakhuwa, (13) Gitonga, (14) Kimwani, (15) Shimakonde, (16) Xichangana, and (17) Xirhonga.

In addition to the above linguistic varieties, other languages that are listed in the Ethnologue report of languages of Mozambique are: (18) Barwe, (19) Dema, (20) Kokola, (21) Koti, (22) Kunda, (23) Lolo, (24) Lomwe or Makhuwa-Lomwe, (25) Makhuwa-Maindo, (26) Makhuwa-Marrevone, (27) Makhuwa-Meeto, (28) Makhuwa-Moniga, (29) Makhuwa-Saka, (30) Makhuwa-Shirima, (31) Makwe, (32) Manyawa, (33) Manyika, (34) Marenje, (35) Mozambican Sign Language, (36) Mwani, (37) Nathembo, (38) Ngoni, (39) Nsenga, (40) Nyungwe, (41) Phimbi, (42) (44) Swahili, (45) Swati, (46) Takwane, (47) Tawara, (48) Twe, (49) Tsonga, (50) Tswa, and (51) Zulu. Finally, languages such as Shona and Xinanga are also listed by INE 1998.

The national languages of Mozambique are classified as belonging to the Bantu language family, most

⁴³ I shall return to the issue of Mozambican standards, under Section 2.3.1 below, when briefly discussing the emerging variety of the Portuguese of Mozambique. Note, however, that Lopes (1998) raises some doubts concerning Mozambicans' level of command of the Portuguese language, when arguing that the "argument that a bilingual (Bantu/Portuguese) Mozambican can use the official language (Portuguese) in official situations is flawed for the following reasons: If languages cannot be used in official situations, they will not be adequately learned and developed; and if they are not properly learned, how can people fully and consciously identify with languages which are poorly known, and in some instances not known at all?"

⁴⁴ An example of a borrowing from the national Mozambican languages is the word *chima*, which means a type of porridge eaten with a sauce. *Chima* is used in Emakhuwa, Cisena, and Cinyungwe, and now quite extensively in the Portuguese of Mozambique. Two examples of neologisms are: the word *machimbombo*, which means *bus*; and the word *desconseguir*, which means *not being able to/unable*.

⁴⁵ *Relatório do II Seminário sobre a Padronização da Ortografia de Línguas Moçambicanas or Report on the II Seminar for the Standardization of the Orthography of the Mozambican Languages.*

particularly to the Niger-Congo grouping (Guthrie 1971). According to Guthrie, the Bantu languages spoken in Mozambique are classified in four major linguistic zones, respectively:

1. Zone G (G40): Swahili
2. Zone P (P20): Yao [P21 Yao; P23 Makonde; P30 Makua]
3. Zone N (N30): Nyanja [N40 Senga-Sena]
4. Zone S (S10): Shona [S50: Tswa-Ronga; S60 Chopi]

Note that a number of linguistic subzones and groupings are also considered in this classification⁴⁶. The Bantu languages are spoken not only in Southern Africa, but also in North, Central, and East Africa. The literature⁴⁷ refers to a Bantu emigration about 4.000 years ago (2.000 BC), from the South-western part of Nigeria and Cameroon to Africa south of the equator, an area that was at the time populated by Neolithic hunter-gatherers such as the Bushman of Botswana, and the Khoekhoe and San who currently live in South Africa and Namibia. Table 1, below, presents the seventeen Bantu languages covered by the NELIMO 2000 Report and their alternate names.

Table 1: The 17 Linguistic Varieties and their Alternate Names

<i>No.</i>	<i>Languages</i>	<i>Alternate Name(s)</i>
1	Cibalke	Barwe, Balke
2	Cicopi	Shichopi, Copi, Cicopi, Shicopi, Tschopi, Txopi, Txitxopi
3	Cimanyika	Manyika
4	Cindau	Ndau
5	Cinyanja	Nyanja, Chinyanja
6	Cinyungwe	Nyungwe, Chinyungwi, Cinyungwe, Nyonwe, Yungwe, Teta, Tete
7	Cisena	Sena, Cisena, Chisena
8	Citshwa	Shitshwa, Kitshwa, Sheetshwa, Xitshwa, Tshwa
9	Ciutee	Ciute, Chiute, Tewe, Teve, Vateve, Wateve
10	Ciyao	Yao, Chiyao, Achawa, Adsawa, Adsoa, Ajawa, Ayawa, Ayo, Djao, Haio, Hiao, Hyao, Jao, Veiao, Wajao

⁴⁶ Firmino (2005: 47-49) presents a detailed listing of the four linguistic zones and additional subzones in which the Bantu Languages of Mozambique fall.

⁴⁷ See Guthrie (1948; 1971) and/or Greenberg (1963).

11	Echuwabu	Chuwabu, Chuwabo, Chwabo, Cuwabo, Cuabo, Chuabo, Chichwabo, Cicuabo, Txuwabo, Echuwabo, Echuabo
12	Emakhuwa	Makhuwa, Makhuwa-Makhuwana, Makua, Emakua, Makua, Makoane, Maquoua, Makhuwa of Nampula
13	Gitonga	Bitonga, Tonga, Shengwe, Inhambane
14	Kimwani	Mwani, Mwane, Muane, Quimuane, Ibo
15	Shimakonde	Makonde, Chimakonde, Chinimakonde, Cimakonde, Konde, Makonda, Maconde, Matambwe
16	Xichangana	Changana, Shangaan, Shangana, Hlanganu, Hanganu, Langanu, Changa, Shilanganu
17	Xirhonga	Shironga, Xironga, Gironga

Source: Ethnologue Report for Mozambique 2009; NELIMO Report 2000

If we look carefully at the above seventeen linguistic varieties (as presented by NELIMO, 2000) and compare them with those in the Ethnologue 2009 list, we can clearly see that what we have, in most cases, do not seem to be different linguistic varieties, but a single one with a different designation. Take, for instance, Cibalke (in the NELIMO list), which is apparently the same as Barwe (in the Ethnologue list).

If we consider linguistic varieties twenty-four to thirty (24-30) (The Ethnologue, 2009), and compare them with Lopes's (1998: 442) classification of Mozambican Bantu Languages, it seems that each of these are, in fact, dialects of the Emakhuwa Language. According to Lopes (ibid), among the *variants* of Emakhuwa, we find Emetto, Esaaka, and Echirima, herein presented under numbers (27) Makhuwa-Meeto, (29) Makhuwa-Saka, and (30) Makhuwa-Shirima. Linguistic varieties (24) Lomwe and (26) Marrevone are also classified as dialects of Emakhuwa, by NELIMO (2000: 67); in the NELIMO 2000 Report referred to as Elomwe and Emarevoni.

Quite a number of the linguistic varieties presented as separate languages, in the Ethnologue list of Languages of Mozambique, appear to be classified under the same language; for example, Tsonga (number 49) is said to be a language that comprises three major linguistic varieties, which are mutually intelligible; namely, Xirhonga, Xichangana and Citshwa. Lomwe (number 24), for example, is presented by NELIMO, as one of the variants of Emakhuwa. Marenje (number 34, above) is

considered as a variant of Echuwabu. Once again, this uncertainty, regarding whether some of these linguistic varieties stand as fully-fledged languages or as dialects of one or another language, also contributes to the difficulty in deciding on the number of languages spoken in Mozambique.

Table 2, below, presents the above languages, the number of speakers, as well as their geographical distribution (according to INE 1998 and 2007). It also presents data pertaining to other languages spoken in Mozambique, with a particular focus on Elomwe, Portuguese, Kiswahili, Swazi and Zulu.

Table 2: Languages, Number of Speakers and Geographical Distribution⁴⁸

<i>No.</i>	<i>Languages</i>	<i>Number of Speakers</i>	<i>Geographical Distribution (Region/Provinces)& Countries other than Mozambique</i>
1	Portuguese	2,088,798	Mostly spoken in the major urban areas and provincial capitals/capital cities
2	Cibalke	15,000	Central Region - Manica Province
3	Cicopi	405,521	South - Inhambane and Gaza Provinces
4	Cimanyika	121,993	Central Region - Border Area between Manica Province and the Republic of Zimbabwe
5	Cindau	581,000	Central Region - Sofala, Manica, Inhambane Provinces and the Republic of Zimbabwe
6	Cinyanja	607,671	North - Niassa, Zambézia, Tete Provinces and the Republics of Malawi and Zambia
7	Cinyungwe	446,567	North - Tete Province, Malawi, Zimbabwe and Zambia
8	Cisena	1,171,673	Centre and North – Sofala, Manica, Zambézia and Tete
9	Citshwa	763,029	South and Centre- Maputo, Gaza, Inhambane, Manica and Sofala Provinces, as well as Zimbabwe and South Africa
10	Ciutee	250,000	Centre – Manica Province
11	Ciyao	374,426	North – Niassa Province, Malawi and Tanzania
12	Echuwabu	733,926	North - Zambézia Province
13	Emakhuwa	4,153,811	North – Nampula, Cabo-Delgado and Zambézia Provinces
14	Gitonga	319,836	South – Inhambane and Maputo Provinces
15	Kimwani	29,980	North- Cabo-Delgado Province

⁴⁸ See Appendix Three, which presents a table with updated and detailed information on Mozambicans of 5 years of age and older and their knowledge of Portuguese.

16	Shimakonde	371,111	North – Cabo-Delgado Province
17	Xichangana	1,710,801	South – Maputo, Gaza and Inhambane Provinces, and Centre – Manica and Sofala Provinces
18	Xirhonga	626,174	South – Maputo, Gaza and Inhambane Provinces, and Centre – Manica and Sofala Provinces
19	Kiswahili	21,070	North – Cabo Delgado Province
20	Swazi	7,742	South – Maputo Province
21	Zulu	3,529	South – Maputo Province
22	Elomwe	1,132,755	North – Zambézia Province

Source: INE 1998 and 2007

As we can see from the above table (Table 2), the largest linguistic groups, out of a total population of 20,530,714, are the **Emakhuwa**, followed by the **Cisena**, **Xichangana**, **Elomwe**, and **Echuwabo**. Emakhuwa speakers amount to about 24.8% of the country's total population, followed by Cisena and Xichangana with 11.2%, Elomwe (7.9%), and Echuwabo (7.5%). The table also shows that the Portuguese language is mostly spoken in the urban areas or the major cities, and as stated by Gonçalves (2009) such a high predominance or concentration of speakers of Portuguese in the cities is particularly linked to socio-economic factors, namely the fact that knowledge of this language constitutes a pre-condition for access to formal work for all citizens of Mozambique, both in rural and urban areas.

The next section looks briefly at the historical background, the role, the status, and the contexts of use of languages such as Portuguese, the Mozambican national languages, as well as English. The section also considers the social and political attitudes to these languages.

2.3.1 The Portuguese language

As previously stated, when Mozambique attained its independence from the colonial power in 1975, Portuguese was chosen as the only official language in the country. It should be noted that it had already played this role under the Portuguese colonial administration, and this was a continuation of the previous policy. As the official language, Portuguese became the sole medium of instruction and the main vehicle for the state administration and conduction of the government's businesses. It should

be highlighted, though, that at the time of independence, the percentage of people who were able to speak Portuguese was below 10% (Instituto Camões, 2009). In fact, as Firmino (1998: 249) explains, it was not a surprise that when Mozambique became independent, the Portuguese language, although spoken by a small minority of Mozambicans, emerged as the only language being disseminated throughout the whole country, because it was not marked either regionally or ethnically and, above all, it was known by the elites, especially those that had been through the colonial educational system.

The adoption of the former colonial languages as official languages has been common practice in many independent countries in Africa. Among the reasons that appear to be behind the choice of the ex-coloniser's languages at the expense of the local African languages is the fact that the newly-independent countries did not really have any other alternative. It should be said that, in many countries, most of the African languages either did not have a written form or decisions had to be made concerning the language to select from amidst the mosaic of languages.

According to Richard Ruíz (1988: 7), a large part of the work in the field of language planning has been inspired by the "preponderance of problem-oriented language planning approaches", which seem to establish a link between language and language diversity with social problems and therefore multilingualism is perceived as ultimately leading to a lack of social cohesiveness⁴⁹; with everyone speaking their own language, political and social consensus being *impossible* (pp.10)⁵⁰. In fact, Roy-Campbell (2003: 96) referring to Tsonope (1995) argues that there is a generalised "misconception that encouragement of several languages militates against national unity and highlights the risk of accentuating cleavages between communities⁵¹".

⁴⁹ We have to look at the equation – multilingualism means problems - with caution, as a number of examples exist throughout the world of linguistically homogeneous areas (like Northern Ireland, Rwanda or Somalia), which also lack social cohesiveness; and if we compare them with Switzerland, which is extremely heterogeneous but still cohesive, then it becomes difficult to argue in favour of the equation.

⁵⁰ A very interesting critical review of the suggested correlation between high linguistic diversity and level of socioeconomic development or the relationship between multilingualism and social wealth of a country is presented by Coulmas 1992, who draws on Pool (1972: 222) who argues that "linguistically highly fragmented countries are always poor".

⁵¹ See David Laitin (2004) for an interesting discussion of the correlation between language policy and civil war and the evidence he presents "against claims that the elimination of minority grievances would be a sure fire way of lowering the incidences of civil war" (p. 178). See also François Grin (2004) for the costs of maintaining cultural diversity.

In Mozambique, according to many (see, for example, Ganhão 1979) Portuguese was certainly a politically neutral language, spoken by a very small percentage of Mozambicans, but which would serve well the purposes of nation building, and surely a better option than any other national language for avoiding conflicts. The view of multilingualism or language diversity as a problem was certainly present in Mozambique at the time of independence. The vision of a multilingual Mozambique was out of the political agenda; the key goal at the time was to urgently build the Mozambican nation and make it work as such. The fact that there were so many languages spoken by the various ethnic groups constituting the new Mozambican state, and the fact that none of them was spoken nation-wide as a common language or *Lingua Franca*, would probably have constituted a hindrance to the birth of the new nation.

In Mozambique, as expressed by Ganhão (1979: 2), the decision to opt for Portuguese as the country's only official language was thoroughly examined in political terms, having as its major goal – the preservation of national unity and the integrity of the territory. He argues that this decision to adopt Portuguese does not actually date back to 1975, but to 1962, when FRELIMO came officially into being as the front for the liberation of Mozambique. Because the members of the FRELIMO movement came all from different geographical regions and different linguistic backgrounds, it was urgent to adopt a common denominator, which was Portuguese. Portuguese was used in the liberation camps as the common language of the FRELIMO movement, and the language used to build literacy of the combatants. Or as put by Stroud (1999: 346), the Portuguese language in Mozambique was symbolically appropriated and transformed from

A language of colonial oppression to an instrument of the Mozambican people's liberation. The language of oppression during colonial times was appropriated by the FRELIMO movement. Its ownership was challenged, its alliances reconceived, and its boundaries redrawn – the language was, to all intents and purposes, symbolically taken and subsequently transformed into a weapon of the revolution.

As a result of its adoption as the only official language, and thus its connection to jobs in the formal labour market, including both the public and private sectors, and its exclusive use in the education

system⁵², the Portuguese language has enjoyed a very high status and prestige. It is a language, thus, seen as the key to academic, social, professional, and economic ascendance. It is a language linked to the top of the social hierarchy, and a language highly valued by the social and political elites and equally by the masses⁵³. The Portuguese language in Mozambique is no longer seen as the ex-coloniser's language, but a Mozambican language in its own right⁵⁴. It certainly differs from the Portuguese of Portugal or the Portuguese of Brazil in many respects, and particularly at the lexical level. It is quite common, nowadays, to hear and read about the nativisation of the Portuguese language in Mozambique, which according to Firmino (2005: 143) comprises not only a linguistic dimension, as new usages are being developed, but also a symbolic dimension, characterised by the emergence of new social attitudes and ideologies. Gonçalves (1996: 61) points out that Mozambican Portuguese is characterised by the coining of new words, as well as extensive borrowings not only from the Bantu languages, but also from English; although it still draws on the European Portuguese, new semantic values and syntactic properties have developed. Lopes (1998: 475), on the other hand argues that the Portuguese language is no longer foreign, as it "has been evolving as a naturalised variety to serve the needs of Mozambicans". The naturalisation and indigenisation processes have led to the acquisition of new features, adapting the language to the "local realities, including the journalistic and literary registers of use". In Couto's (1986) view, alterations to the Portuguese language go beyond the linguistic domain and reveal a different perception of the world and life. "Mozambicans are in the process of transcending their role as simply users of the Portuguese language and assuming a status in which they are co-producers of this means of expression".

⁵² It should be highlighted that the *Plano Curricular do Ensino Básico* or the Curricular Plan for Basic Education (2003: 17) stipulates that the medium of instruction in the whole education system is Portuguese, regardless of the fact that the large majority of children do not speak it when they start schooling.

⁵³ Firmino's (2005) study on attitudes to Portuguese in Maputo city appears to confirm that the Portuguese language is highly valued due to its pragmatic function, or in his own words, "*os sentimentos em relação ao Português é de que esta língua se tornou um importante instrumento linguístico em Maputo, em parte como resposta às exigências do Mercado linguístico e socioeconómico, mas também como resultado de uma consciência metapragmática da mudança do seu estatuto social*". Essentially what Firmino states is that feelings in relation to Portuguese indicate that this is an important linguistic tool in Maputo, partly as a response to the demands of the linguistic and socioeconomic market, but also as a result of a metapragmatic awareness to change in its social statute. In her study of Trilingualism in Guinea-Bissau, Carol Benson came up with a similar conclusion as per the attitudes of ordinary people towards the Portuguese language. She argues that "although only a small percentage of Guineans claim to speak Portuguese (9% total according to the 1991 census), there is a widespread, unquestioning belief in its value for future employment and other opportunities". (2004: 170).

⁵⁴ Although in the official discourse and, most particularly, in the Constitution of the Republic, there is a reference to the *national languages*, meaning territorially and ethno-culturally Mozambican, and the Portuguese language (still seen as an exogenous language).

As already stated, in the new independent Mozambique, emerging in 1975, Portuguese was instituted as the only official language and thus the main vehicle and tool for building literacy skills. The main objective of the new FRELIMO- led government, at the time, was to eliminate any ethnic or tribal differences, and build a united Mozambique - a genuine Mozambican nation-state; and certainly the adoption of any of the Mozambican languages to be accorded the official status would have been seen as a threat to this unity. It would be difficult to imagine, at the time, a situation in which the Makua people or the Changana had to speak the Senas' language on a daily basis and have their children learning it as medium of instruction, particularly considering the fact that none of them is spoken as a common language, at national level. Thus, the choice of Portuguese as Mozambique's only official language was, to a great extent, justified by fears of tribal and ethnic conflicts that could likely emerge if any one of the national languages had been chosen instead.

I maintain that FRELIMO took the right decision in 1975. The national unity goal has undoubtedly been achieved throughout this thirty-five year period. The national identity comes before the group or 'tribal' identity. It is now possible to expand the vision of the Mozambican identity even further and conceive a vision of a multilingual future and consider ways of bringing on board the Mozambican national languages, as they do not in any way represent a threat to the national unity.

Having briefly reviewed the role and status of the Portuguese language in Mozambique, and considered some of the reasons that might have dictated its adoption as official language at the time of independence, the next section will focus on the role, status, and attitudes to the national languages of Mozambique.

2.3.2 The National Languages of Mozambique

As mentioned earlier, none of the languages spoken in Mozambique can claim a numerical linguistic majority at national level. In other words, from the universe of twenty or more languages spoken in the Mozambican territory, there is not a single one that is spoken or understood by at least fifty percent of the Mozambican population. Nevertheless, as previously mentioned, the Mozambican Constitution, the Government and State institutions refer officially to the indigenous languages of Mozambique (all of

them of Bantu origin), as ‘National Languages’⁵⁵, regardless of their geographical coverage, or the size of their speech community.

This may come as a surprise to most, considering that in the field of Sociolinguistics, the term ‘National Language’ usually refers to any language that is spoken or understood by the majority; a common language. As a matter of fact, Brann (1994: 129-130) claims that the term “National Language” has four distinctive meanings or connotations; namely, *territorial language*, *regional language*, *language-in-common* or *community language* (used throughout a country), and *central language* (used by the central government). In the Mozambican case, although neither the second meaning, that is, *language-in-common* or *community language* or the last meaning – *central language* – apply, it seems that the term national language is used to refer to their territorial basis; that is, the fact that these are languages associated to the geographical territory known as Mozambique, and it is certainly also possible to assign them to particular geographical regions within the country.

When considering the role and status of the Mozambican national languages, it is important to revisit the text of the 1990 Constitution of the Republic, in its Article 5, that stipulates that the Mozambican State values the national languages and promotes their development and increasing utilisation as vehicles of communication and in the education of citizens. There is certainly a positive political rhetoric about and towards the national languages and the need to value them as symbols of the Mozambican ethno-cultural identity.

Until recently,⁵⁶ the use of the Mozambican National Languages had mostly been assigned to the home, family, and other informal spheres such as shops, market places, etc. In addition, some of the Mozambican languages have also been used in radio broadcasting, particularly for news, and also for religious purposes. In regards to the status of the Mozambican National Languages, it would be quite prudent to argue that feelings and attitudes towards them have, throughout the years, been quite ambivalent; a mixture of positive and negative feelings.

⁵⁵ Thus, the term National Language in Mozambique would certainly exclude the Portuguese language, as well as Arabic, and Chinese.

⁵⁶ Most specifically, early 1990s, with the introduction of the national languages in literacy development (see Mário and Nandja 2005) and under the umbrella of the Mother Tongue Bilingual Education experimental project.

Soon after independence, the use of these languages in the public sphere (particularly schools) was strongly discouraged by the FRELIMO government, the education authorities and also at the level of certain families (especially, urban and literate). In other words, there was no space, in the public sphere, for the use of the Mozambican National Languages. Among the reasons that appeared to have prevented their use in the public sphere were, the need to promote national unity by speaking a neutral⁵⁷ language, the fact that these languages were seen as underdeveloped (particularly when it came to their readiness to be used as vehicles of instruction, issues related to their orthography or lack of it, etc.). One could perhaps attempt and say that, in fact, they seemed to be deprived of prestige, considering that during the colonial period and in the pre-independence years they were all considered dialects, with all the related connotations.⁵⁸

Regarding the question of attitudes to indigenous African languages, Kamwangamalu (2006: 730) points out that

A set of beliefs ... perpetuate the colonial myth that indigenous African languages do not have the linguistic complexity to be used in higher domains; and that these languages are good only to preserve African cultures and traditions. [Such a model, in his opinion, has] ideological implications that condemn languages to perennial status as underdeveloped. Consequently, in the post-colonies in Africa the position of the indigenous African languages in education and other higher domains has remained closely linked to the inherited colonizer's model, which perpetuates the hegemony of ex-colonial languages over the indigenous African languages.

Although the use of the Mozambican National Languages has been excluded from the formal contexts, they are strongly viewed as vehicles and symbols of the Mozambican national ethno-linguistic and cultural identity and, for that reason, their vitality is quite high⁵⁹. They are still being transmitted from parent to child, from generation to generation, particularly in the rural areas and, in no way, could they

⁵⁷ *Neutral* in this sense means one language without any association with the indigenous ethnic groups present in the Mozambican territory, that is, an exogenous language, such as Portuguese

⁵⁸ In the popular use, the term dialect is commonly seen as a linguistic variety which is 'inferior', less prestigious, and something 'less' than a proper or a fully-fledged language

⁵⁹ It is probably this strong identification with their mother tongues, as markers of ethno-cultural, linguistic and group identity that has contributed to the vitality and maintenance of these languages.

be classified as threatened or endangered languages. In fact, with their introduction in the education system, it is possible to argue, without a doubt, that there is a renewed vigour and even prestige in speaking and using these languages (as will be shown later in this dissertation).

Having considered the Mozambican National Languages, their role, status, and attitudes towards them, the next section will focus on the English language in Mozambique.

2.3.3 The English language

The value of English in Mozambique is widely recognised at all levels and sectors of the society. Such a value is illustrated by the high demand for English language skills throughout the country, not only in the main provincial capitals such as Maputo, but also in rural areas, particularly in those areas where foreign companies or international organisations operate, such as, for example, Panda and Mozal⁶⁰. The presence of the British Council⁶¹, the Institute of Languages⁶², and international language schools, as well as private and public schools providing English language teaching/learning courses, confirms the perception of importance of commanding the English language. Overall, attitudes regarding English language learning are very positive.

Some of the reasons presented as dictating the relevant role played by the English language in Mozambique are⁶³:

- 1) Mozambique's geographical position, the fact that the majority of countries in Southern Africa have English as Official Language;
- 2) Mozambique's membership to SADC (the Southern African Development Community), the Commonwealth of Nations, the AU (African Union), and other international organisations,

⁶⁰ It should be noted that Mozambique hosts two mega-projects, namely, Panda Natural Gas Project located over 600 km from Maputo, and Mozal, which is an aluminium plant, located in the outskirts of Maputo City.

⁶¹ The British Council has been operating in Mozambique since 1989 and it has a Teaching Centre in Maputo, which over the years has trained more than 5.000 adult learners. For further details see the British Council website.

⁶² The Institute of Languages (IL) is a state-owned institution, subordinated to the Mozambican Ministry of Education and Culture. It offers language courses, mainly English and French, and Portuguese courses to foreigners. The IL has delegations or branches in all the major provincial capital cities.

⁶³ See *Plano Curricular do Ensino Básico* or the Curricular Plan for Basic Education (2003: 33) for a comprehensive review of the role of English in Mozambique.

where English is the main working language⁶⁴; and

- 3) Mozambique's preparedness to face the globalisation phenomenon, in which the majority of political, social and economic interactions, worldwide, are conducted in English.

Mozambique appears, geographically, like an island surrounded by English Speaking countries, such as South Africa, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, and Tanzania. Although Portuguese is spoken in countries such as Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Brazil, Portugal, and to a small extent in Macau, and although it is listed as one of the top ten most spoken languages in the world⁶⁵, in order to communicate with the rest of the world, Portuguese alone would not suffice. However, the findings of the present study indicate that the English language would neither be enough. As shown in Chapter Five, while admitting the importance of speaking English, the children in the urban school seem to look at multilingualism (including the use of Portuguese and the Mozambican National Languages) as part of the answer to the challenges of globalisation.

On a daily basis, English is used not only by the many people crossing the border from Mozambique to South Africa or vice versa, although Bantu languages are also used in this case, but also at the many international meetings, seminars, and conferences counting with the participation of foreign delegates. A number of examples can be found, at various levels of Mozambican society, of the many uses of English. When dealing with the many foreigners or tourists visiting the country, English is used as a lingua franca, by waiters in bars and restaurants, receptionists at hotels, workers at mobile phone companies such as Mcel or Vodacom, etc. The fact that a number of UN agencies are represented in

⁶⁴ It may come as a surprise to some people that these organisations are mentioned as one of the reasons for learning English, because they are elite organizations. However, in Africa, the elites are made up of the masses; as Samora Machel (Mozambique's first President) always said, the children in Africa and in Mozambique, those from the masses, are the future leaders of Africa, the future ministers, presidents, diplomats, etc. And this is the reality; very few of Africa's leaders come from the elites, as they are in their majority, men of the people. If we look at the leaders of Mozambique, and particularly at the first three presidents of FRELIMO, their humble beginnings are quite obvious. Eduardo Mondlane, the first President of Frelimo, was born in Manjacaze District, in Gaza Province; he was educated by the Swiss missionaries, and was the only member of his family who received primary education; his academic career included a secondary school education taken at a South African School, and University studies in both Portuguese and American universities, and ended with a doctorate degree awarded by the University of Illinois. Samora Machel was born in Xilembene in Gaza Province, started schooling at the age of 8/9 and was trained as a nurse, before he assumed the leadership of Frelimo. Joaquim Chissano was born in the village of Malehice, in Chibuto District, also in Gaza Province, and was the first black student to attend the only high school in the then Portuguese colony; he was later educated as a diplomat. What was common to the three Mozambican leaders is their impoverished childhood.

⁶⁵ SIL Ethnologue Survey (1999).

Mozambique, such as, for example, UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO, UNFPA, etc., also suggests that English is most likely a working language, considering that these agencies employ many expatriate staff and international consultants, most of whom with short-term contracts. It should be noted though that in cases where the expatriate staff are based in Mozambique for long periods, they certainly end up learning and speaking Portuguese on a regular basis.

The Mozambican Government has a number of multilateral and bilateral cooperation agreements with various foreign governments and international organisations, such as the Finnish FINNIDA, the Danish DANIDA, and the Swedish SIDA. Similarly to what was stated above, in the previous paragraph, because these types of institutions tend to employ international experts, who are not necessarily based in Mozambique and who do not necessarily speak Portuguese, English becomes the major vehicle of communication.

From the situations⁶⁶ presented above, we can therefore conclude that the English language in Mozambique is not a mere token, but an actually functional language, one of the *de facto* languages of internationalisation, with an instrumental value. It is for this reason that English is generally recognised as the main international language used in the country and taught in the Mozambican Education System, from Grade 6 in the upper primary school, to children aged 11 years. It is a language that enjoys a very high status and prestige, because of the perceived opportunities likely to emerge with a command of the language, such as the possibility to find the best paid jobs⁶⁷.

Having briefly looked at the English language in Mozambique, the discussion turns to a description of the Mozambican Education System.

2.4 The Mozambican Education System

⁶⁶ Although anecdotal evidence and requiring further study.

⁶⁷ A number of studies with a focus on a variety of countries in Africa, Asia, Europe and America also underline the instrumental value and prestige of English as being attached to perceived opportunities associated to command of the language; among them, Etxeberría-Sagastume (2006) when talking specifically about the Basque Autonomous Community. In fact, Etxeberría, for example, writing on Trilingual Education in the Basque Country, says: “The ‘obsession with English’ has taken over families, educators and educational administrators and, although some do not believe in its efficacy, it appears that nobody wants to come off the bandwagon of market offers. Every day the publicity reminds us that a lack of knowledge of English is a handicap for our young people” (2003: 198).

The Government of Mozambique considers Education as one of its top priorities. This is confirmed by the many efforts carried out with the purpose of expanding the school network to the most remote and isolated areas in the country, promoting an equitable access to education, regardless of the children's social and economic background, and also by the efforts aimed at providing quality education. The Government acknowledges that in order to promote national development, sustained well-being, and fight poverty, it is crucial that people have access to education. According to the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Education and Culture (PEEC 2006: 8), the Government's commitment to ensure access to education and improve the quality of basic education will contribute to the achievement of the national objectives of reducing absolute poverty, promoting economic and social justice, gender equity, and fight HIV/AIDS.

The Government's commitment to education is also confirmed by the fact that it is a signatory of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁶⁸ and, as mentioned earlier, it has also ratified the Education for All Declaration (EFA)⁶⁹.

The Constitution of the Republic stipulates that Education is a right and also a duty of all citizens and, as such, the strategy for the education sector, based on the National Education Policy, reiterates that Education is a fundamental human right and a key tool for improving the living conditions and for

⁶⁸ The MDGs are based on the Millennium Declaration, adopted by 189 nations and signed by 147 heads of state and government, at the UN Millennium Summit, in September 2000 (UN, 2008). The MDGs consist in eight (8) goals that are intended to be achieved by 2015, with the purpose of responding to the world's main development challenges, among them, the need to achieve Universal Education.

⁶⁹ Education for All (EFA) is an international commitment first launched in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990. The main purpose was to expand the benefits of education to "every citizen in every society." In response to slow progress over the decade, the commitment was reaffirmed in Dakar, Senegal in April 2000 and then again in September 2000, when 189 countries and their partners adopted two of the EFA goals among the eight MDGs (World Bank 2009). The six major goals under the EFA declaration are as follows: (1) Expand and improve comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children. (2) Ensure that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, those in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete, good quality free and compulsory primary education. (3) Ensure that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life-skills programs. (4) Achieve a 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults. (5) Eliminate gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and achieve gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls' full and equal access to and achievement in good quality basic education. (6) Improve all aspects of the quality of education and ensure excellence of all so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills.

reducing poverty (MEC 2006: vi).

The enrolment rate for primary education is estimated in 77%⁷⁰ of both girls and boys. This figure reduces drastically to 6% for secondary school enrolment (both girls and boys). Enrolment rates in the urban areas are significantly higher than those in rural areas. Enrolment for tertiary education corresponds to only 1% (2% for male and less than 1% for female). The literacy rate is 44% of adults and 52% of youths. The literacy rate in the rural areas corresponds to 34%, while in the urban area is 70%. There is a steady reduction of the literacy rate from the south to the north.

In Mozambique, Basic Primary Education, which usually starts at around age six⁷¹, is free and compulsory. Basic Primary Education lasts for seven years, and Secondary Education lasts for five years. The Mozambican National Education System is divided into five main levels, namely:

- (1) EP1 or Primary Education – level 1 (which lasts five years, from Grade 1 to Grade 5)
- (2) EP2 or Primary Education – level 2 (with a duration of two years, from Grade 6 to Grade 7)
- (3) ESG1 or General Secondary Education (which lasts three years, from Grade 8 to Grade 10)
- (4) ESG2/EPU or Pre-University Education (lasting two years, from Grade 11 to Grade 12)
- (5) Tertiary Education (lasts for four years; three years of Bachelor's, plus one year *Licenciatura or graduate Degree*). Included in this level are mainly universities, and university colleges.

In addition, it should be included the provision of,

- (6) Non-Formal or Adult Education,
- (7) Technical/Vocational Education, and
- (8) Distance Education

At the level of Primary Education, as shown above, under sections 1 and 2, there are two sub-sectors, respectively, the lower primary school level or primary education (level or cycle one), known as EP1,

⁷⁰ The fact that the EP1 sub-sector accounts for 77% does not come as a surprise as, in most African countries, the primary school level is characterized by very crowded classrooms, considering that basic education is free and compulsory. However, as the educational level progresses, high dropout rates are reported, particularly at the level of the EP2 and secondary education, as girls tend to marry early and boys dropout in order to find ways of supporting the livelihoods of the household, particularly in the rural areas.

⁷¹ *Plano Curricular do Ensino Básico (2003: 24)*.

which comprises Grades 1 to 5, and the higher primary school level or primary education (level two), referred to as EP2, consisting of Grades 6 and 7. General Secondary Education (ESG) is comprised of two sub-sectors, namely, *Ensino Secundário Geral 1* (ESG1), which goes from Grade 8 to Grade 10, and *Ensino Secundário Geral 2* (ESG2), which comprises Grades 11 and 12.

2.4.1 Languages in the Curriculum

Returning to the language question, it should be said that literacy development in Mozambique has always been heavily linked to the Portuguese language; in other words, from the time of national independence, to the early nineties, the Portuguese language was exclusively used as medium of instruction from the lower primary school level to the tertiary level. In addition to being the main medium of instruction, it is also taught as a subject in primary, secondary and in the first semester of some courses at tertiary level.

When discussing the language education question in Mozambique, it is important to deal with the urban and rural contexts separately, considering that at the moment, two different language education policies are in practice. The languages present in the Mozambican Education System, with a particular reference to the urban schools, are Portuguese, English, and French. As already stated above, instruction, in the Mozambican urban schools, is solely conducted by means of the Portuguese language, from the primary school level to the secondary and tertiary levels⁷². English is the main foreign language taught in the Mozambican school system, and it is introduced in Grade 6 (EP2) and it is taught for seven years, until the end of secondary or pre-university level (Grade 12).

According to the Ministry of Education, the general objectives of English language Teaching (ELT) are directed at developing the linguistic and communicative competence of learners, in other words, equipping them with the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), so that they can

⁷² It should be highlighted, though, that not all university courses are conducted in Portuguese, as both at the Pedagogic University (or *Universidade Pedagógica*) and Eduardo Mondlane University there are courses that are offered either in English or French. This applies particularly to the BA and Licenciatura or graduate Degree Courses on Teaching English as a Foreign Language (at *Universidade Pedagógica*), whose main target students are already English language Teachers at primary or secondary level, who joined the course with the purpose of getting a higher or a university degree, which will eventually lead to higher wages, or because they want to get acquainted with new and current English language teaching methodologies. The BA and *Licenciatura* Degree Courses on French Language Teaching, also offered by the *Universidade Pedagógica*, are conducted in French, with the major goal of training teachers of French for the secondary school level.

cope with the demands of their future studies and employment. The French language was introduced, for the first time in independent Mozambique, in 1994, and it is taught at the second cycle of the secondary school level (ESG2), in Grades 11 and 12. According to the Mozambican Ministry of Education, among the reasons that justify the introduction of French in the school system are the fact that the French language is used by thirty-five countries as the main official or working language, and also in a number of international organizations. In addition, French is the official language in more than twenty countries, the majority of which in Africa. Therefore, to develop the French Language in Mozambique should contribute to a better communication and an effective exchange with the outside world, in particular with the French-speaking African countries.

The following table (Table 3) shows the time load, in terms of hours per week, allocated to Portuguese, the Mozambican National languages, and English, in the national curriculum, at the primary school level (EP1 and EP2):

Table 3: Time-Load Allocated to Portuguese (as medium of instruction), the Mozambican National Languages and English (as subjects) at the EP1 Level – Monolingual (Portuguese) Classes

LANGUAGE	GRADES						
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7
Portuguese Language	10	10	8	7	7	6	6
National Language			2	2	2	2	2
English Language						3	3

Source: Adapted from *Plano Curricular do Ensino Básico (2003: 41)*

Note that the above time load refers to a Monolingual Portuguese program in which the Mozambican National Language may or may not be used as a resource, or as an elective subject. It should be highlighted, at this stage, that not all the children in the rural areas follow a Mother-Tongue based

Bilingual Education Program. As will be further discussed in Chapter Five, the parents and children in the rural areas are given the possibility to opt for either a bilingual or a monolingual program. In the case of a Monolingual (Portuguese) Program, the time allocated to Portuguese as medium of instruction is 10 hours a week in Grades 1 and 2, and the amount of hours is gradually reduced from 8 (in Grade 3) to 6 (in Grade 7). The time allocated to the Mozambican National Language in a Monolingual Portuguese Program is 2 hours a week from Grades 2 to 7. Three hours a week are allocated to English both in a monolingual and a bilingual program. Following is Table 4 which refers to the time-load in a Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Program.

Table 4: Time-Load Allocated to Portuguese, the Mozambican National Languages and English at the EP1 Level – Bilingual Classes

LANGUAGE	GRADES						
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7
Portuguese Language	4	5	7	7	8	7	7
National Language	8	7	5	3	2	2	2
English Language						3	3

Source: Adapted from *Plano Curricular do Ensino Básico (2003: 41)*

As we can see from Table 3, in the early grades of a monolingual Portuguese program, the number of hours of Portuguese per week is quite high and it diminishes gradually the higher the grades. This is quite understandable, as at the initial grades there is an attempt to provide as much exposure to Portuguese as possible to the new learner, who in many cases is unfamiliar with the Portuguese language. And considering that it is the main medium of instruction, the language through which the pupil will be introduced to other subjects, such as Mathematics, Geography, etc., it is important that as early as possible he/she should build a basic knowledge of the language. On the other hand, in a mother tongue bilingual program, the lower the grade, the lower the number of hours allocated to Portuguese language, considering that it is a second language (L2) subject.

If we look at the time-load allocated to the English language, we can immediately notice that three hours a week is a minimal amount of teaching time, especially if the purpose of teaching English is to produce communicatively competent learners. Combined with this reduced time-load allocated to the English language, we have the problem of lack of qualified and competent teachers, and the problem of availability of resources. Thus, it should not come as a surprise that after seven years of English, that is, combining the two years of English at the primary school level with the five years at the secondary school level, we still have students who cannot communicate in English. Although I am not aware of any surveys carried out on the English language competence of Mozambican students, my observations come from my work at the level of the English Department at Universidade Pedagógica, where every year the staff has to provide academic or service English to the other faculties of the University and witnesses a number of communication difficulties on the part of first year university students.

An important development to note in regards to the language question in Mozambique, as already mentioned elsewhere in this thesis, is the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages as medium of instruction in schools in rural areas. The use of the Mozambican Languages in early schooling marks an important step towards the valorisation and preservation of the national languages, and it appears to be a direct response to the government's call for action towards the preservation of these languages as the main repositories and vehicles of the national traditions, as communication tools for the majority of Mozambicans, and a fundamental element for the involvement and participation of citizens in the country's social, economic and political life (Boletim da República 1997: 122-(7))⁷³.

However, as it will be discussed later on in this study, a number of challenges seem to affect the use of the Mozambican National Languages in education; among them, the fact that Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Education is confined to the rural context, the question of lack of textbooks and general

⁷³ The introduction of the national languages in the school system is certainly a very effective way to ensure the survival and spread of these languages to a larger number of people. In fact, Benton (1986: 58), reflecting on the cases of the Maori Language in New Zealand, and Irish in Ireland, acknowledges the important role that the school system seems to play as the 'chief agency' in maintaining or reviving a country's indigenous languages. The crucial role of the school is also underlined by Extra & Yagmur (2004: 405) when stating that it is the school's responsibility to promote linguistic diversity by actively encouraging the teaching and learning of the widest possible range of languages.

reading materials⁷⁴, and teacher training. Another alarming issue emerging during the field work and as already briefly mentioned under the methodological considerations, was the fact that quite a number of children were not able to read in Portuguese, in spite of the five-year exposure to the language. The reading difficulties observed in Portuguese seem to suggest deficiencies in the quality of Portuguese language teaching. Lopes (1998: 464) seems to suggest that the blame should be put on the type of bilingual education model adopted which, in his view “has not provided enough oral competence in the L2 so as to permit a gradual and well succeeded transition to the L2”. I shall return to this issue in Chapter Five.

2.5 Summary

The present chapter started by presenting the geography, history, demographics, the major ethnic groups and religions in Mozambique, and focused on the country’s linguistic profile, referring specifically to the Portuguese language, the National Languages of Mozambique, and the English language. Finally, the chapter dealt, with a certain level of detail, with the Mozambican Education System.

What is important to retain from this chapter and for the purposes of the present study is, first and foremost, the multilingual nature of the country, that is, the fact that Mozambique is an ethno-linguistic mosaic, characterised by high levels of linguistic and cultural diversity. Secondly, it should be kept in mind that such ethno-linguistic diversity is not recognised by the urban school, as at the present moment the Portuguese language is still exclusively used as medium of instruction. Thirdly, it has to be noted that in addition to Portuguese, the other languages in the curriculum are English (introduced already at the primary school level) and French (introduced in the upper secondary school level).

It is equally relevant to remember that the Portuguese language in Mozambique is endowed with a high prestige (both by the Government, the education authorities and in the society at large), particularly because it is the country’s official language and key to provide access to the labour market. In addition,

⁷⁴ Van Eys (2007) reporting on the involvement of *Progresso* association in materials or textbook production in five (5) languages spoken in Niassa and Cabo Delgado Provinces in Mozambique, claims that the production of ‘post-literacy’ or reading materials is an urgent issue, particularly for children and adults “who have taken their first steps on the path to literacy”.

and interesting enough, is the question of the appropriation and nativisation or indigenisation of the Portuguese spoken in Mozambique. Thirdly, it is important to keep in mind the key role played by the English language in Mozambique, as the main foreign language in the curriculum, and characterised by a high demand at societal level, knowledge of which is perceived as likely resulting in better paid jobs. Finally, it should be kept in mind that the national languages of Mozambique are characterised by a high vitality, especially due to the fact that they are spoken on a daily basis by a large number of Mozambican families. I shall return to these issues throughout the present dissertation. In the next chapter, a review is made of key terminology in the field of Language Planning and Policy, which have been central in informing the present study.

CHAPTER THREE

KEY TERMINOLOGY IN LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION PLANNING

The major aim of this Chapter is to review key terminology in the field of Language Planning and Policy which has been extremely relevant in informing the present PhD Project. The chapter starts by revisiting the Language Garden Analogy and then moves into a discussion of the issue of Language Diversity and Multilingualism, followed by an analysis of the typology Monoethnic, Dyadic, Triadic and Mosaic Societies. The Linguistic Imperialism or Diffusion-of-English Paradigm is discussed in connection with the phenomenon of Globalisation and Global English. Emerging in relation to this discussion is the Linguistic Genocide Theory, as well as the concept of Linguicism. The Linguistic Human Rights or Ecology-of-Language Paradigm is revisited in association with the increasing demands for Mother Tongue Education. In this connection, the chapter looks at different models of Bilingual Education, paying particular attention to the distinction between subtractive and additive models. In addition, the chapter briefly examines the issue of Language Attitudes, Language Maintenance, Language Shift and Language Loss or Death. The chapter also thoroughly considers the concept of Mother Tongue as well as the dichotomy Minority vs. Majority Languages, and analyses the extent to which these concepts can be transferred to and applied in the Mozambican context. After this, the chapter presents a number of definitions of the concepts Language Policy and Planning, as well as Language Management. The chapter then moves to focus on Status Planning, Corpus Planning and Acquisition Planning as the three main types of Language Planning Activities. The chapter also

reviews the major components, actors and institutions involved in the Language Policy and Planning process, and ends by briefly looking at economic considerations involved in this process.

3.1 The Language Garden Analogy

In order to explain the concept of Linguistic Diversity and the importance of preserving it, Ofelia Garcia (1992) uses the analogy known as the **Language Garden**, which compares the many different languages in the world today with the different flower and plant types or species. She defends the view that if the countries of the world were gardens with a single variety of flowers, with the same colour, size and shape, the world would surely be a boring place. This analogy implies that if the peoples of the world spoke only majority languages, the world would not be so interesting. According to Baker (2001: 53), “the analogy suggests that language diversity requires planning and care”, and that “a laissez-faire situation is less desirable than deliberate, rational language planning. Gardeners are needed (e.g. teachers in schools) to plant, water, fertilize and reseed the different minority flowers in the garden to ensure an enriching world language garden”.

This is certainly an interesting way of looking at the diversity of languages existing in the world today, and of pointing out the need to care for and preserve such diversity, because the many languages, small or large, have a potential value due to the many cultures and traditions with which they are associated. And obviously, one of the best ways of making sure that the many languages will keep their vitality, regardless of whether they are majority or minority is by using the school system as the guardian of such languages. It is well established that the use of languages in the education system, either as medium of instruction or resources, not only ensures their survival, but also their spread to a larger number of speakers, as well as a better participation in the teaching and learning process on the part of both teachers and pupils. I shall return to this discussion throughout this chapter.

3.2 Linguistic Diversity and Multilingualism

Linguistic Diversity or **Multilingualism** is very common in many parts of the world, such as in Africa, Asia, and the Americas, for example, where it is possible to find countries with as many as 100 languages or more. For instance, over 100 languages are spoken in Tanzania (Légere 2009), and approximately 200 languages are spoken in India (Annamalai 1995). Countries in Europe are also

becoming increasingly multilingual and multicultural, partly as a result of the recent high levels of economic immigration.

Linguistic Diversity refers to the existence of a multitude of languages and dialects in the world today⁷⁵. It is claimed that between 5000 to 6000 languages are spoken in the approximately 200 countries of the world. According to the European Commission (2007: 6), **Multilingualism** is defined as the “ability of societies, institutions, groups and individuals to engage, on a regular basis, with more than one language in their day-to-day lives”. Increasing levels of multilingualism often raise important and complex challenges to most of the world’s States and school systems in particular. Such questions and challenges have to do with what would be the ideal approach to multilingualism, balanced with the most feasible and practicable one, considering the often scarce resources.

Because multilingualism is often seen as a problem and as an impediment to social, economic, political, and academic progress and development, the most common approach in different countries has been to neglect it, in favour of the adoption of only one official language (usually a majority one). This trend is confirmed by McCarty, Romero & Zepeda (2006: 91), who indicate that “education policies and practices often deny that multilingual, multicultural reality, attempting to coerce it into a single, monolingualist and monoculturalist mold”. In this respect, Pattanayak (1986: 13) postulates that despite the “doubt expressed that many languages cannot unite the many subgroups in a pluralist society”, and the objection raised concerning the school’s ability to cope with many languages, if there is will on the part of the school to cope with many mother tongues, the “school can not only act as a policy instrument for maintaining multilingualism, but can create a milieu where use of many languages will lead to the fullest co-ordinated and balanced development of human personality”.

In spite of the challenges in managing multilingualism and diversity at society and school level in particular, a number of successful examples are reported from different parts of the world. For instance, among others, we have in Europe the ‘European School Model’⁷⁶ in providing multilingual education,

⁷⁵ For Sayers (2009), linguistic diversity not only comprises all the dialects of all the languages in the world, but also the potential for language to change in new ways.

⁷⁶ See Baetens Beardsmore (1995) for details on the European School Experience, comprising provision of education in eight or nine different languages (majority European languages). Of course, I am not suggesting that this model would be

and in India, there is the case of Tribal Multilingual Education⁷⁷. Referring specifically to the latter, Choudry (2001: 404-405) writes the following:

The multilingual reality in India dictates that the country should aim at unity underlying diversity in its educational language planning rather than seek triumph over diversity through uniformising and stultifying constraints of a monistic policy... Similarly, Singh (1993: 35) suggests that in development planning one must take a pluralistic paradigm seriously, where identification and observation of language problems are essentially classificatory, and the description of language and education planning strategies are essentially based on our understanding of planning typology, whether they are comprehensive or partial, global or local, predictive or a combination of these strategies.

I also maintain that a monolingual policy as historically advocated by a number of nation states is not the best management solution for diversity⁷⁸. I postulate that the State has to take on an explicit advocacy of diversity at all levels of society. As many have argued before me, although managing diversity is a very “arduous and expensive” endeavour⁷⁹, it is worth it. Multilingualism and language diversity should be seen as “sources of knowledge and enrichment” (Extra & Yagmur 2004), as “much more of an asset than a disadvantage” (Hélot & Young (2006), or as very appropriately put by Jo Lo Bianco (1987) as resources for the individual, the society and the economy. Linguistic Diversity enriches our world and our reality; because, “all languages are depositories of knowledge and some of the endangered languages constitute the only possibility of access to valuable indigenous knowledge that reaches far back into the history of human species” (Alexander, 2006: 3). In addition, the benefits of multilingualism are also manifested in the form of facilitation of information exchange, facilitation of transfer of technology, promotion of mobility, and integration into and within a society.

easily replicated in a context such as Mozambique, because of the very favourable conditions of the European School Model, characterised by a whole wealth of resources (human, material, etc); conditions which are not easily available in Mozambique. What I imply is that it is possible, despite the difficulties, to ‘imagine a multilingual school’. This will be further discussed in Chapter six.

⁷⁷ See Mahendra Mishra (2004) for an account of Tribal Multilingual Education in India.

⁷⁸ See, for instance, Olshtain and Nissim-Amitai (2003: 47-49) for the need for national policies to adopt a “multilingual perception, which is open, liberal and easy to live with”.

⁷⁹ On the 2nd February 2008, Jutta Limbach, President of the Goethe-Institut, stated the following, in her paper entitled *Plurilingualism and Multilingualism – Obstacles on the Route towards a European Public*: “For some, the postulate of multilingualism appears to be an annoying national relic within the mosaic of the future European culture. However, this criticism misjudges the very special nature of European integration. The EU member states and their people do not want to follow the model of the nation state when shaping the European Union. When singing the praise of multilingualism, we must not forget a particularly weighty argument – the fact that language pluralism proves to be arduous and expensive.”

A vital insight, on the basis of what is stated above, is that we cannot afford to lose any language or languages⁸⁰. A multilingual diverse world is therefore a better option than a monolingual one, as it entails the possibility of valuable knowledge even in “smaller” local languages that could possibly have a life-sustaining or life-saving relevance⁸¹. Behind every language there is a whole wealth of traditions and cultures that would be worthwhile preserving. We could also add that, if the claim made by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is valid, that is, the argument that the language one speaks is likely to influence the way he or she views and perceives the world, then we could argue that the more languages one speaks the broader will be his/her world view, and the broader will be his/her way of constructing reality⁸². There is no doubt that language diversity is good because it enriches our experience of reality. In accordance with principles 5 and 6 of the Action Plan for the implementation of the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, there is a need to safeguard the linguistic heritage of humanity and give support to expression, creation and dissemination in the greatest possible number of languages and encourage linguistic diversity, while respecting the mother tongue at all levels of education, wherever possible, and fostering the learning of several languages from the earliest age. (2001: 15).

3.3 Monoethnic, Dyadic, Triadic and Mosaic Societies

It appears opportune at this stage to briefly review what are known in the literature as Monoethnic, Dyadic, Triadic and Mosaic countries. There is a belief that Language Planning decisions are very much influenced by the homogenous or heterogeneous ethnolinguistic composition of a particular society. In other words, in relatively homogenous ethnolinguistic (or **Monoethnic**) societies like Japan, only one

⁸⁰ Or as put by Fishman (1995: 60-61), “What is lost when a language is lost, especially in the short run, is the sociocultural integration of the generations, the cohesiveness, naturalness and quiet creativity, the secure sense of identity, even without politicized consciousness of identity, the sense of collective worth of a community of a people, the particular value of being “Xians in Xish”, rather than “Xians in Yish” or “Yians in Yish”, even when the conveniences of daily living are “greener in the other field”. He goes on and says that “what is lost is cultural creativity (song, story, theatre, myth, dance and artefacts and in the representational arts) that ultimately enriches not only the immediate vicinity in the original language but also the total human experience in a myriad of translations”.

⁸¹ Particularly in the context of epidemics such as HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and others.

⁸² A fact increasingly acknowledged publicly; see for instance the article by Lera Boroditsky published by The Wall Street Journal on July 23, 2010, where cognitive science suggests that language deeply influences the way people view the world. See also Ronald Wardhaugh (1986), for a useful discussion of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis. I will, however, refrain from discussing the issue within the scope of the present study.

language is usually chosen as the *de jure* official language. However, as Spolsky notes, in this type of countries there may be linguistic minorities, but they are often seen as “small and insignificant and are geographically or socially marginalised” (2004: 58). This is very much true when we think, for example, about countries such as the United States of America or the United Kingdom; that is, even though only one language is spoken officially, they tend to host a huge number of ethnolinguistic minorities.

As examples of **Dyadic or Triadic** societies, figure countries such as Canada, where there are two or three major ethnolinguistic groups which are relatively similar in numbers and power. In this type of societies there are usually two or three official languages.

Countries such as Mozambique or the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) would be good examples of **Mosaic** societies. They are characterised by a large variety of ethnolinguistic groups. Rather than adopting a variety of languages as official, the decision in most of these countries has been the adoption of the languages of the former colonial power; for example, Portuguese in Mozambique or French in the Democratic Republic of Congo.⁸³ One of the exceptions in this category of mosaic countries is South Africa, with its eleven (11) languages official policy.

In my view, it is important to bring this typology forward as an introduction to the many complex issues that governments and language planners face, particularly in mosaic societies. Although it could be argued that language planning issues are becoming increasingly similar in the three types of societies, especially as a result of increasing migration patterns and the high levels of multilingualism, the task of the latter countries seems to be even more difficult than that of the former. It should be said that most of the mosaic societies happen to be in the category of Third World countries, and as such they are heavily hit by serious state budget constraints, and a very low GDP. Thus, it would surely be much easier to manage an official bilingual or multilingual policy, or to establish bilingual schools in a country such as Canada or Belgium, than in Mozambique, for example, considering the heavy financial burden of multilingualism for the country’s educational system. In addition to the cost of establishing bilingual schools, for example, there is also the question of language choice and the allocation of functions to the various languages, as well as the costs involved in language development and

⁸³ See Spolsky (2004) for a detailed review of monoethnic, dyadic, triadic and mosaic countries.

standardization. I shall return to the issue of financing language policies later on in this chapter, and also in Chapter Six.

3.4 Language Attitudes

Language Attitudes research has been traditionally carried out in relation to motivation toward first, second or foreign language learning⁸⁴ or in connection with language choice⁸⁵, or even in relation to people's views on language shift within a particular community, their views on the use of standard or non-standard forms of language, loyalty to one's own language, etc. There is now an increasing recognition of the value of language attitude surveys for the field of Language Planning and Policy. Such relevance, as already mentioned under section 1.1 in Chapter One, derives from the fact that it is well understood that people's beliefs and preferences tend to exercise a decisive role in the outcome of policy implementation. If, for example, for whatever reason, people in Mozambique were not aware of the psychological and pedagogical benefits of mother tongue medium education they would probably fail to buy-in, and as a result all the efforts made would have been in vain. In other words, people's knowledge of the advantages of instruction in one's mother tongue is likely to influence their attitudes to it. This claim, that is, the importance of listening to people's preferences prior to formulating policies, seems to be confirmed by Kamwendo's (2006: 61) very interesting citation below:

While governments can formulate language policies that support the promotion and official recognition of minority languages in order to check language shift or death, the final determiners of the fate of any language are its native speakers. If speakers of a minority or marginalised language want to maintain it, it will be maintained. Governments can only complement the efforts of the speakers of the language.

Basically, what Kamwendo says is that no matter how well-intentioned the Governments are and the policies they formulate, if there is no grassroots' ownership and support, such policies are bound to fail. As such, it is always important to consult and to listen to the voices of the target groups for which any policy is designed.

⁸⁴ See, for example, the study conducted by Willard Shaw (1983) on Asian student attitudes towards English, which analyses the types of motivation (instrumental or integrative) that are crucial for second language achievement.

⁸⁵ For instance, Baker (2001: 14) postulates that attitudes and preferences influence people's choice of language; in some situations they may prefer one language over another; they may reject, for example a minority language in favour of a majority language due to perceived awareness of its high status, importance for the labour market, etc.

Language attitudes may be positive or negative, or as put by Trudgill, they range between “very favourable to very unfavourable, and may be manifested in subjective judgements about ‘correctness’, worth and aesthetic qualities of their speakers” (2003: 73). In most cases, language attitudes are based on extra-linguistic factors (social, economic, political, etc.). However, they are important determinants of the success of language policy implementation. In this connection, Bratt Paulston writes that the “most elegant educational policies for minority groups are doomed to failure if they go counter to prevailing social forces, especially the economic situation” (1986: 142). As it will be discussed in Chapters Five and Six, the fact that the findings of this study reveal that parents in the two rural schools have very positive attitudes towards the introduction of mother tongue education, which they see as a valorisation of the Mozambican languages, but also the fact that they seem very satisfied because their children learn both Portuguese and English (viewed as languages of opportunity and progress), might be an indication of the possible outcome of the policy being proposed within the scope of this study.

3.5 Language Maintenance, Shift and/or Death

Studies on Language Maintenance, Language Shift and Language Death also predominate in the literature, and they are approached from a variety of perspectives. It could be said that language maintenance is the opposite of language shift and language death. Language maintenance occurs when a group of people continues speaking its home language, rather than shifting to another language. It may occur, for example, in cases where people emigrate to a new country and thus encounter a new language; they may then decide to retain the language or languages they come with or if the opposite occurs, they may end up replacing their home or country language with the language of the new community; language replacement, that is, the replacement of one’s L1 by an L2 is an instance of Language Shift. Maintenance may occur if there is intergenerational transmission of the home language or if such language is used in the education of their children. If replacement occurs, and the languages are no longer used, it may mean that the language has died, in that there has been a shift towards speaking another language.

Studies in this area also tackle the issue of **Endangered or Threatened Languages**, that is, those languages facing the risk of dying or vanishing, either because they are no longer transmitted from

parent to child, and because they are not used in the education of children in the school context, or because they are being neglected as a result of preference for the majority and dominant language.

The case of Mozambique is very interesting in the sense that the danger of losing languages does not appear to be present on a large scale. This has already been mentioned under section 2.3.2 *The National Languages of Mozambique*. It should be noted though that language endangerment, shift or death has happened at an individual or family level, considering that a number of Mozambican-born parents did not transmit their home languages to their children. These children ended having Portuguese as their first language (L1), although they are black, Bantu, and Mozambican. In cases this occurred, the parents were mostly urban, and educated; the parents were probably included in the category of “*assimilados*”. During the colonial period, the term ‘*assimilado*’ was used to refer to people that were black on their skin colour, but white inside, and with western “civilised” manners, as they had assimilated and acculturated to the Portuguese language, culture and values. These parents would probably have been civil servants in the Portuguese administration. In most cases these children who only spoke Portuguese ended not having a common language to speak to their grandparents or other relatives. In present-day Mozambique, this situation still occurs, mostly in urban and elite or middle class families, who use mainly Portuguese as the home language, instead of one of the Mozambican National Languages.

Although Language Shift may have occurred in the case of the families mentioned in the previous paragraph, Language Maintenance seems to be the most common practice. A large number of Mozambican families, mostly semi-urban and rural, retain their home languages and transmit them to their children. This happens mainly because in the rural areas, the main vehicle of communication is still one of the Mozambican National Languages, because the majority of people are illiterate and do not have command of the Portuguese language, and also because although Portuguese is the official language, there are in the rural areas very few jobs in the official sector.

One of the main reasons for this brief review of the issues of language maintenance, language death, language shift and endangered languages here was to illustrate the status quo in Mozambique, resulting from its condition of mosaic society. And as mentioned elsewhere in this study, although the primary

goal of the language education policy here proposed has a human rights-orientation, meaning that mother tongue or L1 education is viewed as a question of human rights, Language Maintenance and Spread will certainly be two other indirect outcomes of the policy. In case of children, particularly those in urban areas, who do not acquire the Mozambican National Languages at home, through their parents, that will likely happen through the school system; in this way, the school will have the function of spreading these languages to this group of children, while at the same time keeping them alive.

3.6 Minority vs. Majority Languages and Languages of Wider Communication (LWC)

Much research in this field also deals with studies on Minority Languages or/and Majority Languages. The definition of these two concepts is not so simple and straight forward; in fact, and as shown in the literature, these concepts are highly controversial, as **minority** and **majority** can mean different things in different contexts. On one hand, Bamgbose (1984: 22) maintains, that the “difference between the so-called minority languages and the major ones is in the narrower scope of roles and allotted functions. And it is possible for the scope of use to be broadened as part of deliberate policy of creating a literate environment”. Coulmas (1984: 10), on the other hand, defines minority languages as “minor languages that do not serve as standard or national languages in any country”.

On the basis of what is stated in the above paragraph, we can first infer that the roles and functions a language performs will be determinant in its categorisation as a minority or majority language. In other words, the wider the range of functions of a language, the higher the likelihood of it being a majority language. The second inference could be that minority languages are usually non-standard and do not usually perform the role of national language.

If we bring the Mozambican National Languages into this picture, and look at them with a point of departure on Bamgbose’s definition, we could say that because they do not perform a wide range of functions and, most importantly, because they are excluded from the formal sphere and their role is limited to the informal and family contexts, then they would be considered minority. However, on the basis of Coulmas’ definition above, the Mozambican National languages could not fit into the category ‘minority’ language because they are officially designated national languages of Mozambique.

Nevertheless, and as Coulmas himself acknowledges, in “countries such as Nigeria, Cameroon, or New Guinea, where languages range in the hundreds, no autochthonous language may have majority status and the former colonial language may indeed be the language most widely understood in the country. In such cases, of course, not all of the autochthonous languages should indiscriminately be regarded as minority languages”. (pp. 11)

Looking specifically at the Mozambican context, instead of the terms minority and majority languages, the terminology commonly used is official versus national languages. Because I understand the dichotomy minority-majority languages not in terms of numbers, but in terms of presence or absence of power⁸⁶ (social, economic, and political) on the part of the language itself and language users, if we compare the Portuguese language to the Mozambican national languages, it would be possible to argue that the former could be included in the category of majority languages, while the latter could be classified as minority languages⁸⁷. It is obvious that the number of Portuguese speakers in Mozambique is lower than the number of people who speak Emakhuwa, for example⁸⁸. However, Portuguese has more power than Emakhuwa as it is spoken throughout the country as the official language and thus the range of its uses is much wider, than the uses of Emakhuwa. In addition, the social status and prestige of Portuguese seems to be higher than that of any of the Mozambican National Languages.

⁸⁶ When discussing the semantics of the term minority, Srivastava (1984: 99-101) maintains that it is important to consider the notion of “language power”, on the basis of the following three criteria: “(a) the wider action radius and range of usage in a certain domain; (b) greater degree of control over the speakers of another language, and (c) higher status and prestige in the eyes of the people”. He stresses that “Language Power brings out the dichotomy of dominant [+ power] versus dominated [- power]. He analyses the dichotomy minority-majority on the basis not only of the Power dimension, but also the Quantum dimension, and draws very interesting conclusions. Basically, he argues that in the case of India, a minority language group would be described as having [-] Quantum, and [-] Power; a majority one would have [+] Quantum, and [+] Power; the *Janta* group would have [+] Quantum, and [-] Power; and finally the Elite group would be categorised as having [-] Quantum, and [+] Power. Although this is a very interesting analysis of the terms minority-majority languages, it does not really apply to the Mozambican situation because speakers of the Mozambican national languages are the majority in terms of numbers, and the Mozambican elites are made up of people who also speak the Mozambican national languages as their L1, home or family language; in other words, there is simply no common ground for comparison; although also multilingual, the situation in India differs significantly from the Mozambican one .

⁸⁷ In fact, Lopes (1998: 446) agrees that the “kernel of the traditional majority-minority model, as it has been applied to situations of high linguistic diversity should rather (and perhaps especially) [be based] on social and power relationships. Indeed, the notion of ‘minority’ language in a country like Mozambique, which shares linguistic groupings across six geographic borders and where some are quite sizeable is controversial to say the least, and adds little to the ‘majority-minority’ language debate”.

⁸⁸ According to INE (2007), there are 2,088,793 speakers of Portuguese and 4,153,811 speakers of Emakhuwa in Mozambique.

Stephen May's (2006: 263-264) analysis of the dichotomy majority vs. minority languages seems to be quite appropriate to the Mozambican situation; in his view,

Majority languages are lauded for their "instrumental" value, while minority languages are accorded "sentimental" value, but are broadly constructed as obstacles to social mobility and progress. Learning a majority language will thus provide individuals with greater economic and social mobility. Learning a minority language, while (possibly) important for reasons of cultural continuity, delimits an individual's mobility; if minority-language speakers are "sensible" they will opt for mobility and modernity via the majority language.

What we observe in Mozambique, and as illustrated by the findings of this study, is that there is a great awareness at the grassroots' level of the importance of speaking both Portuguese and English and of the fact that knowledge of these languages condition access to jobs and further education. For this reason and as already mentioned in the previous chapter, the prestige attached to both Portuguese and English is quite high. At the same time, it is also recognised the value of speaking the Mozambican National Languages as symbols of the Mozambican ethno-cultural identity.

In Europe, America and in other regions throughout the world, the debate in relation to Minority vs. Majority Languages has for years been focused on **Immigrant Minority Languages** as opposed to **Regional Minority Languages**. According to Article 1 of the Council of Europe Charter for Regional Minority Languages (1992), regional or minority languages refer to "languages that are traditionally used within a given territory of a State by nationals of that State who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the State's population"; and they are "different from the official language(s) of that State". The Charter also refers to the so-called **non-territorial languages**, which are those languages "used by nationals of the State which differ from the language or languages used by the rest of the State's population but which, although traditionally used within the territory of the State, cannot be identified with a particular area thereof". Examples would be languages such as Yiddish and Romani. Note that in the case of Mozambique immigrant languages such as Chinese and Panjabi, for example, are also present, and although spoken by a relatively small number of people, they are still not designated as immigrant **minority** languages.

It is important to notice, however, that the terms **Community Languages** and **Heritage Languages**⁸⁹ are also used to refer to the languages brought by immigrant populations in different countries of the world. According to Edwards (2001: 243), in the case of the United Kingdom, for example, the preference for the use of the terms Community Language or Heritage Language results from a recognition of the fact that the “vast majority of speakers in question, are second, third or even fourth generation of settlers” in the country.

Examples of **Immigrant Languages** would be, Arabic in France and Spain⁹⁰, brought by immigrants from North Africa or Chinese in Australia, brought by immigrants from China or Singapore⁹¹. Examples of **Regional Languages** would be Welsh and Scottish Gaelic in the United Kingdom⁹² or Sámi in Sweden⁹³. **Majority Languages** would be all those languages spoken as official in the EU countries. Part of the debate on Minority vs. Majority Languages has been focused on how to approach the different languages or their speakers. At the level of the EU, as mentioned elsewhere in this thesis, the question is focused on how to respond to the increasing multilingualism of countries and schools in Europe; how to provide for the Linguistic Human Rights of children from Immigrant Minority Groups or Regional Minority Groups.

Closely related to the notion of Majority Languages is the concept of **Languages of Wider Communication (LWC)**, which I understand as referring to those languages that are spoken beyond the geographical borders of a country, by a large number of speakers. In my understanding, not all Majority Languages are Languages of Wider Communication; as majority implies official and a LWC does not necessarily have to be official beyond a country's borders. Languages of Wider Communication are spoken as regional or even international languages. For instance, while Danish is a Majority Language in Denmark when compared to other languages spoken within the Danish geographical borders (German, Turkish, etc.), it is not a Language of Wider Communication regionally,

⁸⁹ Baker (2001) makes the claim though that the term heritage language, which can be synonymous to native, ethnic, minority, ancestral, aboriginal or ‘langues d’ origine’ is a dangerous term, as it refers “to the past and not to the future, to traditions rather than the contemporary; in that way, it is not unambiguous as it may well refer to a language such as Navajo or Spanish in the context of the USA.

⁹⁰ See Caubet (2001), and García & Molina (2001), for detailed accounts on the Arabic language in both France and Spain

⁹¹ For an account of immigrant languages in Australia, see Ozolins & Clyne 2001.

⁹² See Colin Williams (2001) for a detailed account of Welsh in the UK and Boyd Robertson (2001) for Gaelic in Scotland.

⁹³ Leena Huss (2001) writes quite extensively on the official approach to the Sámi language in Sweden.

that is, in Nordic Countries or at the level of the EU. English, on the other hand, is both a Majority Language (spoken as official language in countries such as the United Kingdom, for example,) and a Language of Wider Communication (spoken as the main vehicle of communication in a variety of international contexts). Spanish is definitely a Language of Wider Communication spoken throughout most of Latin and South America, and not only there.

The importance of reviewing the terms minority-majority languages within the scope of this study, in spite of the fact that they are highly controversial and do not apply in a simple and unproblematic way to the Mozambican case, lies in that the language education policy being proposed here highlights the need to bring on board both “small” and “big” languages. In other words, “small” and “big” would be synonymous of minority and majority, or borrowing a few of the terms used by Haberland (1999), “small” would be the same as “lesser used” or “less often taught” languages or “weak” languages; and “big” languages would be the same as “strong” languages. For Haberland (1999:3), “terms like ‘lesser used’ and ‘less often taught languages’ both attempt to capture some aspect of powerlessness” and the term ‘small language’ can refer to a language which is “rarely if ever used as a lingua franca”. In my view, an inclusive and democratic language education policy should include both Languages of Wider Communication, which are perceived as having power (economic, political, etc.) and those languages that are often less used and spoken, which are seen as being deprived of power, possibility, opportunity and/or potential⁹⁴.

3.7 Linguistic Imperialism and Linguistic Genocide (Linguicism)

It is important to mention at this stage that the spread of English is not always seen as a natural phenomenon, resulting from the need to find a common vehicle for transnational or international communication to overcome the language barrier that would otherwise emerge in a situation where people spoke different mother tongues. A theory often mentioned in relation to the spread of the

⁹⁴ I understand the concept of power in exactly the same sense as defined in the *Vocabulaire Européen des Philosophies – Dictionnaire des Intraduisibles*, edited by Cassim (2004); that is, “*Pouvoir*” or power means “*Possibilité*” or “*Potentialité*” (p. 979). I postulate that certain languages seem to be loaded with power, prestige and status; and these are the so-called “big” languages or Languages of Wider Communication. If people have access to them, their range of possibilities and opportunities will be expanded; their potential, for example, to proceed with their further education, to get jobs in a variety of countries will also be expanded.

English language being a result of conscious political efforts made by two of the world's most powerful countries, is **Linguistic Imperialism**.

According to Phillipson's **Linguistic Imperialism** theory, the spread of English worldwide is a consequence of a conscious policy of language diffusion carried out by British and American powers. In other words, there is a hidden agenda behind the spread of English; the agenda of the American and British political and economic powers, which intends to promote the English language together with Capitalism, Transnationalization, Americanization and Homogenization of World Culture, Linguistic, Cultural and Media Imperialism (1999: 29). Linguistic Imperialism is also discussed under the **Diffusion of English Paradigm**. As already mentioned earlier on in this dissertation, particularly under section 1.7 in Chapter One, the spread of English may be detrimental to smaller languages, and may result in **Linguicism** and **Linguistic Genocide**. The underlying claim of this is that majority languages or languages of wider communication such as English, Portuguese, or French are annihilating 'smaller' and 'weaker' languages.

Basically, **Linguicism**⁹⁵ refers to negative attitudes towards languages, which may lead to **Linguistic Genocide** or to language death resulting from a language contact situation in which one of the languages is the dominant one and therefore due to unequal power relations it ends by replacing the dominated languages. **Linguicism** is defined by Skutnabb-Kangas as "ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language" (1999: 191). She draws a parallel between linguicism and racism and sexism, and claims that linguicism is a major factor in determining whether speakers of particular languages are allowed to enjoy their linguistic human rights.

Spolsky⁹⁶(2004: 87), refuting what he calls the Conspiracy Theory advocated by the major proponents of the Linguistic Imperialism theory (Phillipson) and Linguistic Genocide theory (Skutnabb-Kangas), advises against the use of terms like *imperialism* or *neo-colonialism*. For Spolsky, "the socio-economic

⁹⁵ Which Skutnabb-Kangas (1986b) compares to racism, classism, sexism and ageism.

⁹⁶ Drawing on Fishman (1996: 369).

forces encouraging the spread of English are now indigenous, in most countries of the world, and do not depend on outside encouragement or formal language-diffusion policy”, considering that the demand for English comes not only from countries that have a British or American colonial past, but also from many other places.

Figueira (2009), in her very interesting PhD study, seems to agree with the claims of the Linguistic Imperialism theory and argues that there is in fact an intentional and conscious language spread policy perpetrated by the governments of Portugal, the United Kingdom and France in order to spread and/or maintain their languages in Lusophone or Portuguese-speaking countries such as Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. She argues that there is a competition among these countries with the purpose of spreading and maintaining their languages.

There seems to be in present-day Mozambique a covert language hierarchy, in which at the top we find languages such as English, followed by Portuguese, and, at the bottom, languages such as the Mozambican National Languages. Such a hierarchy probably results from the association that is made between languages and their instrumental value, in terms of their link with the labour market. It is also true that there is in Mozambique an increasing grassroots' demand for the English language, as already mentioned under section 2.3.3 in Chapter Two. In a way, this partly confirms both Spolsky and Fishman's claims that “the socio-economic forces encouraging the spread of English are now indigenous”. However, Figueira's study suggests that there is a need to be cautious and critical as well. Although there is a demand for English, for example, on the part of the local communities, it is also true that the establishment of the Portuguese 'Instituto Camões', the French 'Centro Cultural Franco-Moçambicano' or the British Council, which present themselves as essentially cultural and educational centres, is not a mere coincidence. They are certainly an outcome of a conscious official policy of language maintenance and spread, in the case of the Portuguese 'Instituto Camões' and language diffusion, in the case of both the British Council and the 'Centro Cultural Franco-Moçambicano'.

Regardless of the above claims of intentional language-diffusion policy, what is important to observe is that the world is in need of shared vehicles for communication in the international arena, the regional and national levels. One possible way to promote communication at a variety of levels could be a much

more widespread language teaching and learning in order to make people more multilingual. Another way could possibly be a lingua franca; although the English language tends to emerge as the most normal choice in many contexts today, it is not the only choice as any other language or languages could also play the role of Lingua Franca. After all, it is not the first time in the history of mankind that the world has seen languages being used as international *Lingua Francas*; first there was Greek, followed by Latin, Arabic, and French as some of the languages that throughout history have served as common vehicles of communication. In today's world, if we think, for example, about the Lusophone or Francophone countries, that is, those countries that share Portuguese or French, obviously either Portuguese or French would naturally emerge as common vehicles of communication.

In Mozambique, the risk of **Linguicism** or **Linguistic Genocide** does not appear to be present, as so far, both Portuguese and English Language Learning have been additive, for the vast majority of people. As mentioned under section 2.3.2 in Chapter Two, the Mozambican National Languages are still very much used on a daily basis, and this will continue, at least in a foreseeable future, especially in rural areas. Or, as postulated by Firmino (2005: 67), it is in the Mozambican 'autochthonous' languages that ethnic identity is manifested; and this in itself underlines the importance of these languages to the Mozambicans, and suggests that they are very strongly embedded in the Mozambicans' lives. In relation to language being one of the most significant markers of ethno-linguistic identity, Smolicz (1995: 236) came up with the **Theory of Core Values**, which argues that in ethnically plural societies "some ethnic groups are very strongly-language centred, so that their existence as distinct cultural and social entities depends on the maintenance and development of their ethno-specific tongues". This theory recognises "the special role of language not only as a bridge which furthers communication with others, but also as an identity-maker, and a core value which symbolises a person's belonging to a particular community, and no other". It appears that for most Mozambicans, the Mozambican identity is first and foremost constructed on the basis of the Mozambican National Languages as argued by Firmino (2005). However, that is not always the case, particularly for the group of Mozambicans who do not have any Mozambican National Language as their L1. In this case, identity seems to be a rather fluid concept as the Mozambican identity of this latter group is not necessarily language-based.

3.8 Globalisation and Global English

The process of **Globalisation** is very much present in every sphere of the contemporary world, ranging from the globalisation of information technology, the Media, transnational companies, among others. The field of Language Policy does not escape from the process. As a matter of fact, highly relevant in the current research on Language Planning and Policy is the whole issue of the ongoing Globalisation phenomenon and its implications at local, national and transnational level, particularly in linguistic terms.

There seems to be a widespread agreement that one of the major vehicle of globalisation is the English language or the ‘Anglo-American’⁹⁷ language, which is one of the most learned and spoken second and foreign languages, and used internationally as the most common auxiliary language or *Lingua Franca*. The term **International Language** refers to a language that is used for communication purposes internationally, that is, by citizens of different countries or different regions of the world, with different backgrounds as a common vehicle of communication. For example, Trudgill claims that International Language is a ‘lingua franca which is used for communication between different countries.’ (2003: 64). *Lingua Franca*, on the other hand, is usually defined as a common vehicle of communication between people who do not share a native language.

Although the concept of Globalisation appears everywhere, defining it seems to be rather complex. Like Fairclough (2006), I maintain that globalization is ”a complex, interconnected but partly autonomous set of processes affecting many dimensions of social life (economic, political, social, cultural, environmental, military and so forth) which constitute changes in the spatial organization of social activity and interaction, social relations and relations of power, producing ever more intensive, extensive and rapid interconnections, interdependencies and flows on a global scale and between the global scale and other (macro-regional, national, local, etc.) scales” (pp. 163). I understand globalisation as meaning the same as internationalisation; a situation which involves the ‘fall’ of the geographical borders of nation-states, increasing cooperation between political, cultural, and social actors, worldwide, and, most importantly, increasing migration levels. In addition, globalisation

⁹⁷ According to Daryai-Hansen (2008: 273) ‘Anglo-American’ is the term proposed and used in the German research to highlight that the status of English as an international *lingua franca* derives primarily from extralinguistic factors such as the increasing dominance of American culture, science, economy, and politics.

manifests itself in such a way that events taking place in a specific part of the world may have a global impact. It could be said that globalisation has a snowball effect, as it tends to spread over into various directions.

Increasing migration levels, which are partly due to ongoing globalisation, obviously result in high levels of multilingualism. According to Extra (2008: 3), in order to look at the effects of globalisation for multilingualism in Europe, for example, one has to consider effects at two major levels; at the transnational level, where there is a convergence towards English as a *Lingua Franca* for intercultural communication, and the national level, where there is a diversification of home languages and languages at school. Although what Extra says is correct, I would add that at internal or national level we witness both a diversification of home languages and languages at school, but also an increasing demand for English by all layers of society. In the Mozambican context, for a large number of people, this demand for English comes most likely as a realisation of its perceived value at the national level, because of the possibility of getting jobs at the foreign companies operating in the country, and at the regional level, because of the possibility of travelling abroad, particularly to South Africa in search of jobs in the mining industry and other sectors.

In this respect, Spolsky (2004: 58) argues that the effects of globalisation are evident ‘in the increasing relevance of English as a universal auxiliary language. Whatever other issues a national language policy must confront in the twenty-first century, it must deal with the place of English’. This is very true in many countries of the world - the realisation that the English language is a *sine qua non* condition of life in the contemporary world. The Language Policy debate in Nordic Countries such as Denmark, for example, is very much focused on the dual relation English versus Danish, on whether they should be used as ‘parallel languages’ (Harder 2009) or ‘complementary languages’ (Preisler, 2009). Also in Denmark, for example, a number of concerns exist relating to the question of ‘domain loss’ of Danish in relation to English (see Haberland 2008 for a critical review of the issue); the view that the English language is gaining terrain in a number of fields, such as for example, as the main language for scholarly publications⁹⁸, while the Danish language is losing terrain.

⁹⁸ In this respect, Phillipson (2006: 350) argues that “scientific scholarship is increasingly an English-only domain in international communication (journals, reference works, textbooks, conferences, and networking) which has a knock-on

Other examples of the increasing demand for English come from the Basque Country (Cenoz 2001), Sweden (Cabau-Lampa 2007), South Africa (Dyers 2009), Ethiopia (Lanza 2009, Heugh et al. 2007), and Hong Kong (Li 2009), where the English language stands out as the most preferred language in a number of contexts, lending plausibility to the claim that English is taking over domains at the expense of other languages.

As a consequence of the increasing demand for English in many countries of the world, and as stated by Spolsky (2004), Language Policies, in addition to looking at any other emerging issues such as whether or not to provide Mother Tongue Multilingual Education, have also to accommodate the issue of English Language Teaching and Learning. The question is not whether to provide English language teaching, but when to do so, that is, at what stage in the school system and for how long. Because there is a widespread perception in Mozambique of the relevance of English, as already mentioned under section 2.3.3, it is crucial that any language education policy should consider the place of English in the school curriculum. I understand this need to deal with the place of English in the school curriculum as an instance of what Fairclough (2006) refers to as “globalization from below”, that is a process “driven by the strategies of individuals or groups in specific places to adapt to and gain from change, or defend themselves against it”. As discussed under section 1.3 in Chapter One, by formulating a sound and well-balanced language education policy that considers both local and national needs as well as regional or international needs we will be preparing the populace at large or at least those who have access to the formal education system to face emerging challenges at these levels.

3.9 Linguistic Human Rights in Education

Studies dealing with Linguistic Human Rights in Education are mainly concerned with the extent to which educational systems are willing and able to grant to children the right to learn their parents’ language(s). It is argued that linguistic human rights in education go beyond support for intergenerational transmission of the parents’ language to children, and include raising the parents’ awareness to the long-term implications of failure to transmit their languages to their children, and to the future of the language itself (Skutnabb-Kangas 1999).

effect nationally (language shift to English, particularly at the graduate level)”.

Article 23 of the 1996 Universal Declaration on Linguistic Rights stipulates that Education must:

- Help to foster the capacity for linguistic and cultural self-expression of the language community of the territory where it is provided.
- Help to maintain and develop the language spoken by the language community of the territory where it is provided.
- Always be at the service of linguistic and cultural diversity and of harmonious relations between different language communities throughout the world.

The Declaration concludes that “within the context of the foregoing principles, everyone has the right to learn any language”.

The role of education in promoting language maintenance, through the provision of L1 or Mother Tongue Education, in fostering positive attitudes to linguistic and cultural diversity, and preventing language shift or death has been acknowledged by many. In this connection, Fishman (1986: 320) posits that

Because education is generally obligatory, it focuses on the young, and its sway not only continues uninterrupted for many years among those who “stay with it”, but is oriented toward future gains that may last for additional untold years. This combination of factors renders education a very useful and highly irreversible language-shift mechanism for statutes that are literacy related.

The granting of linguistic human rights in education, in the form of Mother Tongue Education, for example, benefits each individual child not just in psychological, pedagogical, and academic terms, but also, and as maintained by Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1995: 102), because the “child builds up a linguistic repertoire which is necessary for basic social and psychological survival and economic and political participation”. Firstly, the psychological shock or confusion that would otherwise occur in a situation where children start schooling in a language that is different from their home language is avoided. Secondly, and as will be discussed further in Chapter Five, because the children are familiar with the medium of instruction, this translates into more student participation and interaction in the

classroom, as well as better social skills both in the school and the community. If the children's home language is promoted in the wider society it means that their chances of surviving economically and professionally will be much higher, and so will their ability to participate in political and democratic processes. Education is undoubtedly one of the most appropriate vehicles for the promotion of linguistic human rights. If the Mozambican children at large receive L1 education, this will not only benefit them individually, or the country collectively, but also the Mozambican National Languages, in terms of corpus development, as their use in education would demand a constant and systematic development of the corpus of the languages, for example, in order to cope with developments in areas such as science and technology. The benefits of linguistic human rights in education may also spread out to the country at large, in the sense that its citizens will be more active and able to make their voices heard, and contribute to the solution of the many problems that affect society.

When designing language policies and considering the granting of linguistic human rights in education, there are usually two principles to bear in mind; these are, the **personality principle** and the **territorial principle**. According to Grin (1995: 35), while the personality principle "states that language rights attach to individuals, irrespective of their geographical position", the territorial principle "means that each language should correspond to a specific area, in order to ensure the latter's linguistic homogeneity; the language rights enjoyed by individuals are then conditional on their geographical position". As further discussed in this study, particularly in Chapter Six, the language education policy being proposed for urban Mozambique combines both principles, because promoting educational linguistic human rights based on the territorial principle alone would not work in a highly heterogeneous context.

3.10 Mother Tongue Education

Much of the literature in the field of Language Planning and Policy has concentrated on Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual or Multilingual Education. The concept of Mother Tongue though is quite controversial, and has been defined in a variety of ways. For instance, Arthur (2003: 93) postulates that

Marginalisation – a majority rather than a minority perspective – is, indeed, reflected in the undifferentiated use of the term 'mother tongue' to refer to languages which serve a wide range of communicative and

symbolic roles in the lives of members of minority communities. Such languages may or may not be the first language to be acquired, or the main language of the home. They may be national languages of countries of origin, languages of religious heritage or scriptural languages

Indeed **Mother Tongue** can have several meanings, among them, the first language acquired, the home language, and the language of the mother or/and the father. A Mother Tongue can be a national language, a majority language, a minority language, a religious language, a scriptural language, a community language and much more. According to Coulmas (1992: 105), “since the notion “mother tongue” is theoretically problematic and often used in a misguided or improper way, it may not be unnecessary to recall that its meaning is properly to be determined with reference to the speaking individual.” Thus, throughout this study, any reference to the concept of Mother Tongue is done in connection to an individual’s first language or languages (**L1**), that is, those languages acquired first and which are predominantly used in the home context, with close relatives or/and acquaintances and friends. Mother Tongue is used in this context to refer to the first or primary language or languages in which a child has been socialised.

The core of many studies in this area is on the provision of Mother Tongue or L1 education for all children, which is seen as a Linguistic Human Right. Major arguments in favour of Mother Tongue Education, regardless of the status of such a language, that is, whether it is a minority or majority language, indicate the pedagogical, academic, attitudinal and emotional benefits of developing literacy and oracy in one’s first language (UNESCO 1953, Cummins 1981, 1984, Skutnabb-Kangas 1995, 2006, Benson 1997, 2004). For instance, Artigal (1995: 179) confirms that “proficiency in the family language is a *sine qua non* prerequisite for any child’s linguistic, cognitive and academic development”. In addition, Cummins (1984: 142-144) postulates that a child’s home language (L1) is a valuable basis for the learning of the second language (L2). Furthermore, he argues that legitimization of the use of students’ home languages within the classroom is essential, considering that “students’ home language (L1) knowledge is an educationally significant component of their cultural capital; [and] students’ attitude towards and use of L1 changes positively in L1-supportive classroom contexts” (2006: 62-63).

UNESCO (1953:11) makes a strong case for mother tongue education, when arguing that in

psychological terms, the mother tongue “is the system of meaningful signs that in [the child’s] mind works automatically for expression and understanding. Sociologically, it is a means of identification among members of the community to which he belongs. Educationally, he learns more quickly through it than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium”. Studies indicating the positive benefits of Mother Tongue Education come from many places from around the world⁹⁹. For instance, Gibbons et al (1995: 258-259) reporting on a bilingual programme introduced with the purpose of fighting ‘educational disadvantage among Lebanese-Australian children’ in Campsie in Australia, indicate that among the principles guiding the programme were the following: (1) the fact that the first language constitutes a fundamental and valuable basis for second language learning, as often advocated; (2) mother-tongue education leads to a positive socio-emotional environment, which provides the basic conditions for learning; and that (3) mother tongue education allows normal cognitive development. On the other hand, Pattanayak (1986: 10), commenting on the cognitive advantages of initial Mother Tongue Education, points out that “studies with Spanish American children [for example] show that initial mother tongue education not only gives greater coping ability but also leads to better conceptual development of the child and that the language of the dominant culture develops in meaningful dimensions in a child anchored in education in the mother tongue”.

As already mentioned above, the benefits of education in one’s Mother Tongue are enormous and varied in terms of scope; and as it will be discussed in Chapter Five, the findings of the present study seem to confirm the advantages of the use of the Mother Tongue in education in terms of more student participation and student-teacher interaction, as well as very positive attitudes toward the L1, as a direct result of a Mother Tongue-supportive school and classroom environment.

3.11 Purposes and Models of Bilingual Education

A considerable amount of research in the field of Language Planning and Policy has been conducted on **Bilingual and/or Multilingual Education**, which refers to the use of two or more languages as medium of instruction. It is often argued that bilingual education is not solely concerned with a balanced use of two languages in the classroom; among its aims are, for example, assimilation into the mainstream society, and unification of different groups in a multilingual society. In Baker’s view,

⁹⁹ Refer, for example, to Khubchandani (1977 or 2003) for the case of Mother Tongue Education in India.

“behind bilingual education are varying and conflicting philosophies and politics of what education is for. Sociocultural, political and economic issues are ever present in the debate over the provision of bilingual education” (2001: 193). In other words, the arguments for whether to provide bilingual education or not are not merely linguistic, but extra-linguistic as well. It would be possible to argue that in the Mozambican case, sociocultural arguments would be present, for example, if consideration was taken of the need to respect sociocultural diversity; political arguments would be present if, for example, the goal was to prevent any conflicts between people with different political affiliations; and finally, economic arguments would be present when assessing the viability of introducing bilingual education on a national scale.

When discussing Bilingual Education Programmes, a distinction is usually made between **Additive** and **Subtractive** bilingualism. While **Additive Bilingualism** accounts for a learning situation in which there is an attempt to successfully develop competence in two languages (for example, L1 and L2), **Subtractive Bilingualism** refers to a situation in which the language learning experience is not positive and enriching as it results in replacement or substitution of the first language, by the second one (i.e., L2 replaces L1).

Two major types of bilingual education programs are usually mentioned in the literature: **maintenance** and **transitional**¹⁰⁰. While **Maintenance Bilingual Education**¹⁰¹ is aimed at strengthening and maintaining a particular language (minority, threatened, or other), a **Transitional Bilingual Education** program has as its major goal to replace the home or minority language almost entirely by the majority language. It is usually argued that the goals of a maintenance program are geared towards additive, positive, and enriching bilingualism. Conversely, transitional bilingual programs are said to be subtractive, and reductionist.

¹⁰⁰ See Fishman (1976) or Baker (2001) for a detailed description of these kinds of bilingual programs or Mikes (1986) for an excellent typology of languages of instruction.

¹⁰¹ Gibbons (1995: 102) gives a detailed explanation on this particular type of bilingual education, and argues that maintenance bilingual education refers to a context in which “two languages are used to teach content subjects, one language being the dominant language of the majority group; the other language of instruction is the home language of minority children, and this language is used in school with the objective of maintaining and developing this mother tongue, so that minority language children can become fully bilingual”.

Reference is also made, in the literature, to **Enrichment Bilingual Education**, which is very similar to a maintenance bilingual education programme type. Beardsmore describes this type of bilingual education in the following way: “An enrichment programme is one where a second language does not replace the first, but is added so as to enable the user to function adequately in the second but at no cost to the first” (1995: 23).

In addition, a contrast is made between **Immersion** and **Submersion** programmes. While it is argued that the major goal of an immersion program is bilingualism and biculturalism, on the other hand, a claim is made that submersion education, usually for language minority children, is aimed at assimilation in the majority language and culture. Immersion programmes are said to be beneficial, enriching and positive, while submersion is said to be detrimental, diminishing and negative, often resulting in failure to acquire the majority language and failure in progressing through the academic life.

Another type of bilingual education, particularly common in the United States of America is the **Two-way Bilingual Immersion** model, which is aimed at “developing high levels of proficiency in L1 and L2” (Dolson and Lindholm 1995: 79). Among the features of this model are the use of two languages as medium of instruction (or dual language instruction), and the fact that the target group is comprised of both native and non-native speakers of the two languages involved.

A distinction is yet made in the literature, between **Strong Forms** and **Weak Forms of Bilingual Education**¹⁰². Among the Strong forms of bilingual education are included the following: Immersion, Maintenance or Heritage Language, Two-Way or Dual Language and Mainstream Bilingual Education. The two main goals in strong forms of bilingual education are both bilingualism and biliteracy in the majority and minority languages, as well as maintenance, pluralism, and enrichment (Baker 2001). Under the **Weak Forms of Bilingual Education** are included: Transitional Bilingualism, Submersion (or Structured Immersion), Segregationist¹⁰³, and Separatist. The major linguistic and societal goals in

¹⁰² See Baker (2001: 193-194) for an excellent review of these forms of bilingualism.

¹⁰³ Phillipson, Skutnabb-Kangas and Africa (1986: 81) present two examples of Segregationist education: a segregation model for majority population, in South Africa under Apartheid, designated Bantu Education, with the linguistic goal of L1 dominance and societal goal of perpetuating the Apartheid system. As an example of a segregation model for minorities,

weak forms of bilingual education are monolingualism and assimilation.

As will be further discussed later on, specifically in Chapter Five, Mozambique adopted a transitional model of bilingual education in 1993, with the major goal of using the mother tongue as a means to build on competence in the Portuguese language. It could be argued that under the present circumstances bilingualism and biliteracy in Portuguese and the national language(s) are not the ultimate goal; rather proficiency in the Portuguese language, which is the main medium of instruction at secondary and tertiary levels.

3.12 Language Planning and Policy vs. Language Management

There are quite a number of definitions of **Language Policy**¹⁰⁴, and most of them seem to focus on either one or all of the three aspects below:

- (1) Decisions aimed at interfering with the **status** or **functions** of a particular language or languages within a state,
- (2) Decisions regarding the development of the **corpus** or the **internal structure** of a language or languages, or yet
- (3) Decisions regarding the **teaching** and **learning** of languages in the school context.

Most definitions¹⁰⁵ tend to agree that the formulation of an explicit Language Policy is a government responsibility, and it usually results in legislation or court decisions pertaining to language use and language development. However, as will emerge throughout this Chapter, many other non-governmental actors are also interested on language policy decisions, and are often actually involved in such exercises.

they refer to the case of mother tongue Turkish education for migrant Turks in Bavaria, Germany with a dual goal of dominance in Turkish and preparing them for forced repatriation.

¹⁰⁴ In fact, most of the articles in Ricento 2006 include a definition of the concept, which is the core subject of the book. For instance, Schiffman's definition adds the concept of Linguistic Culture, defined as the "sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, myths, religious strictures, and all the other cultural 'baggage' that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their culture" (2006: 112). On the other hand, Wodak's definition includes both top-down and bottom-up public and political initiatives through which languages are validated, function and are disseminated; in her view, "like all policies, it is subject to conflict and must regularly be reordered through constant discussion and debate" (2006: 170).

¹⁰⁵ See for example, Beacco and Byram's (2003) definition.

Stavans and Narkiss present a comprehensive definition of the term, in the sense that it includes the three above foci, namely, status planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning. In their view,

Language Policy has to do with decisions ‘regarding which language will be taught by whom, for how long, and in what manner, it will also involve issues of the official status of a language, the norms of the language within a society, whether there will or will not be a language hegemony, whether languages are going to be taught equally in formal and informal education, and above all how the planning and policy making occurs.’ (2003: 139)

Equally comprehensive is the definition presented by Beacco and Byram, which states that Language Policy is

A conscious official or militant action that seeks to intervene in languages of whatever type (national, regional, minority, foreign, etc.) with respect to their forms (the writing system, for example), social functions (choice of language as official language) or their place in education. The language policy may be pursued by citizens or groups, by political parties and in the voluntary or private sector. Such language policies are also, however, based on principles (economy and efficiency, national identity, democracy, and so forth) which give them a meaning that extends beyond current circumstances. (2003:15)

The second definition is even more detailed in that it enumerates different types of languages that can be the subject of language policy actions, not just national languages, but also regional, minority and foreign languages. It also brings forward the idea that in addition to governments or public authorities, there are other possible actors involved in language policy decisions, such as, for example, individual citizens or groups. Also emerging from the definition are some of the principles underlying language policy decisions, among them, economy, efficiency, national identity, and democracy.

A second term that is closely related to Language Policy is **Language Planning**. It appears that the first definition of the term was given by Haugen already in 1959, when he stated that Language Planning refers to the “activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community”. (pp.8)

Haugen’s definition, however, seems to be restricted to the so-called *Corpus Planning*. In other words,

orthographic norm and the development of grammar books and dictionaries relate primarily to the form or the internal structure of a particular language. Nevertheless, there is a need to bear in mind that language development activities are not often seen as the ultimate goal of Corpus Planning, as they tend to occur in association with the purpose of interfering with language usage or the functions to which a language is put to in a particular context. In addition, the definition only covers non-homogeneous contexts, although language planning also occurs in homogeneous settings. A particular example would be a situation where there is more than one written or spoken norm, and the need emerges for developing one that will be instituted as the standard norm, for example, to be used as the model for education.

For Robert Cooper (1989:45), Language Planning refers to “deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, and functional allocations of their linguistic codes”. This definition clearly covers the three foci of Language Policy already mentioned under section 3.12.

However, if we compare the definitions of Language Policy and Language Planning, it appears that the same processes are involved, and perhaps it is not strange that they seem to overlap. In fact, it is not uncommon to find scholars that talk both about Language Planning and Policy (Ricento 2006). Bakmand (2000:2) suggests that “one way of distinguishing "language policy" from "language planning" is to consider "language policy" as the expression of the ideological orientations and views, and "language planning" as the actual proposal that makes up their implementation”.

A third term used by Bernard Spolsky (2004) is **Language Management**. In his own words, “In studying language policy, we are usually trying to understand just what non-language variables co-vary with language variables. There are also cases of direct efforts to manipulate the language situation. When a person or a group directs such intervention, I call this language management” (Spolsky 2004: 8). He goes on and says that “Language Management refers to the formulation and proclamation of an explicit plan or policy, usually but not necessarily written in a formal document, about language use”. (pp.11)

I consider that the processes involved in Spolsky's Language Management are similar to those related to Language Policy. Similarly to Language Policy, Language Management is also aimed at defining laws, plans or policies (explicit or not) determining, for example, which language or languages should be used in official spheres or as medium of instruction. Thus, my major concern in the present PhD project is with language policy decisions that have to do with the languages in the curriculum, in particular how to approach mother tongue education in multilingual contexts such as the urban schools of Mozambique.

3.13 Types of Language Planning

The definitions of Language Planning and Policy presented under section 3.12 above already encapsulate the three major goals of the Language Planning Process. In other words, when planning for language, language planners have one or all of the following purposes: interfering with the **Status** or functions of a particular language, working on the **Corpus**, the form, body (or internal structure) of a language, or/and creating the conditions for the **Acquisition**, learning or spread of a particular language by means of the education system. Thus, it can be argued that these are three major types or goals of the language planning process: **Status Planning**, **Corpus Planning** and **Acquisition Planning**.

Status Planning refers to activities aimed at interfering with the functional uses of a language, which can result in expansion of the contexts of use of such a language, or reduction of the functional levels at which such language once performed. An example of Status Planning is the introduction of the use of the national languages in education in Mozambique. In other words, because these languages, which were once restricted to the home, family and informal spheres, are now allowed into the formal education sector, it means that they have gained status. Status loss can also occur, for example, if a language ceases to be used in a particular context, such as education, because no one is interested in learning it; if the French language were no longer taught at Roskilde University because of lack of demand on the part of the students, then it could be said that it lost its status.

As specific instances of **Corpus Planning**, Cooper (1989: 31) refers to the coinage of new terms, spelling reform, and adoption of a new script. Activities such as the development of a standard norm, grammar books and dictionaries are also part of the Corpus Planning process. So as to allow the use of

the Mozambican national languages in education, for example, there was certainly a great deal of Corpus Planning activities that took place, a process mostly led by NELIMO (the Centre for the Study of Mozambican Languages). Most of the Mozambican languages did not have a standard written norm and, first of all, there was surely a need to develop one. In addition, there was also a need to coin terminology in order to be able to talk about mathematics, biology, and natural sciences, among others. In this connection, Baker (2001: 56) says that a common process for both majority and minority languages is the modernization of vocabulary, particularly as a response to the spread of science and information technology. The use of ‘loan words’ appears to be an alternative for the modernization of vocabulary in many languages. Borrowings from English are quite common in the Portuguese of Mozambique in such a way that it is frequent to hear people talking about *workshops*, and *software* in contexts demanding a Portuguese word or expression.

Fishman, however, correctly maintains that Corpus Planning and Status Planning are often referred to as two sides of the same coin because it would be “unwise for a language to attain new statuses (e.g., in government, the courts, higher education, the military, etc.) without having an adequate corpus by which the topics relevant to such statuses can be readily, accurately, and felicitously expressed” (2006: 315-316).

As already stated above, **Acquisition Planning** concerns the teaching and learning of languages; it is directed towards responding to questions such as: which language or languages should, for example, be used in the education system (as medium of instruction or as subjects) and for how long (how many years, how many hours per week)? When or at what level should such languages be introduced? Clearly, language spread, and increasing the users and uses of a language is the key goal here¹⁰⁶. In the particular case of Mozambique, among the goals of Acquisition Planning are obviously language spread, that is, expanding the users of Portuguese, English, and now the Mozambican National Languages, as well as language maintenance, and improving educational performance, by means of provision of L1 education.

¹⁰⁶ See Cooper (1989), Baker (2001), or Spolsky (2004) for more details on these goals.

3.14 The Main Actors and Institutions in the Language Planning and Policy Process

Although Language Planning and Policy are mainly a top-down governmental activity, and therefore the major actor is the Government itself, the State, or the legitimate authorities of a particular polity, a number of other actors have also been recognised. The rationale for this, as presented by Cooper (1989: 37-38) is that “the same processes which operate in macro level planning also operate in micro level planning”. Therefore, it is not surprising that the school and the community figure as major actors involved in the language planning process.

It is claimed¹⁰⁷ that language planning starts at home, and within the family. Due to an increasing number of intermarriages, across cultures, languages, and geographical borders, there are more and more families that are bilingual, trilingual or pluri-/multilingual; families in which one of the parents speaks one language, the other speaks a different language, and they reside in a society where a third different language is spoken. At times, conscious decisions have to be made, at family level, about the language to speak with the children, or the languages to speak between the parents, for the children’s benefit. Other times such decisions are made unconsciously or ‘blindly’, as not all families will have access to notions of cultural capital that often drive acquisition planning decisions; in these cases they seem to be susceptible to issues of power and dominance. Although the scope of this language planning is certainly restricted to the family, decisions are taken having in mind the languages of the outside world and most particularly the society and the various institutions such as education.

Other actors and/or institutions claimed to be involved in the Language Planning Process are the schools and other educational systems, the church and other religious organizations, social, sport, ethnic and cultural clubs or associations, the village or other immediate neighbourhood, market places and commercial enterprises, just to mention a few¹⁰⁸.

What was reported under section 3.5 above *Language Maintenance, Shift and Death*, the fact that after Mozambique’s independence in 1975 and even before, during the colonial period, a number of parents

¹⁰⁷ See, for example, Spolsky (2004).

¹⁰⁸ See Spolsky (2004: 46) for a detailed description of these institutions.

chose not to teach the Mozambican National Languages to their children, and instead they opted for Portuguese as the medium of communication within the family is an instance of Language Planning within the family. However, such a decision was taken with a view to the wider society; Portuguese being the official language, there was an attempt to give the children the tool to successfully function at all levels of the Mozambican society (particularly, within the education and economic-professional sectors).

3.15 Major Components of the Language Planning and Policy Process

When planning for language, it is important to bear in mind that it is a complex process, which involves a wide range of extra-linguistic factors. Thus, there is, at all times, a need to consider what Spolsky (2004) designates components of the Language Policy of a speech community. These components refer to the community's **language practices**, its **language beliefs** or **ideologies**, and any specific attempts to modify or influence such practices by means of language intervention, **planning or management**.

As already mentioned in the introductory chapter, **language practices** refer to the habitual language choices made by individual speakers or groups when speaking, which relate, among others, to age, gender, social class and education level, and depend on the setting (formal or informal), the individuals involved, the topic of the conversation, among other factors. Such language practices may or may not include the speaker's attitudes and preferences. For example, the language practice of the urban Mozambican classroom is characterised by the formal use of Portuguese, as the legitimate language.

As to the second component, language **ideology and beliefs**, Spolsky (2004: 14) argues that "the members of a speech community share also a general set of beliefs about appropriate language practices, sometimes forming a consensual ideology, assigning values and prestige to various aspects of the language varieties used in it. These beliefs both derive from and influence practices". When we look at the major findings of the present study, we will clearly see what language ideology and beliefs prevail in the Mozambican rural school.

The third component of the Language Policy process, as stated above, has to do with specific efforts to alter or influence the language practices of a community. This refers to the level of language

management, which may or may not agree with people's language ideology or beliefs. Thus, Language Management has to be seen as the core of the Language Planning and Policy process. Language Management, however, may or may not result in the formulation of an explicit written policy. In fact, it is argued that language policies have different forms and shapes; they may be written or unwritten; explicit or implicit (Spolsky 2004). I maintain though that if conditions exist, written, overt, and explicit policies should be the ultimate goal, as they can help to eliminate any doubts or ambiguities and serve as a mechanism to make people accountable.

3.16 Economic Considerations in the Language Planning and Policy Process

An increasing number of scholars indicate the need to adopt an economic approach to language issues, and particularly in the formulation of language policies. According to Djité (1990: 96), "the formulation of a rational language policy in a multilingual nation is in itself an economic issue and should have as high a priority as other economic issues". Because the introduction of bi-/multilingual-based mother tongue education demands resources, such as the training of teachers, and the production and distribution of materials, it is important from the onset to determine where the funds to cover such activities are going to come from. In many cases, the solution is to place the primary responsibility with the Government. Coulmas (1992: 117-118) explains the government's responsibility for languages in the following terms:

Languages are a cost factor for national and local governments. They are assets in need of proper care which are recognised in many parts of the world as an object of government responsibility. For properly executing their functions, in order to perpetrate themselves and to reinforce their stability, states depend in large measure on language. Many of their functions manifest themselves verbally. Communication of the various organs of the state with each other and with the citizens is largely by means of language.

This citation not only highlights the fact that language is an item for which public funds need to be budgeted and spent, but also stresses how important language is for the smooth conduct of the government's businesses. It is important that civil servants are able to use the official language of the government correctly in order to fulfil their duties, but the existence of the right language skills demands training; and as such government funds have to be spent for developing the language skills of civil servants. In the case of Mozambique, for example, in addition to being able to speak Portuguese,

the ability to speak English is a must for civil servants such as customs and immigration officers placed at most of the border posts. Thus, English language training would also demand public funds.

In Mozambique, in addition to the above, other language-related areas that demand the investment of public funds are, for example, the translation of official (SADC or AU) documents from English or French into Portuguese, interpretation services in government official meetings (counting with regional or international participation), and obviously the introduction of Bilingual-based Mother Tongue education¹⁰⁹.

An economic approach to language also demands cost-benefit analyses, as whenever investment is made in a particular area, some kind of return, benefit or profit is expected in exchange. In this connection, Fishman (1985)¹¹⁰ indicates that there is a greater cost-effectiveness of multilingual experts in the public service, industry, business and the military, because they have a greater potential than their monolingual counterparts to succeed and do their jobs efficiently, as they communicate with a range of people, and can serve more people. While in the short-term, it may seem that the benefits of investment in bilingual education, for instance, are somehow limited or not that easy to grasp and that they do not go beyond such issues as more student participation, more student-teacher interaction, among others, in the long-term the gains can be innumerable. I shall return to this issue throughout the present study, particularly in Chapter Six.

3.17 Summary

The main conclusions that can be drawn from this terminology chapter are first and foremost that there is a need to manage and cater for language diversity; and this is the main lesson that we can extract from Garcia's Language Garden Analogy. The rationale for such management derives from the need to prevent a situation where everyone shifts into the use of majority languages alone, while the 'smaller' languages are neglected. Secondly, the value of multilingualism and linguistic diversity is underlined by a number of scholars; and on the basis of all the arguments presented, I also advocate the need to preserve Mozambique's linguistic diversity and multilingualism, and to take it to another stage, that of

¹⁰⁹ An exhaustive description of public funds invested in language-related activities is presented by Coulmas (1992), who pays particular attention to the case of Canada.

¹¹⁰ Cited in Coulmas (1992: 101).

the recognition and value of multilingualism at the level of the school system.

The third point made was that although language planners face increasingly similar issues, in monoethnic, dyadic or triadic and mosaic societies, the task of planners in mosaic societies appears to be the hardest. This is due to budgetary constraints for language development, and establishment of bilingual or multilingual schools, as well as the difficulty of deciding which languages should be used for which purposes. In addition, the importance of listening to and consulting the target groups for which decisions are made and policies are formulated was highlighted, as people's voices, attitudes, and preferences seem to affect the degree of success of any policy implementation.

The chapter also reviews the issue of language maintenance, shift and death and points out that although the Mozambican National Languages do not appear to face the risk of disappearing, and especially not in the rural areas, language shift has however taken place in the case of a number of urban families¹¹¹. As a result, with the possibility of introducing the Mozambican National Languages in the urban schools, language maintenance and spread will likely occur, with a special focus on those children who may not have acquired any of the Mozambican National Languages at home, through their parents.

The chapter revisits the minority-majority language debate and, after considering the difficulty and the problems involved in defining such concepts, stresses that there is a need to distinguish between Languages of Wider Communication, which are loaded with prestige and power, and those languages that are less used and less learned, and which seem to lack power and prestige. The relevance of including this minority-majority debate in this study results from the fact that the Language Education Policy being proposed advocates the need for teaching both 'big' languages and 'smaller' ones.

The Linguistic Imperialism and Linguistic Genocide theories were also reviewed and on the basis of some of the claims of the former, focus was placed on the fact that there is a need to be cautious and critical when analysing the policy of the British Council, the French-Mozambican Cultural Centre, as well as the 'Instituto Camões' in Mozambique. It was noted that there is an increasing grassroots'

¹¹¹ Note that the percentage of L1 Portuguese speakers is estimated in 6.5%.

demand for English; nevertheless, that does not seem to bring the risk of Linguicism or Linguistic Genocide, as it appears that people in Mozambique seem to be learning Languages of Wider Communication in an additive way, that is, not replacing the languages they already have, but building on what they already have.

The relationship between Globalisation and the English language was discussed with the purpose of underlining the fact that due to the increasing demand for English in many countries of the world, one of the tasks of language planners is not only to consider how to provide Mother Tongue Multilingual Education, but also to accommodate the issue of English Language Teaching and Learning. This indicates the need to adopt both a local and global emphasis when planning the languages in the curriculum.

After presenting a definition of the concept of Mother Tongue for the purposes of this study, that is, that Mother Tongue refers to the students' L1 or first language acquired, the chapter reviewed a number of the arguments pointing to the advantage of Mother Tongue Education, among them, the psychological, sociological and educational benefits.

The main Bilingual Education Models and their aims were thoroughly reviewed in this chapter. The chapter also distinguished between additive and subtractive forms of bilingualism and ended by indicating that the current Bilingual Education Program being implemented in Mozambique fits into the category of a transitional type of bilingual education, which is usually seen as a weak form of bilingual education. As will be discussed in Chapter Five, the main goal of the Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Education introduced in Mozambique is to use the Mozambican National Languages as a bridge to building Portuguese L2 language skills.

Of key relevance to this study are the concepts of Language Planning and Policy, as well as the types of Language Planning activities, which were reviewed under sections 3.12 and 3.13 in this chapter. Language Planning and Policy were defined as activities aimed at interfering with the uses, functions and form of any language or languages, on the part of the government or any other actor. It was also mentioned that these activities often go hand-in-hand, or that they are two sides of the same coin, as in

order for a language to perform different functions in government, and other areas in society, it needs to have an appropriate corpus.

The chapter also highlights the fact that in addition to the government, other actors involved in the language planning process are the family, the school, religious institutions, among others. Thus, when analysing language planning and policy, attention should also be paid to these actors who in most cases would plan their language use in view of the language policy of the wider society.

Finally, two other issues reviewed in this chapter are the major components of the language planning and policy process and economic considerations. It was mentioned that when developing a language policy, there is a need to take into account the language practices, beliefs or ideologies and any attempts to interfere with such practices by means of language intervention, planning or management. While the language practices are important because they reveal what actually happens within the community in terms of language use, the value of considering the community's beliefs and ideologies is undeniable, as they often interfere with the success of language management. The need to adopt an economic approach to language was discussed on the basis of the realisation that a considerable amount of government's funds are often allocated to language-related activities such as teacher training and/or materials development.

Having considered relevant terminology in the field of Language Planning and Policy, the next chapter moves onto looking at the issue of Language Education Planning in Southern African countries, with a particular focus on South Africa. The chapter looks at the linguistic and language education situation in these various countries, and concentrates on the South African case due to the fact that a number of insights could possibly be replicated in the Mozambican context, such as South Africa's experience in the management of official multilingualism, the management of mother tongue-based multilingual education, South Africa's insights into the costs involved in financing multilingualism and multilingual education, etc.

CHAPTER FOUR

LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION PLANNING AND POLICY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

While the previous chapter provided a review of key terminology in the field of Language Planning and Policy, the present chapter looks at the linguistic and language education situation in various Southern African countries. It examines the language education policy choices made by the newly-independent countries in Southern Africa, in the 1960's and 1970's, and considers recent trends towards the use of the African Mother Tongues in education. The chapter pays particular attention to the new South African Language Policy, as a large number of lessons learnt in the process of implementing the country's new multilingual language policy could be highly relevant in informing language policy-making in Mozambique, among them, the South African experience in the management of mother tongue-based multilingual education.

4.1 The Language Situation and Post-Independence Language Policy Trends in Southern Africa

The Language Policies in most of the newly-independent countries in Africa, in the 1960's and 1970's, were inspired by an ideology of national unity. Essentially, the initial concern of the post-colonial governments was to unify the many diverse ethnic, tribal, cultural and linguistic groups and build the nations amidst this diversity. The goal of unifying the newly-independent mosaic countries, with all their different ethnolinguistic groups, was high on the politicians' agenda¹¹². Nation-building and the

¹¹² In this regard, see, for instance, Kashoki (2003: 186-187), who argues that "for many years after attaining political independence, even up to the present day, the predominant preoccupation of most newly independent African countries has been a search for 'national integration' which in the main entails conscious efforts aimed at welding pre-independence

preservation of peace was a higher priority than any tribal or linguistic identity. Thus, most of the newly-independent countries in this region retained the metropolitan colonial languages as the main official languages. Consequently, in the majority of these countries, Portuguese, French or English, was adopted as official language.

The geographical block known as Southern Africa is composed of the following countries, in alphabetical order, Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Due to the Portuguese colonial legacy, the official language adopted after independence in Mozambique and Angola was Portuguese. Because the Congo DRC was under Belgian rule, French became the official language. French is also one of the official languages in the Seychelles and in Mauritius. In the remaining countries, English is either the only official language or one of the co-official languages.

Being aware of the fact that the language ecology of Southern Africa as a whole was already very heterogeneous prior to colonization, I maintain that the multilinguality of present-day countries in this region is primarily a consequence of the arbitrary way in which the colonial boundaries were drawn¹¹³, as discussed under section 2.2 in Chapter Two. The majority of the countries in Southern Africa are highly heterogeneous in ethno-linguistic terms¹¹⁴. Examples exist though, of countries in this region, which are relatively homogeneous, such as the cases of Swaziland and Lesotho, for example, which are less heterogeneous because they both have a very small territorial area, and the geographical borders coincide with the ethnolinguistic boundaries. If we compare Swaziland to Mozambique, for example, while the geographical boundaries of the former surround only one ethnolinguistic group, in the case of the latter, as already seen in Chapter Two, there are over ten major ethnolinguistic groups. When arguing that countries such as Swaziland are relatively homogeneous, I am not suggesting that only one ethnolinguistic group is present. What I imply is that they are less diverse in comparison with mosaic

disparate ethnic entities into a 'unified nation'".

¹¹³ See also Makoni and Mashiri (2006) for a thorough review of this issue and further "evidence of the impact of European colonialism in shaping Africa's linguistic map".

¹¹⁴ See Appendix Four, for a brief linguistic profile of the countries in the Southern African region.

countries with over twenty languages, because they have only four or five minority languages, and at least one language which could be said to be a national language¹¹⁵, spoken and/or understood by the majority.

At first glance, it may appear that Swaziland and Lesotho belong to the category of Monoethnic countries, reviewed under section 3.3 in Chapter Three, because, first of all, they are both relatively homogeneous in ethnolinguistic terms and, secondly, they have linguistic minorities that are not taken into consideration. However, because instead of one official language, similarly to what happens in Monoethnic societies, they have two official languages each, then it could be said that they would probably fit into the Dyadic category of countries. It should be highlighted though that in both Swaziland and Lesotho, there is only one major ethnolinguistic group, instead of two or three major ethnolinguistic groups that are relatively similar in numbers and power. Obviously the language of such a group is in both cases the co-official and national language; SiSwati in Swaziland and Sotho in Lesotho. The second co-official language, English, is not spoken by the large majority, but it is the ex-colonial language, and often perceived as having power because of its association with the economic and professional sectors.

It seems that there is now a shift from a single language integrationist or national unity ideology to a pluralist ideology, throughout the region. This shift of ideology and recent developments in the Southern African region result from an acknowledgement of the need to protect the countries' linguistic diversity as a cultural asset, of the importance of language for social, political and democratic participation and empowerment, and also from the awareness of a link between quality of education and medium of instruction. As mentioned elsewhere in this study, particularly under section 3.10 in Chapter Three, there is now widespread agreement on the fact that the medium of instruction is of paramount importance for a child's academic success, and that mother tongue education results in a range of benefits, among them, cognitive, academic, and pedagogical. A number of governments and scholars in the region admit that the post-colonial language policies so far implemented did not yield positive results. Commenting, for example, on the failure of such policies, Alexander (1995: 5) points

¹¹⁵ National language, in this context, means indeed common language; and not territorial as in the case of Mozambique. See section 2.3.2 for Brann's (1994) four meanings of the term National Language.

out that

Language policies over the last three decades in Africa have shown comprehensively that despite all efforts to make the European language (English, French, and Portuguese) available to their citizens, they have been resounding failures; and Zambia is an example of one of the most serious failures of this kind. There are now fewer people able to communicate effectively through English than before that country's independence despite an English-only policy in schools. Consequently, English has succeeded neither as a language to facilitate national unity nor as a language of empowerment for the public at large. It empowers only a shrinking minority.

The negative consequences of a monolingual language policy are not only restricted to Zambia, as similar results are reported for other countries in the region. A number of studies (Benson 2000, Qorro 2007) indicate an intrinsic correlation between the medium of instruction, quality of education and academic success. It has been pointed out that the high repetition and dropout rates reported throughout the region at large constitute a direct consequence of the medium of instruction adopted. Because most children start schooling in a language with which they are not familiar, they tend to face a number of major emotional and psychological barriers, and in this way their academic progress is impaired. Such barriers are manifested through a failure to understand what the teacher is saying, major reading and writing difficulties, problems of interacting and actively participating in the teaching and learning process, and many others.

In Mozambique, because a large number of children start school in Portuguese, a language that is different from the languages used or spoken at home, their academic experience is far from being ideal, as in most cases instead of focussing on the subject matter being taught, they are still struggling with the language itself. Academic failure¹¹⁶, rather than success, appears to be the common result. Confirming Alexander's claim above, the fact that Portuguese has been used as Mozambique's only official language for thirty-five years now does not necessarily translate into a widespread use of the language nationwide, as the percentage of those who communicate fluently in Portuguese is still very low, particularly in rural areas. In this respect, Gadelii (2001: 11) points out that although many Mozambicans have some kind of competence in Portuguese, the Portuguese language "remains very

¹¹⁶ A very interesting study was conducted by Dias (2002) on the relationship between sociolinguistic inequalities and academic failure in Mozambique.

weak as an L1 and even as the language most frequently spoken in the home at the national level.” It should be noted however that there has been an increase in the percentage of people who are able to speak Portuguese. According to the National Statistics Institute (INE), in 1980 the percentage of people who spoke Portuguese as L1 was 1.2%; in 1997, there were 6% of Mozambicans who spoke Portuguese as their L1. The increase is also reported in relation to Portuguese L2 speakers. In 1980, there were 25% of Mozambicans who spoke Portuguese as their L2 and, in 1997 the number had increased to 39%. In contrast to English in Zambia, in Mozambique Portuguese plays indeed the role of language of national unity, as it is actually used as the common vehicle of communication by Mozambicans of many different language backgrounds. However, it appears that grassroots’ empowerment would only come with the expansion of the range of uses of the Mozambican National Languages, as already suggested by a number of Mozambican linguists. As postulated by Firmino (2005), while Portuguese has been able to reinforce national unity, it has also been a factor of exclusion of many Mozambicans from the national system, as participation in the political, social and economic spheres depends to a large extent on knowledge and use (of specific forms) of this language. Although it is true that Portuguese has excluded many Mozambicans, the same is true of any other Mozambican National Language that would exclude even more people, considering that none of them is widely spoken nationally.

4.2 The Language Education Policies in Southern Africa

When discussing the issue of language education in the Southern African region, there is a need to bear in mind the apparent relation between the use of the African languages as medium of instruction and the type of colonial language policies encouraging or discouraging such use. According to Bamgbose (2004: 2), there are three categories of African countries, depending on whether they were under British or/and Belgian colonial rule, French or/and Portuguese colonial rule, or any other colonial rule; that is: 1. British and Belgian rule, 2. French and Portuguese rule, and 3. multiple colonial rule.

The first category refers to all those countries, in Africa, that were under British (or Belgian) colonial rule, which is characterised by encouragement of the use of the African languages as medium of instruction. Examples are Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and the Democratic Republic of Congo. In these countries, in the colonial period, the African mother

tongues were used in initial literacy and in early primary school, at least for three or four years. After independence, most of them continued encouraging the use of the mother tongues in schooling, especially primary education. The second category accounts for countries that were either under Portuguese colonial rule, such as Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde and São-Tomé e Príncipe, or French colonial rule: Benin, Senegal, Mali, Cameroon, Niger, and other countries in West Africa. During the colonial period, the African mother tongues were not allowed as medium of instruction, and after independence the same trend remained. The third category, under multiple colonial rule, refers to countries such as Mauritius, and Seychelles, which can be said to have had a dual colonial influence, and consequently have a dual language policy, or have a policy that differs from that of the colonial power. Although Seychelles had a French colonial past, it allowed the use of the mother tongue (Seychellois Kreol) in primary schooling. In addition, while Mauritius later became a British colony, it never promoted mother tongue education, continuing with the French policy¹¹⁷.

As stated under section 4.1 above, the current tendency in Southern Africa indicates an increasing orientation towards mother tongue education. In most cases, this shift results, first of all, from the realisation that the use of the ex-colonisers' languages as medium of instruction alone is not enough to ensure academic success. Secondly, there is also an increasing realisation, as in the case of Malawi, that what is often called mother tongue education does not seem to cover all the L1s present in the school universe, as in a number of countries (for instance, Botswana or Lesotho), mother tongue education only covers the national official languages. Thirdly, as often discussed in the case of Tanzania, there is an increasing demand for mother tongue education also at the post-primary school level, that is, secondary and/or tertiary. It should be said that recent developments towards mother tongue education in the region are a consequence of governmental initiatives, civil society or grassroots' pressure, or even NGOs' commitment to the cause; they are also a consequence of a growing awareness of the cognitive, academic, and pedagogical advantages of mother tongue education, and of UNESCO's claims in this regard.

¹¹⁷ See Appendix Five for a brief description of the *status quo* regarding mother tongue education in Southern African countries.

4.3 The New Language Policy and the Language Policy for Schools in South Africa

South Africa appears to have one of the most highly praised language policies in contemporary times. In Makoni's words, this is a policy classified as the most "progressive and politically enlightened because of the significance it attaches to human rights and its acknowledgement of multilingualism in the African context" (2003: 132). Kamwendo (2006: 67), on the other hand, writes that "despite the fact that South Africa is travelling on a rather bumpy road towards the implementation of a language rights-oriented language policy, the country, backed by its enormous resources, still remains Africa's best model and leader in language planning". Other reasons leading to such a widespread appreciation of the new South African Language Policy is the fact that this is a policy that is grounded on principles aimed at promoting linguistic and cultural tolerance and diversity, and also the fact that democracy is a core value in this policy, as will be further discussed throughout the present chapter.

It seems that it is not possible to revisit the issue of language education in South Africa, without mentioning the Bantu Education Act of 1953; an Act that dates back to the Apartheid era, which was aimed at (1) extending mother tongue education for Blacks from grade four to grade eight, (2) imposing the use of Afrikaans and English as subjects in Black primary schools, and (3) introducing, in equal proportions, the use of Afrikaans and English as media of instruction in Black schools (Kamwangamalu 1997, De Klerk 2002). The Bantu Education Act is fundamental in understanding current attitudes towards Mother Tongue Education in South Africa, as it has, to a great extent, contributed to shape such attitudes. Under Apartheid, Phaswana (2003: 120) claims, "Black South Africans vigorously opposed the use of Afrikaans as a language of instruction as well as the promotion of African languages as media of teaching and learning beyond the fourth year of schooling. The expansion of African languages as media of instruction was perceived by Blacks as part of the Afrikaners' divide-and-rule policy". In other words, in the eyes of Black South Africans, the use of the African Mother Tongues in schooling was something negative, as it served to keep them at the bottom of the social hierarchy and served to separate them even further from the economic and political power, whose main vehicle was English.

According to Hartshorne (1995), among the principles underlying the Bantu Education Act was a

primary school curriculum designed to prepare black students for their subordinate role in society, in contrast to the more academic-oriented curriculum in use in white, coloured and Indian schools. In addition, Hartshorne claims that the fact that mother tongue education was extended to eight years was perceived as being aimed at separating African students from development and preventing them from developing aspirations outside their own communities. Thirdly, at the core of the Bantu Education Act was a secondary school curriculum relatively similar to the curriculum in use in white schools, but one which could in fact only reach a small number of black students who had been lucky enough to reach secondary school.

It is against this background that current attitudes to mother tongue education in South Africa have to be understood. In this regard, Heugh (1999: 302-303) maintains that

African language speaking parents and students resented “Bantu Education” and correctly interpreted the mother tongue policy in primary school as a mechanism to prevent access to power. From the early years of African resistance to segregation, English had come to symbolise the language through which access to power and international ideas were possible. “Bantu education” not only appeared to make access to English recede to secondary school, but brought an unwelcome compulsion to learn through Afrikaans alongside English. To make matters worse, in the years following the Bantu Education Act, Afrikaans became the dominant language in black education, especially at the levels of management, control and administration and teacher-training.

Between twenty-five to thirty-one languages are estimated to be spoken in South Africa. Moreover, eleven official languages are recognised by the new South African Constitution (1996), namely, English, Afrikaans, Zulu, Xhosa, Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, Tswana, Tsonga, Swati, Venda and Southern Ndebele. According to the Constitution, these languages should be equitably used in the public sphere, in the education of citizens, in governance, public administration, and other sectors. While two of these languages, namely Afrikaans and English, occupied a privileged position under the Apartheid regime, the remaining nine African languages were all marginalised. These nine African Languages were the languages spoken by the black majority. As mentioned above, such marginalisation was not only on the part of the then Apartheid regime, but also on the part of the

masses that looked at those languages as obstacles to progress¹¹⁸.

According to the LANGTAG¹¹⁹ Report (1996), the following are among the major goals of the new South African Language Policy:

- (1) to promote national unity within the country's linguistic and cultural diversity;
- (2) to entrench democracy, which includes the protection of language rights;
- (3) to promote societal multilingualism, which is seen as a national resource and an integral part of nation building and the creation of access;
- (4) to promote respect for and tolerance towards linguistic and cultural diversity;
- (5) to further the elaboration and modernisation of the African languages; and
- (6) to promote national economic development

It is argued (Alexander 1995) that the process leading to the formulation of the new language policy was as democratic and consultative as possible, in the sense that it involved a whole range of actors at the various levels of the South African society; from grassroots' communities, Community Based Organisations (CBOs), Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), civil society at large, as well as private and public actors. Kamwendo (2006: 62) points out that contributions came both from "academic and non-academic quarters such as media debates and submissions (e.g. in form of letters to the editor), deliberations and recommendations of learned societies, political party manifestos, and contributions from specialised committees such as the Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG)." Moreover, specific bodies were established with the purpose of making sure that linguistic rights are being respected at all levels of the South African society, and to assure that the eleven official languages are actually being used as such. One such body is the PANSALB, which stands for the Pan South African Language Board. The Mission Statement of the PANSALB reads as follows:

The purpose of the Pan South African Language Board is to promote multilingualism in South Africa by:

- Creating the conditions for the development of and the equal use of all official languages;
- Fostering respect for and encouraging the use of other languages in the country;

¹¹⁸ As stated by Pluddemann (1999: 329), negative stereotypes to African languages are "held not only by English and Afrikaans-speakers, but even by many of the speakers of the African languages themselves".

¹¹⁹ Language Plan Task Group.

- Encouraging the best use of the country's linguistic resources, in order to enable South Africans to free themselves from all forms of linguistic discrimination, domination and division and to enable them to exercise appropriate linguistic choices for their own well being as well as for national development.

The South African Constitution gives the power and responsibility for monitoring and promoting the use of the eleven official languages not only to the central government, but also to the provincial governments and the municipalities. The Constitution stipulates that all the eleven official languages should enjoy the same treatment. Following from the adoption of the new multilingual Language Policy in South Africa, a new Language Education Policy was passed in 1997. Among the goals of the South African Language Policy for Schools are the following: (1) the promotion of additive multilingualism, which means the maintenance of the home languages as the main medium of instruction or Languages of Learning and Language of Teaching (LoLTs), with the subsequent addition of other languages; (2) the granting of the right to choose the medium of instruction to every child or, at least, their parents and guardians; (3) the encouragement to all schools for the provision of education in more than one language, where the need arises. In addition, the policy gives the responsibility to schools and provincial education departments to overcome any barriers resulting from differences between the learners' L1 and the medium of instruction. In this respect, the schools are required to state in which way their language policy will lead to the promotion of multilingualism; learners' language demands, concerning instruction in any of the eleven official languages, are to be covered by the provincial departments of education, depending on practicality.

In spite of the constitutional provision for the promotion of multilingualism in South Africa, a number of bottlenecks are reported both in relation to the implementation of the Language Policy and the Language Education Policy. As for the Language Policy and, as already mentioned throughout this chapter, the first obstacle to the implementation of the South African multilingual language policy is related to the issue of attitudes to the use of the African languages as medium of instruction. The second one pertains to the inability of PANSALB and other language-policy watchdogs to fulfil their mandate of promoting the development of all the official languages in South Africa. These and other challenges affecting the successful implementation of the South African 11 official language policy are discussed below. In relation to the Language Policy for Schools, it appears that the most pressing

challenge is connected with the lack of materials both for teachers and learners, especially in the nine African languages. As argued by Pluddemann (1999: 334),

There is a chronic lack of classroom materials that promote multilingualism. Because of their low status in education and civil society generally, African languages have lagged far behind English and Afrikaans in terms of the number of titles published. In 1991, for instance, only 15.8% of all book titles published were in African languages. Home-language speakers of the African languages make up 73.4% of the population. Almost half (49.5%) of all book titles were in English (8.7% of population), and about one-third (33.8%) in Afrikaans (15.7% of population).

4.3.1 Challenges affecting the new South African Language Policy

As already reported above, the attitudes to the use of the African languages in public contexts such as education and governance, particularly on the part of the population at large are far from being positive. It has been widely reported that there is in the South African society a clear preference for the English language, at the expense of all the other official languages; in primary, secondary and tertiary education¹²⁰, at the level of the South African Parliament¹²¹, and in various other contexts. There seems to be an agreement that although promotion of multilingualism is the major goal of the South African Language Policy, the actual language practices are becoming more monolingual English. In South Africa, English is seen as the most powerful language in all spheres of public life; it is seen as the most prestigious and privileged language.

Referring to the multilingual language policy in South Africa, Makoni (2003: 139-140) writes the following:

The version of multilingualism implicit in the South African Constitution is one best described as plural monolingualism: a variant and an extension of monolingualism. Instead of South Africans being encouraged to be multilingual, the policy could actually end up making each citizen merely competent in his/her own language. That is, since all the country's languages are officially recognized, all one need do is become competent in the standard version of his/her own language. The South African language policy should have specified only two or three African languages as official languages. However, to propose

¹²⁰ See, for example, the paper entitled 'The Problem of an English-only Policy at a Multilingual University in South Africa', authored by Charlyn Dyers (2009).

¹²¹ See Phaswana (2003) in regards to the issue of attitudes toward the African languages on the part of members of the South African Parliament.

official status for nine so-called “indigenous” African languages is to reaffirm the separateness of Black South African ethnic groups through language. It is a false separation, linguistically and ethnically, whereby the present South African government is, paradoxically, proposing a policy which the apartheid South African government could not successfully implement... to keep each language group to itself.

Makoni’s fears appear to have been shared by the South African Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, Dr. BS Ngubane, in 1995, when he observed that it was clear that a “definite tendency to unilingualism” was emerging in the country despite the fact that multilingualism was indeed a sociolinguistic reality in South Africa. He added that multilingualism was “invisible in the public service, in most public discourse and in the major mass media”, and that the Government had “failed to secure a significant position for language matters within the national development plan.”¹²² Nevertheless, it would be difficult to imagine a situation in which the South Africans could become more monolingual in the African languages, as a result of the present policy. The simple fact that the majority of South Africans use at least one of the African languages as their home language or their first language, and the fact that mother tongue bilingual education in South Africa only extends until the fourth grade, after which English becomes the main medium of instruction would be enough to refute such a possibility. In addition, a number of studies¹²³ confirm that South Africans want to learn English, because this is a language which is seen as having an economic value. There is a widespread belief that command of English in the South African society is a prerequisite for progress in the social, academic, professional and even political ladder. As postulated by Barkhuizen (2002: 499/500),

However much language planners and policy makers might not like to hear it, English holds a dominant position in education in South Africa. Students in schools want to learn English, and their parents agree with them. In contrast, the two main themes evident in the language-related clauses in the Constitution of South Africa (Republic of South Africa, 1996) are the promotion of multilingualism in the country and “the need for the state to take practical and positive measures to elevate the status and advance the use of the indigenous languages of the country”.

¹²² See Granville *et al.*, 1988 or the South African Government Information site at <http://www.info.gov.za/speeches/1995/34396b14.htm>

¹²³ See, for example, Alexander’s (1999) enlightening paper ‘English Unassailable but Unattainable: The Dilemma of Language Policy in South African Education’, which reflects on the position of English in the South African society.

It is for this reason that many scholars, inspired by studies on the economics of language¹²⁴, among them Kamwangamalu (2008), call for a more “market-oriented approach to status planning for African languages if the masses who speak these languages are to participate actively in the social, political and economic development of the African continent”. It is argued that if speakers of “smaller” languages realise that knowledge or command of an African language is essential, for example, in order to get a job, they will more likely be inclined to develop such language¹²⁵. In this respect, Alexander (2006: 7) argues that because the African languages “are perceived as having no, or only minimal, market value, the enhancement of status that this usage brings with it is of exceptional importance for the respective user communities, including the intellectual communities, concerned”.

In connection with Makoni’s statement above, I would further argue that the objectives of the South African Government when promoting linguistic pluralism at official level cannot be compared with those of the apartheid government¹²⁶. There is in fact a genuine objective, on the part of the South African government, of elevating the status of those languages that were once marginalised so that they can perform at the same level as the previously privileged Afrikaans and English. I understand though that it may not be an easy task to implement and manage such a multilingual policy and, for that reason, Makoni’s warnings need to be taken seriously, as good principles can also lead to disastrous consequences. However, I maintain that a pluralist principle is something to praise, and it is a useful attempt to respond to concerns of a possible ‘minority’ language loss which may result from the ongoing globalisation phenomenon and from tendencies that support a privileged position for the English language.

¹²⁴ See, for example, Coulmas (1992) who, writing on the value of language, claims that language “has value. Like the possession of money, the possession of a language implies a potential for unfolding individuals’ range of action and hence their enrichment.” (pp.55). He goes on and writes that “languages have a market value. The commodity nature of languages manifests itself most clearly in the domain of foreign language learning and teaching which can be described as a market.” (pp. 77-78)

¹²⁵ See Kamwangamalu (2000) for a further discussion on how to market African languages in such a way that they are perceived by the masses as having prestige and value, and for how Afrikaans (once labelled a ‘kitchen’ language is now able to compete in equal terms with English

¹²⁶ De Klerk (2002: 33) describes such goals in the following way: “Language-planning projects in South Africa were part of the larger social-engineering project that would ensure the segregation of different racial groups and the hierarchical organization of South African society, with Black South Africans in the lowest rung of an exploited workforce. The key difference between the development efforts for Afrikaans and other languages is that Afrikaans was developed for high-status functions, whereas the African languages were relegated to low-status functions; in fact, the government was “underdeveloping them quite deliberately.”

In addition to the question of attitudes to the South African languages, as well as the unchallenged hegemonic position of English in South African society, it appears that meagre financial and material resources have been impairing the management of multilingualism in South Africa. In fact, Beukes (2004: 15) points to both financial and material constraints as the major obstacles preventing the effective work of the PANSALB towards the management of language development and the protection of language rights.

Commenting on the South African Language Policy, Kamwendo (2006: 65/6) states that the fact that the South African Language Policy has been heavily inspired by the Linguistic Human Rights Paradigm is a strength, but it can also turn out to be a weakness. He elaborates on this point by stating that

One weakness of the linguistic human rights paradigm is its idealism. The idealism associated with the Linguistic Human Rights Paradigm is also reflected in the naively phrased clauses of the Universal Declaration on Linguistic Rights. As an example, let us consider Article 25. All language communities are entitled to have at their disposal all the human and material resources to ensure that their language is present to the extent they desire at all levels of education within their territory: properly trained teachers, appropriate teaching methods, textbooks, finance, buildings and equipment, traditional and innovative technology. It is simply unrealistic to expect all languages to be used at all levels of education.

Although fully aware of the costs and the complexity involved in promoting a plurilingual policy to the extent that all languages can be equally used at all levels of education, I postulate that there is a potential in the Linguistic Human Rights Paradigm and that it is a fairer and more equitable starting point than ruling out some possibilities from the beginning. Perhaps the paradigm is idealistic and the Universal Declaration on Linguistic Human Rights is naively phrased, but the key issue is that what is being advocated is the possibility of promoting language diversity and multilingualism, and the possibility to use all languages in the education of citizens. I am more inclined to look at the cost of not promoting a plurilingual policy; at everything that would possibly be lost, in terms of the specific knowledge that would come from all languages or their speakers. I am more inclined to look at the costs or resources wasted in terms of the number of children who drop out, fail, and repeat every year

because they are simply not able to follow the education system. As Coulmas (1984: 17) says,

An important aspect of doing justice to linguistic minorities, however is that it is less a question of money, and more a question of tolerance and a change of consciousness. If cultural diversity and multiplicity of languages are taken as a positive value, and if it is recognized that the question of whether or not a given minority culture or language will disappear has its answer in a historical process resulting from specific policy decisions rather than “natural” tendencies of convergence, it becomes easier to promote or maintain bi- and multilingualism in culturally diverse societies”.

It is important to look at everything as a phased process; what I mean is that it may not be possible to use all languages at once at all levels of education, and in all sectors in society, but if we allow time to consider thoroughly how to approach and introduce mother tongue-based bilingual education gradually and in stages, if we try to learn from others who have been through the process and if we use the scarce resources rationally, such a goal can be achieved. I defend the position that it is possible to start by concentrating on each level of education, for example, primary education; develop materials for such level, train teachers, deploy the basic infrastructure to move into the implementation phase and later on, after a year or two, move on to the next level. In other words, my argument is that if we want to introduce, for example, the Mozambican National Languages either as subject or as a resource in the Mozambican urban schools, instead of starting by looking at all grades in the primary school level, it would be possible to start from only one Grade, let us say, Grade 1. For instance, it could be decided that in 2012, the goals would be selecting one of the Mozambican National Languages (instead of all languages) to introduce in Grade 1. In the same year, attention would be paid to selecting classroom materials from those already available and in use in the rural schools, if deemed appropriate, or designing new classroom materials. In the same year, the focus would also go to teacher training. After considering the most appropriate teacher training modalities, move onto training teachers from Grade 1 who would be involved in either providing mother tongue-based bilingual classes or teaching the selected Mozambican National Language as a subject. The availability of skilled teachers and didactic materials (including textbooks) would be a good starting point for using the Mozambican National Languages in education, not necessarily in 2012, but perhaps in the following year. The following years, 2013 or 2014 could, for example, concentrate on Grade 2 and so on and after introducing one of the Mozambican National Language throughout the whole primary school system, then it would be

possible to move on to a second language. My claims are in accordance with Bamgbose's (1984: 24-5) position that

The main argument against the use of minority languages in literacy is the cost factor. The various activities required in using a language for literacy work are expensive, and the cost of using several languages is likely to be prohibitive. At least, so the argument goes. But several factors are ignored in this argument. Local interest may account for a substantial input. For example, local language committees may contribute teachers, writers, and even financial subsidy; there are other interested agencies such as missionary groups which are engaged in literacy work, particularly in minority languages (for example, the Summer Institute of Linguistics); and the cost of producing materials may not be as excessive as is often suggested.

I defend the position that a key step to a successful implementation of mother tongue education, for example, is the involvement of a large variety of stakeholders, at various levels, in order to gain their support for a number of issues; I shall return to this issue in detail in Chapter Six. Notwithstanding all the challenges so far mentioned in relation to the implementation of the South African multilingual policy, various positive insights can be useful in informing language policy developments in the Mozambican context, and this is the core of what follows.

4.4 Lessons to learn from the South African Language Policy Process

What is outstanding in the South African context is, first and foremost, the fact that the principles underlying the language policy are explicitly outlined. These are, among others, the key position given to Linguistic Human Rights, the heavy emphasis given to democracy in the South African Language Policy, and the fact that key resources and responsibilities have been allocated to particular entities, such as the PANSALB (the board responsible for promoting multilingualism), established by means of a Government Act.

In line with what has already been said throughout the present study, the Linguistic Human Rights Paradigm defends the view that everyone has the right to use the language of his or her own choice in order to function in his or her daily life, in school, in the public space, and other spheres. If this is not the case, they are disempowered and therefore unable to participate and to influence key decision-making processes that affect their lives. As posited by Alexander (2006: 5)

The individual citizen can only benefit optimally when s/he engages with her environment in a language s/he has very good command of. For most people, this is the “mother tongue” or the language of the immediate community. Thus, the use of local languages and not only languages of high status is a prerequisite for the maintenance of a democratic regime based on the equal dignity of all the citizens and for optimal economic development.

In the light of the above citation, it is essential to note that because the Portuguese language in Mozambique is only spoken and/or understood by a small minority, the majority of Mozambicans are not able to participate in the democratization and economic development processes. The extent to which they are able to understand information that is mostly disseminated in the Portuguese language needs to be seen as a limiting factor, as it is not translated into better ways of improving their own living conditions and the society at large. Writing about the language question in Mozambique, Firmino (1995: 287) argues in the following terms:

I envision a situation in which participation in the national system is not limited by differential access to linguistic resources. For this reason, I propose the use of the different languages known by the citizens in different official activities, that is, both Portuguese and indigenous languages. Linguistic unification could be achieved in Mozambique with the officialization of Portuguese at a national level and with the officialization of indigenous languages at a regional/local level. Officialization of indigenous languages would also respect concerns for language rights, under the ideology of linguistic pluralism and vernacularization.

Firmino seems to acknowledge as well that language is a factor that conditions popular participation in national life and in order to promote an effective participation he suggests the need to make some of the Mozambican languages official. However, while it is outside the scope of the present study to defend the need for the officialisation of the Mozambican National Languages at regional or local level, I maintain that Mozambique has already given its first steps towards bringing the Mozambican languages into the public sphere, with their introduction in the school system, as a result of the awareness of the fact that language means empowerment.

I postulate that Mozambique would benefit a great deal by considering the creation of a body similar to

the Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB), which has been specifically established with the mandate to function as a language rights watchdog and to promote multilingualism in South Africa through the development of previously marginalized languages. Because there is already in Mozambique a body responsible for the development of the Mozambican national languages, particularly their orthography, that is, NELIMO, the establishment of one more structure would perhaps be out of the question. Perhaps more important would be to expand NELIMO's mandate, beyond that of developing the orthography of the national languages. As shown by the South African experience, there is no doubt that "the key to the promotion of multilingualism in education is the development of the African languages in terms of a standard orthography, vocabulary elaboration and modernization, the creation of technical registers, and a raised status" (Pluddemann 1999).

In addition to the above, other lessons that Mozambique could possibly learn from South Africa would be in the area of teacher training models, both pre-service (initial) and in-service training. As will be discussed in Chapter Five, under the current Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Education in Mozambique, teacher training is lagging behind. A number of innovative and effective programs for teacher development are reported from South Africa; among them the Further Diploma in Multilingual Education for in-service teachers in Western Cape, jointly run by the Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa (PRAESA) and the School of Education, University of Cape Town¹²⁷.

Regardless of the difficulties reported above in the area of materials for the promotion of multilingualism, this is another area where Mozambique could benefit considerably from the lessons from the South African situation. Although the availability of materials for multilingual education, especially in the African languages, is still under the optimal level, materials are being produced, published and used in the South African schools. In Mozambique, as will be reported in Chapter Five, there is an urgent need for materials for Mother Tongue-based bilingual education, as confirmed by Rafael Sendela, the national coordinator for bilingual education, in an interview conducted on May 5th, 2008.

¹²⁷ See Pluddemann (1999), for other relevant teacher training programmes ongoing in South Africa.

The necessary logistics as well as the costs involved in implementing a multilingual-based mother tongue education curriculum would be other areas to explore and to learn from the South African context. I also maintain that lessons could be learnt even from the issues that did not work; the right approach would be to look at both the positive experiences and the negative ones and assess what could be of use in the Mozambican context and what would not work and why.

4.5 Summary

Among the highlights of the present chapter is, first of all, the fact that the countries in the Southern African region are mostly highly heterogeneous. It was mentioned that such heterogeneity is probably and partly a legacy of the arbitrary partition of Africa, which ignored ethnolinguistic diversity, as expressed by Mazrui (1998) and Kaskoki ((2003) and also a result of the missionaries' misclassification of African languages, as posited by Makoni (2003).¹²⁸ The chapter stresses that despite the fact that Southern Africa is an ethnolinguistic mosaic, the Language Policies in the 1960's and 1970's were mostly guided by an integration and national unification ideology, which resulted in the adoption of one of the ex-colonisers languages as the only official language in most of these countries. Reference is also made to the fact that in spite of the high levels of linguistic diversity in the Southern African region, there are a number of countries that are relatively homogeneous in ethnolinguistic terms, among them, Lesotho and Swaziland. However, if we analyse the latter against the background of the typology – Mosaic, Monoethnic, and Dyadic/Triadic – it becomes quite difficult to place them in one specific category.

The chapter also considers developments in relation to the language policies of countries in the region, and looks at the recent shift towards a pluralist ideology and the introduction of Mother Tongue Education. Some of the arguments that may have contributed to such a shift are a perceived need to protect the countries' cultural and linguistic diversity as a cultural asset, the importance of language for social, political and democratic participation and empowerment, as well as the realisation that the use of the ex-colonisers' languages alone is not enough to guarantee academic success. The chapter stresses that while in a number of countries in this region, the ex-colonisers' languages did not succeed in facilitating national unity, in Mozambique the goal of national unity seems to have been attained by the

¹²⁸ See the discussion under section 2.2 in Chapter Two.

Portuguese language, as confirmed by Firmino (2005), in spite of the fact that it is not spoken by all Mozambicans. Although only spoken by approximately 40% of Mozambicans, Portuguese is used as a Lingua Franca by Mozambicans of different language backgrounds, as none of the Mozambican National Languages is spoken or understood by the wide majority.

In addition, the chapter briefly reviews Bamgbose's three-category of countries that allowed or did not allow the use of Mother Tongue Education, depending on the past colonial influence. Bamgbose claims that Mother Tongue Education was encouraged before and after independence in the majority of countries that were under British colonial rule, such as Tanzania; and those countries under Portuguese or/and French colonial rule, such as Mozambique or Senegal did not encourage the use of the African languages in schooling. Bamgbose's third category covers countries such as Seychelles or Mauritius that had a dual colonial influence, which ended with a language policy that differs from that of the colonial power. Seychelles which was first under French colonial rule allowed the use of the mother tongue (Seychellois Kreol) in primary schooling. Mauritius which later became a British colony never promoted mother tongue education, continuing with the French policy.

The Bantu Education Act is reviewed to show that it was extremely important in influencing current negative attitudes towards the use of the African languages in education in South Africa. The African languages were and are still seen as barriers to social, economic and academic progress and development. The goals of the new South African Language Policy are presented, among them, the promotion of societal multilingualism, and cultural and linguistic diversity, entrenching democracy, including protection of human rights. The chapter also reports on the fact that the process leading to the formulation of the new policy was considered very democratic and highly consultative, as it involved many stakeholders at various levels. Reference is made to the establishment of specific bodies (among them, the PANSALB) to ensure respect for language rights and the promotion of multilingualism in all eleven languages. The chapter also mentions two relevant goals of the new Language Education Policy, namely, the promotion of additive multilingualism and encouragement to schools for the provision of education in more than one language. Among the obstacles to the successful implementation of the South African multilingual policy were the question of negative attitudes towards the African languages and the exaggerated preference for English. In relation to the Language Education Policy,

one of the most serious constraints mentioned was the lack of materials for teachers and students in the nine African languages.

The chapter briefly reviews one of the main criticisms made on the Linguistic Human Rights Paradigm, particularly the fact that it seems to be very idealistic because it defends the need to provide education in everyone's L1, which is not always possible, especially in multilingual settings. The chapter then suggests the need to involve a wide range of actors in order to overcome financial constraints, among other barriers. The Linguistic Human Rights Paradigm is also revisited at this stage in connection to the argument that promoting one's mother tongue may be equal to promoting democratic participation and development.

The review of the language policies and language education policy situation in southern African countries was mainly conducted with the purpose of showing that Mozambique was not unique either in terms of the choice of the ex-coloniser's language as official language or in its exclusive use of an exogenous language as medium of instruction. Finally, the considerable attention that is paid to the South African situation in this chapter is done with a view to stress that because South Africa is outstanding in its adoption of a multilingual language policy both at societal level and in the field of education, then it would be worth looking at the country, both in terms of the implementation and management of such multilingual policies. I maintain that lessons can be learned both from the positive experiences and the constraints faced in the process.

After this review of the language policy and language education policy situation of countries in Southern Africa and the particular emphasis on South Africa, the focus of the next chapter is on the major empirical contribution of this thesis in the form of a language attitudes survey conducted in 2008, in two rural public primary schools, as well as one urban public primary school in Mozambique, involving pupils, teachers, school administrators, parents and educational professionals.

CHAPTER FIVE

LANGUAGE ATTITUDES IN THREE PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN SOUTHERN MOZAMBIQUE

Having considered developments in relation to the language policy and language education situation of countries in Southern Africa, with a specific focus on the new Language Policy and Language Education Policy in South Africa, the present chapter, which contains the bulk of my primary research work, reports on the fieldwork conducted in two rural public primary schools in which Mother Tongue Education is already ongoing, as well as in a urban public primary school. The chapter's first emphasis is on methodological considerations, including a description of the data collection tools, the subjects, and key characteristics of schools in the rural areas and those in the urban areas. The chapter also considers a number of limitations that emerged during the data collection and analysis. Afterwards, it focuses on the questions that have been relevant in building a picture of existing linguistic attitudes. In addition, the chapter reports on the results of the investigation of the attitudes of pupils, teachers, school administrators, parents, and educational professionals in relation to the languages in the curriculum. The research results are then analysed and discussed with a view to provide an insight into the language attitudes of the above actors, which are going to be used as an indication of the likelihood of success of the language education policy proposed in Chapter Six of this thesis.

5.1 Research Methodology and Procedures

As mentioned earlier under section 1.2, in the Introductory Chapter, the major purpose of the present

study was primarily to investigate the attitudes, perceptions and views of pupils, teachers, school administrators, parents and educational professionals, in relation to the various languages in use in the new Mozambican rural primary school, namely, Portuguese, the Mozambican National Languages, and English. In order to obtain such data, a **language attitudes survey** was conducted in the period May-June 2008, involving a total of **236 subjects**, respectively, 218 pupils, 12 teachers, 4 parent representatives and 2 educational professionals, both in Maputo City and also in the districts of Boane and Matutuine in Maputo Province, in Mozambique. The study resorted to two main types of data collection tools: **questionnaires** and **interviews**. Prior to the fieldwork, and assuming that the number of pupils and teachers whose attitudes would be documented would be relatively high, I deemed that the most appropriate method to reach such a large sample would be the survey questionnaire. As such, questionnaires were mainly administered to pupils and teachers. In addition, the study also resorted to the use of face-to-face interviews, particularly to parent representatives and educational professionals. The rationale for the use of interviews especially to gain inputs from educational professionals was to be as open as possible, and not just restricted to a set of pre-prepared questions, and allow the subjects to elaborate freely on any specific issue they would find pertinent.

From the two types of data collection tools designed (questionnaires and interviews), the first questionnaire was a **pupils' questionnaire** to be filled in by the children in the schools under investigation, and the second one was a **teachers' questionnaire**, to be completed by the teachers involved in Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education classes. The design of the pupils' questionnaire was decided after careful consideration, and the questions and wording were cautiously assessed, with a view to formulate questions that were simple enough to be understood by the children, aged between 9-15, and free from any technical terms, jargon and ambiguities. For instance, after I had initially used the term *lingua materna* or mother tongue both in the pupils' and teachers' questionnaires, and realising that it was a technical term, I decided to use the term L1 instead, which was already in use at the school level and actually a term used by the national education authorities. Both at Mudada and Mahubo primary schools, the teachers and pupils used the term L1 to refer to Xirhonga, and L2 to refer to Portuguese. In the questionnaire designing process, I took into consideration what Extra, Yagmur and Avoird (2004) state in their study under the Multilingual Cities Project, that is, when designing a questionnaire to be administered to children, there is a need to meet a number of conditions; among

them, (1) to make sure that the questionnaire is appropriate to all children, and (2) to make sure that the questionnaire is both short and powerful. In their view, a questionnaire “should be short in order to minimize the time needed by teachers and children to answer to it during school hours, and it should be powerful in that it should have an appropriate set of questions which should be answered by all children individually, if needed – in particular with younger children – in cooperation with the teacher, after an explanation of the survey in class” (2004: 113). In fact the pupils’ questionnaires were completed during the class period, and I was given the 55 minute slot allocated to each class. Although the pupils’ questionnaires only had 25 and 16 questions, respectively, I used all the 55 minutes given, as the children were not supposed to leave the classroom before this time had expired. The process of completing the questionnaires took longer in the two rural schools than in the urban. At the level of the rural schools, it took longer to have the questionnaires completed in the bilingual classes than in the monolingual Portuguese classes. One of the reasons was the fact that, in the bilingual classes, the questions had to be translated into Xirhonga by the classroom teacher.

Both the questionnaires and the interviews were originally written in English, considering that English is the language in which this PhD thesis is written. The data collection tools were later translated into Portuguese¹²⁹, as it is the official language of Mozambique and the legitimate language used for the conduction of the administrative business in the Mozambican schools and also in order to allow understanding, from the pupils, teachers and parents. The parents’ interview questions had to be further translated into Xirhonga, due to the fact that the parents were not fluent enough in Portuguese. Prior to travelling to the two rural communities, Boane and Matutuine, where the schools are located, and knowing that command of Portuguese is not common in the rural areas, I calculated that there would be a need to translate or interpret from Portuguese into Xirhonga, and vice versa. Therefore, I asked my mother to work as interpreter for me as she is a native Xirhonga. However, before interviewing the parents, one teacher in each school volunteered to interpret from Portuguese into Xirhonga and vice versa.

The **pupils’ questionnaire** contained a combination of open-ended questions and closed questions, and it was focussed on such issues as the languages they spoke and the various contexts of use (school,

¹²⁹ See Appendix Seven for the Portuguese translation of the data collection tools.

home, and the community); the languages they preferred to speak and learn; the languages they would like to learn; and finally, whether they liked to learn to read and write in their L1. There were two different drafts of the **pupils' questionnaire**; one draft designed for children in the rural schools and a second one for the children in the urban school. While the **questionnaire for children** in the rural schools consisted of a total of 25 questions, the questionnaire designed for children in urban areas was reviewed and ended with a total of 16 questions¹³⁰. The main reason for the existence of two different drafts of the pupils' questionnaire and for the reduction in the number of questions in the second draft of the questionnaire was the fact that because Mother Tongue Education was only being offered in the rural context, the questions referring to this aspect were not really relevant for children in the urban school and were consequently deleted; although question 16 (in the urban questionnaire) makes specific reference to the children's L1s¹³¹. One example is question 12, which asked about the languages that the children (in rural areas) spoke with different groups; assuming that the children in the urban contexts would mostly speak Portuguese in different contexts, the question was deemed irrelevant. The pupils' questionnaires, both in rural and urban schools, were administered in my presence. I thought it relevant to be physically present in order to guide the pupils through the questionnaires, clarify any possible misunderstandings, and elicit or probe answers to questions the children had not answered. This proved extremely relevant, as when I read through the questionnaire, in the rural schools, I realised that not all the children were able to follow and understand the questions written in Portuguese. In both rural primary schools, the teachers seemed to be aware of the fact that not all the children in the classes were able to read Portuguese and as such they willingly intervened and translated the questions into Xirhonga (the children's L1 or home languages) so that pupils could understand. I shall return to the issue of reading difficulties observed in the two rural schools, throughout this chapter, and particularly on the discussion section.

There were two questionnaires administered to the staff in the rural schools; one for the School Director, and a second one for the Teachers. The two school directors (one at each rural school) completed two questionnaires each, both in their roles as directors and teachers. The **School Director's Questionnaire** was mostly aimed at collecting factual information about the school, that is, number of

¹³⁰ See Appendix Six (I & II) for samples of the questionnaires for children in the rural schools and in the urban school.

¹³¹ Assuming that the children's L1s would be the Mozambican National Languages.

pupils, year of introduction of bilingual education, teacher training modalities, materials available, etc¹³². The **Teachers' Questionnaire**, on the other hand, included both open-ended and closed questions, and it was focussed on issues such as language competence and language use by the teachers themselves and pupils. The teachers were also asked to comment on their pupils' motivation to learn Portuguese and English, whether they thought any other language should be taught in school, and which one(s) and they were asked to make any further comment on the issue regarding the schools and the languages in the curriculum. The procedure adopted consisted in handing the questionnaires to the school director and teachers and give them some time to respond on their own. The time to fill the questionnaires ranged from about 3 hours (in Mudada) to 48 hours (in Mahubo). Considering the distance and the very bad condition of the rural roads, I thought it wise to collect as much data as possible from Matutuine, at once.

The focus of the **parents' interview** was on finding out about the community or the parents' involvement in decision-making concerning the medium of instruction; their views regarding the use of the mother tongue in schooling, and their beliefs in relation to languages such as Portuguese and English. The parents were interviewed in the school premises in the presence of at least one teacher from each school.

The choice of **educational professionals to interview** was mainly dictated by the type of institution they were associated to, that is, the institutions' work in the area of development of the Mozambican National Languages (NELIMO) and their connection to the process leading to the introduction of Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Education (INDE). Therefore, from the two educational professionals interviewed, one is a renowned linguist from Mozambique's largest university, Eduardo Mondlane University, Professor Gregório Firmino, and the second one is based at INDE, Dr. Rafael Sendela, and he is the National Coordinator of the Bilingual Education Program. The first interview took place at the Faculty of Arts, at Eduardo Mondlane University and the second one at INDE headquarters, both located in Maputo City. The interviews with the educational professionals were aimed at obtaining information concerning the reasons leading to the introduction of mother tongue education, criteria for the selection of the medium of instruction, society's response to the introduction of Bilingual

¹³² See Appendix Ten (II) for basic facts about the schools and the bilingual education program.

Education, etc.

Before contacting the school authorities and informing them about the purpose of my study, I visited the District Directorate of Education in Boane with the intent of getting official permission to conduct the fieldwork at Mudada Primary School. The authorization was issued the same day. In order to collect data from the second school, there was no need to approach the District Directorate of Education in Matutuine District, as one of the teachers (the pedagogical director) at the first school called one of the teachers he knew from the second school and informed about my purposes. Although the majority of the subjects were children, I can maintain that the principle of **informed consent** was respected in the sense that the subjects had all been informed about the purpose of my study and the uses to which their responses would be put to. However, it is rather difficult to state to what extent the requirement of **voluntary participation** was fulfilled, considering that the children did not really have a choice, but had to complete the questionnaires as members of a group or a class. In relation to the parent representatives interviewed, the school authorities offered to contact a number of parents that lived in the vicinity and who were relatively active on issues regarding the relationship between the school and the home. As for the two educational professionals, after getting their contact details, I called them and informed of the goals of my study; and they promptly agreed to meet me within one or two days. Data from the interviews were mostly recorded, although for unknown reasons, one of the educational professionals preferred not to be recorded. Thus, I can firmly argue that no major obstacles were observed in approaching the target population and collecting the data. In fact, the subjects were very willing, cooperative, and supportive.

5.1.1 Main Characteristics of the Schools in Rural and Urban Areas

It should be noted, and as stated earlier in this thesis, that mother-tongue based bilingual education in Mozambique has been introduced only in schools located in the rural areas of the country, and their main feature is having pupils who have languages other than Portuguese as their L1. The two rural schools which were the primary focus of this study are both located in Maputo Province, in southern Mozambique. They are both public primary schools, catering for children from Grades 1 to 5 (lower primary level) and Grades 6 and 7 (upper primary level). A key common feature of the two schools is the fact that mother-tongue based bilingual education is already ongoing. The first school, Mudada is

located in Matutuine/Bela-Vista District, which is about 100 km from Maputo city, and the second school, Mahubo, is located in Boane District, approximately 30 km from Maputo City.

The crucial characteristics of the rural and/or urban contexts in Mozambique can be explained first and foremost according to the type of infrastructure available. Among other aspects which are important for the distinction of urban and/or rural Mozambique is access to electrical power or lack of it, access to piped water or use of water from other sources such as rivers, lakes, standpipes or boreholes, presence or absence of standard toilets, type of building materials used in the construction of houses, the distance to health posts or hospitals, and access to a variety of other services. Common building materials in urban schools are mainly cement blocks, bricks and zinc plates. On the other hand, in the rural areas, with a few exceptions, schools are built mostly with traditional and locally available materials; they often have clay walls made on wood or bamboo frames, and the roof is usually made of straw or palm leaves. In addition to the physical features of the schools, other aspects that distinguish rural schools from urban ones are access to electrical power, piped water, and flush toilets, which are usually available in schools located in urban areas. The availability of chairs and desks would also be a relevant feature to distinguish schools in urban areas from those in the rural areas. In most cases, the schools in the rural areas do not have any furniture¹³³. Other characteristics relevant to consider when distinguishing the rural context from the urban context, in general, are whether the households own goods such as radio, television, telephone, fridge or bicycle, for example¹³⁴.

¹³³ See Appendix Eight for pictures of a typical rural classroom in Mahubo Primary School, located 30 km from Maputo City.

¹³⁴ From a survey conducted by the Mozambican National Statistics Institute (INE) in 1997, involving a total of 9,282 households, key features important to distinguish households in the rural areas from those in the urban areas are based on whether they possess or not the following goods:

Durable Goods	Urban	Rural	Total
Radio	58,7	24,0	30,5
Television	14,5	0,4	3,0
Telephone	5,4	0,0	1,0
Fridge	14,9	0,8	3,5
Bicycle	14,3	15,1	15,0
Motorcycle	5,3	0,6	1,5
Private Car	5,7	1,0	1,8
None	35,8	68,3	62,2
No. of households	1,750	7,532	9,282

The next section briefly reviews the background leading to the introduction of the first mother tongue-based bilingual education project in the history of Mozambique – the PEBIMO Project. As already explained, bilingual education in the context of Mozambique refers to the simultaneous use of Portuguese and one of the Mozambican National Languages as medium of instruction. The PEBIMO Project (Pilot Bilingual Education Project in Mozambique) marks the beginning of the use of mother tongue education, at primary school level in the country. What follows is a brief description of the developments leading to its introduction.

5.1.2 The Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education Experience in Mozambique

In 1993, Mozambique introduced, for the first time ever, a Pilot Bilingual Education Project (PEBIMO)¹³⁵, putting an end to the exclusive use of Portuguese as the only medium of instruction in the country. The main aims of the Bilingual Education Program were to contribute to the improvement of the quality of basic education in Mozambique, acknowledging that Portuguese is not the mother tongue of the majority of Mozambican children. It is supported by international research and practice pointing to the academic and cognitive advantages of the use of the mother tongue in initial schooling (UNESCO 1953; Benson 1997; Trudell 2008). As expressed by Benson (2000: 149), the central questions raised in the early 1990s by a “small group of Mozambican innovators” were: “could the use of the mother tongue in primary education reduce student attrition due to dropout, failure, and repetition? Could bilingual education improve schooling in Mozambique?”

The Pilot Bilingual Education Project started with only two Mozambican National languages, Cinyanja (in the northern province of Tete) and Xichangana (in the southern province of Gaza). According to Sendela¹³⁶, in 2008, sixteen languages were already in use as medium of instruction, in various rural schools throughout the country. The fact that sixteen Mozambican languages are already in use in the school context, in addition to Portuguese, may suggest that it would be appropriate to talk about a countrywide **Multilingual Education** Programme. However, because at the classroom level, there are only two languages involved, at any given time, Portuguese and one of the Mozambican National Languages, then it is correct to talk about **Bilingual Education**.

¹³⁵ In Portuguese, *Projecto de Escolarização Bilingue*.

¹³⁶ Rafael Sendela, INDE, Maputo; personal communication, 5 May 2008.

According to Sendela (PC), the decision on the Mozambican National Language to adopt as medium of instruction in a particular rural school is jointly taken by the school and the community, and it is usually the language spoken by the majority in that particular community. Considering that most rural regions in Mozambique are highly homogeneous in ethnolinguistic terms, the choice of the language of instruction is often unproblematic. In the two rural schools subject of the present study, the Mozambican National Language, jointly chosen by the school and the community, as medium of instruction is Xirhonga, widely spoken in the region. In addition, the parents in the rural areas have the right to choose their children's medium of instruction; that is, whether they should be enrolled in monolingual Portuguese classes or mother tongue-based bilingual classes. However, in cases where the mother tongue-based bilingual classes do not have a reasonable number of children, the school authorities have the right to transfer children enrolled in the monolingual Portuguese classes to the bilingual ones. In fact, this is what happened in the two rural schools under study, as will be later reported in this chapter.

As stated earlier on in the present study, under section 3.11, the Mozambican Bilingual Education is a Transitional Model of Bilingual Education, meaning that the objective is to teach pupils to read and write in their L1s and simultaneously they are supposed to develop oracy in the L2 (Portuguese), so that at a later stage they can transfer the skills developed in the L1 to the L2. Thus, in the first three years of schooling, the L1 is used as the main language of instruction, and Portuguese is taught as a subject. The transition occurs in Grade 4. Therefore, from Grade 4 to 6, the amount of Portuguese (L2) increases, while the amount of L1 decreases. Portuguese becomes then the main language of instruction and the L1 is taught as a subject, and is subsequently phased out in Grade 7. Mother-Tongue Education, in the Mozambican context, although perceived as a welcome initiative by those directly affected, especially the people in the rural areas (as illustrated by the findings of the present study), also raises questions as to whether resources should not be well spent on improving the quality of Portuguese language teaching and learning. During the interview with Sendela, it emerged that a number of people, particularly in Maputo City and other urban areas disagree with the use of the Mozambican languages in education; they argue that as Portuguese is the country's official language, then the focus should be on establishing the right conditions for quality Portuguese language teaching

and learning.

Although such doubts exist, the findings to the present study point to a perceived awareness of the benefits of mother tongue education, particularly on the part of people in the rural areas; and this is in fact confirmed by the parents interviewed, as will be further presented within this chapter. It is important to stress, at this stage, that assessments carried out by INDE and Benson (2000), on the Bilingual Education experience in Mozambique, point out to a number of positive results emerging as a direct consequence of the introduction of the Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education Program. Among them, it should be mentioned increasing levels of student participation in the classroom, self-confidence, and higher levels of teacher-learner interaction.

5.1.3 Limitations

One of the limitations of the study is the fact that it only concentrated on schools located in southern Mozambique, and particularly in Maputo Province. It would have been interesting to obtain a comprehensive sample based on a wider geographical coverage, in order to see whether the attitudes would still be similar. The second limitation is the fact that the fieldwork only lasted for approximately two months in 2008. It would have been relevant to go back after this two-year period, and check whether the views still prevail. Thirdly, the interpretation of a number of items in the pupils' questionnaire proved rather difficult; see, for example, questions 17-18, and 23-25 (pupils' questionnaire – rural schools). These were *why* questions, that is, questions that asked for the reason for the pupils' view on a particular issue. In a number of cases, for example, if question 18 was posed - *Which other language(s) would you like to learn/why* – the children would either just list a few languages or not give any reason whatsoever or just write that they would like to learn a particular language *x* or *y* because it is beautiful. Another limitation of this study regards the fact that the study failed to assess the extent to which the children in the rural schools were able to read and write in Xirhonga; this would have been relevant in order to measure the degree to which the goals of bilingualism and bilinguality are being achieved. Among the limitations, it should be mentioned that several cases of non-responses were observed, mainly in the answers to the open-ended questions in the questionnaire for pupils in the rural schools. From the 218 questionnaires completed, 57 questionnaires were not entirely usable, due to the children's inability to write full responses in Portuguese. This was

rather expected, especially considering the reading difficulties observed during the administration of the questionnaire; it obviously makes sense that if some pupils are not able to read Portuguese, then they will naturally display some writing difficulties as well. The type of non-responses varied considerably, from instances of non-language or non-words or meaningless words and phrases in Portuguese; repetition of the same key word that had appeared in the question; and blank spaces, where no answers were given to the question. See Appendix Nine for examples of non-responses. The following table presents the number of occurrence of non-responses in both monolingual and bilingual classes in the two rural schools:

Table 5: Occurrence of Non-responses

School Name	Grade	Monolingual	Bilingual	Number of Non-responses	Total Number of Pupils in Class
Mudada	5	X		7	24
Mudada	6	X		2	15
Mudada	6		X	8	13
Mahubo	5	X		19	27
Mahubo	5		X	7	22
Mahubo	6	X		10	41
Mahubo	6		X	4	16
Total of Non-responses				57	-
Total Pupils					158

That no major differences occurred in terms of whether the pupils were in monolingual Portuguese or mother-tongue based bilingual education should be considered as a relevant factor, as it seems that the higher amount of exposure to Portuguese in the monolingual Portuguese classes does not appear to make any significant difference in terms of pupils' performance. I shall return to this issue later in this chapter, particularly under the discussion section. A major weakness of the urban questionnaire was to assume that because the children in the urban schools did not receive instruction in any other language than Portuguese, then they would not be able to make any linguistic choices in their daily life. As shown by the research results, in fact, other languages than Portuguese, not necessarily Mozambican National Languages are present in the urban children's linguistic repertoire. When analysing the urban children's responses to question 15, *would you like to study in your mother tongue*, I realised that the question could have been put differently. I used the term 'mother tongue' to refer to the Mozambican

National Languages. However, because for 59 children the mother tongue was Portuguese and they were already using it as medium of instruction, the question was not as informative as it could be. The following section is specifically focussed on the content of the data collection tools, and questions that are most relevant and valuable to provide an insight on the existing linguistic attitudes.

5.2 The Pupils' Questionnaire

Out of the 218 questionnaires completed by the student population, 158 questionnaires were filled in by Grade 5 and 6 children, aged between 9 and 15, in the two rural schools – Mudada and Mahubo. The main reason for focussing on Grades 5 and 6 was the realisation that by the time the pupils would have reached Grades 5 and 6, they would have had five or six years of mother tongue-based bilingual education and, therefore, it would be the most appropriate moment to assess, not only their linguistic attitudes, but also their level of competence in both Portuguese and the Mozambican National Language; although this assessment was not done directly, but it was made on the basis of the teachers' views on children's progress and skills in both the L1 and the L2. As mentioned above, the age range of the pupils varied between 9 to 15 years, and the proportion of girls and boys was rather balanced; that is, 78 girls and 80 boys. A total of 52 questionnaires were filled in by children from Mudada Primary School, one Grade 5 class and two Grade 6 classes, and the remaining 106 questionnaires were filled in by Grades 5 and 6 children at Mahubo Primary School. Although bilingual education was being offered in the two rural schools, it is important to underline that monolingual Portuguese classes were still also available. As such, among the population of this study, it is included both Bilingual and Monolingual classes; to be more precise, and as illustrated on Table 5 above, at Mudada Primary School, the questionnaires were completed by one Grade 6 bilingual class (15 pupils), one Grade 5 monolingual class (24 pupils), and one Grade 6 monolingual class (13 pupils). On the other hand, at Mahubo, the questionnaires were completed by one Grade 5 monolingual class (27 pupils), one Grade 5 bilingual class (22 pupils), one Grade 6 bilingual class (16 pupils) and one Grade 6 monolingual class (41 pupils).

The questionnaire for the children in rural schools was composed of 25 questions, designed with the goal of capturing a broad range of views on the languages in the curriculum. The following categories of questions were included in the 25-item questionnaire: (1) personal information; (2) number of

languages spoken/understood/read/written; (3) groups with which the languages are used/and how often; (4) languages used in the school; (5) whether they had opted for mother tongue-based bilingual education or monolingual Portuguese classes; (6) languages they preferred to speak at school/home and why; (7) languages they preferred to/would like to learn; (8) languages they did not like and reasons; (9) languages they considered beautiful/ugly/important; (10) languages their parents considered important to learn; (11) whether they liked to learn English/Portuguese/and the L1, and reasons. Of relevance to provide an insight on the pupils' attitudes to the languages in use in the school context, are questions 12 to 25; respectively:

- (12) With which groups do you use the languages listed below?*
- (13) When and how often do you use each one of the languages below?*
- (14) Did you choose the Bilingual Education Program or the Monolingual?*
- (15) Which language(s) do you prefer to speak at school?*
- (16) Which language(s) do you prefer to speak home?*
- (17) Which language(s) do you prefer to learn the most/Why?*
- (18) Which other language(s) would you like to learn/Why?*
- (19) Which language(s) don't you like?*
- (20) In your opinion, which languages are beautiful?*
- (21) In your opinion, which languages are ugly?*
- (22) Which language(s) do you think your parents consider as important to learn?*
- (23) Do you like to learn English? Why?*
- (24) Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why?*
- (25) Do you like to learn your mother tongue? Why?*

On the one hand, questions 12 and 13 are important because they clearly deal with language use, frequency of use, and contexts of use. Through the answers to these questions it is also possible to infer the relevance of a particular language in order to meet the children's daily communication needs. On the other hand, question 14 indirectly suggests that whether a child or his/her parents have opted for mother tongue-based bilingual or monolingual Portuguese classes likely indicates their preference for one or another language, for whatever reasons. Questions 15 to 25 are definitely attitudinal as they are

concerned with the children's preferences, likes or dislikes, their perceptions of 'beautiful' or 'ugly' languages, as well as their awareness of their parents' view of importance of the languages present in their environment. As such, the answers to such questions are highly informative.

Sixty (60) questionnaires were filled in by pupils from two Grade 6 classes at 3 de Fevereiro Primary School, in Maputo City. The pupils' age ranged between 10 to 13 years, and there were 34 girls and 26 boys. As already mentioned throughout this study, the inclusion of this urban school was initially for comparative purposes, considering that at the time no mother tongue based-bilingual education is being provided in the urban context. However, as will be discussed later on in this chapter, the urban children's responses provide clear and relevant insights on their views concerning 'minority' and 'majority' languages. Of key importance, and for the same reasons as stated in the above paragraph, in order to gain insight into the urban pupils' attitudes to the languages in the curriculum and particularly mother tongue education are questions 7, 10 to 16 below. When adapting the questionnaire to be used in the urban context, I thought that Question 7 would be particularly important because it would give a general image of the Mozambican National Languages known and used by the student population. However, the answers to this question came as a major surprise; this will be discussed under section 5.7.2.

(7) What is your Mother Tongue (L1)?

(10) Which other language(s) would you like to learn? Why?

(11) Which language(s) don't you like? Why?

(12) Which language(s) do your parents consider as important to learn?

(13) Do you like to learn English? Why?

(14) Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why?

(15) Would you like to study in your mother tongue? Why?

(16) Would you like to learn to read and write in any other Mozambican National Language (for example, Changana, Ronga, Maconde, etc.)? Why?

5.3 The Teachers' Questionnaire

Twelve teachers in total completed the questionnaires; six from each school. The teachers' ages ranged between 25 to 44 years. The sample included five female teachers and seven male teachers. All of them were born in southern Mozambique and either had Xirhonga, Xitswa or Xichangana as their L1¹³⁷. Most of the teachers reported having had an initial pedagogical training of three years, after having completed Grade 7; in fact, this teacher training model known as Grade 7+3 is quite common in Mozambique, and it emerged as a way to respond to the high demand for primary school teachers. In addition, all the teachers reported having had a two-week preparatory training to work with mother tongue-based bilingual education¹³⁸.

The teachers' questionnaire was divided into six parts, containing a total of 43 questions. Questions 1-9, in Part 1, were focussed on personal information (age, place of birth, mother tongue and other languages spoken/written/understood/read. Questions 10-16, in Part 2, were aimed at finding out about the academic and professional qualifications of teachers, type and duration of training, experience as a teacher, grades/classes and subjects taught, as well as total number of pupils. Questions 17 and 18, in Part 3, intended to obtain information about the teachers' language use, that is, contexts of use of certain languages and frequency of use of such languages. Questions 19-21, in Part 4, had as their major focus to look at teachers' assessment of language use by the pupils, and especially find out about the languages that the pupils use when addressing the teachers in different contexts, the languages used among the pupils themselves, in class and during breaks and also issues regarding the pupils' language competence. Questions 22-40, in Part 5, were concerned with the teachers' views on mother tongue based-bilingual education (the languages taught in the school, whether they were taught as subjects or medium of instruction, how long they had been teaching such languages, and their comments on the time allocated for each language in the school curriculum. The questions were also aimed at finding out whether the teachers had received any training on mother tongue based-bilingual education, location, duration and the materials used in the classroom. The teachers were also asked if they believed that pupils should be encouraged to speak the Mozambican National Languages and their opinion regarding community past and present reactions to the use of the Mozambican National languages in the school

¹³⁷ Note that these three linguistic varieties, which are mutually intelligible, are usually grouped under the Tsonga language. See section 2.3 in Chapter two.

¹³⁸ See Appendix Ten (I) for a detailed profile of the teachers in the two rural schools.

system. Teachers were asked to comment on any differences of opinion noticed between parents and children and/or between illiterate and literate parents, whether they thought Bilingual Education was beneficial or detrimental, and whether they had observed any changes in terms of pupils' motivation to attend school with the introduction of mother tongue-based bilingual education). Whether they had observed any improvements in the pupils' academic performance due to the use of their L1 in school, and whether they had noticed any reduction in the number of dropouts, again as a direct result of the introduction of Bilingual Education. Questions 41-43, in Part 6, were focussed on Portuguese, English and any other foreign language. Teachers were asked to comment on their pupils' motivation to learn Portuguese and English, whether they thought any other language(s) should be taught in school, and which one(s) and finally they were asked to make any further comment on the issue regarding the languages in the curriculum.

Of particular relevance in order to elicit teachers' personal attitudes to mother tongue-based bilingual education are questions 32 [*Do you think your pupils should be encouraged to speak their mother tongues? Why?*] and 37 [*What is your personal opinion about Mother Tongue Medium Instruction? Is it beneficial or detrimental? Why?*]. In addition, questions 33 to 36, as presented below, are also important as they attempt to find out about teachers' awareness of the community or parents' perceptions and opinions on the use of the Mozambican National Languages in the school context.

- (33) *Can you describe the community's reaction to the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction?*
- (34) *Comment on any possible changes you may have observed on the community's perception or opinion, over time, concerning the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction.*
- (35) *Comment on any possible differences of opinion you may have noticed between the parents and the children, on the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction.*
- (36) *Comment on any differences of opinion you may have noticed between parents who are educated and parents who are illiterate concerning the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction.*

Three other questions that I see as relevant, because they are directly focused on teachers' perception

on the relationship between use of L1 and motivation towards the school, academic success and reduction of the dropout rate, are questions 38 to 40. They read as follow:

- (38) *Do you think that pupils feel more motivated towards the school, now that they are allowed to use their native languages in the school setting? Elaborate!*
- (39) *Comment on any progress or improvements you may have observed in pupils' academic performance as a direct result of the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction.*
- (40) *Have you observed any reduction, for example, in the number of dropouts as a direct result of the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction?*

5.4 The School Director's Questionnaire

This questionnaire was divided into four parts, containing a total of 32 questions. Questions 1-8, in Part 1, were focussed on personal information (age, place of birth, mother tongue and other languages spoken, as well as information concerning the academic qualifications of the School Director). Questions 9-15, in Part 2, were aimed at getting information pertaining to the school (school's name, geographical location, date of establishment, total number of students, number of boys and girls, number of children in bilingual classes or in monolingual classes, and the children's L1. Questions 16-28 had as their main focus the process leading to the introduction and implementation of mother tongue-based bilingual education (the year the program was initiated in that particular school, the languages involved, languages taught as subjects, criteria used for the selection of the local language to be used in that school, the level of community (or parent) involvement and community reaction, teacher training issues, materials available, the school director's perception on pupils' feelings regarding the use of their L1 in the school system, literacy achievements, that is, whether pupils were able to read and write in the Mozambican National Languages, problems encountered so far with the implementation of the bilingual education program, and the director's personal opinion concerning Mother Tongue Medium Instruction. Questions 29-32 in Part 4 were focussed on Portuguese, English and any other Foreign Language. Basically, the purpose was to investigate what, in the School Director's opinion, was the role of Portuguese, the importance of English in Mozambique, as well as whether he/she believed that any other languages should be introduced in the school system. And the last question concerned his/her own response or belief in regards to Mother Tongue Medium

Instruction.

Particularly relevant in order to shed light into the School Directors' attitudes to the languages in the curriculum and especially the use of the Mozambican National Languages in education are questions 28 to 31; respectively:

(28) In your opinion, is Mother Tongue Medium Instruction beneficial for the pupils? Why?

(29) In your opinion, what is the role of the Portuguese language in Mozambique today?

(30) Comment on the importance of the English language.

(31) Which other language(s) do you think should be taught in the Mozambican schools? Why?

5.5 The Parents' Interview

The parents' interview contained a total of 19 questions; the first seven questions were mostly focussed on the parents' language ability and knowledge (especially, question one that asked about the languages the parents were able to speak), as well as language use and contexts of use (questions 2-6). In addition, there was a question that attempted to find out about whether the parents had been involved in the process leading to the introduction of mother tongue education, or at least in the process regarding the selection of the Mozambican National Language to introduce in the curriculum (question 10). Questions 13 [*How do your children feel about the Mozambican National languages?*], 14 [*How do they feel about Portuguese?*] and 15 [*How do they feel about English?*] were aimed at finding out whether the parents were aware of their children's views on the languages in the curriculum. Nevertheless, of special importance in order to elicit parents' perceptions and views on the introduction of mother tongue education are the following questions:

(7) Which language(s) do you speak to your children?

(8) Which language(s) would you like your children to learn at school?

(9) Which language(s) do you think the school should choose as the language of instruction? Why?

(11) What is your opinion about the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages in the school system?

(12) Is it important for your children to learn to read and write in the National languages? Explain!

(16) Is there any other language that you think your children should learn at school? Which one? Why?

(17) How important do you think it is to learn Portuguese?

(18) How important do you think it is to learn English?

Whether Portuguese or Xirhonga had, for instance, emerged in response to question 7, as the language or languages used by the parents to speak to their children, would likely be an indication of the parents' own competence in such language(s); it would give an idea of their perception of the academic, social and cultural value of any of those languages. Obviously the answers to questions 17 and 18 would also contribute to this picture.

5.6 The Educational Experts' Interview Guide

Important questions in order to provide an insight into the Educational Professionals' positioning, perceptions and attitudes towards language policy and language education issues in Mozambique are the following ones:

(15) Would you agree that the Portuguese language, in today's Mozambique, represents much more than just the coloniser's language, much more than just the language of national unity, but a language that represents a truly Mozambican National Identity in its own right?

(16) What about the National Mozambican Languages? What do they mean and represent?

(17) How would you describe the role of English in Mozambique today?

(18) Do you believe that it would be possible to develop a language in education policy in Mozambique that articulates the 3 major discourses on Mother Tongue Medium Instruction, Ethno-Cultural Identity and Globalisation?

(19) In your opinion, what would be an 'ideal'/proper Language Policy for Mozambique and why?

In addition, question 8 is particularly relevant because it tackles the educational professionals' awareness of the attitudes of different groups in society towards the use of the Mozambican National

Languages in education. The question reads as follows:

- (8) *Can you talk about society's overall reaction to Mother Tongue Medium Instruction in the country?*
- 8.1 *Have there been differences of opinion in different circles (educated/non-educated) and/or geographical areas (urban/ rural)?*
- 8.2 *What has been the reaction at community level?*
- 8.3 *Do parents and children alike seem to share the same views?*

Having presented in detail the crucial questions both in the questionnaires and interviews, which have been highly relevant in informing the present study, the next section presents the main findings of the attitudes' survey.

5.7 Main Findings

The findings are presented in accordance with each one of the five categories of participants, respectively, pupils, teachers, school directors, parents and educational professionals. In relation to the key questions in the **Pupils' Questionnaire** (rural schools), that is, questions 12 to 25, the major findings are as follows:

5.7.1 Pupils' Responses (rural schools)

In regards to question 12 – [*With which groups do you use the languages listed below?*], and as illustrated by the following table, Xirhonga emerged as the language most spoken in the home context, used by 153 children (out of a total of 158) when communicating with friends, 134 children when communicating with their siblings, 132 when interacting with the adult members of their families, by 128 children when playing with friends at school, 114 children when communicating with public servants (for example, at hospital), and by 117 children when communicating with community members. Portuguese emerged as the second most spoken language used by 144 children (out of a total of 158) when communicating with the teachers at school, by 139 children when communicating with the School Director, 114 children when interacting with their siblings, 111 children when interacting with adult members of the family, 90-91 children when playing with friends home and colleagues and friends at school. 82 children reported using Portuguese when they are at hospital or when interacting

with any civil servant at district level. In addition to Xirhonga, Portuguese, and XiChangana, the other languages reported are Xitsua, Zulu and Swazi. Table 6 below, summarises the present findings.

Table 6 - Pupils' Responses to Question 12 (Language Use)

N= 158

	Portuguese	English	French	Xirhonga	XiChangana	Other language (Specify)
Family (parents, & other adults)	111	3	0	132	37	21 (two languages mentioned in this category were Zulu and Swazi)
Family (siblings)	114	2	0	134	37	5
Friends (at home)	90	0	0	153	37	0
Friends & Colleagues (at school)	91	0	0	128	32	0
Teachers	144	84	0	61	0	0
School Directors	139	0	0	32	0	0
Public servants (hospital, police)	82	0	0	114	0	0
Community Members	33	0	0	117	0	0
South African or Zimbabwean Citizens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Foreigners (Specify)	0	0	0	0	0	0

As for question 13 – *[When and how often do you use each one of the languages below?]* the majority of the children reported to speak Portuguese and Xirhonga many times a day, to be more precise, 116 children reported to speak Portuguese many times during the day, and 107 children reported to speak Xirhonga several times a day. English was reported by 84 children as being spoken at least once a week and that most likely occurs within the classroom, during English lessons which take place twice a week. 81 children reported to speak Portuguese at least once a day, and that probably occurs in the school context. It occurred that a few children ticked the three top categories for both Xirhonga and

XiChangana. In that case, I have only considered one of the responses, that is, either to Xirhonga or to XiChangana, as it appears, as confirmed by the teachers, that because the languages are mutually intelligible, the children are not always sure about which language they speak¹³⁹. Table 7 below, presents the children’s responses in numbers.

Table 7 - Pupils’ Responses to Question 13 (Frequency of Use)

	Portuguese	English	French	Xirhonga	XiChangana	Other language (Specify)
Many Times Daily	116	7	0	107	7	1 (Zulu)
At least Once/Day	81	9	0	8	1	1 (Swazi)
At least Once/Week	7	84	0	0	0	1
Very Rarely	0	0	0	1	1	0
Never	0	14	0	11	13	0

In regards to question 14 - [*Did you choose the Bilingual Education Program or the Monolingual?*], although all the children in monolingual classes wrote *monolingual* and those in mother tongue-based bilingual education classes wrote *bilingual*, it is difficult to know to what extent the fact that they had been placed in one or another type of education program had been a matter of choice or a result of the school authorities’ decision to attempt to reach a balance in the number of children in monolingual and bilingual classes. As briefly mentioned under section 5.1.2, the parents have the right to choose their children’s medium of instruction. However, the final decision lies in the hands of the school authorities. If for instance, the bilingual classes established have a very small number of pupils, the school can randomly move a few of the children enrolled in monolingual Portuguese classes to bilingual ones. Nevertheless, there were a total of 107 children in Monolingual Portuguese classes (Grades 5 and 6), and a total of 51 children in Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education classes (Grades 5 and 6). See Table 5, under section 5.1, for a detailed number of children in monolingual and bilingual classes at each school. I consider this as an important indicator of the children’s or their parents’ view on either

¹³⁹ It should be said at this stage, and as briefly mentioned in Chapter Two, that Xirhonga and XiChangana are grouped under the Tsonga language family. However, while Xirhonga is associated to Maputo Province in the south of Mozambique, XiChangana is said to be spoken in Gaza Province, also in the South of Mozambique.

type of education program. I shall return to this issue throughout the discussion section.

In response to question 15 - [*Which language(s) do you prefer to speak at school?*], a high number of children (131 out of a total of 158) selected Portuguese. Although quite many children (93 pupils) did not present the reason why they prefer to speak Portuguese at school, from among the reasons given by the children were the following: *I prefer to speak Portuguese at school because: in that way I can learn to speak it; I want to learn the language; I want to be able to read it; it is the language of the school; I do not know it; it is good; I speak it well; it is fun; it is beautiful; I like it; it is easier for me; the teacher speaks it; many people like to speak it; I do not speak Changana at school; the teachers often teach us to speak it; I am not able to speak it; I prefer it; and because it is important.* 9 children indicated that they prefer to speak their L1 at school, and did not give any reasons for that, 6 pupils reported preferring to speak English at school, and two of the reasons presented were the following: *I prefer to speak English at school because: I want to learn it; and I very much would like to speak it.* It should be mentioned, at this stage, that quite a number of children indicated that they prefer to speak more than one language; for example, Portuguese and English or Portuguese and Xirhonga, or even Portuguese, English and Xirhonga.

In relation to question 16 - [*Which language(s) do you prefer to speak home?*], 90 pupils selected the L1 (Xirhonga and/or XiChangana, or even Zulu or Swazi) as the language they preferred to speak home. Among the reasons presented for Xirhonga/XiChangana were the following: *I prefer to speak Xirhonga/XiChangana because I am Changana; because I like it; because we are not able to speak Portuguese home; because my siblings prefer to speak XiChangana.* 51 pupils responded that they prefer to speak Portuguese in the home context, and the reasons presented were as follows: *because I am not able to speak it; because I like it; and because it is the most spoken language in our country.* English was selected by 1 child as the language he prefers to speak at home, and the two reasons given were: *because I would love to speak it better; and because I enjoy speaking it.*

What emerged in relation to question (17) - [*Which language(s) do you prefer to learn the most/Why?*] was the following: the majority of pupils (107) chose Portuguese as the language they prefer to learn the most; this was followed by 59 children who selected English as the language they prefer and finally

33 children who selected either Xirhonga or XiChangana. The Reasons presented for their preference for Portuguese are the following: *because I want to learn it; because it is a language I want to be able to speak; because the teacher speaks it; because I cannot speak it; because both Portuguese and English are the languages used in education; because in the community, many people speak Portuguese; because it is important to the world; because it is beautiful when people speak it; because it is good to learn it so that we can understand the teacher; it is the most important language; if people cannot speak it, they cannot get a job; and because my brothers speak it.* Two of the reasons presented for the choice of English were: *because it is spoken in South Africa; and it is an important language.* In relation to the L1, the reasons justifying the children's preference are: *because most people speak XiChangana home; because when I am home, I prefer to speak it; because my mother speaks it; because I speak it with my grandmother; and because my father speaks Xirhonga.*

As for question (18) - *[Which other language(s) would you like to learn/Why?]*, the numbers that emerged are the following: 34 pupils indicated that they would like to learn English, 21 stated that they would like to learn Portuguese, 19 indicated French, 18 Xirhonga, 6 Swazi, 5 Zulu and 1 Emakhuwa. Among the reasons advanced for English were: *because I would like to be able to speak the language well; I would like to learn it; because it is important to learn many languages; and because I cannot yet speak it.* Justifying the choice of Portuguese, the children stated that they would like to learn it for the following reasons: *because I cannot speak it; I can speak it when I travel to Maputo; my parents like it and because it is an important language.* One of the reasons given for French was that *I would like to learn it.* As for Xirhonga and the other African languages, the reasons presented are; *I would like to learn Xirhonga, because I cannot speak it; because many people in the community speak it; and Zulu because it is spoken in South Africa.*

The pupils' answers to question (19) - *[Which language(s) don't you like?]* are the following: 15 children mentioned 'Xingondo',¹⁴⁰ a term which includes languages such as Emakhuwa and Maconde. 13 children mentioned XiChangana; 4 children indicated French and 2 Xirhonga. The main reason

¹⁴⁰ 'Xingondo' is a term used by the people in the South of Mozambique to refer to those that come from Northern Mozambique, especially from the provinces of Nampula and Zambézia; the term is also used to refer to the language they speak. According to Francisco et al. (2007), the term "xingondo" refers to the stranger, the outsider, the "other one".

given was that *'I do not like it because I cannot speak it'*.

In regards to question (20) - *[In your opinion, which languages are beautiful?]*, the pupils' responses were the following: 98 children selected Portuguese, 62 indicated English, 6 Xirhonga, 6 Zulu, 5 Swazi and 2 XiChangana. As for question (21) - *[In your opinion, which languages are ugly?]*, 15 pupils chose Xirhonga, 4 'Xingondo' (Emakhuwa), 3 XiChangana and 2 Swazi. The children's responses to question (22) - *[Which language(s) do you think your parents consider as important to learn?]* indicated first Portuguese (70), followed by English (24), Xirhonga (7), Zulu (2) and Swazi (1).

In relation to question (23) - *[Do you like to learn English? Why?]*, 122 pupils responded positively and presented the following reasons: *because it is good; because there is a lot I do not understand; because I will learn to speak it; it is important; it is fun; because it is a good subject; we like it; it is a beautiful language; I would like to be an English language teacher; if I meet someone who speaks English, I will be able to answer; because it is important to other countries; because it can be applied in many contexts; to speak with the teacher; because I can speak it when I travel to South Africa; and because I want to be able to read it.*

Question (24) - *[Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why?]* answered affirmatively by 120 pupils, produced the following reasons: *because I can communicate with people from other regions; because I will learn it; because it is good; it is important; because I do not know the language/I am not able to speak it; because we do not use the L1 at school; it sounds good; because we read in Portuguese; because my mother speaks it; because I like to speak Portuguese; I like to read in Portuguese; it is the language of the school; because we learn to read and write; because it is beautiful; because I like it a lot; because my cousins speak Portuguese; I like it because I like it; because it is good for the world; because it is much used in class; and because the school director writes many things in it.*

80 pupils responded affirmatively to question (25) - *[Do you like to learn your mother tongue? Why?]*, and the reasons presented include the following: *because it would be good to be able to write in my own language; because it is good; it is fun; because that is my language; because that is the language we speak home; because we do not speak Portuguese home; because my grandparents speak*

XiChangana; because many people like to speak it; because I am not able to say many things in my L1; I like it because my grandparents understand it; because my father is a Changana speaker; because my father reads Changana; because it is important for our grandparents; because that is the language we speak with my parents; to be able to speak with the family and colleagues; because I can speak freely; because I can speak with my friends; because in my family, they do not like if I do not speak my L1; because if I find an old woman in the street who cannot speak Portuguese, I can use the L1; because I want to learn more; because my whole family speaks it and therefore I like it; because my mother speaks it; because many people cannot speak Portuguese; and because I cannot write or read in my L1.

The responses to questions 15-25 are summarised on table 8 below.

Table 8 - Pupils’ Responses to Question 15-25 (Language Preference, Languages Liked/Disliked, Beautiful and Ugly Languages, Language Importance

Question	Portuguese	English	L1 (Xirhonga, XiChangana, Xiswana, Zulu and/or Swazi)
(15) Which language(s) do you prefer to speak at school?	131	6	9
(16) Which language(s) do you prefer to speak home?	51	1	90
(17) Which language(s) do you prefer to learn the most/Why?	107	59	33
(18) Which other language(s) would you like to learn/Why?	21	34 (children in Grade 5)	18 (Xirhonga and/or XiChangana - children in monolingual Portuguese classes) 6 (Swazi) 1 (Emakhuwa) 5 (Zulu)
		19 (French)	
(19) Which language(s) don't you like?	0	0	13 XiChangana 12 Xirhonga (mostly by those in monolingual classes)
		4 (French)	15 ('Xingondo'/Emakhuwa, Maconde) 1 ('Xi-Inhambane'/Chopi)
(20) In your opinion, which languages are beautiful?	98	62	6 (Xirhonga) 2 (XiChangana) 6 (Zulu) 5 (Swazi)

(21) In your opinion, which languages are ugly?	0	0	15 (Xirhonga) (Grade 6 monolingual) 3 XiChangana 4 Xingondo/Emakhuwa 2 Swazi
(22) Which language(s) do you think your parents consider as important to learn?	70	24	7 Xirhonga 2 Zulu 1 Swazi
(23) Do you like to learn English? Why?	-	122	-
(24) Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why?	120	-	-
(25) [Do you like to learn your mother tongue? Why?]	-	-	88

5.7.2 Pupils' Questionnaire (urban schools)

After presenting the main findings that emerged from the pupils' questionnaire (rural schools), I shall now move on to report the findings from the pupils' questionnaire (urban schools), with a specific focus on questions 7, 10-16.

As stated under section 5.2, when adapting the questionnaire to be used in the urban context, I thought that question (7) would be particularly important because it would give a general picture of the Mozambican National Languages known and spoken by the children in the urban classroom. However, the responses were not exactly what I had expected. The responses to the question on what is your mother tongue (L1) are as follows: out of a total of 60 Grade 6 pupils at '3 de Fevereiro' Primary School, located at the centre of Maputo City, 56 children declared to have Portuguese as their L1, 2 indicated XiChangana as their L1, 1 reported to have Ndau, and 1 French. That the vast majority of children reported to have Portuguese as their first language somehow came as a surprise, and it is an important indicator of the fact that in the urban context, intergenerational language transmission particularly in relation to the Mozambican National Languages does not seem to be occurring. This finding justifies the need to extend mother tongue-based bilingual education to the urban context with

the purpose of preventing language loss on the part of children in the Mozambican cities. I shall return to this issue during the discussion section.

The most significant responses to question (10) – [*Which other language(s) would you like to learn/ Why?*] are that 39 children selected English, followed by 33 children who indicated French, and 15 children who referred to Spanish. In addition, German was also mentioned by 5 children. It was interesting to observe that languages such as Italian, Greek, Russian, Chinese, and Arabic were also mentioned, by the children: 5, 1, 2, 2 and 1 respectively. Equally interesting was the fact that a small number of children mentioned Mozambican National Languages such as XiChangana (1) and Ndaou (1). Many of the reasons indicated by the children for the languages they mentioned are quite similar; for example, referring to languages such as English, French and Spanish, they argue that each one of them *is very beautiful; is an important language; I like it; if I travel to any country in which those languages are spoken, I can communicate with people there; it is good to learn new languages; and sometimes I go to restaurants where they only speak English and French, and what am I going to say if I am not able to speak the languages?!* Specific reasons presented for English include the following: *I have family in South Africa; I often travel to South Africa for holidays; the majority of people speak English worldwide; my father and I like it a lot; it has always been my dream to be able to speak it; it is an easy language to learn; I like watching movies in English; and when my father gets enough money I will either study in South Africa or the United States of America (USA).* Among the reasons presented for French are: *it is a simple language; and a very important language especially if I travel to France.* And other reasons mentioned for the remaining languages are: *I have family members who are Greek; I think Arabic is a beautiful language; I would like to travel to Spain and live with my father who is already there; I want to communicate with the Germans when I travel to Germany; I like Ndaou and I would like to speak it well; my father speaks Russian; and I want to learn Chinese because my father has business interests with China.*

In relation to question (11) – [*Which language(s) don't you like/ Why?*] 14 children stated that they actually like all languages, because *it is important to learn languages and if I study a lot I can travel abroad.* 22 children indicated that they do not like XiChangana, 10 Zulu, 9 Makhuwa, 6 Xirhonga, 4 Chinese, 3 Maconde, 1 Chuabo, 1 Cena, 1 Bitonga, 1 French and 1 Italian. The main reasons presented

and which are in fact common to the different languages mentioned were: *because my parents did not teach me; it is difficult to understand; it is a complex language; I do not like the way it sounds; it does not sound like Portuguese; it is not beautiful; and we do not speak it home.*

Question (12) – [*Which language(s) do your parents consider as important to learn?*] presented the following results: 40 children mentioned English, followed by 11 children who mentioned French, 9 Portuguese, 9 XiChangana, 4 Xirhonga, 3 Spanish, 2 Chinese, 2 Emakhuwa, 1 Chopi, 1 German, and 1 Russian.

An overwhelming number of 59 children responded positively to question (13) – [*Do you like to learn English/Why?*]. The reasons presented are quite similar to those already mentioned in relation to question 10: *My father likes it; it is fun and beautiful; when I travel abroad I will have to speak English; it is spoken in many countries; it is an important language; I like/love the language; I have relatives in South Africa; I would like to live in America; it is an important subject; it is very communicative; if I meet a foreigner, I can use it; it is easy to learn; it is very important for our daily life; I can speak with the South Africans; my parents would like to send me to the USA; to listen to music in English; it is widely used; when I get rich I will travel to many countries where they speak English.*

All the children (60) responded affirmatively to question (14) – [*Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why?*]. Their arguments are as follows: *It is the most spoken language in Maputo; it is the most spoken language in Mozambique; it is spoken in many countries; because I can speak to Portuguese and Brazilians; it is the language I speak with my parents, siblings and family; it is the language I speak with the people from my province; it is very easy to learn, to sing in and to write poetry; I grew up speaking Portuguese; it is the language of my country; it is the most important language for me; I learn many things (history and poems) through Portuguese; it is a very educative and communicative language subject; I would like to become better; it is an official language and my L1; it is an interesting language; I want to become a doctor; it is one of the most important languages in the country; it is the national language; because the Mozambicans speak it; it is a basic and important subject in our country; I have to speak Portuguese if I want to live in Brazil; it is the language I speak*

home and at school; because I am proud to be Mozambican; it is in Portuguese that I first learnt to write; and it is a very beautiful language.

Regarding question (15) – [*Would you like to study in your mother tongue/ Why?*], while 43 pupils responded positively, 17 responded negatively. Among the reasons presented by the 43 pupils who stated that they would like to study in one of the Mozambican National Languages are the following: *it is a language spoken by my mother, and I would like to be able to speak it; so that I can travel throughout Mozambique; because I would be able to communicate more and better with my relatives who do not speak Portuguese; in that way I would learn my parents' language; because my whole family speaks that language; it would be funny; I would be able to communicate with my parents in a different language; it is the language of my country; it is a language spoken by our parents; I would love to speak one of those languages; because I cannot yet speak it; yes, but my mother does not want me to speak, although my whole family speaks it; to be able to speak with those who do not speak Portuguese; because my father was born in Gaza province; I like it; my mother wants me to learn it so that when I travel with her I can also speak the language; it is interesting; it is important to study our mother tongues; to speak to the others; and I would be able to speak to my grandfather.* On the other hand, the arguments presented by those who responded negatively are the following:

I would not like because they do not have any style to be learned; they are mixed languages and are not beautiful; they are very complicated and messy dialects; I simply do not like it; because it is not my mother tongue; I do not like it; because if everyone studied in their L1 we would not understand each other; I would not like to learn national languages, but international languages; I do not like XiChangana; and I would not be able to understand it.

39 children responded positively and 21 children responded negatively to question (16) – [*Would you like to learn to read and write in any other Mozambican National Language (for example, Changana, Ronga, Maconde, etc.)? Why?*]. The reasons advanced by the pupils are the following: *Yes, because I would speak with the whole Mozambique; I would write letters to all the provinces; if I was the country's president I would not need a translator/interpreter; I like some of them; to talk to all my relatives; because I like XiChangana a lot and would like to be able to read and write it; only Emakhuwa, because I think it is easy to learn; because I did not grow up speaking those languages; if I*

travel to an area where they do not speak XiChangana, I would not be able to do anything; XiChangana, because it is the language of Maputo; XiChangana, because I would travel in the south of Mozambique and speak to all; to communicate better with Xirhonga speakers; I would love to be able to write in XiChangana; my parents and grandparents speak it; it is important to write and read in the Mozambican languages; it would be easier to communicate; I would like to be able to learn all the languages that exist in the world; XiChangana, is an interesting language; only Emakhuwa, because I do not understand when my father speaks it; and to communicate when we travel to other provinces. The reasons for the negative responses are: because they are very messy; I do not like them, not even a little; I try to read my grandmother's books in those languages and they are difficult to understand; they are not particularly beautiful; I simply do not like them; they are strange languages and difficulty to learn; because the Mozambican National Languages are not very useful; and they are too difficult for my imagination.

Table 9 – Urban School - Language Preference, Languages Liked/Disliked, Beautiful and Ugly Languages, Language Importance

Questions	English	French	Other European Languages					African Languages		Asian Languages	
			Spanish	Italian	German	Russian	Greek	Changana	Ndau	Chinese	Arabic
(10) Which other language(s) would you like to learn? Why?	39	33	17	5	5	2	1	1	1	2	1
(11) Which language(s) don't you like? Why?	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	22 XiChangana 10 Zulu 9 Makhuwa 6 Xirhonga 3 Maconde 2 Chuabo/Cena 1 Bitonga		4	
(12) Which language(s) do your parents consider as important to learn?	40	11	9 Portuguese 3 Spanish 1 German 1 Russian					9 XiChangana 4 Xirhonga 2 Emakhuwa 1 Chopi		2	
(13) Do you like to learn English? Why?	59 Positive responses										

(14) Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why?	60 Positive responses
(15) Would you like to study in your mother tongue? Why?	43 Positive responses 17 Negative responses
(16) Would you like to learn to write and read in any of the Mozambican National Languages? Why?	39 Positive responses 21 Negative responses

5.7.3 Teachers' Responses

Having presented the main results from the pupils' questionnaire, I shall now report on the major findings that emerged from the Teachers' Questionnaire. As stated under section 5.3, of particular relevance to elicit teachers' personal attitudes to mother tongue-based bilingual education are questions 32 to 40. Regarding question 32 - *[Do you think your pupils should be encouraged to speak their mother tongues? Why?]*, all the teachers responded positively, and the arguments they presented are as follows: *In addition to being an individual human right, they also learn more easily when the language in use at school is one that they command; because the pupils understand better in their L1; they learn better because it is a language they know; it facilitates understanding of the content or the subject matter; their vocabulary is rich; because it is the language they mostly use to communicate with adults (grandparents) in rural areas; because we are Mozambican and therefore we have to speak and write our languages; it is a good thing, as long as there are materials available; because they (the L1s) are a great help, especially because the elderly do not know the current money/currency and the children can help; because the children will be able to read the bible at church; because it will facilitate written communication and problem resolution; however, there is a need to overcome the problem of lack of materials (students' books) as they feel different from the others that have a textbook; because the 'traditional' language is part of the culture of a people; because it is people's identity; therefore it is*

important for a group of people to be able to represent graphically their language, so that they are able to communicate through written language; and because the L1 is wealth.

In relation to question 37 - [*What is your personal opinion about Mother Tongue Medium Instruction/is it beneficial or detrimental? Why?*], the teachers' responses are as follows: one teacher stated that at this stage he does not consider mother tongue-based bilingual education beneficial, but detrimental because *there is a lot still to be done in what concerns teacher training and other problems related to the logistics and general organisation of mother tongue education.* Another teacher argued that in order for bilingual education to *be more effective it needs to be followed by the promotion of the Mozambican L1s at all levels in the public sector and NGOs, similarly to what happens in South Africa.* Two teachers claimed that it is both beneficial and detrimental; beneficial *because the L1 'enters directly into the pupils' minds'; and it is a universal right.* Detrimental because *the vocabulary is very limited; there are no names for many things; writing is extremely difficult; and there are also difficulties in teaching and learning numbers.* The remaining teachers claim that mother tongue education is beneficial. Among the reasons presented are: *because the children understand better; they participate more actively in the classroom; in the classroom, the children communicate freely using their L1, what does not occur in L2 classes; whenever there are problems in other subjects in understanding something said in Portuguese, we have already started using the L1 as a resource; it helps the children a lot in communicating both at school and outside; because the children speak the language of instruction correctly, then it becomes a key tool for the teaching and learning process; when correctly administered it can facilitate understanding and knowledge of the social environment; and it enriches vocabulary.*

As for question 33 - [*Can you describe the community's reaction to the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction?*], one of the teachers reported that it was very difficult to introduce L1 education because at first the community did not want to accept the idea; the community did not understand the reasons for L1 education, but after the explanation given by the school authorities and with time, the community came to accept the idea. Another teacher argued that in the rural areas, there is not yet a clear vision about the importance of education at large; however, according to the community, bilingual education is a great step ahead in the motivation of the children to join school. One teacher stated that

part of the community sees this move as something positive, but there is a problem of lack of direct follow-up of the teaching and learning process. Eight teachers responded that the community is very pleased and fully welcomes mother tongue-based bilingual education, because very few people are able to communicate in Portuguese; nevertheless, there are lots of complaints about the lack of material.

The teachers' responses to question 34 – *[Comment on any possible changes you may have observed on community's perception or opinion, over time, concerning the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction]*, can be summarised in the following lines: *the community considers mother tongue-based bilingual education positive and think that it should be comprehensive to all children; the community considers it as a motivating factor; part of the community members believe that L1 education is going to help them solve several of the previous communication problems faced with the exclusive use of the L2; L1 education will help in terms of writing various documents in the Mozambican National Languages and also in terms of translation; the community demands the existence of both monolingual and bilingual classes; and in spite of the positive mood, the community complains about the lack of school books or textbooks for the pupils.*

The findings in relation to question 35 – *[Comment on any possible differences of opinion you may have noticed between the parents and the children, on the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction]* indicate, according to two teachers, that there are mixed opinions concerning mother tongue-based bilingual education. In the teachers' words, even after the explanation given for the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages in education, there was still a group of parents who were in favour of L1 education, while another group was against; although the parents see it as positive they are not following their children's education. Two teachers reported that at the beginning, the children did not agree with the introduction of L1 education, because they were more interested in Portuguese. Their argument was that the children already knew and were able to speak their L1. The same teacher stated that for the parents, on the other hand, the reaction was utterly positive as they were proud of seeing their languages being used in the school context. One teacher reported that one of the fears voiced by the parents is that this type of education (L1 education) has the risk of making the poor poorer. Two teachers pointed out that there was a strong adherence on the part of the children because they already knew their L1, and could communicate with anyone, and because they considered L1

education interesting and funny. Another teacher reported that he did not notice any opposition neither from parents or the children because they understood that this could be a way for the grandchildren to communicate with the grandparents.

Question 36 – [*Comment on any differences of opinion you may have noticed between parents who are educated and parents who are illiterate concerning the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction*] brought the following results: four teachers observed that *initially, some of the schooled parents were not in favour of L1 education because they thought that it would delay their children's progress, while illiterate parents welcome L1 education and claim that the language does not matter, they just want to see their children in school*. Three of the teachers said that *overall, the opinion was the same as it was underlined that L1 education would mean the valorisation of the Mozambican national languages, similarly to what happens in other countries; they are all in favour of bilingual education, because the child should not only know one single language, but also their L1*. One teacher reported *no major difference between schooled and non-schooled parents*; two other teachers underlined that *parents mostly question the lack of preparedness of teachers who once taught monolingual Portuguese classes to work with bilingual classes, and the problem of lack of textbooks*.

As for questions 38 to 40, focused on teachers' perception on the relationship between L1 use and motivation towards the school, academic success and reduction of the dropout rate, the responses are presented below:

Overwhelmingly, all teachers responded affirmatively to question 38 – [*Do you think that pupils feel more motivated towards the school, now that they are allowed to use their native languages in the school setting? Elaborate!*], and they argued that the pupils are surely more motivated *because they learn what they already know in their L1 and feel more at easy; from day one the subject matter is presented in a familiar language; because there is more interaction and they can easily express their ideas; they are able to give opinion in a language they command; they are no longer shy as in the past; they communicate freely with the teacher and colleagues; they seem to be more confident than the children in monolingual classes; because the school allows the use of the L1 and they feel free; there is a better participation and collaboration on the part of the children; they appear to understand better; and they do not want to miss classes*.

Question 39 – [*Comment on any progress or improvements you may have observed in pupils' academic performance as a direct result of the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction*] brought the following responses: *they appear to be progressing well, but the major problem for my pupils is related to writing; they display a better freedom of expression/speech; there is progress because they are encouraged to express themselves in the L1; we have a number of examples of children who are able to read and write in both languages and they interpret facts and phenomena better; they read with easiness, considering that it is a language they command; the L1 encourages learning in the classroom; there is a better student-teacher interaction in the classroom and a better participation; and the L1 helps considerably, the children participate actively and understand most of the issues presented in Xirhonga.*

In relation to question 40 – [*Have you observed any reduction, for example, in the number of dropouts as a direct result of the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction?*], while two teachers affirmed that they have in fact observed a reduction of the dropout level, two other teachers claimed that they have no evidence and the remaining teachers responded negatively. They argue that dropouts still occur, and these are not directly related to the language issue, but to intrinsic habits and traditions of the area or to social and family-related problems.

5.7.4 School Directors' Responses

After reporting on the teachers' views on mother tongue-based education, I shall now move on to present the School Directors' responses to questions 28-31, which are a direct indication of their positioning in relation to the languages in the curriculum and particularly the use of the Mozambican National Languages in education. Responding to question 28 - [*In your opinion, is Mother Tongue Medium Instruction beneficial for the pupils? Why?*], the two School Directors stated that bilingual education was in fact extremely important for the children, given that they learn in their own L1 (a language they speak well) and therefore they participate actively in the learning process. Concerning question 29 - [*In your opinion, what is the role of the Portuguese language in Mozambique today?*], both directors claimed that Portuguese plays a preponderant role in Mozambique, considering particularly the country's linguistic diversity, and therefore it is definitely the language of national

unity. The School Directors' comments to question 30 - *[Comment on the importance of the English language]* indicated that like Portuguese, the English language is also important for the country because it is through this language that the Mozambicans can connect to the international community. Finally, in relation to question 31 - *[Which other language(s) do you think should be taught in the Mozambican schools? Why?]*, the language mentioned by one of the directors was French, and he did not advance any reasons. The second director mentioned Swahili because it was selected as one of the languages of the African Union.

5.7.5 The Parents' Responses

As mentioned under section 5.5 above, questions 7-9, 11-12 and 16-18 are of special importance in order to elicit parents' perceptions and views on the issue regarding the languages in the curriculum, and particularly the introduction of mother tongue education. The parents' response to question 7 - *[Which language(s) do you speak to your children?]* indicated that Xirhonga or/and XiChangana are the languages mostly used by the parents in the two rural communities to communicate to their children. As for question 8 - *[Which language(s) would you like your children to learn at school?]*, the parents indicated that in addition to Portuguese, the other language that should be used in the school is Xirhonga, considering that it predominates in the community. In relation to question 9 - *[Which language(s) do you think the school should choose as the language of instruction? Why?]*, Portuguese and Xirhonga were the languages mentioned. Concerning question 11 - *[What is your opinion about the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages in the school system?]*, the parents' answers were that the use of these languages (1) *facilitate learning*; (2) *promote respect for the language and the language users*; (3) *facilitate the learning of other languages*; (4) *promote understanding*; and (5) *encourage the children to work as language-brokers or interpreters between the school and the home*. In response to question 12 - *[Is it important for your children to learn to read and write in the National languages? Explain!]*, the parents argued that it was an added value to the children and it had brought many advantages. Responding to question 16 - *[Is there any other language that you think your children should learn at school? Which one? Why?]*, the parents argued that the languages already in use were enough, that is, Portuguese, Xirhonga and English. In relation to question 17 - *[How important do you think it is to learn Portuguese?]*, the parents stated that Portuguese was very important *because it is the language used with outsiders or speakers of other languages; it is the*

language used in adult literacy development programs; it promotes better understanding; and it is a 'permanent' language in Mozambique. Lastly, regarding question 18 - [How important do you think it is to learn English?], the parents' arguments are that English is important because it facilitates a better development of the country for the children; there are many foreigners in Mozambique who do not speak Portuguese; and there are many foreign companies, mainly English-speaking ones, operating in the country.

5.7.6 The Responses of the Educational Professionals

The next set of findings emerged from the interview held with the Educational Professionals. In regards to question 15 - *[Would you agree that the Portuguese language, in today's Mozambique, represents much more than just the coloniser's language, much more than just the language of national unity, but a language that represents a truly Mozambican National Identity in its own right?]*, both experts underlined that although Portuguese is an exogenous language, it is seen by the Mozambicans as a true and genuine language of national unity, uniting Mozambicans of all linguistic backgrounds especially because none of the Mozambican National Languages is either spoken or understood by a wide majority. They also referred that the fact that a new Mozambican variety was emerging confirms its appropriation as a Mozambican language. Responding to question 16 - *[What about the National Mozambican Languages/What do they mean and represent?]*, they argued that they are both symbols of ethno-linguistic and group identity. As for the role of English in Mozambique, question 17, the arguments were that English is an important international and regional language and extremely useful in the 21st century. Concerning question 18 - *[Do you believe that it would be possible to develop a language in education policy in Mozambique that articulates the 3 major discourses on Mother Tongue Medium Instruction, Ethno-Cultural Identity and Globalisation?]*, the experts' response is that such a policy would be the ideal and somehow with the introduction of mother tongue education, the first steps towards such a policy have been given. The educational professionals' response to question 19 - *[In your opinion, what would be an 'ideal'/proper Language Policy for Mozambique and why?]*, was that it should be a policy that not only does not exclude any citizen, but also promotes their participation in a variety of areas. As for question 8 which is particularly relevant because it deals with the educational professionals' awareness of the attitudes of different groups in society towards the use of the Mozambican National Languages in education, reference was made to the existing resistance on

the part of some urban citizens to the use of the Mozambican National Languages in education, and their lack of understanding of its importance. Reference was also made to peoples' initial fears in the rural areas in relation to mother tongue education and a change of attitudes brought about as a result of a major grassroots' awareness development at community level, especially in the rural areas where mother tongue education is already a reality.

Having presented the major findings emerging from the study, I shall now turn on to the discussion of the most relevant issues emerging.

5.8 Discussion

In analysing the findings from the pupils' questionnaires, it is worth considering, first and foremost, the issue relating to both the reading and writing difficulties in Portuguese observed during the administration of the questionnaires in the rural schools, and also during the data processing, especially taking into account the occurrence of non-responses. It should be mentioned that no major differences occurred in terms of whether the pupils were in monolingual Portuguese or mother tongue-based bilingual education, as it seems that the higher amount of exposure to Portuguese in the monolingual Portuguese classes does not appear to make any significant difference in pupils' performance. Such difficulties may suggest that something may be wrong with the teaching of Portuguese, particularly in the rural areas, as those difficulties were not observed with the urban questionnaires. It would have been interesting to have checked to what extent the children were able to read and write in Xirhonga, especially because mother tongue-bilingual education suffers seriously from a lack of materials, which is not the case in Portuguese. Whatever the reasons are for the difficulties displayed by the children, they raise serious concerns regarding the quality of education. If bilingualism and bilinguality is the major goal of the current L1 education, then it appears that such goal is far from being reached, especially taking into consideration the fact that during my informal observations, during the short time I spent in the school areas both at Mudada and Mahubo, and by talking to the children I noticed that not all of them were able to communicate in Portuguese. After all, when we look at the pupils' responses to questions 12 and 15, they suggest that the use of Portuguese is mainly associated to the school context.

Another relevant finding to consider regards the fact that in both schools there are many more pupils in

Monolingual classes rather than in Bilingual classes; to be more precise, 107 children in monolingual Portuguese classes and 51 children in mother tongue-based bilingual classes (Grades 5 and 6). It is not possible to say whether the placement of more pupils in monolingual classes is due to the fact that there are more teachers prepared to teach in only one language, in this case Portuguese, or whether it has anything to do with attitudinal issues. Perhaps this is a reflection of the fact that somehow the community still believes that more benefits (social, economic, etc.) are likely to result from being educated in Portuguese rather than in the local languages, and they perhaps still rate L1 education as being slightly below the monolingual Portuguese education and in this case they would rather have their children learning in Portuguese. As mentioned earlier on when presenting the findings to question 14, regardless of the response given by the children, it is difficult to know to what extent the fact that they had been placed in one or another type of education program had been a matter of choice or a result of the school authorities' decision to attempt to reach a balance in the number of children in monolingual and bilingual classes. An interesting issue to follow would be to look at the extent to which the parents' freedom and right to choose their children's medium of instruction is being respected or not, as the final decision in establishing bilingual and monolingual classes or streams lies in the hands of the school authorities. Whatever the reason for this difference in numbers, we have to consider that mother tongue-based bilingual education is a new experience in the country and as such people may still want to wait and see in order to judge its worth.

Yet another finding that deserves consideration is related to the number of children in the urban school who reported having Portuguese, instead of any Mozambican National Language, as their L1, despite the fact that their parents had one of these languages as L1. First of all, this is a clear indication of the lack of intergenerational language transmission (from parents to children); secondly, it raises issues of a possible language loss and shift by young urban generations of Mozambicans; thirdly, it raises concerns regarding a common communication barrier or language breakdown between young generations of Mozambicans living in the cities and their grandparents and other relatives; and fourthly, this confirms the urgent need to introduce the Mozambican National Languages also in the urban schools as a form of promoting language maintenance and spread. The children's interest as indicated by the findings of the present study would be something to build on, and a possible sign that the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages in the urban context would be welcome. We

should bear in mind that as many as 71% of the children indicated that they would like to learn their parents' language to be able to talk to their grandparents.

The findings reveal that, despite the value awarded to the English language, by the educational authorities, and in spite of the high demand for English language skills in Mozambican society, the urban children view multilingualism (including the use of Portuguese and the Mozambican National Languages, as well as knowledge of languages such as Greek and Russian) as extremely important for their present and future lives. In other words, what the findings seem to indicate is that the English language is one possibility among several and is not the default language of globalisation. On the basis of the findings we can also conclude that bilingualism and/or multilingualism appear to be perceived as an advantage; language appears to be considered a resource for travelling, studying abroad, speaking to foreigners in Mozambique and abroad, for doing business (question 13 – urban questionnaire) and people are certainly aware of the benefits of speaking the L1, the L2 and foreign languages such as English, French, Arabic, Chinese, and others (question 10 – urban questionnaire).

The findings also indicate a positive attitude to mother tongue-based bilingual education (question 32 – Teachers' questionnaire, question 28 – School Directors' questionnaire, and question 8 – parents' interview). Judging by the responses, it seems that the right mindset exists in order to make the Bilingual Education experience a success. Overall, the participants consider mother tongue-based education as beneficial; they seem to be pleased with the use of the L1 in education; the children seem to be motivated towards learning and in the teachers' words, they seem to understand better through the use of their home language and are more active within the classroom.

Nevertheless, a number of improvements need to be made, particularly regarding Teacher Training, which, as reported under section 5.3, only lasts for two weeks, and the development and availability of materials and guide books for teachers and textbooks for pupils. Two weeks of preparation to use the L1 as a medium of instruction is definitely not enough, considering especially the fact that teachers' initial training (Grade 7 plus 3 years) is deficient. As the teachers themselves acknowledge, mother tongue-based education can be beneficial if the right conditions exist, but it can also be detrimental if conditions are not improved. The lack of materials and textbooks was mentioned several times as a

major constraint. At the moment, materials are mainly produced by INDE, the National Institute for Educational Development, and according to some of the teachers, they are sometimes involved in material design during the two-week seminars or any training section. But this does not seem to suffice. There is a need to consider a variety of ways to solve the problem. I shall return to the issue of alternatives for teacher training and materials design in the next chapter.

5.9 Summary

The present chapter revisited the methodological considerations underlying the investigation of the attitudes of primary school children, teachers, school directors, parents and educational professionals, regarding the languages in the curriculum. It included a description of the data collection tools, the subjects, and key characteristics of schools in the rural areas and those in the urban areas. In addition, the chapter also looked at a number of limitations that emerged during the data collection and analysis, and focused on the key and relevant questions in building a picture of existing linguistic attitudes. The chapter's major focus was on reporting on the findings of the investigation of the attitudes of the above-mentioned actors in relation to the languages in the curriculum. The chapter carefully analyses and discusses the research findings, with a view to weigh the likelihood of success of the language education policy which is proposed in the next chapter. After an analysis of the findings concerning language attitudes, and following a careful consideration of the experiences from other countries, and informed by research results in the field, Chapter Six moves on to formulate what I consider to be a sound, inclusive and appropriate language in education policy for the Mozambican multilingual context, and particularly for the urban context.

CHAPTER SIX

TOWARDS A LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR MOZAMBIQUE

The core objective of Chapter Six is to suggest a policy proposal for a sound and inclusive language education policy for Mozambique; a policy that is intended to be beneficial and inclusive for children both in rural and urban areas. This is a policy that is very much based and inspired by both a Linguistic Human Rights approach and a Language as a Resource approach. As already mentioned throughout the present study and in particular in Chapter Three, enough arguments exist concerning the academic, cognitive, emotional and attitudinal benefits of education in one's mother tongue. In addition, and as suggested by the findings of the present study, language (both 'minority' and 'majority')¹⁴¹ appears to be seen as an empowering resource for communication with people with whom no common language is shared,¹⁴² a resource for studying,¹⁴³ for travelling¹⁴⁴ and a resource for being seen as a member of a group.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ See the urban pupils' responses to Question 10, which include not only the so-called 'small languages', but also 'big languages'.

¹⁴² As indicated by the children's responses to Question 24; for example, I want to learn Portuguese *because I can communicate with people from other regions in the country*.

¹⁴³ As illustrated by a comment such as I want to learn Portuguese *because it is the language of the school*; see the response to question 15.

¹⁴⁴ As suggested by the following statement: I want to learn German because *I want to communicate with the Germans when I travel to Germany*.

¹⁴⁵ This is illustrated by a number of answers to question 25 such as, for example, I would like to learn one of the

The present policy proposal comes into being as a result, first of all, of what emerged from the fieldwork but also and mostly as a consequence of extensive readings on examples of good practice and policy on Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual and Multilingual Education worldwide. I am fully aware of the fact that what is good and what works in a particular context, may not work in a different context, due to a number of reasons, and that there is always a need to consider local specificities when attempting to transfer experiences that have been successful elsewhere. In relation to the need for comparison, Edwards (2001: 331) writes the following:

In preparation for any policy, it is advisable to look carefully at other contexts. Of course, each setting is unique, but this is not because its elements are found nowhere else; in fact, basic constituencies are remarkably similar across settings. The uniqueness arises, rather, through particular combinations of essentially the same building blocks. The implication is clear: things can be learned.

I fully agree with the above, and it was with the purpose of learning from others that I looked at the bilingual and multilingual education practices of countries as far and varied as India, with its ‘grassroots multilingualism’ (Annamalai 2004) and ‘tribal education experience’ (Mishra 2009b); Canada, with its immersion programmes (Cummins 1984, 1995); the Netherlands, with its experience in providing education in minority languages, both regional and immigrant (van der Avoird, Broeder, & Extra 2001); autonomous and popular education programs as alternatives to public schools in Mexico (Ogulnick 2006); and multilingual education in the Russian Federation (Leontiev 1995a and 1995b), among others. Obviously, not all the programs revisited would apply simply and straightforwardly to the Mozambican context, due to its particularities, but the process of reviewing what is already ongoing in different regions of the world has surely been a learning experience.

In addition, and highly relevant is the fact that the Mozambican context already has two essential ingredients to establish an enabling environment for mother tongue bilingual education, namely, a high level political will and positive attitudes on the part of the population at large. These are two ingredients that appear to be absent from a number of countries in the Southern African region, thus

Mozambican National Languages *because in my family, they do not like it if I do not speak my LI.*

affecting the success of existing language and language education policies.¹⁴⁶ However, political will and positive attitudes are not all that is needed in order to make a successful language policy; equally important, as already mentioned throughout this study, are competences in terms of skilled teachers, and didactic resources.

6.1 The Importance of a Multilingual Policy

As stated earlier, the proposed language education policy is conceived with the idea of maintaining Mozambique's linguistic diversity, considering the value of individual and societal multilingualism. It is a policy that is aimed at promoting cultural and economic development, while at the same time fostering national integration, and helping the Mozambicans to keep abreast of world developments and to participate actively in the knowledge society. I maintain that this is a necessary and urgent policy, especially considering the increasing danger of language loss faced by young urban generations of Mozambicans, resulting from a lack of intergenerational L1 transmission. I argue that national integration is going to be even made more robust by the valorisation of the Mozambican National Languages which is partly achieved by their educational use also in the urban context. Because languages are important vehicles of culture, the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages in the education system in the urban context will contribute to keep the Mozambican cultures and traditions alive. Economic development will be achieved by providing the ordinary Mozambican with the linguistic skills which are needed to access the national, regional and international social, academic, techno-scientific, professional and economic sectors.

It seems appropriate, at this stage, and as a way of justifying the pluralist nature of the policy being proposed, to quote Djité (2009: 10/11), who says the following on the value of multilingualism:

The available evidence suggests that policies aiming at the protection and promotion of multilingualism are well worth the cost, and that language barriers are barriers to progress. Multilingualism is a ready resource for the facilitation of the transfer of information, technology and know-how. Speech communities will be empowered to take charge of their own destinies when they are able to do so in the languages of their

¹⁴⁶ See, for example, Nyati-Ramahobo (2006), who discusses the lack of political encouragement and will on the part of the Government of Botswana in promoting the development, revival and use of the 'minority' languages of Botswana in a variety of contexts, including bilingual education. See also, Pashwana (2003), who explores the issue of negative attitudes of the South African population to the use of the South African Languages in education.

everyday interactions, and when these languages are allowed in key sectors of society and governance, even in a globalised world. It is therefore in everyone's interest to encourage, support and invest in multilingualism, in order to help release the tremendous resources of human capital everywhere, regenerate communities and place them where they should be. The language situation affects the process of information exchange upon which everything else rests – identity issues, education and health, good governance, growth with equity, and economic development.

Multilingualism is certainly a resource; the more languages one speaks the better one will be prepared to function in today's world; the better one can access information and know-how. If the Mozambican children are allowed to develop literacy in their L1s, and if at the same time, they are given the opportunity to master Portuguese and at a later stage, English, French and any other language, they will no doubt be empowered to face their present and future lives with confidence. Thus, the education system has an enormous responsibility of finding alternative ways for catering for the multilingual needs of children in schools. As appropriately put by Mohanty (2006: 281), “multilingual education holds a central position in planning for a resourceful multilingualism that does not marginalize and deprive the minor, minority, and tribal language groups”. In the same line of thought, Cummins (2006: 86) argues that

As language educators, we feel that more than one pedagogical model should be presented to future primary teachers, and that it is not enough today in our globalised world to learn [only] one or two dominant languages. Just like the protection of the environment is now part of the science curriculum, young children should be made aware of the wealth of languages spoken by human beings and of the value of their own, whether they are monolingual, bilingual or multilingual.

The findings of the present study indicate that young Mozambicans are already aware of the potential value of speaking a variety of languages – national, regional and international – they know that languages are important for travelling, studying in the country and abroad, for finding work, speaking with their relatives, etc., and this is something to bear in mind. In addition, there is also a grassroots' awareness of the importance of being bi-/multilingual, as confirmed by the parents' responses. Equally important is the strong recognition on the part of the Government of Mozambique that human capital is the engine of development and thus the need to expand access to Education through the enlargement of

the school network and improvement of education services in the country.¹⁴⁷

6.2 Rationale for the Proposed Policy

As stated throughout the present thesis, the Portuguese language is the only medium of instruction which is continuous throughout all levels of education in Mozambique, from the primary school level, through the secondary, and up to the tertiary level. On the other hand, the rural primary school has two different language education policies being simultaneously implemented:

1. Monolingual use of Portuguese as Medium of Instruction, and
2. Bilingual Education in Portuguese and one of sixteen Mozambican National Languages, where from Grades 1 to 3, Portuguese is a subject, and the medium of instruction is one of the Mozambican languages. Then, from Grade 4 to Grade 6, Portuguese becomes the main medium of instruction, while the Mozambican National Language becomes a subject.

The formulation of the language education policy here proposed is justified by the fact that ever since Mother Tongue Education was instituted in 1993, it has been restricted to the rural primary schools. The assumption under this policy is that only the children in rural areas suffer as a result of the fact that when they start schooling, the language they find is different from the home language. However, as a result of internal migration in search of better living conditions, job opportunities or any other reasons, the Mozambican urban (and sub-urban) schools may also host a number of children for whom Portuguese may not be the mother tongue either; children who also may suffer the negative academic, cognitive, and social consequences of being educated in an unfamiliar language. Even more alarming is the realisation that language loss or shift might be a reality for many urban Mozambicans. In line with the Government's aim of expanding access to quality education for all, and taking into account a number of research results that underline the academic and cognitive benefits of education in one's mother tongue (Cummins 1981), I maintain the need to extend Mother Tongue Education to children in the urban schools in order to promote quality education, in cases where children enter school without knowledge of the language of instruction, and simultaneously with the purpose of preventing language loss or shift on the part of Mozambican children who may not have acquired any of the Mozambican National Languages from their parents. As postulated by Spolsky (1986: 1),

¹⁴⁷ *Boletim da República* (1995:176).

The difference between languages that children learn in the home (their mother tongues) and the languages valued by society and established therefore as medium of instruction at the various levels of schools is an almost universal problem in educational systems, although one that is often made worse because it is not always clearly recognized. Proposals for mother tongue education, for bilingual programmes of various kinds, or for more effective teaching of literary or standard languages all alike depend on an understanding of the underlying problem of language education in multilingual settings and represent various analyses of the best way to resolve it.

As important as to provide every child the opportunity to be educated in his or her mother tongue is the need to promote respect for and value the Mozambican National Languages. Such recognition of the need to respect and value the Mozambican National Languages should go beyond the constitutional provision, and be materialised in the form of an actual valorisation of such languages through their introduction in the school system. I postulate that a full appreciation of the value of the Mozambican National Languages comes into being if such languages are made available in the school curriculum, either as **subjects**, **medium of instruction**, or **resources** for those children who may choose to be educated in those languages. The introduction of the Mozambican National Languages in the urban context would help to develop positive attitudes towards these languages, not only on the part of those who choose to receive instruction through their medium, but also on the part of pupils in general and other actors at the school level, the community, and the Mozambican society at large.

Having briefly looked at the rationale for the formulation of a new language education policy in Mozambique, the following section presents four main underlying principles that should guide the provision of Mother Tongue-Based Education in Mozambique, and focuses on the major goals or purposes of the proposed Language Education Policy. In the following sections, there is a presentation of the policy framework itself, that is, of the languages that should be present in the Mozambican school curriculum, the stage or level at which they should be introduced, the time load that should be allocated to each one of them, and a justification for what is proposed. The Chapter ends by assigning different possible roles and responsibilities to various stakeholders, starting from the Ministry of Education and Culture, moving on to INDE, Universidade Pedagógica, UEM, Teacher Training Institutions, NGOs as well as reviewing the role of the Media, the School, the teachers and pupils, and the family.

6.2.1 Underlying Principles

1. In areas that are linguistically homogeneous, like most regions in rural Mozambique, and where the choice of a common language is unproblematic, Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education should be provided to those children who themselves (or whose parents and caretakers) choose or wish to be educated in a Mozambican National Language,
2. In areas that are linguistically heterogeneous, like Maputo City,¹⁴⁸ and most of the provincial capitals, especially Beira and Nampula,¹⁴⁹ where people have different ethno-linguistic, cultural and social backgrounds, and where the choice of a common language¹⁵⁰ other than Portuguese is rather difficult, the Mozambican National Language(s) should be made available as (1) an elective or optional subject, for those who wish to develop literacy skills in them, and (2) as a resource language, especially in the first years of schooling, for children who do not speak Portuguese as L1 and who, as a result, may experience learning difficulties.
3. Mother Tongue Education should be provided on a voluntary basis in the urban primary schools; in other words, children (or their parents) should freely decide whether or not to follow L1 classes.
4. The primary responsibility for providing and managing mother tongue-based bilingual education (for example, dealing with matters of hours per week, choice of language or languages, whether it should take place within or outside the regular school timetable, as a curricular or extra-curricular activity, etc.) should be left to the discretion of each school.

Assuring the fulfilment of what is stated above would be the equivalent to responding to Linguistic Human Rights concerns, while at the same time ensuring quality of education, promoting multilingualism, and fostering positive attitudes and the valorisation of the Mozambican National Languages.

6.2.2 Three Possible Language Education Scenarios for the Urban School Context

Some of the reasons that may hinder the provision of mother tongue-based bilingual education in the context of the urban school are:

¹⁴⁸ Mozambique's Capital City.

¹⁴⁹ Mozambique's second and third major cities, respectively.

¹⁵⁰ Widely spoken by the majority.

- The question of **Human Resources**, that is, teachers qualified for the provision of Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education in various languages;
- Lack of **Didactic Materials** (textbooks, grammar books, and both students' books, and teachers' books) in the Mozambican National Languages; and
- Availability of **Reading Materials** (easy readers, and general literature) in the National Mozambican Languages, considering that a very limited number of literary works are written in these languages.

The above-mentioned reasons cannot be seen in isolation, as they are closely tied with the availability of **Financial Resources**, both for teacher training and materials development and the question of the **Time** it takes to train human resources and also to produce didactic material with the necessary quality. However, under the present conditions in Mozambique, especially in a classroom setting characterised by the presence of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds, it is possible to use the competences available, in the form of teachers' knowledge of one or various mother tongues, as well as the learners' own knowledge to build on the teaching and learning process. In other words, what I am suggesting is that there is a need to make it clear, to the schools and especially to the teachers, that in cases where Mother Tongue-Based Education cannot be provided, neither as medium of instruction or a subject, the students' L1 can or should, whenever necessary, be used as a resource, particularly for those students entering school who may seem to be experiencing understanding difficulties as a result of the fact that they do not know Portuguese. Although the findings of the present study reveal that quite a large number of children, to be more precise 56 out of a total of 60¹⁵¹, in the middle of Maputo city in fact have Portuguese as their L1 and as such may not be facing major academic difficulties, then the focus should be on children in the sub-urban schools surrounding the major cities, who may have one of the Mozambican National Languages as L1.

As a matter of fact, the *Plano Curricular do Ensino Básico* (2003: 42-43) already mentions the possibility for students to learn a Mozambican National Language as an optional or elective subject from Grade 3, in a monolingual (Portuguese) program. The use of the L1 as a resource is also already a reality in the rural schools. On the basis of my observations during the field work, I was able to confirm

¹⁵¹ See the responses of the children in the urban school.

that this is in fact happening in both Mudada and Mahubo primary schools. During the administration of the students' questionnaire in bilingual classes, when the class teachers were present, they resorted to the Mozambican National Language to explain one or another item. I postulate that the same openness to the use of the Mozambican National Language should also apply to the urban primary school, as it will not only facilitate the teaching and learning process, in cases where the children do not master Portuguese well, but it will also contribute to foster positive attitudes towards these languages. Therefore, I maintain that in present-day Mozambique, it is possible to think about Mother Tongue Multilingual Education across the board. Because Mother Tongue Education is already provided in sixteen languages, it would be possible to choose some of those languages that are already in use throughout the country and introduce them as medium of instruction, a subject or a resource, obviously depending on the demand from the student population, that is, on the number of children who might face problems in initiating schooling through Portuguese. Thus, it would be worthwhile considering the following three scenarios/teaching options in the urban school:

1. All learning is carried out in Portuguese, and a Mozambican National Language is taught as an **elective or optional school subject** (at the primary school level, from Grade 1),
2. All learning is conducted in Portuguese, and one or various Mozambican National Languages are used as a **resource** (in the early primary school level, Grades 1 to 3); this is a scenario where **translation** is allowed as a means to overcome communication and understanding difficulties,
3. Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education in Portuguese and one of the Mozambican National Languages, (at the earlier Grades 1-3, in the lower primary school).

The three-above scenarios are constructed considering that Portuguese is Mozambique's official language, and thus the prominence given to it. Scenarios one and two should be made available nationwide, in all urban schools of the country, and the languages to offer as subject should either be [A] the L1's most spoken in the province or [B] three L1's representing the North, Centre and South regions of Mozambique. [A] *the L1's most spoken in the province or region* is justified by the fact that it is possible to assign each Mozambican National Language to each province, for example, Xirhonga

or XiChangana are easily identified as being mostly spoken in the south of Mozambique, in the provinces of Maputo and Gaza, and Cena and Ndaou are easily assigned to the centre of the country, especially to Sofala Province. Therefore, the question of language choice for each province would be rather straightforward. However, because the urban context gathers people from a variety of geographical and linguistic backgrounds, then [B] *three LI's representing the North, Centre and South regions of Mozambique* is worth considering. It is common knowledge in the Mozambican context, and as reviewed by Firmino's study (2005), that a number of Mozambican National Languages are predominant in specific geographical regions; for example, Emakhuwa in the North, Nyanja-Sena in the Centre and Tsonga (including Xirhonga and XiChangana) in the South¹⁵². Thus, [B] is taken into account with the purpose of ensuring that the three main geographical regions, or at least the languages assigned to them, are represented in each one of the country's urban schools.

It would be feasible to combine Scenarios one and two with the modalities applied in the context of the European Schools as reported by Baetens Beardsmore (1995: 36), which consist in providing (1) "Support Classes", where tailor-made instruction is given, including help with handling subject or content-matter material taught through the L2, and/or (2) "Extra lessons" outside the normal school timetable, choosing periods (morning or afternoon) or days (Saturday, for example) when the children are free. Scenario three above, that is, the provision of mother tongue-based bilingual education in Portuguese and one of the Mozambican National Languages would likely be possible in the context of a number of sub-urban schools. Although the present study did not cover any school located in the outskirts of a city such as Maputo, I assume that the sub-urban schools would be relatively linguistically homogeneous in Xirhonga. However, I am also aware of the fact that some of the internal immigrants coming from the other provinces in the country, when arriving to the city would first install themselves in the sub-urban areas, building cheap houses. In order to make sure that there is a certain degree of both geographical and linguistic coverage, it would be wise to combine this scenario with scenario one 1 [B], that is, [1] one or various Mozambican National Languages taught as optional subject and [B] three languages, each one corresponding to each major geographical region (North, Centre and South) offered either as optional subjects or provided in the form of extra lessons.

¹⁵² See Table 2 in Chapter Two for the number of speakers of the various languages.

6.3 The Language Education Policy

1. The Portuguese Language is a compulsory subject, from Grade 1 throughout the end of the school system, given its role as the country's official language.
2. Provision for the use of the students' mother tongues (L1) in the early grades should be made by the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) and this power should be given to the provincial or district directorates of education and culture, and ultimately to the school authorities.
3. The same model of mother tongue-based bilingual education being implemented in schools in rural areas should apply to schools in the sub-urban areas, in such a way that:

3.1 From Grades 1 to 3, the children's mother tongues (L1's) can be used either as

- 3.1.1 **Medium of Instruction**, provided that there is at least a minimum number of ten (10) children in class who share the same L1 (or the minimum number to be determined by each school);
- 3.1.2 **Subject**, provided that the same conditions as 3.1.1 above apply;
- 3.1.3 **Resource**, provided that there is at least one (1) child for whom Portuguese is not the mother tongue, and who may be experiencing learning difficulties due to the language issue; this provision can only be materialised in case the teacher is able to understand and speak the child's language.

3.2 In case the children's mother tongues are used as **Medium of Instruction**, they will function as such from Grades 1 to 3. Grade 4 will be the transitional year, where change to Portuguese as major medium of instruction will take place. Portuguese will also continue to be the medium of instruction in the last three grades of the primary school level (Grades 5 to 7). Although one Mozambican mother tongue will be used as main medium of instruction from Grades 1-3, the Portuguese language should be introduced as a subject, right from the beginning until Grade 4, when the transition to Portuguese medium instruction occurs. Thus, the mother tongue becomes a subject until the end of primary schooling.

- 3.3 In case the children's mother tongues are used as **Subject**, they will be introduced from Grade 1 to the end of primary schooling (Grade 7). They should therefore be taught at least once a week, that is, for at least 90 minutes, each time.
- 3.4 In case the children's mother tongues are used as **Resource**, there should not be any restrictions of their use in oral communication for student-teacher interaction within the classroom. Using the language as a resource means that translations will be allowed, and in case the teacher observes any understanding problems, the children should be allowed to explain by means of their L1. The use of the L1 as a resource should be allowed at least until Grade 3. It should be observed that it will not always be possible to use all the children's mother tongues as resources, especially in cases where not all teachers in a given school speak a particular L1.
4. The other languages present in the curriculum are English and French. For the time being, their provision should continue as in present. The English language is introduced in Grade 6 of the second level of primary education, and continues throughout the school system. The French language is offered from Grade 10 to 12. English remains the main foreign language in the curriculum due to its acknowledged relevance, as stated throughout the present study, and French remains the second foreign language provided in the Mozambican school curriculum¹⁵³. However, at a later stage, there would be a need to open up and expand the range of other languages offered in the school system to include, for example, Swahili and/or Arabic as the two other official languages of the African Union.¹⁵⁴ Other foreign languages to consider including could be one or several of the languages mentioned by the children, such as German, for example.

6.4 The Question of Rights and Duties

As repeatedly mentioned throughout this study, the language education policy being proposed responds

¹⁵³ See section 2.4.1, in Chapter 2, for the reasons for teaching of French in Mozambican schools.

¹⁵⁴ In addition to Portuguese, English and French.

to concerns of linguistic human rights. However, it is not always the case that people are aware of their rights, of what such rights consist of and of those to approach in order to make sure that their individual rights are respected. Because mother tongue education is seen as a matter of linguistic human rights, there is a need to provide it. Nevertheless, if people are not made aware of the benefits of being educated in their L1's they are not going to demand such a right, especially if the attitudes to their L1's are not positive, if they do not link knowledge of their L1's with perceived advantages in the cultural, academic, economic, professional and other sectors in society. I maintain that awareness comes with information; thus, the importance of conducting awareness-raising campaigns, not just at the level of the target groups, but also throughout the whole society. During the interview with the parent representatives, I was overwhelmed and surprised by the parents' level of awareness of the advantages of L1 education. It felt as if they had been indoctrinated; I felt as if they were saying what they thought I wanted to hear. Later on, during the interview with the National Coordinator for Bilingual Education at INDE, I found out that there had been a massive awareness-raising campaign at the level of the rural communities, carried out by the Ministry of Education and INDE. The parents' level of information in relation to issues regarding L1 education proves the effectiveness of awareness-raising activities, in this particular case to inform about the benefits involved, but also about the sectors and people responsible for protecting such rights. On matters related to the provision of mother tongue education, the primary responsibility is with the Mozambican Ministry of Education and Culture, including its various levels, namely, the national, provincial and district directorates of education and culture, as well as the schools.

6.5 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Stakeholders

Like in many other areas of life, I regard the collaboration and cooperation between as many actors as possible as crucial for success of mother tongue-based bilingual education. I maintain that with various inputs or insights, similar and different ways of looking at things, it is possible to make a difference. It is in this context, that I envisage specific roles and responsibilities for a number of stakeholders in Mozambique, and these are presented below.

6.5.1 The Role of the State

The role of the State goes beyond that of working as a legislator. In addition to its political will and

commitment, the State has a key role in making a budgetary provision for mother tongue education. Such a budgetary provision should be seen as one of the priorities of the education sector, that is, the Ministry of Education and Culture. In the same way that it is important to budget for the construction of schools, the production of textbooks, as well as teacher development (through in-service training or other short and long term refresher and capacity-building courses), there is also a need to budget for Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Education. It is the responsibility of the Mozambican State to ensure the teaching of (1) Portuguese (as the country's official language); (2) all or, at least, the main mother tongues spoken in the three main geographical areas; and (3) the two foreign languages currently taught in the Mozambican school system. The teaching of the languages mentioned under 1 to 3 should be done on a compulsory basis. However, the law should be flexible enough to allow the choice of the mother tongue on which to develop literacy, on the part of students, their parents or caretakers.

6.5.2 The Role of Teachers

According to Stavans and Narkiss (2003: 163) "Teachers can contribute to policy making and implementation and deserve to be consulted. After all they are the 'brokers' between the 'ideal' and 'real' of language education practices". The important role played by teachers in regards to policy implementation is recognised by many. For instance, Skilton-Sylvester (2003: 10) underlines the teachers' fortunate position in being able to "create different classroom policies of their own, depending on their underlying ideologies". She argues that "change is most likely to come from the bottom-up than from the top-down"; and as put by Ricento & Hornberger (1996), analysing the ways teachers re-invent "classroom policies of their own while accepting and challenging the policies that are handed down to them is a useful and important endeavour in working toward more equitable educational policies and practices for linguistically diverse students". Thus, it can be argued that if there is will and motivation on the part of the teachers, if their attitudes towards the languages that students bring are positive, they can build on such linguistic resources and use them in order to make the teaching and learning process more successful. They can use the children's linguistic resources in order to promote more interaction and make the students participate actively in the teaching and learning process. In a situation affected by a severe lack of materials, I argue that the teachers should try and be creative and play an active role in the production of materials for mother tongue-based bilingual education.

6.5.3 The Role of the Community

Although policies are usually developed at the macro level, there is certainly room for community participation at different stages of the Language Education Planning and Policy process. Community involvement can be fundamental, for example, at the level of awareness-raising of the new generations towards the need to preserve their languages. Its involvement can also be materialised through the actual provision of mother tongue education, at community level, in cases where the State is not able to provide. Examples of community literacy programs exist in many parts of the world. For instance, Arthur (2003: 94-97) reports on the Chinese community classes in Newcastle and the 'Baro Afkaaga Hooyo' or Somali Literacy Course in Liverpool. In both cases, members of both the Chinese and Somali communities took the initiative to provide literacy development in either Chinese or Somali to their children. Similar initiatives can be replicated in different places and using locally available resources and means. Martin-Jones and Saxena, on the other hand, report on the use or recruitment of bilingual adults from local linguistic minority groups as 'bilingual aides' or 'bilingual classroom assistants' in schools in England. They claim that 'bilingual support' "is a special provision that has been developed for bilingual learners from minority ethnic groups, primarily in multilingual urban areas of England, Wales and Scotland. The organisation of this provision varies from school to school, but generally speaking, it involves occasional use of learners' home or community language, along with English, in the mainstream classroom context and in a range of teaching/learning events across the curriculum. The language backgrounds of bilingual classroom assistants are diverse and generally reflect the sociolinguistic make-up of the local population and the linguistic minority groups represented there. Speakers of different languages of Asian and African origin, such as Punjabi, Gujarati, Urdu, and Somali, are involved in developing this form of educational provision."(2003: 107-108). This is an experience that could possibly be transferred to the Mozambican situation.

6.5.4 Other Stakeholders

Other stakeholders that would have a key role to play in relation to issues regarding mother tongue-based education are the Municipalities, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), as well as the Civil Society at large. They could participate either in the awareness-raising process regarding the advantages of education in the Mozambican National Languages, not just in academic terms, but

because these languages are important symbols of the Mozambican cultural identity. They could participate by producing communication and information material to the wider society. I envisage their participation also in terms of contributing with financial, material and human resources for mother tongue-based bilingual education; they could contribute with funds for sponsoring teacher training and didactic materials production; in this way, L1 education would not just rely on funds from the State Budget. Their contribution could also be in terms of providing physical facilities for L1 classes or human resources (teachers) who would be involved in delivering L1 education; their participation could also be in the form of inputs and expertise on the subject. Considering that there are NGOs already involved on issues of developing literacy in the Mozambican National Languages, such as PROGRESSO, it would be possible to consider teacher training even outside the government structures (perhaps organised by NGOs or other Civil Society Organisations). There is a key role that should be played by universities, research and teacher training institutions such as the *Universidade Pedagógica* (UP), Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM) as well as INDE. Such a role involves both the conduct of relevant research on the Mozambican National Languages (as is already taking place in the context of NELIMO - UEM), and improvement of the quality of teacher training. Another relevant role should be played by the Media in using the Mozambican National Languages in radio broadcasting (as is already ongoing), publishing journals and newspapers in these languages, and also allowing their use in public debates and other contexts. The Private Sector would also be a relevant player in this process in terms of the funding possibilities that could possibly emerge for mother tongue-based bilingual education. The involvement of the private sector should be seen within the scope of the already ongoing public-private partnerships in Mozambique in a variety of areas, including HIV and AIDS, water and sanitation, education and health, and tourism.¹⁵⁵

6.5.5 Policy Formulation, Implementation, Dissemination, Follow-up and Assessment

It has already been mentioned that the primary responsibility for official policy formulation is with the

¹⁵⁵ For instance, UNICEF, acknowledging the real difference that the private sector can make in children's lives, posits that "we all have a responsibility in building a brighter future for Mozambique's children. By supporting a child-friendly initiative, corporate partners can bring resources and valuable expertise to add more momentum to those Government, Civil Society, NGO and UN programmes which are already ongoing" (p. 25). Retrievable from http://www.unicef.org/mozambique/Partnership_Menu_ENG_110509.pdf

Government of Mozambique and particularly with the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Ministry of Education and Culture should also be responsible for the dissemination of the policy referring to the provision for mother tongue education in all Mozambican schools. However, actual implementation is effected at the school level; and the primary responsibility is with the teachers. The actors that should be involved in the follow-up and assessment processes are the Ministry of Education and Culture, INDE as well as the provincial and district directorates of education and culture.

6.6 Summary

The focus of the present chapter was on presenting the justification or the rationale for the language education policy which is here proposed. The chapter discusses the importance of a multilingual policy, it presents the underlying principles for the language education policy proposed, and introduces three possible language education scenarios or options for the provision of mother tongue-based bilingual education in the urban school context. The chapter presents the actual language education policy proposed, reviews the issue of rights and duties, as well as the roles and responsibilities of a number of stakeholders in Mozambican society in relation to issues regarding the provision of L1 or mother tongue-based bilingual education and ends by considering duties regarding policy formulation, implementation, dissemination, follow-up and assessment.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD

The three major assumptions voiced earlier under section 1.5 in Chapter One appear to be either partially or fully validated by the findings of the present study. While a number of findings seem to support the assumptions, others point to new directions. In relation to assumption one - The English language is *positively viewed* by the Mozambicans because it is seen as the language of opportunities (mainly social, academic, professional and economic) - the children's answers to Question 23 in the pupils' questionnaire (rural schools) seem to corroborate it, in the sense that out of a total of 158 children, 122 responded that they like to learn English because, among other reasons, English is an important language because it is one of the languages of the school and a language they can use to speak with people they meet in the street or in any other context. The positive attitude towards English is also illustrated by the fact that out of a total of 60 pupils (urban school), 59 responded that they like to learn English (Question 13) because it is an important language, for example, when travelling and studying abroad. Nevertheless, when we look at the urban children's answers to other questions such as, for example, Question 10, we can observe that although their attitude towards English is positive, the same is true in relation to many other languages such as French and Spanish. Other findings which seem to suggest the existence of positive attitudes towards the English language in Mozambican society are, for example, the parents' response to Question 18, that is, English is an important language because it facilitates the country's development and because there are many foreigners in Mozambique who do not speak Portuguese. In addition, the Educational Professionals' answer to Question 17, that is, their view of English as an important international and regional language also supports this

assumption.

Quite a number of findings appear to reinforce assumption two - The Mozambican National Languages are *positively viewed* by the Mozambicans because they represent the languages of ethnic and cultural identity as well as the languages of group solidarity. One of the findings supporting this assumption is the fact that out of a total of 158 children, 153 children reported using Xirhonga on a daily basis to communicate with a variety of people and in a variety of circumstances. In addition, the pupils' answers to Question 25 (rural questionnaire), where 80 children out of a total of 158 claimed that they like or would like to study in their L1, for instance, because it is the language they speak home, the language of their grandparents and families also supports this assumption. Question 16 in the urban questionnaire, where 39 children (out of 60) indicated that they would like to learn to read and write in the Mozambican National Languages because their parents and grandparents speak them or because it is important to write and read in the Mozambican languages also corroborate this assumption. Many of the teachers' responses also suggest a positive view towards the Mozambican National Languages; for instance, the teachers' argument, when responding to Question 32, that the simple fact that the pupils were Mozambican was enough to justify the importance of learning and studying in the Mozambican National Languages.

Assumption three - The Portuguese language is *positively viewed* by the Mozambicans because it is the country's official language and the Lingua Franca and as such the Language of national unity – is supported by the fact that in the rural schools, 131 children indicated that they prefer to speak Portuguese at school, 107 children responded that they prefer to learn Portuguese the most and 120 children said that they like to learn Portuguese because it is a language that is used to communicate with people from other regions in Mozambique, because it is the most important language in Mozambique and because it is the language of the school. The urban children's answers to Question 14, and their argument that Portuguese is the most spoken language in the country, the parents' statement that Portuguese is a 'permanent' language in Mozambique, as well as the educational professionals' claim that in spite of being an exogenous language Portuguese is seen as a true and genuine language of national unity, uniting Mozambicans of different language backgrounds all reinforce the positive attitudes towards Portuguese in Mozambican society.

These findings seem to indicate both an awareness of the value of multilingualism and a tolerance of language diversity, and they surely justify the need for the formulation and implementation of a language education policy that combines the globalisation paradigm with that of the linguistic human rights paradigm. I maintain that such paradigms do not necessarily have to exclude each other; on the contrary, they can be complementary. In order to play an active role in the local, national, the transnational and the global arenas, there is a need for individuals who are fully-equipped with a diversity of linguistic tools or in other words with multilingual language competencies; the local and national languages, which allow them to function within the national borders, but also international languages, so that they are not left out of the globalisation process. I shall now conclude by presenting, in a summarised form, the main arguments of the present study.

7.1 Conclusions

I have argued, throughout this study, that when formulating language education policies, there is a need to consult those who are the ultimate targets of such policies, considering that their positioning or attitudes might be determinant in influencing the success or failure of policy implementation. In the particular case of this study, the targets are the pupils, teachers and school administrators in the two rural schools, the pupils in the urban school, as well as the parents in the rural communities. The responses they have given indicate the existence of an awareness of the benefits of bilingualism and multilingualism; the responses point to a grassroots' interest for developing linguistic skills both in those 'small', 'less taught' or 'less learned languages' and languages of wider communication. Overall, and as confirmed by the findings of the study reported in Chapter Five, the attitudes to the languages in the curriculum are overwhelmingly positive. Therefore, when comparing and weighing the arguments in favour of mother tongue-based bilingual education and those against it, definitely the former weigh more, as the benefits of L1 education have been widely underlined and recognised. Nevertheless, in order to have a major support for the use of the Mozambican National Languages in education there is a need for a massive awareness-raising activity at various levels of society. A wider grassroots' awareness of the benefits of L1 education, the existing political will, supporting legislation and enabling institutional structures in Mozambican society, as well as the mobilisation of the variety of actors cited in Chapter Six, are the key pre-requisites for a successful language education policy in

Mozambique. In order to ensure the vitality of the Mozambican National Languages not just in the rural context, but also in the urban, in order to promote positive attitudes to these languages and provide the possibility for ordinary Mozambicans to be mobile in a number of spheres, the key solution is the formulation of a language education policy that is inclusive in its nature and with a broad perspective.

7.2 The Way Forward

The focus of the present section is on key areas that require further research and on the way forward. On the basis of the findings of the present study, I argue that there is a pressing need for further research in each one of the following areas:

- 1) Alternative Models for **Teacher Training** (both initial and in-service training).
- 2) Effective ways for designing **Didactic Materials** for mother tongue-based bilingual education.
- 3) Analyses of the **Economic Demands** involved in providing Bilingual and/or Multilingual Education; in this regard it would be important to consider studies on the **Economics of Language**, particularly the issue concerning the promotion of languages for economic development.
- 4) Assessment of the **Quality** and the **Major Linguistic and Academic Outcomes** of the current mother tongue-based bilingual education programme in Mozambique.
- 5) Assessment of whether the current model of bilingual education, that is, **the Transitional Model is the most appropriate and feasible** one for the Mozambican school context.
- 6) Investigate the **Degree of Mozambican National Language shift** as well as the level of linguistic homogeneity or heterogeneity in schools in the outskirts of Mozambique's main cities.
- 7) Explore the **Patterns of Language Use and Language Choice** in different communities in Mozambique. Consider such issues as the factors that dictate code-mixing and code-switching; whether the language of communication between people with different mother tongues is always Portuguese both in rural and urban contexts.
- 8) Investigate whether there is a need or a possibility to **'Deconstruct and Reinvent' National Languages?** Would it be possible to imagine the construction of a 'national language' like

Filipino was constructed based on Tagalog?¹⁵⁶

In relation to point one above, it is worth researching on the issue of alternative models for **Teacher Training**, especially considering that teacher training (particularly for the provision of mother tongue-based education) at the moment is a sole responsibility of the Ministry of Education, and is provided by INDE in two-week seminars. One possible way of looking at teacher development could be the inclusion of a training component in all courses currently offered at the level of the primary teacher training institutions such as the IMAPs, CFPPs, IAPs and IFPs for the provision of mother tongue-based bilingual education. This would ensure that all people that have been trained as primary school teachers would have been introduced and exposed to current teaching methodologies for mother tongue-based bilingual education. Another possibility could be the introduction of teacher training courses on mother tongue-based bilingual education both at the level of *Universidade Pedagógica* and Eduardo Mondlane University. Yet a third possibility could be encouraging non-governmental and civil society organisations operating in the area of L1 education, and who have expertise, to provide capacity-building courses for people involved in mother tongue-based bilingual education.

Admittedly, there is a need to carry out more research on the most effective ways for designing materials in the Mozambican National Languages. One of the issues that emerged from the field work was that the lack of textbooks and other reading materials in the Mozambican National Languages was quite alarming. As earlier mentioned in Chapter Five, one of the major excuses given by the publishing house (supposed to publish textbooks in the national languages) was that they were not used to printing materials in the local/national languages, but only in Portuguese. As a result, the Ministry of Education (or INDE) was considering the possibility of looking at the South African publishers, due to their wide and acknowledged experience in this area. I see a number of possibilities for designing Didactic Materials (both textbooks and other reading materials) for mother tongue-based bilingual education in Mozambique, and at least one of them agrees with the current practice of involving teachers in producing materials. Considering that all languages used as medium of instruction already have a script, I maintain that the point of departure is teacher empowerment, which in my view implies

¹⁵⁶ For further details on Tagalog/Filipino, see Rubino (1998) or for a recent update on Tagalog, see the Wikipedia February 2010 version.

making teachers aware of their own potential, first because they master the language of instruction (orally and in written form), second because they have the pedagogical skills and are therefore aware of the most appropriate teaching approaches and methodologies, and thirdly because they have the ability to examine, judge, and censor. Because teachers are closer to the children's everyday lives, they should be involved in designing materials. With these skills, I envisage a situation where it would be viable to consider one or all of the following options:

- 1) Write one standard textbook in one of the national languages, which would be translated into the other languages already in use as medium of instruction or subject;
- 2) Write down a number of known traditional or folk stories in the national languages they are usually told in;
- 3) Write a number of easy readers, with themes common to the children's daily lives, the family, the market, the school, animals, foods, etc.

I have just mentioned a few of the possible ways of tackling both the issue of teacher training and materials development; however, many such successful experiences are reported in the literature, which in itself could be the subject of a whole research study.¹⁵⁷

In regards to point three, one possible way of analysing the costs involved in the provision of mother tongue-based bilingual education would be to try and learn from the South African experience and from other countries that have been through the process. In addition, studies on the Economics of Language would also be very informative, particularly in relation to issues such as the promotion of languages for participation and economic development, the costs and benefits of different language planning options and the costs of different bilingual education models. Point four, regarding the need to assess the quality and the major linguistic and academic outcomes of the current mother tongue-based bilingual education programme in Mozambique, indicates the need to ask questions of the type: (a) did the children/students that have been involved in the bilingual education programme from the onset succeed in linguistic and scholastic terms? (b) Did they become effective bilinguals in Portuguese and one of the Mozambican National Languages?

¹⁵⁷ See, for instance, David Klaus (2003) for Papua New Guinea's experience in the introduction of indigenous languages in early schooling.

As for point five, the need to assess whether the current model of bilingual education, that is, the transitional model is the most appropriate and feasible one for the Mozambican school context. As mentioned in Chapter Three, Mozambique's current bilingual education model fits into the category of the so-called subtractive and weak type of bilingual education, characterised by an early-exit to the L2, where the major focus is proficiency in it, at the expense of the L1. In the same perspective, there is a need to analyse the possibility of considering other models and ask questions regarding whether the transition period/year should remain where and as it is, at the moment, or whether it should be moved, for example, from Grade 4 to the end of primary schooling. There is a need to consider whether a late-exit or any form of additive mother tongue-based bilingual education would be an option in Mozambique. In this context, it will be necessary to consider the implications (financial, material and human) of any possible changes, as well as whether the children would be competent enough in Portuguese with 6 or 7 years of Portuguese as a subject, among other issues.

In relation to point six, it is important to investigate the degree of Mozambican National Language shift, that is, the extent to which urban Mozambicans have shifted into Portuguese, at the expense of the Mozambican National Languages. In addition, it would be equally interesting to investigate the level of linguistic homogeneity or heterogeneity in schools in the outskirts of Mozambique's main cities. Point seven refers to the need to explore the patterns of language use and language choice in different communities in Mozambique (rural and urban). In this connection, it would be relevant to investigate the factors that dictate code-mixing and code-switching and whether Portuguese always emerges as the common vehicle of communication between people with different mother tongues in Mozambique or whether any other languages are likely to emerge. Finally, point eight underlines the need to investigate whether there is a need or a possibility to 'deconstruct and reinvent' national languages in the Mozambican context. By deconstruction I mean the need to question and review the country's current linguistic diversity and the language numbers; by reinvention, I refer to the possibility of constructing a 'national language', out of existing ones or using any other options in order to contribute to the building of a 'genuine' Mozambican identity.

7.3 Contribution of the study

Considering the highly linguistic diverse background of the urban schools in Mozambique, and the

complex and challenging task of introducing Mother Tongue Education in such a context, I claim that the major contribution of this PhD project is the fact that it sets up a platform for bridging the gap between what is already happening in the rural areas (in terms of the use of different mother tongues in schooling), and the urban context (mainly characterised by the monolingual use of Portuguese as the only medium of instruction for hundreds and thousands of children with a multilingual mother tongue background). In other words, the major contribution of this study is that it brings further insights on how to approach multilingual education in highly linguistically diverse contexts such as the urban schools of Maputo City.

It certainly constitutes an added value to Mozambique as a country and to the Education Authorities to have an insight on possible and alternative ways of making mother tongue-based bilingual education also available in the urban contexts, this with the purpose of not only preventing language loss and shift on the part of urban generations of Mozambicans, but also with the purpose of fostering positive attitudes to the Mozambican National Languages. The fact that the present PhD study considers a number of alternatives on how to use the National Mozambican Languages, (1) as medium of instruction, (2) as a subject and (3) as a resource in the urban schools is an innovation in itself.

Another major contribution of this PhD project to the field of Language Education Planning and Policy is the fact that it defends the need to use the results of attitude surveys to inform policy making. In addition, this is a project that adds a Human Rights perspective to language education issues in Mozambique; in other words, it defends the need to view language as a fundamental human right, and thus the need to include in the whole range of basic individual human rights and, in particular, children's rights, also the right to receive education in one's mother tongue (or L1).

7.4 Implications of the Study

I want to conclude by stressing that I expect that the outcomes of this study can be of use to policy makers and educators in Mozambique, who are particularly concerned with promoting the use and raising public awareness for the need and importance of the provision of mother tongue-based bilingual education. In addition to reducing the dropout and repetition rates, the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages also in the urban schools constitutes a pressing need, especially when we consider

the danger of language loss on the part of new urban generations of Mozambicans. This study shows that in multilingual societies, the choice of the language of instruction needs to consider the attitudes and views of its users, and only in this way we will be able to formulate a language education policy that is widely accepted by the society.

REFERENCES

- African Union (AU) (2000). *The Constitutive Act of the African Union*. Lomé, Togo; retrievable from www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key_oau/au_act.htm
- African Union (2009), in <http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/index/index.htm>
- Alexander, N. (1989) 'Language Planning from Below'. In R. Herbert (Ed.), *Language and Society in Africa: The Theory and Practice of Sociolinguistics*, 56-68. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Alexander, Neville (1995). 'Language Policy and Planning in the New South Africa'. Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa. Cape Town: University of Cape Town
- Alexander, Neville (1999). 'English Unassailable but Unattainable: The Dilemma of Language Policy in South African Education'. Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the International Federation for the Teaching of English. University of Warwick, England, July 7-10, 1999
- Alexander, Neville (2001). 'Majority and Minority Languages in South Africa'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 355-369)
- Alexander, Neville (2006). 'Communicating in Local Languages: a Prerequisite for Community Access', Paris: Fourth Session of the Intergovernmental Council for UNESCO's Information for All Programme (IFAP)
- Alidou, Hassana (2003). 'Language Policies and Language Education in Francophone Africa: A Critique and a Call to Action'. In Sifre Makoni et al. (2003). *Black Linguistics. Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge (pp. 103-116)

- Annamalai, E. (1995). 'Multilingualism for All – An Indian Perspective'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 215-220)
- Annamalai, E. (2004). 'Public Perception of Language Diversity'. Paper presented at the Linguapax Congress on Language Diversity, Sustainability and Peace, 20-23 May, 2004, Barcelona
- Arthur, Jo (2003). "'Baro Afkaaga Hooyo!'" A Case Study of Somali Literacy Teaching in Liverpool', in Angela Creese and Peter Martin (Eds.) (2003). *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies. Interrelationships, Interactions and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp.93-106)
- Artigal, Josep Maria (1995). 'Multilingualism for all – A Catalan Perspective'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 169-182)
- Asfaha, Yonas, Jeanne Kurvers, and Sjaak Kroon (2008). 'Literacy and Script Attitudes in Multilingual Eritrea'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12/2, 2008: 223-240
- Avoird, Tim van der, Peter Broeder and Guus Extra (2001). 'Immigrant Minority Languages in the Netherlands'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 215-242)
- Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo (1995). 'The European School Experience in Multilingual Education'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 21-68)
- Baker, Colin (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. (3rd edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD
- Baker, Colin (2006). 'Psycho-Sociological Analysis'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp. 210-228)
- Bakmand, Bente (2000). 'National Language Planning, why (not)?' In Jens Allwood (Ed.) (2000) *Intercultural Communication*. April, Issue 3, 2000. URL: <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/>.

- Bamgbose, Ayo (1984). 'Minority Languages and Literacy'. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.) (1982). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers (pp. 21-27)
- Bamgbose, Ayo (2004). 'Language of Instruction Policy and Practice in Africa.' Dakar: UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Africa
- Barkhuizen, Gary P. (1995). 'A Comment on Neville Alexander's 'Language Policy and Planning in the New South Africa''. CODESRIA Publications: Dakar, Senegal
- Barkhuizen, Gary P. (2002). 'Language-in-Education Policy: Students' Perceptions of the Status and Role of Xhosa and English'. In *System* 30 (2002) 499-515
- Bhatia, Tej K. and William C. Ritchie (Eds.) (2006). *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Benson, Carol (1997). 'Relatório Final sobre o Ensino Bilingue: *Resultados da Avaliação Externa da Experiência de Escolarização Bilingue em Moçambique (PEBIMO)*'. Maputo: INDE
- Benson, Carol (1998). 'Alguns Resultados da Avaliação Externa da Experiência de Escolarização Bilingue em Moçambique'. In Christopher Stroud and António Tuzine (Eds.) (1998). *Uso de Línguas Africanas no Ensino: Problemas e Perspectivas*. Maputo: INDE (pp. 279-301)
- Benson, Carol (2000). 'The Primary Bilingual Education Experiment in Mozambique, 1993 to 1997'. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Vol. 3, No. 3, 149-166
- Benson, Carol (2004a). 'Trilingualism in Guinea-Bissau and the Question of Instructional Language'. In Charlotte Hoffmann and Jehannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 166-184)
- Benson, Carol (2004b). 'The Importance of Mother Tongue-based Schooling for Educational Quality'. Commissioned Study for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005. Paris: UNESCO. Web edition retrievable from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001466/1466322e.pdf>
- Benton, Richard A. (1986). 'Schools as Agents for Language Revival in Ireland and New Zealand'. In

- Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. (pp. 53-76)
- Beukes, Anne-Marie (2004). 'The First Ten Years of Democracy: Language Policy in South Africa'. Paper presented at the Linguapax Congress on Linguistic Diversity, Sustainability and Peace, 20-23 May, 2004, Barcelona
- Blommaert, Jan (Ed.) (1999). *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Boletim da República (1997). Resolução no. 12/97 de 10 de Junho. Política Cultural de Moçambique e Estratégia de sua Implementação. Imprensa Nacional, Maputo, 10 de Junho de 1997
- Boroditsky, Lera (2010). 'Lost in Translation'. The Wall Street Journal, 23 July 2010. Retrievable from http://online.wsj.com/article_email/SB10001424052748703467304575383131592767868-1MyQjAxMTAwMDIwOTEyNDkyWj.html
- Brann, C.M.B (1994). 'The National Language Question: Concepts and Terminology'. In Karsten Legère and H.V. Gretschel (Eds.) (1994). *Language Ecology in Africa*. Windhoek: University of Namibia. Logos, 14, 1994, (pp. 125-135)
- Braun, Andreas (2009). 'The Role of Education in the Language Practices of Trilingual Families'. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 10-12 September 2009
- British Council (2009). 'English language Courses'. Available at <http://www.britishcouncil.org/africa-mz-english-language-courses.htm>. Retrieved on 5 August 2009
- Cabau-Lampa, Beatrice (2007). 'Mother Tongue Plus Two European Languages in Sweden: Unrealistic Educational Goal?' In *Language Policy* (2007) 6:333-358
- Cameron, Barbara and Janet Kunkel (2002). 'A sociolinguistic survey of the Dhimba language.' SIL Electronic Survey Reports 2002-070. <http://www.sil.org/silesr/abstract.asp?ref=2002-070>
- Campbell-Makini, Z.M. (2000). 'The Language of Schooling: Deconstructing Myths about African Languages'. In Sinfree Makoni and Nkonko Kamwangamalu (Eds.) (2000). *Language and*

- Institutions in Africa*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (pp. 111-131)
- Canagarajah, Suresh (2006). 'Ethnographic Methods in Language Policy'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp. 153-169)
- Cassin, Barbara (Ed.) (2004). *Vocabulaire Européen des Philosophies – Dictionnaire des Intraduisibles*. Le Robert, Éditions du Seuil
- Caubet, Dominique (2001). 'Maghrebine Arabic in France'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 261-277)
- Cenoz, Jasone (2001). 'Basque in Spain and France'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 45-57)
- Choudhry, Amitav (2001). 'Linguistic Minorities in India'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 391-406)
- Cooper, Robert (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Coulmas, Florian (Ed.) (1984). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers
- Coulmas, Florian (1984). 'Linguistic Minorities and Literacy'. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.) (1984). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers (pp. 5-20)
- Coulmas, Florian (1992). *Language and Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Council of Europe (1992). *The Council of Europe Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. In www.coe.int
- Couto, M. (1986). 'Uma Maneira Moçambicana de Contar Histórias Moçambicanas'. In an interview to the *Gazeta de Artes e Letras*. *Tempo* 835
- Cummins, Jim (1981). 'The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational

Success for Language Minority Students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.) *Schooling and Language Minority Students. A Theoretical Framework*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education (pp. 16-62). Retrievable from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED249773.pdf>

Cummins, Jim (1984). *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Cummins, Jim (1995). 'The European Schools Model in Relation to French Immersion Programs in Canada'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 159-168)

Cummins, Jim (2006). 'Identity Texts: The Imaginative Construction of Self through Multiliteracies Pedagogy'. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 51-68)

DACST – Department of Arts, Culture, Science & Technology. (1996). *Towards a National Language Plan for South Africa - Final Report of the Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG)*. Pretoria: Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology

Daryai-Hansen, Petra (2008). 'Promoting Linguistic Diversity: Reflections on the Language Policy of European Language Policy Conferences'. In Bent Preisler et al. (Eds.) (2008). *The Consequences of Mobility. Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones*. Roskilde: Department of Culture and Identity. Roskilde University (pp. 272-275)

De Bot, K. (Ed.) (1993). *Case Studies in Minority Languages*. *AILA Review* 10: 52-70

De Klerk, Gerda (2002). 'Mother-tongue education in South Africa: The Weight of history'. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol. 2002, Issue 154 (29-46)

Dias, H. N. (2002) *As Desigualdades Sociolinguísticas e o Fracasso Escolar – Em Direção a uma Prática Linguístico-Escolar Libertadora*.

Djité, Paulin (1990). 'The Place of African Languages in the Revival of the Francophonie Movement.

International Journal of the Sociology of Language 86, 87-102

- Djité, Paulin (2009). 'The Problematic of Linguistic Diversity in the World and How to Preserve it'. Paper presented at the Forum International de Bamako Sur le Multilinguisme, January 2009
- Dolson, David and Kathryn Lindholm (1995). 'World Class Education for Children in California: A Comparison of the Two-way Bilingual Immersion and European School Model'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 69-102)
- Dyers, Charlyn (2009). 'The Problem of an English-only Policy at a Multilingual University in South Africa'. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges*, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009
- Edwards, John (2001). 'Multilingualism and Multiculturalism in Canada'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 315-332)
- Edwards, Vivian (2001). 'Community Languages in the United Kingdom.' In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 243-260)
- Ethnologue. Living Languages of Mozambique. Retrieved on 4 February 2009 from www.ethnologue.com/show_country.asp?name=mozambique
- Etzeberria-Sagastume, Feli (2006). 'Attitudes Towards Language Learning in Different Linguistic Models of the Basque Autonomous Community'. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Globalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 111-133)
- Etzeberria, Felix (2003). 'Trilinguals at Four? Early Trilingual Education in the Basque Country'. In Charlotte Hoffmann and Jehannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 185-201)
- European Commission (2007). *Final Report - High Level Group on Multilingualism*. Luxembourg:

European Communities

Extra, Guus (2008). 'Dealing with New Multilingualism in Europe: Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School'. Paper presented at the British Council Conference – Languages for Europe – held in Berlin, February 1-2, 2008

Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Extra, Guus, Kutlay Yagmur and Tim Van Der Avoird (2004). 'Methodological Considerations'. In Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 109-131)

Fairclough, Norman (2006). *Language and Globalisation*. London: Routledge

Figueira, Carla S. (2009). *Languages at War in Lusophone Africa – Portugal, United Kingdom and France's External Language Spread Policies towards Portuguese-speaking Africa at the Turn of the 21st Century. The cases of Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau*. PhD Dissertation. London: City University, Department of Cultural Policy and Management

Firmino, Gregório (1995). *Revisiting the "Language Question" in Post-Colonial Africa: The Case of Portuguese and Indigenous Languages in Mozambique*. PhD Dissertation; University of California, Berkeley

Firmino, Gregório (1998). 'Língua e Educação em Moçambique'. In Christopher Stroud and António Tuzine. (1998) (Eds.). *Uso das Línguas Africanas no Ensino: Problemas e Perspectivas*. Cadernos de Pesquisa no. 26. Moçambique: INDE (pp.279-301)

Firmino, Gregório (2005). *A "Questão Linguística" na África Pós-Colonial. O Caso do Português e das Línguas Autóctones em Moçambique*. Maputo: Texto Editores

Fishman, Joshua (1985). *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin & New York: Mouton

Fishman, Joshua (2006b). 'Language Policy and Language Shift'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An*

Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp.311-328)

Francisco, António, Albertina Mucavele, Paula Monjane e Sónia Seuane (2007). *Mozambican Civil Society within. Evaluation, Challenges, Opportunities* Maputo: FDC, Civil Society Index 2007

Gadellii, Karl Erland (2001). 'Languages in Mozambique' In *Africa & Asia*, No. 1, 2001, pp. 6-12. University of Göteborg, Department of Oriental and African Languages

Ganhão, F. (1979). 'O Papel da Língua Portuguesa em Moçambique'. 1 Seminário Nacional sobre o Ensino da Língua Portuguesa. Unpublished Paper. Mozambique: Ministry of Education and Culture

García, Ofélia (1992). 'Societal Bilingualism and Multilingualism'. Unpublished Document. City University of New York, New York

García, Ofelia, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006). *Imagining Multilingual Schools Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd

Gibbons, John (1995). 'Multilingualism for Australians'? In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 103-112)

Gibbons, John, William White and Pauline Gibbons (1995). 'Combating Educational Disadvantage among Lebanese Australian Children'. In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Phillipson, Robert (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 253 – 262)

Gonçalves, Perpétua (1989). 'Situação Linguística em Moçambique – Opções de Escrita'. In *Colóquio Letras*. No. 110/111. July 1989 (pp.88-93)

Gonçalves, Perpétua (1996). *Português de Moçambique: Uma Variedade em Formação*. Maputo: Livraria Universitária, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane

Governo de Moçambique (1995). *A Constituição da República de Moçambique*. Maputo: Imprensa

Nacional

Graddol, David (2006). *English Next*. United Kingdom: British Council

Granville, S., H. Janks, M. Mphahlele, Y. Reed, P. Watson, M. Joseph, and E. Ramani (1998) 'English With or Without G(u)ilty: A Position Paper on Language in Education Policy for South Africa', *Language and Education*, 12: 4, 254-272

Greenberg, Joseph (1963). *The Languages of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Grimes, Barbara (Ed.) (1992). *The Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. (12th edition), Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. Also available at <http://www.ethnologue.com>

Grin, François (1995). 'Combining Immigrant and Autochthonous Language Rights: A Territorial Approach to Multilingualism'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.31-48)

Grin, François (2001). 'English as economic value: facts and fallacies'. In *World Englishes*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 65-78, 2001

Grin, François (2004). 'On the Costs of Diversity'. In P. Van Parijs (Ed.) (2004). Proceedings of the Seventh Francqui Colloquium. Brussels: De Boeck. Retrievable at <http://www.uclouvain.be/cps/ucl/doc/etes/documents/13.Grin.pdf>

Grin, François (2006). 'Economic Considerations in Language Policy'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. (pp. 77-94)

Guthrie, Malcolm (1948). *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*. London: Oxford University Press for the International African Institute

Guthrie, Malcolm (1971). *Comparative Bantu*, Vol. 2. Farnborough: Gregg International

Haberland, Hartmut (1999). 'Small and Endangered Languages: a threat to the language or to the speaker?' In A. F. Christidis (Ed.) (1999) "*Strong*" and "*Weak*" Languages in the European

Union: Aspects of Linguistic Hegemonism, Vol. 1 Thessaloniki: Center for the Greek Language (pp. 3-10)

Haberland, Hartmut (2008). 'Domains and domain loss'. In Bent Preisler et al. (Eds.) (2008). *The Consequences of Mobility. Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones*. Roskilde: Department of Culture and Identity. Roskilde University (pp. 227-237)

Harder, Peter (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen

Harder, Peter (2009). 'Parallel Language Use: a Case for Active Social Construction'. In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp. 109-128)

Hartshorne, K. (1995). 'Language Policy in African Education: A Background to the Future'. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.) (1995) *Language and Social History: Studies in South African Sociolinguistics*. Cape Town: David Phillip

Haugen, Einar (1987). *Blessings of Babel. Bilingualism and Language Planning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Hélot, Christine and Andrea Young (2006). 'Imagining Multilingual Education in France: A Language and Cultural Awareness Project at Primary Level'; In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 69-90)

Heugh, Kathleen (1999). 'Languages, Development and Reconstructing education in South Africa'. In *International Journal of Educational Development* 19 (1999) 301-313

Heugh, Kathleen (2008). 'Language Policy and Education in Southern Africa'. MLE Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi, India, 5-8 February 2008

- Heugh, Kathleen (2009). 'The Case Against Bilingual and Multilingual Education in South Africa'. PRAESA. Retrieved on the 5th February 2009 at <http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/praes/OccPap6.PDF>
- Heugh, Kathleen et al. (2007). *Final Report Study on Medium of Instruction in Primary Schools in Ethiopia*. Commissioned by the Ministry of Education, September to December.
- Hoffmann, Charlotte and Jehannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Hornberger, Nancy (2002). 'Multilingual Language Policies and the Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Approach'. In *Language Policy*, 1: 27-51
- Huss, Leena (2001). 'The National Minority Languages in Sweden'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp.137-157)
- Instituto Camões (2009). Ministério dos Negócios Estrangeiros – Portugal. Retrieved on 29 July 2009 from <http://www.instituto-camoes.pt/encarte-ji/mocambique-o-estado-da-lingua-portuguesa.html>
- Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE). (1998). *Inquérito Nacional aos Agregados Familiares sobre Condições de Vida, Resultados Gerais*. Maputo: Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE)
- Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE). (2009). *Recenseamento Geral da População e Habitação 2007*. Retrieved on the 29 January 2009 from <http://www.ine.gov.mz/censo2007>
- Kamwangamalu, Nkonko (2006). 'Bi-/Multilingualism in Southern Africa'. In Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie (Eds.) (2006). *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing (pp. 725-741)
- Kamwangamalu, Nkonko (2008). 'Reflections on Language Policy Balance Sheet in Africa'. Paper presented at the 15th World Congress of Applied Linguistics (AILA). Essen, Germany, August 24-29, 2008
- Kamwendo, Gregory H. (2006) 'No Easy Walk to Linguistic Freedom: A Critique of Language Planning During South Africa's First Decade of Democracy'. In *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 15(1): 53-70 (2006)

- Kashoki, Mubanga E. (2003) 'Language Policy Formulation in Multilingual Southern Africa'. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol. 24, No. 3, 2003 (184-194)
- Khubchandani, Lachman (1977). 'Language Ideology and Language Development'. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Issue 13, Pages: 33-52
- Khubchandani, Lachman (2003). 'Defining Mother Tongue Education in Plurilingual Contexts'. In *Language Policy 2*: 239-254, 2003. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers
- Klaus, David (2003). 'The use of indigenous languages in early basic education in Papua New Guinea: A model for elsewhere?' In http://www.sil.org/asia/ldc/parallel_papers/david_klaus.pdf
- Laitin, David (2004). 'Language Policy and Civil War'. In P. Van Parijs (Ed.) (2004). Proceedings of the Seventh Francqui Colloquium. Brussels: De Boeck. Retrievable at <http://www.uclouvain.be/cps/ucl/doc/etes/documents/12.Laitin.pdf>
- Lanza, Elizabeth (2009). 'Language Ideology and Language Policy at the Crossroads: Globalisation and Regionalization in Ethiopia'. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges*, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009
- Legère, Karsten (2009). 'Tanzania – Language Policy in Education. Swahili Stagnating. English in Favour, Other Languages Ignored'. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges*, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009
- Legère, Karsten and H.V. Gretschel (Eds.) (1994). *Language Ecology in Africa*. Windhoek: University of Namibia. Logos, 14, 1994, pp. 125-135
- Leontiev, Alexei (1995a). 'Multilingualism for all – Russians'? In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 199-214)
- Leontiev, Alexei (1995b). 'Linguistic Human Rights and Educational Policy in Russia'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming*

Linguistic Discrimination. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.63-70)

Lewis, E.G. (1981). *Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Oxford: Pergamon

Lewis, M. Paul (ed.) (2009). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Sixteenth edition. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>

Li, David C.S. (2009). 'Internationalising Cantonese and Putonghua as Local/Regional Languages in Asia's World City: Problems, Prospects and Research Plan'. Paper presented at Roskilde University. Department of Culture and Identity, Friday Afternoon Lectures at the *Forskergrupperne SCALPS og FGP* 29 May 2009

Limbach, Jutta (2008). 'Plurilingualism and Multilingualism – Obstacles on the Route towards a European Public'? Paper presented at the British Council Conference – Languages for Europe – held in Berlin, February 1-2, 2008

Linehan, Shay (1995). 'Language of Instruction and the Quality of Basic Education in Zambia'. Paris: UNESCO

Lo Bianco, Joseph (1987). *National Policy on Languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service

Lopes, Armando Jorge (1997) *Language Policy: Principles and Problems*. Maputo: Imprensa Universitária

Lopes, Armando Jorge (1998) 'The Language Situation in Mozambique', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 19, No. 5 & 6, 440-486

MacCarty, Teresa, Eunice Romero and Ofelia Zepeda (2006) 'Reimagining Multilingual America: Lessons from Native American Youth'. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Globalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 91-110)

Mackay, Sandra Lee and Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong (Eds.) (1988). *Language Diversity. Problem or Resource?* New York: Newbury House Publishers.

- Maho, Jouni F. (2009). *NUGL Online. The Online Version of the New Updated Guthrie List, a Referential Classification of the Bantu Languages*. Available at <http://goto.glocalnet.net/mahopapers/nuglonline.pdf>
- Makoni, Sinfree (2003). 'From Misinvention to Disinvention of language: Multilingualism and the South African Constitution'. In Sinfree Makoni et al. (2003). *Black Linguistics. Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge (pp. 132-151)
- Makoni, Sinfree and Nkonko Kamwangamalu (Eds.) (2000). *Language and Institutions in Africa*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society
- Makoni, Sinfree et al. (2003). *Black Linguistics. Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge
- Makoni, Sinfree and Alastair Pennycook (Eds.) (2006). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Makoni, Sinfree and Pedzisai Mashiri (2006). 'Critical Historiography: Does Language Planning in Africa Need a Construct of Language as Part of its Theoretical Apparatus?' In Sinfree Makoni and Alastair Pennycook (Eds.) (2006). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp. 62-89
- Mário, Mouzinho and Debora Nandja (2005) 'Literacy in Mozambique: Education for All Challenges'. UNESCO Background Paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2006.
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn and Mukul Saxena (2003). 'Bilingual Resources and 'Funds of Knowledge' for Teaching and Learning in Multi-ethnic Classrooms in Britain'. In Angela Creese and Peter Martin (Eds.) (2003). *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies. Inter-relationships, Interactions and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp.107-122)
- Matiki, Alfred J. (2006). 'Literacy, Ethnolinguistic Diversity and Transitional Bilingual Education in Malawi.' Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- May, Stephen (2006). 'Language Policy and Minority Rights'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp.

255-272)

- Mazrui, Ali and Alamin Mazrui (1998). *The Power of Babel - Language and Governance in the African Experience*. Oxford: James Carrey Ltd
- Mikes, Melanie (1986). 'Towards a Typology of Languages of Instruction in Multilingual Societies'. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ministério da Educação MINED. (2003). *Plano Curricular do Ensino Básico. Objectivos, Política, Estrutura, Plano de Estudos e Estratégias de Implementação*. Maputo: DINAME
- Ministério da Educação e Cultura (MEC). (2006). *Plano Estratégico de Educação e Cultura 2006-2010/11*. Maputo: MEC
- Mishra, Mahendra (2004). 'Contextualizing Classrooms in Tribal Area Schools in Orissa. An Experiential Learning'. In *Language in India*. Volume 4: 4 April 2004.
- Mishra, Mahendra (2009). 'Tribal Education in Orissa' In S. NBDhal and M.K. Mishra, *Multilingual Education and Other Initiatives in Orissa*. Retrieved on 20 September 2009 from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/15048144/Tribal-Education-in-Orissa>
- Mohanty, Ajit (2006). 'Multilingualism of the Unequals and Predicaments of Education in India: Mother Tongue or Other Tongue?' In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp.262-283)
- Mordaunt, Owen G. (1990). 'Swaziland's Language Policy for Schools'. In *Educational Studies*, Volume 16, Issue 2 1990, pages 131-140
- Nyati-Ramahobo, Lydia (2006). 'The Long Road to Multilingual Schools in Botswana'. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 200-219)
- Ogulnick, Karen (2006). 'Popular Education and Language Rights in Indigenous Mayan Communities:

- Emergence of New Social Actors and Gendered Voices. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 150-168)
- Olshtain, Elite and Frieda Nissim-Amitai (2003). 'Being Trilingual or Multilingual: Is There a Price to Pay?' In Charlotte Hoffmann and Jehannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 30-50)
- Organisation of African Unity (OAU) (1986). *The Language Plan of Action for Africa*. Addis Ababa: OAU
- Ozolins, Uldis and Michael Clyne (2001). 'Immigration and Language Policy in Australia'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 371-390)
- Pan-African Parliament (2004). *The Pan-African Parliament*. Retrievable from <http://www.pan-african-parliament.org>
- PANSALB (2008). Pan South African Language Board – *Mission Statement*. Retrievable from <http://www.pansalb.org.za/home.html>
- Patel, Samima (2005). *Olhares sobre a Educação Bilingue e seus Professores em uma Região de Moçambique*. MA Dissertation. Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Instituto de Estudos de Linguagem. Campinas, SP, Brazil. Retrieved in October 2007 from <http://libdigi.unicamp.br/document/?code=vtls000391329>
- Pennycook, Alastair (2008). 'Praise for Language as Commodity: Global Structures, Local Marketplaces'. In Peter Tan and Rani Rubdy (eds.) (2008), *Language as Commodity* (p.xii). London: Continuum
- Pattanayak, D.P. (1986). 'Educational Use of Mother Tongue'. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. (pp.5-15)
- Paulston, Cristina Bratt (1986). 'Linguistic Consequences of Ethnicity and Nationalism in Multilingual

- Settings'. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. (pp. 117-152)
- Phaswana, Nkhelebeni (2003). 'Contradiction or Affirmation? The South African Language Policy and the South African National Government'. In Sifree Makoni et al. (2003). *Black Linguistics. Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge (pp. 117-131)
- Phillipson, Robert (1999). 'International Languages and International Human Rights'. In Miklós Kontra et al. (Eds.) (1999). 'Language: A Right and a Resource – Approaching Linguistic Human Rights'. Budapest: Central European University Press. (pp. 25-46)
- Phillipson, Robert (2003). *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge
- Phillipson, Robert (2006). 'Language Policy and Linguistic Imperialism'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp. 346-361)
- Phillipson, Robert (2009a). 'The EU and Languages: Diversity in what unity?' Paper presented at the PhD Course in Language Policy. Copenhagen Business School: Dalgas Have, 19 November 2009
- Phillipson, Robert (2009b) 'English in Higher Education: Panacea or Pandemic?' In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp.29-57)
- Phillipson, Robert (2009c) 'Something is rotten in the state of Denmark in language policy' *Paper presented at the Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. 22 January 2009*
- Phillipson, Robert, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Hugh Africa (1986) 'Namibian Educational Language Planning: English for Liberation or Neo-colonialism?' In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Pluddemann, Peter (1999). 'Multilingualism and Education in South Africa: One Year On'. In *International Journal of Educational Research* 31 (1999) 327-340

- Pool, Jonathan (1972). 'National Development and Language Diversity'. In Joshua Fishman (Ed.) (1971). *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague (pp. 213-230)
- Preisler, Bent et al. (Eds.) (2008). *The Consequences of Mobility. Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones*. Roskilde: Department of Culture and Identity. Roskilde University
- Preisler, Bent (2009). 'Complementary Languages: The National Language and English as Working Languages in European Universities'. In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp. 10-28)
- Qorro, Martha (2007). 'Prospects of Mother Tongue and Bilingual Education in Africa: with special reference to Tanzania. Paper presented at the Conference on Mother Tongue and Bilingual Education, Myths, Realities and Consensus. Copenhagen, 28 – 29 November 2007
- República de Moçambique (2004). Constituição da República de Moçambique 2004. Maputo: Assembleia da República. Also available at <http://www.mozambique.mz/pdf/constituicao.pdf>
- Ribeiro, Fátima (2005). 'Ensino Bilingue: uma aposta viável? Cento e muitos livros diferentes só para as três primeiras classes do EP1. Já a caminho, um pesadíssimo sistema nacional de ensino de viabilidade e qualidade duvidosas à partida. Alguns aspectos que reclamam urgentemente mais atenção. 25 February 2005. Retrieved from http://Makua.blogs.com/moambique_para_todos/2005/02/ensino_bilingue.html, on 05 May 2009
- Ribeiro, Fátima (2007). 'Ensino Bilingue em Moçambique: Preocupações que Deviam ser de Todos'. 06 August 2007. Retrieved on 05 May 2009 from http://oficinadesociologia.blogspot.com/2007/08/ensino-bilingue-em-moambique-um_07.html
- Ricento, Thomas (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd
- Ricento, Thomas (Ed.) (2006). 'Language Policy: Theory and Practice – An Introduction'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp. 10-23)

- Risager, Karen (2009). 'Cosmopolitan Language Policies'. Paper presented at Roskilde University, Denmark, 2009
- Robertson, Boyd (2001). 'Gaelic in Scotland'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 83-101)
- Robinson, Clinton D.W. (1993). 'Tilting at the Future: How Can We Know Whether a Minority Language Development is a Viable Proposition? – Dimensions of Decision-Making'. Paper presented at Horsleys Green, UK, 2-9 June 1993 at the Second International Language Assessment Conference. Summer Institute of Linguistics
- Robinson, Clinton D.W. (1993). 'Where Minorities are in the Majority: Language Dynamics amidst High Linguistic Diversity'. In K. De Bot (Ed.). *Case Studies in Minority Languages*. AILA Review 10: 52-70
- Robinson, David A. (2006). *Curse on the Land: A History of the Mozambican Civil War*. PhD Dissertation. The University of Australia, School of Humanities
- Roy-Campbell, Zaline (2003). 'Promoting African languages as Conveyors of Knowledge in Educational Institutions'. In Sifre Makoni et al. (2003). *Black Linguistics. Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge (pp. 83-102)
- Rubino, Carl (1998). 'Tagalog: A Brief Look at a National Language'. Retrievable from <http://iloko.tripod.com/tagamida.html>
- Ruiz, Richard (1984). 'Orientations in Language Planning'. In Sandra Lee Mackay and Sau-Ling Cynthia Wong (Eds.) (1988). *Language Diversity. Problem or Resource?* New York: Newbury House Publishers (pp. 3-25)
- Saib, Jilali (2001). 'Berber and Arabic in Morocco'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 429-444)
- Sayers, Dave (2009). *Reversing Babel. Declining Linguistic Diversity and the Flawed Attempts to Protect it*. PhD Dissertation. University of Essex. Department of Sociology

- Schiffman, Harold (2006). 'Language Policy and Linguistic Culture'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp.111-125)
- Sendela, Rafael (2008). Interview conducted on May 5th, 2008, INDE, Maputo
- Shaw, Willard D. (1983) 'Asian Student Attitudes towards English'. In Larry E. Smith (ed.) (1983). *Readings in English as an International Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd. (pp. 21-34)
- Singh, Y. (1993). *Social Change in India: Crisis and Resilience*. New Delhi. Har.-Anand Publ. (pp 12-40)
- Sitoe, Bento & Armindo Ngunga (Eds.) (2000). *Relatório do II Seminário sobre a Padronização da Ortografia de Línguas Moçambicanas*. Maputo: Nelimo- Centro de Estudos das Línguas Moçambicanas. UEM
- Skilton-Sylvester, Ellen (2003). 'Legal Discourse and Decisions, Teacher Policymaking and the Multilingual Classroom: Constraining and Supporting Khmer/English Bilingualism in the United States. In Angela Creese and Peter Martin (Eds.) (2003). *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies. Inter-relationships, Interactions and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp.8-24)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1986a). 'Who Wants to Change What and Why – Conflicting Paradigms in Minority Education Research'. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. (pp. 153-181)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1986b). 'Multilingualism and Education of Minority Children'. In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Phillipson, Robert (1986). *Linguistic Rules in Education*. Part 1. Roskilde: Roskilde University Centre, Institute VI, Denmark
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1999). 'Linguistic Diversity, Human Rights and the "Free" Market. In Miklós Kontra et al. (Eds.) (1999). 'Language: A Right and a Resource – Approaching Linguistic Human Rights'. Budapest: Central European University Press. (pp. 187-222)

- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Ofelia García (1995). 'Multilingualism for All – General Principles'? In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 221-256)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Robert Phillipson (1995a). 'Linguistic Human Rights, Past and Present'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.71-110)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Robert Phillipson (1995b). 'Language Rights in Postcolonial Africa'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 335-345)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Robert Phillipson (2009). 'International Hearing on the Harm Done in Schools by the Suppression of the Mother Tongue'. Executive Summary of Findings and Recommendations. Port Louis, Mauritius, 20-24 October 2009. Retrievable from <http://www.lalitmauritius.org/>
- Smolicz, J.J. (1986). 'National Language Policy in the Philippines'. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. (pp.96-116)
- Smolicz, J.J. (1995). 'Australia's Language Policies and Minority Rights: A Core Value Perspective'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 235 – 252)
- South African Government Information (1995). 'Media Statement by Dr Bs Ngubane, Minister Of Arts, Culture, Science And Technology, Announcing The Establishment Of The Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG)', 12 December 1995. Retrievable at <http://www.info.gov.za/speeches/1995/34396b14.htm>
- Spolsky, Bernard (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Spolsky, Bernard (1986). 'Overcoming Language Barriers to Education in a Multilingual World'. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. (pp.182-191)
- Spolsky, Bernard. (2004). *Language Policy – Key Topics in Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Srivastava, R.N. (1984a). 'Linguistic Minorities and National Languages'. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.) (1984). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers (pp. 99-114)
- Srivastava, R.N. (1984b). 'Literacy Education for Minorities: A Case Study from India'. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.) (1984). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers (pp. 39-46)
- Srivastava, R.N. (1984c). 'Consequences of Initiating Literacy in the Second Language'. In Coulmas, Florian (Ed.) (1982). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers (pp. 29-37)
- Stavans, Anat and Doron Narkiss (2003). 'Creating and Implementing a Language Policy in the Israeli Educational System'. In Charlotte Hoffmann and Jehannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 139-165)
- Stroud, Christopher (1999) 'Portuguese as ideology and politics in Mozambique: Semiotic (re)constructions of a post colony. In Jan Blommaert (Ed.) (1999). *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Stroud, Christopher and António Tuzine (Eds.) (1998). *Uso das Línguas Africanas no Ensino: Problemas e Perspectivas. Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 26. Maputo: INDE
- Summer Institute for Linguistics (1999). *SIL Ethnologue Survey*.
- Szépe, G. (1984). 'Mother Tongue, Language Policy and Education'. *Prospects*, No.1
- Tan, Peter and Rani Rubdy (eds.) (2008), *Language as Commodity*. London: Continuum

The CIA World Factbook. Available at <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

Tomé, Manuel (1999). Interview with 'Expresso', 13 November 1999. Retrievable at <http://www.prof2000.pt/users/jmatafer/jornal/entrevista.htm>

Trudell, Barbara (2008a). 'The place of local languages in education: The ideal, the reality, and the space in between'. Paper presented in September 17, 2008 in Paris. UNESCO

Trudell, Barbara (2008b). 'Contesting the default: The multiple impact of local language choice for learning'. UNESCO/UNU Conference - *Language and Globalisation: Building on our Rich Heritage*. Tokyo, August 2008

Trudgill, Peter (2003). *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Tsonope, Joseph (1995). 'Prospects of the Indigenous Languages of Botswana: Implications of the Government White Paper No. 2 of 1994'. *Mosenodi: Journal of the Educational Research Association* 3(1&2), 5-13

United Nations (1948). Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

New York, 9 December 1948. Retrievable at <http://www.un.org/millennium/law/iv-1.htm>

United Nations (2008). The Millennium Development Goals Report 2008. New York: UN. Retrievable at <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/The%20Millennium%20Development%20Goals%20Report%202008.pdf>

UNDAF (2001). *United Nations Development Assistance Framework. 2002-2006, Mozambique*. Maputo

UNESCO (1953). *The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education*. Paris. UNESCO

UNESCO (1996). *Universal Declaration on Linguistic Rights*. Barcelona: UNESCO

UNESCO (2001). *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. Adopted by the 31st Session of the General Conference of UNESCO. Paris: UNESCO

UNESCO (2003). *Education in a Multilingual World*. Paris. UNESCO

UNICEF (N.A.). 'Mozambique - Partnership Menu Child-Friendly Initiatives'. Retrieved on 20 August 2010, from http://www.unicef.org/mozambique/Partnership_Menu_ENG_110509.pdf

Van Eys, Tinie (2007). 'Mozambique: Local Language Literacy – Some experiences from Progresso'. In *Sociolingo's Africa*. March 6, 2007

Van Parijs, P. (Ed.) (2004). *Proceedings of the Seventh Francqui Colloquium*. Brussels: De Boeck. Retrievable at <http://www.uclouvain.be/en-12569.html>

Wardhaugh, Ronald (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell

Wikipedia (2009). Ethnic Groups in Mozambique. Retrieved on 7 September 2007 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Ethnic_groups_in_Mozambique

Wikipedia (2010). Filipino Language. Retrieved on 19 August 2010 from http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Filipino_language&oldid=344592077#History

Williams, Colin (2001). 'Welsh in Great Britain'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 59-81)

Wodak, Ruth (2006). 'Linguistic Analyses in Language Policies'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp. 170-193)

APPENDICES

Appendix One – Map of Mozambique



Appendix Two – Map of Africa



Appendix Three – INE 2007 Update on Mozambicans of 5 years of age and over and their knowledge of Portuguese

QUADRO 24. POPULAÇÃO DE 5 ANOS E MAIS POR CONDIÇÃO DE CONHECIMENTO DA LÍNGUA PORTUGUESA E SEXO, SEGUNDO ÁREA DE RESIDÊNCIA E IDADE¹⁵⁸

ÁREA DE RESIDÊNCIA E IDADE	SABE FALAR PORTUGUÊS			NÃO SABE FALAR PORTUGUÊS			DESCONHECIDO		
	TOTAL	HOMENS	MULHERES	TOTAL	HOMENS	MULHERES	TOTAL	HOMENS	MULHERES
TOTAL	8,246,713	4,688,437	3,558,276	7,976,158	3,069,514	4,906,644	147,898	70,945	76,953
5 – 9	1,051,290	523,682	527,608	2,102,919	1,039,579	1,063,340	48,337	24,041	24,296
10 – 14	1,509,767	781,812	727,955	879,870	432,246	447,624	16,970	8,610	8,360
15 – 19	1,320,556	716,371	604,185	584,008	203,404	380,604	12,488	5,954	6,534
20 – 24	1,061,055	571,240	489,815	674,720	191,797	482,923	25,164	11,376	13,788
25 – 29	837,673	482,994	354,679	699,634	218,498	481,136	11,712	6,111	5,601
30 – 34	645,991	384,012	261,979	597,919	196,141	401,778	7,644	3,536	4,108
35 – 39	518,489	316,848	201,641	513,328	161,911	351,417	5,770	2,637	3,133
40 – 44	393,231	254,040	139,191	357,973	110,425	247,548	4,401	2,053	2,348
45 – 49	311,347	217,594	93,753	334,985	102,017	232,968	3,564	1,625	1,939
50 – 54	204,170	143,656	60,514	307,218	86,304	220,914	3,132	1,272	1,860
55 – 59	147,541	110,353	37,188	252,849	82,672	170,177	2,278	986	1,292
60 – 64	94,439	70,961	23,478	203,303	68,365	134,938	1,961	820	1,141
65 – 69	66,425	50,778	15,647	173,753	62,481	111,272	1,456	581	875
70 – 74	39,163	29,510	9,653	113,371	42,345	71,026	1,083	433	650
75 – 79	25,344	19,527	5,817	90,351	35,609	54,742	765	312	453
80 e +	20,232	15,059	5,173	89,957	35,720	54,237	1,173	598	575

¹⁵⁸ This table was produced by the National Statistics Institute (INE) on the basis of the Census 2007 and it includes data pertaining to population of 5 years and older and their knowledge of Portuguese according to their gender, area of residence and age.

URBANA	4,185,225	2,189,998	1,995,227	952,291	328,456	623,835	38,739	18,677	20,062
5 - 9	584,870	286,603	298,267	257,880	127,052	130,828	11,519	5,773	5,746
10 - 14	674,177	333,097	341,080	93,552	45,174	48,378	4,225	2,109	2,116
15 - 19	639,624	328,413	311,211	64,242	22,883	41,359	3,613	1,798	1,815
20 - 24	588,787	295,510	293,277	76,334	20,370	55,964	8,233	3,672	4,561
25 - 29	457,676	239,101	218,575	73,583	20,557	53,026	3,403	1,937	1,466
30 - 34	332,081	173,756	158,325	62,652	17,019	45,633	1,799	861	938
35 - 39	258,839	137,052	121,787	54,752	13,505	41,247	1,297	609	688
40 - 44	202,690	114,638	88,052	43,392	9,857	33,535	1,072	521	551
45 - 49	157,239	96,039	61,200	43,187	9,017	34,170	822	364	458
50 - 54	106,364	66,261	40,103	43,234	8,703	34,531	748	294	454
55 - 59	69,891	45,765	24,126	35,782	8,066	27,716	503	207	296
60 - 64	44,879	29,546	15,333	30,214	7,120	23,094	462	176	286
65 - 69	29,830	19,773	10,057	25,747	6,409	19,338	329	104	225
70 - 74	18,494	11,938	6,556	18,899	4,929	13,970	273	83	190
75 - 79	11,110	7,212	3,898	14,804	4,009	10,795	170	49	121
80 e +	8,674	5,294	3,380	14,037	3,786	10,251	271	120	151
RURAL	4,061,488	2,498,439	1,563,049	7,023,867	2,741,058	4,282,809	109,159	52,268	56,891
5 - 9	466,420	237,079	229,341	1,845,039	912,527	932,512	36,818	18,268	18,550
10 - 14	835,590	448,715	386,875	786,318	387,072	399,246	12,745	6,501	6,244
15 - 19	680,932	387,958	292,974	519,766	180,521	339,245	8,875	4,156	4,719
20 - 24	472,268	275,730	196,538	598,386	171,427	426,959	16,931	7,704	9,227
25 - 29	379,997	243,893	136,104	626,051	197,941	428,110	8,309	4,174	4,135
30 - 34	313,910	210,256	103,654	535,267	179,122	356,145	5,845	2,675	3,170
35 - 39	259,650	179,796	79,854	458,576	148,406	310,170	4,473	2,028	2,445
40 - 44	190,541	139,402	51,139	314,581	100,568	214,013	3,329	1,532	1,797
45 - 49	154,108	121,555	32,553	291,798	93,000	198,798	2,742	1,261	1,481
50 - 54	97,806	77,395	20,411	263,984	77,601	186,383	2,384	978	1,406

55 - 59	77,650	64,588	13,062	217,067	74,606	142,461	1,775	779	996
60 - 64	49,560	41,415	8,145	173,089	61,245	111,844	1,499	644	855
65 - 69	36,595	31,005	5,590	148,006	56,072	91,934	1,127	477	650
70 - 74	20,669	17,572	3,097	94,472	37,416	57,056	810	350	460
75 - 79	14,234	12,315	1,919	75,547	31,600	43,947	595	263	332
80 e +	11,558	9,765	1,793	75,920	31,934	43,986	902	478	424

Appendix Four – A Brief Linguistic Profile of Countries in the Southern African Region

Portuguese is the sole official language of Angola, even though it is acknowledged that over twenty (20) indigenous languages are spoken in the territory. Similarly to the case of Mozambique, it appears that there is no agreement on the number of languages spoken in Angola. In fact, The Ethnologue reports that forty-two (42) languages are spoken in the territory. Among the main African languages spoken in the country, the following should be highlighted: Umbundo, which is said to be the most spoken Angolan language, corresponding to 26% of speakers, followed by Kimbundu (or Quimbundo), Mbunda, Chockwe, Oshiwambo, Kikongo (also spoken in the Congo DRC), as well as Dhimba¹⁵⁹ (a language also spoken in Namibia).

The language situation in Botswana is characterised by the use of English and Setswana as the country's main official languages. In addition, it is claimed that twenty-six (26) other languages are spoken in the country, among them, Khoesan languages and also what Nyati-Ramahobo (2006) designates cross-border languages. Cross-border languages are those spoken beyond the geographical borders of a territory, and in this particular case, they include Afrikaans, and Ndebele, which are spoken in South Africa and Zimbabwe respectively. It is argued that 78% of the population in Botswana speak Setswana as a home language.

French is the only legitimate official language of the Democratic Republic of Congo, also known as Congo DRC or Congo Zaire. However, between two hundred and fifteen (215) and two hundred and forty two (242) other languages are listed as being spoken in the country¹⁶⁰. Of these, four are said to be national; namely: Kikongo or Kituba (also spoken in Angola), Lingala, Tshiluba and Swahili (spoken in Tanzania, Kenya and other countries in eastern Africa).

¹⁵⁹ See Cameron and Kunkel (2002), for example, for a detailed sociolinguistic survey of the Dhimba Language

¹⁶⁰ See the Ethnologue Report on the Languages of the DRC for further information

Lesotho, which is a landlocked country completely surrounded by South Africa, has Sotho as the major ethno-linguistic group, corresponding to 99.7% of the population. In addition, the other ethnic groups represented are of European and Asian descent, responding to 0.3% of the population. The country's official language is English. Sesotho (or Southern Sotho) is both the country's national language and co-official language. In addition, Zulu, Xhosa, San, Afrikaans, Khoe, Nguni and languages of Indian origin are also spoken in the country.

Sixteen (16) languages are estimated to be spoken in Malawi. Among them, the following: Chichewa (or Chewa), Nyanja, Lomwe, Yao, and Tumbuka (also spoken in Zambia). The country's two official languages are English and Chichewa. Chichewa is said to be spoken nationally by approximately 57.2% of the population¹⁶¹.

Kreol, the French-based Mauritian Creole, is spoken by 80.5% of the population in Mauritius. It is argued that almost every Mauritian citizen speaks Kreol.¹⁶² The other languages present are Bhojpuri, spoken by about 12% of the population, followed by French and English. With both a French and British colonial past, the two official languages of Mauritius are English and French.

Namibia defied the default norm of adopting an ex-coloniser's language as official. Instead of German or Afrikaans, the country's official language is English, spoken by approximately 7% of the population. In addition, Afrikaans is widely spoken as a common language, followed by German, as well as African languages such as Oshihamba, Herero (or Otjiherero), Oshindonga, and Khoekhoegowab. Although Namibia was a German colony, it was a South African protectorate from the First World War until 1990, when it gained independence. This explains why Afrikaans is widely spoken in the country.

The three official languages of Seychelles are English, spoken by approximately 4.9% of the population, French, and Seychellois Creole. Seychellois Creole, the national language, is a French-based Creole, spoken as a mother tongue by an estimated 94% of the population.

¹⁶¹ See CIA – The World Factbook for further reference

¹⁶² For further details see the Executive Summary of Findings and Recommendations of the 'International Hearing on the Harm Done in Schools by the Suppression of the Mother Tongue' in Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (2009)

The official languages of Swaziland are SiSwati (or Swati), which is spoken by about 97% of the population, and English. In addition, and due to its proximity to South Africa, a number of South African languages are also spoken in the Swazi territory; namely: Afrikaans, Tsonga, and Zulu.

Tanzania has Swahili and English as the two official languages. Furthermore, it is argued that a number of Arabic languages are spoken, as well as about one hundred and twenty nine (129) African languages. Panjabi, Urdu, and Chinese are also spoken in the country¹⁶³.

About seventy (70) African languages of Bantu origin are estimated to be spoken in Zambia¹⁶⁴; among them, Bemba, Nyanja or Chewa, and Tumbuka. Immigrant languages such as Hindi and Mandarin Chinese are also reported. English is the country's official language.

The linguistic situation in Zimbabwe is characterised by the existence of approximately twenty (20) languages. Among the languages listed for Zimbabwe are Nyanja, Ndebele, Ndau, and Manyika. English and Shona are the two official languages. Shona is spoken as a common language or lingua franca by a large majority of Zimbabweans¹⁶⁵.

¹⁶³ A great deal of studies have been conducted on the linguistic situation of Tanzania; for further details see, for example, Karsten Légere (2009), Qorro (2007) or Roy-Campbell (2003).

¹⁶⁴ See Kashoki for a further review of the multilingual situation in Zambia.

¹⁶⁵ See Jan Bernsten for further details on the Shona language in Zimbabwe.

Appendix Five - Description of the Language Education Policies in Countries in Southern Africa

While mother tongue education is non-existent in Angola (as Portuguese is the only medium of instruction), it constitutes a new development in Mozambique, as stated throughout the present study. In Mauritius, as documented by the *International Hearing on the Harm Done in Schools by the Suppression of the Mother Tongue*, efforts at introducing Kreol as medium of instruction are ongoing, and they result partly from the realisation that the use of English alone as the official language of instruction is not enough and therefore there is a need to develop a policy aimed at introducing Creole at primary levels of schooling¹⁶⁶.

In Botswana, Malawi, Lesotho, Tanzania, and Swaziland, for example, although mother tongue education has been present, particularly in the early years of schooling, it has been restricted to the national official languages (Setswana in Botswana, Chichewa in Malawi, Sesotho in Lesotho, Swahili (or Kiswahili) in Tanzania, and SiSwati in Swaziland).

In Botswana, from 1977 to 2000, Setswana was the medium of instruction, from Grades 1 to 4, while English was used as medium of instruction in the remaining grades. In 2000, there was a policy review that resulted in the reduction of the period of use of Setswana as medium of instruction, from four to two years. Consequently, English became the medium of instruction from Grade 3 onwards. Although the use of African languages is permitted in the school system in Botswana, it is restricted to only one mother tongue – Setswana – at the expense of other mother tongues (or L1) present in the country's linguistic mosaic¹⁶⁷.

The main medium of instruction in Malawi is English. However, mother tongue or L1 education is

¹⁶⁶ See Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (2009: 3).

¹⁶⁷ See Nyati-Ramahobo (2006) for the language education policy in Botswana.

provided from Grades 1 to 4, mainly in Chichewa (the national language). Recent developments indicate attempts on the part of the Malawian Government towards the introduction of mother tongue education in other languages spoken in the territory¹⁶⁸.

Sesotho is the main medium of instruction in the primary schools of Lesotho, from Grades 1 to 4. In addition, English is taught as a subject at primary school level, and as a main medium of instruction in the secondary and tertiary levels. Nevertheless, Sesotho continues to be available as a school subject at secondary level.

The languages of instruction in Tanzania are Kiswahili, in the primary schools, and English throughout the remaining levels of the school system (secondary and tertiary). It should be noted though, that the use of English as medium of instruction in the primary school level is not uncommon, particularly in private schools. The medium of instruction in Tanzania constitutes an issue, especially because it is argued that it affects seriously the quality of education. In Qorro's view (2007), "insisting on using English as the language of instruction in Tanzanian secondary schools and institutions of higher learning does more harm than good towards the provision of quality education..." She believes that because neither the teachers nor the students master the English language, there should be a review of the whole issue regarding the medium of instruction, in such a way that Kiswahili should be instituted as medium of instruction also at the post-primary school level.

SiSwati is the main medium of instruction at the early primary school level in Swaziland. The transition to English as main medium of instruction occurs after four years of primary schooling. SiSwati is then taught as a school subject¹⁶⁹.

In Namibia, while English was adopted in 1990, after independence, as the main medium of instruction in all public schools, from Grade 4 onwards, there is a governmental provision, dating back to 2003, for mother tongue education, from Grades 1 to 3. Such provision is made for the following mother tongues: Afrikaans, German, Khoekhoegowab, Oshindonga, Rukwangali, Setswana, Thimbukushu,

¹⁶⁸ See Matiki (2006) for the language education situation in Malawi.

¹⁶⁹ See Mordaunt, Owen G. (1990) for further information on the Language Education Policy in Swaziland.

English, Ju|'hoansi, Oshikwanyama, Otjiherero, Rumanyo, Silozi, and Portuguese¹⁷⁰.

In Seychelles, the languages of instruction are the three national and/or official languages of the country, namely: Creole (or Kreol), English and French. The provision for mother tongue education is made by the Seychellois Constitution, due to the recognition of the importance of the mother tongue at the critical stages of the learning process.

Considerations regarding the introduction of the African languages as medium of instruction in Zambia date back to 1977. At the time, there was an overwhelming recognition that the thirty-year exclusive English-medium instruction was detrimental to educational achievement. Despite the reservations made in 1977, regarding the impracticality of introducing mother tongue education in a multilingual society such as Zambia, in 1991, a decision was made to use a number of Zambian languages in primary schooling, due to the alarming numbers of reading disabilities. In the period 1995-1996, after a number of studies carried out, mother tongue education became a reality in Zambia. Cinyanja is one of the Zambian languages used as medium of instruction in basic education, from Grades 1 to 4¹⁷¹.

Finally, in the Democratic Republic of Congo, mother tongue education was common practice during the colonial period. However, prior to independence, French was adopted as the main medium of Instruction both for the primary and the secondary school level. Due to difficulties in finding teachers skilled enough to teach in French, the use of mother tongue medium instruction is still allowed in the primary schools of the Congo DRC.

¹⁷⁰ For further details, see the document entitled *The Language Policy for Schools in Namibia*, Ministry of Basic Education, Sport and Culture (2003).

¹⁷¹ See Linehan (1995) for a comprehensive review of Mother Tongue Education in Zambia.

Appendix Six– Sample Data Collection Tools

I. Pupils’ Questionnaire (Rural)

Introduction

My name is Sarita Monjane Henriksen, I am a lecturer at Universidade Pedagógica in Maputo, and I am currently doing my PhD studies at the University of Roskilde in Denmark.

The present Questionnaire is part of the field work component of my research and the major purpose is to find out about your perceptions and feelings in relation to the use of the Indigenous languages of Mozambique in the education system, as well as your attitudes towards languages such as Portuguese and English.

1. School’s Name _____
2. Grade _____
3. Student’s Name (optional) _____
4. Age _____
5. Gender (Male/Female) _____
6. Place of Birth _____
7. Mother Tongue (First Language) _____
8. What other languages can you speak? _____
9. What other languages can you understand? _____
10. What other languages can you write? _____
11. What other languages can you read? _____
12. With which groups do you use the languages listed below?

	Portuguese	English	French	Xironga	XiChangana	Other language (Specify)
Family (parents, & other adults)						
Family (siblings)						
Friends (at home)						
Friends & Colleagues (at school)						
Teachers						
School Directors						
Public servants (hospital, police)						
Community Members						

South African or Zimbabwean Citizens						
Other Foreigners (Specify)						

13. When/How often do you use each one of the languages below?

	Portuguese	English	French	Xironga	XiChangana	Other language (Specify)
Many Times Daily						
At least Once/Day						
At least Once/Week						
Very Rarely						
Never						

14. Did you choose the Bilingual Education Program or the Monolingual? _____
15. Which language(s) do you prefer to speak at school? _____
16. Which language(s) do you prefer to speak home? _____
17. Which language(s) do you prefer to learn the most? Why? _____
18. Which other language(s) would you like to learn? Why? _____
19. Which language(s) don't you like? _____
20. In your opinion, which languages are beautiful? _____
21. In your opinion, which languages are ugly? _____
22. Which language(s) do you think your parents consider as important to learn? _____
23. Do you like to learn English? Why? _____
24. Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why? _____
25. Do you like to learn your mother tongue? Why? _____

Thank you for your time.

II. Pupils' Questionnaire (Urban)

Introduction

My name is Sarita Monjane Henriksen, I am a lecturer at Universidade Pedagógica in Maputo, and I am currently doing my PhD studies at the University of Roskilde in Denmark.

The present Questionnaire is part of the field work component of my research and the major purpose is to find out about your perceptions and feelings in relation to the use of the Indigenous languages of Mozambique in the education system, as well as your attitudes towards languages such as Portuguese and English.

1. School's Name _____
2. Grade _____
3. Student's Name (optional) _____
4. Age _____
5. Gender (Male/Female) _____
6. Place of Birth _____
7. Mother Tongue (First Language) _____
8. What other languages can you speak? _____
9. Which language(s) do you speak home? _____
10. Which other language(s) would you like to learn? Why? _____
11. Which language(s) don't you like? Why? _____
12. Which language(s) do your parents consider as important to learn? _____
13. Do you like to learn English? Why? _____
14. Do you like to learn Portuguese? Why? _____
15. Would you like to study in your mother tongue? Why? _____
16. Would you like to learn to read and write in any other Mozambican National Language (for example, Changana, Ronga, Maconde, etc.)? Why? _____

Thank you for your time.

III. Teachers' Questionnaire

Part 1 – Personal Information

- Question 1 - Name (optional) _____
 Question 2 - Age _____
 Question 3 - Gender (Male/Female) _____
 Question 4 - Place of Birth _____
 Question 5 - Mother Tongue (First Language) _____
 Question 6 - What other languages can you speak? _____
 Question 7 - What other languages can you understand? _____
 Question 8 - What other languages can you write? _____
 Question 9 - What other languages can you read? _____

Part 2 – Academic & Professional Information

- Question 10 - Education and Qualifications _____
 Question 11 - Professional/Vocational Training _____

Type of Training (Initial/ In-service)	Institution	Duration	Year

- Question 12 - How long have you been a teacher? _____
 Question 13 - Which Grade(s) do you teach at the moment? _____
 Question 14 - Which Subject(s) do you teach? _____
 Question 15 - How many Classes do you have? _____
 Question 16 - How many students do you have in total? _____ - _____

Part 3 –Language Use

Question 17 - With which groups do you use the languages listed below?

	Portuguese	English	French	Xironga	XiChangana	Other language (Specify)
Family members (children)						
Family members (adults)						
Friends & Acquaintances						
Pupils						
Colleagues						
Superiors						
Government Officials						

Community Members						
South African or Zimbabwean Citizens						
Other Foreigners (Specify)						

Question 18 - When/How often do you use each one of the languages below?

	Portuguese	English	French	Xironga	XiChangana	Other language (Specify)
Many Times Daily						
At least Once/Day						
At least Once/Week						
Very Rarely						
Never						

Part 4 – Teachers’ Assessment of Language Use by the pupils

Question 19 - Which language(s) do your pupils use to address you, in each one of the following circumstances?

- a) Inside the classroom (for example, to ask a question)? _____
- b) Outside the classroom (for example, during the break)? _____
- c) Outside the school area (for example, in the street)? _____

Question 20 - Which language(s) do your pupils use among themselves, in the following circumstances?

- a) In group discussions inside the classroom? _____
- b) In the playground, during the break? _____

Question 21 - Assess your pupils’ competence in each one of the languages used in classroom, on a scale of **5 points**, in which:

- 1 = very competent (meaning that they feel very comfortable in using the language in spoken and written forms, formally and informally)
- 2 = competent (meaning that they feel quite comfortable in using the language in spoken and written forms, formally and informally)
- 3 = average (meaning that even though they use the language in spoken and written forms, formally and informally, they have some difficulties)
- 4 = not good (meaning that, even though they use the language, they experience major problems at all levels/skills)
- 5 = very bad (meaning that they perform really poorly)

Language	1	2	3	4	5
Portuguese					
English					
French					
Xironga					
XiChangana					
Other language (Specify)					

Part 5 – Teachers’ Views on Mother Tongue Medium Instruction

- Question 22 - What are the languages taught in this school? (please specify whether they are languages of instruction or languages taught as subjects)- _____
- Question 23 - In which language(s) do you teach? _____
- Question 24 - How long have you been teaching in this/these language(s)? _____
- Question 25 - What is the time assigned for each language in the school curriculum (p/ week)? _____
- Question 26 - Do you think that the time allocated for each language in the school curriculum is enough so that pupils can be linguistically capable? Argue! _____
- Question 27 - Did you receive any training on Mother Tongue Medium Instruction (Bilingual Education)? Where? _____
- Question 28 - How long was the training? _____
- Question 29 - What materials do you use in the classroom? _____
- Question 30 - Who designs such materials? _____
- Question 31 - How would you judge the materials available? Comment! _____
- Question 32 - Do you think your pupils should be encouraged to speak their mother tongues? Why? _____
- Question 33 - Can you describe the community's reaction to the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction? _____
- Question 34 - Comment on any possible changes you may have observed on community's perception or opinion, over time, concerning the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction. _____
- Question 35 - Comment on any possible differences of opinion you may have noticed between the parents and the children, on the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction. _____
- Question 36 - Comment on any differences of opinion you may have noticed between parents who are educated and parents who are illiterate concerning the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction. _____
- Question 37 - What is your personal opinion about Mother Tongue Medium Instruction? Is it beneficial or detrimental? Why? _____
- Question 38 - Do you think that pupils feel more motivated towards the school, now that they are allowed to use their native languages in the school setting? Elaborate! _____
- Question 39 - Comment on any progress or improvements you may have observed in pupils' academic performance as a direct result of the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction. _____
- Question 40 - Have you observed any reduction, for example, in the number of drop-outs as a direct result of the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction? _____

Part 6 – Teachers' Comments on the English and Portuguese languages

- Question 41 - Comment on your pupils' motivation towards learning English and Portuguese. _____
- Question 42 - Why do you think your pupils want to learn English? _____
- Question 43 - Do you have any further comments? _____

IV. School Directors' Questionnaire

Introduction

My name is Sarita Monjane Henriksen, I am a lecturer at Universidade Pedagógica in Maputo, and I am currently doing my PhD studies at the University of Roskilde in Denmark.

The present Questionnaire is part of the field work component of my research and the major purpose is to find out about your perceptions and feelings in relation to the use of the Indigenous languages of Mozambique in the education system, as well as your attitudes towards languages such as Portuguese and English.

Part 1 – Personal Information

1. Name of the School Administrator (optional) _____
2. Position _____
3. Age _____
4. Gender (Male/Female) _____
5. Place of Birth _____
6. Mother Tongue (First Language) _____
7. Other Languages spoken _____
8. Educational Qualifications _____

Part 2 – The School

9. School Name _____
10. Geographical Location _____
11. Year of Establishment _____
12. Number of Students _____
13. Number of Girls _____
14. Number of Boys _____
15. Pupils' home languages _____

Language	Number of pupils who speak it

Part 3 – Mother Tongue Medium Instruction/Bilingual Education

16. When was the Bilingual Education Program introduced in the school? _____
17. What are the languages involved? _____
18. Which languages are taught as a subject? _____
19. What were the criteria used for choosing the indigenous language to be used in school? _____
20. In what way has the community been involved in the choice of the languages to be introduced in the school? _____
21. How did the community (e.g. parents) react to the introduction of Mother Tongue Medium Instruction? _____
22. Did the teachers receive any training on Mother Tongue Medium Instruction (Bilingual Education)? Where? _____
23. How long was the training? _____
24. What materials did the teachers receive for use in the classroom? _____
25. How do the pupils feel about using their own languages in the school context? _____
26. Are pupils who are now in Grades 6 and 7 able to read and write in their L1? _____
27. What are the problems encountered so far with the Mother Tongue Medium Instruction (if any)? _____
28. In your opinion, is Mother Tongue Medium Instruction beneficial for the pupils? Why? _____

Part 4 – Portuguese and Foreign Languages (English)

29. In your opinion, what is the role of the Portuguese language in Mozambique today? _____
30. Comment on the importance of the English language. _____
31. Which other language(s) do you think should be taught in the Mozambican schools? Why? _____
32. Do you have any additional comments concerning the language situation in Mozambique? _____

Thank you for your attention.

V. Parents' Interview

1. Which language(s) can you speak?
2. Which language(s) do you speak to the other adult members in your family?
3. Which language(s) do you speak to the neighbours?
4. Which language(s) do you speak at the police?
5. Which language(s) do you speak at the health centre?
6. Which language(s) do you speak in the market?
7. Which language(s) do you speak to your children?
8. Which language(s) would you like your children to learn at school?
9. Which language(s) do you think the school should choose as the language of instruction? Why?
10. What has been your involvement in helping the school decide about the languages of instruction?
11. What is your opinion about the introduction of the Mozambican National Languages in the school system?
12. Is it important for your children to learn to read and write in the National languages? Explain!
13. How do your children feel about the Mozambican National languages?
14. How do they feel about Portuguese?
15. How do they feel about English?
16. Is there any other language that you think your children should learn at school? Which one? Why?
17. How important do you think it is to learn Portuguese?
18. How important do you think it is to learn English?
19. Do you have any additional comments you would like to make?

VI. Educational Professionals' Interview

1. Name
2. Title
3. Background - (In what way have you been involved with the Language Issue in Mozambique? And when did such involvement start?)
4. Institution
5. Article 5 of the Constitution of the Republic claims that *In the Republic of Mozambique, Portuguese is the Official Language and the State values the Mozambican National Languages and promotes their development and increasing utilisation as vehicles of communication and in the education of citizens.*
 - 5.1 Does this suffice as a policy document? Why?
 - 5.2 Is there any other official language policy positional statement available?
 - 5.3. In what way(s) has the Mozambican State been valuing the National Mozambican Languages?
6. Is there any consensus on the number of Mozambican National Languages that we have in Mozambique today?
7. What is the status of the implementation of the bilingual education program?
 - 7.1 Has it already been extended to the whole country?
 - 7.2 How many languages are already used in education?
 - 7.3 Is the goal to introduce all Mozambican National Languages or only the main languages spoken in a particular geographical area?
 - 7.4 What are the criteria for the choice of a particular language and its consequent introduction as a medium of instruction?
8. Can you talk about the society's overall reaction to Mother Tongue Medium Instruction in the country?
 - 8.1 Have there been differences of opinion in different circles (educated/non-educated) and/or geographical areas (urban/rural)?
 - 8.2 What has been the reaction at community level?
 - 8.3 Do parents and children alike seem to share the same views?
9. Who are the teachers? Can you refer to teacher training issues (where are they trained? For how long?, etc.)?
10. Which materials are used?
11. Have there been any concerted efforts on the part of the key entities involved with the study of the national languages (NELIMO and ARPAC) and INDE and MEC, regarding Mother Tongue Instruction?
12. Has NELIMO been somehow involved in the Bilingual Education experience (in terms of providing expertise, advice, or in any other way)?
13. Can you describe the status of NELIMO's work regarding the National Mozambican Languages?
14. What has been the role of the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC), both in relation to Mother Tongue Medium Instruction and a Language in Education Policy?
15. Would you agree that the Portuguese language, in today's Mozambique, represents much more than just the coloniser's language, much more than just the language of national unity, but a language that represents a truly Mozambican National Identity in its own right?
16. What about the National Mozambican Languages? What do they mean and represent?
17. How would you describe the role of English in Mozambique today?
18. Do you believe that it would be possible to develop a language in education policy in Mozambique that articulates the 3 major discourses on Mother Tongue Medium Instruction, Ethno-Cultural Identity and Globalisation?
19. In your opinion, what would be an 'ideal'/proper Language Policy for Mozambique and why?

Appendix Seven – Sample Data Collection Tools (Portuguese)¹⁷²

Questionário (Alunos)

Introdução

Meu nome é Sarita Monjane Henriksen, sou docente na Universidade Pedagógica em Maputo e encontro-me neste momento a fazer o Doutoramento na Universidade de Roskilde na Dinamarca.

O presente Questionário faz parte da componente do trabalho de pesquisa de campo e tem como principal objectivo auscultar a vossa opinião e atitudes em relação ao uso das línguas nacionais no sistema de educação, bem como as vossas atitudes em relação a língua Portuguesa e Inglesa.

Parte 1 – Informação Pessoal

1. Nome da Escola _____
2. Classe _____
3. Nome do Aluno (opcional) _____
4. Idade _____
5. Género (Masculino/Feminino) _____
6. Local de Nascimento _____
7. Língua Materna (Primeira Língua) _____
8. Outras línguas que fala? _____
9. Outras línguas que compreende? _____
10. Outras línguas que escreve? _____
11. Outras línguas que lê? _____
12. Com que grupos usa (fala) as línguas apresentadas na tabela a seguir?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	XiRonga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Família (pais & outras pessoas adultas)						
Família (irmãos)						
Amigos (em casa)						
Amigos & Colegas (na escola)						
Professores						
Director(es) da Escola						
Funcionários Públicos (no						

¹⁷² The following data collection tools are presented in Portuguese, the language used both in the administration of questionnaires and interviews.

hospital, na esquadra da polícia)						
Membros da Comunidade						
Cidadãos Sul Africanos ou Zimbabweanos						
Outros Estrangeiros (Especifique)						

13. Quando/Com que frequência usa (fala) cada uma das línguas a seguir apresentadas?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	XiRonga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Muitas Vezes ao longo do Dia						
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Dia						
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Semana						
Muito Raramente						
Nunca						

14. Escolheu o ensino Bilingue ou Monolingue? _____
15. Que língua(s) prefere falar na escola? Porquê? _____
16. Que língua(s) prefere falar em casa? Porquê? _____
17. Que língua(s) prefere aprender? Porquê? _____
18. Que outra(s) língua(s) gostaria de aprender? Porquê? _____
19. De que língua(s) não gosta? Porquê? _____
20. Que línguas acha que são bonitas? _____
21. Que línguas acha que são feias? _____
22. Que língua(s) os seus pais consideram como importante(s) para aprender? _____
23. Gosta de aprender Inglês? Porquê? _____
24. Gosta de aprender Português? Porquê? _____
25. Gosta de aprender a sua língua materna? Porquê? _____

Muito obrigada.

Questionário (Alunos) – Escola 3 de Fevereiro**Introdução**

Meu nome é Sarita Monjane Henriksen, sou docente na Universidade Pedagógica em Maputo e encontro-me neste momento a fazer o Doutoramento na Universidade de Roskilde na Dinamarca.

O presente Questionário faz parte da componente do trabalho de pesquisa de campo e tem como principal objectivo auscultar a vossa opinião e atitudes em relação ao uso das línguas nacionais no sistema de educação, bem como as vossas atitudes em relação a língua Portuguesa e Inglesa.

1. Nome da Escola _____
2. Classe _____
3. Nome do Aluno (opcional) _____
4. Idade _____
5. Género (Masculino/Feminino) _____
6. Local de Nascimento _____
7. Língua Materna (Primeira Língua) _____
8. Que outras línguas fala? _____
9. Que língua(s) fala em casa? _____
10. Que outras línguas gostaria de aprender? Porquê? _____
11. De que língua(s) não gosta? Porquê? _____
12. Que língua(s) os seus pais consideram como importante(s) para aprender? _____
13. Gosta de aprender Inglês? Porquê? _____
14. Gosta de aprender Português? Porquê? _____
15. Gosta de aprender a sua língua materna? Porquê? _____
16. Gostaria de aprender a ler e escrever em qualquer uma das Línguas Nacionais (por exemplo, Changana, Ronga, Maconde, etc.)? Porquê?

Muito obrigada.

Questionário - Professores

Introdução

Meu nome é Sarita Monjane Henriksen, sou docente na Universidade Pedagógica em Maputo e encontro-me neste momento a fazer o Doutoramento na Universidade de Roskilde na Dinamarca.

O presente Questionário faz parte da componente do trabalho de pesquisa de campo e tem como principal objectivo auscultar a vossa opinião e atitudes em relação ao uso das línguas nacionais no sistema de educação, bem como as vossas atitudes em relação a língua Portuguesa e Inglesa.

Parte 1 – Informação Pessoal

1. Nome (opcional) _____
2. Idade _____
3. Género (Masculino/Femenino) _____
4. Local de Nascimento _____
5. Língua Materna (Primeira Língua) _____
6. Que outras línguas fala? _____
7. Que outras línguas entende? _____
8. Que outras línguas escreve? _____
9. Que outras línguas lê? _____

Parte 2 – Informação Académica & Profissional

10. Qualificações Académicas _____
11. Formação Profissional/Vocacional _____

Tipo de Formação (Inicial/ Em exercício)	Instituição	Duração	Ano

12. Há quanto tempo é professor? _____
13. Que Classes ensina? _____
14. Que Disciplinas ensina? _____
15. Quantas Turmas tem? _____
16. Quantos alunos tem no total? _____

Parte 3 – Uso de Línguas

17. Com que grupos é que usa (fala) as línguas apresentadas na tabela?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	Xironga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Parentes (crianças)						
Parentes (adultos)						
Amigos & Pessoas Conhecidas						

Alunos						
Colegas						
Superiores						
Funcionários Públicos						
Membros da Comunidade						
Cidadãos Sul Africanos ou Zimbabweanos						
Outros Estrangeiros (Especifique)						

18. Quando/Com que frequência usa (fala) cada uma das línguas apresentadas a seguir?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	Xironga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Muitas vezes ao longo do Dia						
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Dia						
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Semana						
Muito Raramente						
Nunca						

Parte 4 – Avaliação do Professor do Uso de Língua por Parte do Aluno

19. Que língua(s) os seus alunos usam para falar consigo, em cada uma das seguintes circunstâncias?

- a) Na sala de aula (por exemplo, para fazer uma pergunta)? _____
- b) Fora da sala de aula (por exemplo, durante o intervalo/recreio)? _____
- c) Fora da escola (por exemplo, quando se cruzam na rua)? _____

20. Que língua(s) os seus alunos usam entre si, nas seguintes circunstâncias?

- a) Nos trabalhos em grupo na sala de aulas? _____
- b) Durante o intervalo/recreio? _____

21. Avalie a competência linguística dos seus alunos em cada uma das línguas usadas na sala de aulas, numa escala de **5 pontos**, onde:

- 1 = muito competentes (significando que eles se sentem muito confortáveis a usar a língua, por escrito e oralmente, formal e informalmente)
- 2 = competentes (significando que eles se sentem relativamente confortáveis a usar a língua, por escrito e oralmente, formal e informalmente)
- 3 = médio/razoável (significando que apesar deles usarem a língua, por escrito e oralmente, formal e informalmente, eles enfrentam algumas dificuldades)
- 4 = não muito boa (significando que apesar deles usarem a língua, eles enfrentam grandes problemas, em todas as áreas (fala, escrita, etc.)
- 5 = muito maus (significando que o seu desempenho é de facto muito pobre)

Língua	1	2	3	4	5
Português					
Inglês					
Francês					

Xironga					
XiChangana					
Outra língua (Especifique)					

Parte 5 – A Opinião do Professor sobre o Ensino na Língua Materna/Ensino Bilingue

22. Quais são as línguas ensinadas nesta escola? (queira por favour especificar se são língua de instrução ou apenas línguas ensinadas como uma disciplina). _____
23. (Em) que língua(s) ensina? _____
24. Há quanto tempo ensina nesta(s) língua(s)? _____
25. Qual é a carga horária semanal para cada língua, de acordo com o currículo? _____
26. Acha que o tempo reservado para cada língua no currículo é suficiente para que os alunos se tornem linguisticamente capazes? Argumente!

27. Queira por favour comentar em relação a sua formação e/ou preparação para o Ensino Bilingue? Onde decorreu essa formação?

28. Qual foi a duração dessa formação? _____
29. Que materiais usa na sala de aulas? _____
30. Quem é responsável pelo desenho destes materiais? _____
31. Qual é a sua opinião em relação ao material disponível? _____
32. Acha que os alunos deverão ser encorajados a aprender a ler e a escrever na sua língua materna? Argumente? _____
33. Queira por favour descrever a reacção da comunidade perante a introdução do Ensino na Língua Materna. _____
34. Comente sobre quaisquer possíveis mudanças que possa ter observado na percepção ou opinião da comunidade, ao longo do tempo, no concernente a introdução do Ensino na Língua Materna. _____
35. Comente em relação a quaisquer possíveis diferenças de opinião que possa ter notado entre os pais e alunos, no concernente a introdução do Ensino na Língua Materna. _____
36. Comente sobre quaisquer diferenças de opinião que possa ter observado entre os pais escolarizados e os não escolarizados no concernente a introdução do Ensino na Língua Materna. _____
37. Qual é a sua opinião pessoal sobre o Ensino na Língua Materna/Ensino Bilingue? É benéfico ou detrimental? Justifique? _____
38. Acha que os alunos se sentem mais motivados para frequentarem a escola agora que podem usar a sua língua materna no contexto escolar? Argumente! _____
39. Comente em relação a qualquer progresso ou melhoria que possa ter observado no desempenho académico dos alunos como um resultado directo da introdução do Ensino Bilingue. _____
40. Terá observado qualquer redução, por exemplo, no número de desistências como um resultado directo da introdução do Ensino na Língua Materna? _____

Parte 6 – Comentários do Professor em relação a língua Inglesa e Portuguesa

41. Comente em relação a motivação dos seus alunos para a aprendizagem das línguas Inglesa e Portuguesa. _____
42. Em sua opinião, que outra(s) línguas deveriam ser ensinadas nas escolas Moçambicanas? Justifique! _____
43. Queira por favour acrescentar qualquer comentário que considere pertinente no concernente a questão da língua em Moçambique. _____

Muito obrigada!

Questionário - Directores da Escola¹⁷³

Introdução

Meu nome é Sarita Monjane Henriksen, sou docente na Universidade Pedagógica em Maputo e encontro-me neste momento a fazer o Doutoramento na Universidade de Roskilde na Dinamarca.

O presente Questionário faz parte da componente do trabalho de pesquisa de campo e tem como principal objectivo auscultar a sua opinião e atitudes em relação ao uso das línguas nacionais no sistema de educação, bem como a sua opinião em relação a língua Portuguesa e Inglesa.

Parte 1 – Informação Pessoal

1. Nome do Director da Escola (opcional) _____
2. Posto/Título _____
3. Idade _____
4. Género (Masculino/Feminino) _____
5. Local de Nascimento _____
6. Língua Materna (Primeira Língua) _____
7. Outras Línguas Faladas _____
8. Qualificações Académicas _____

Parte 2 – A Escola

9. Nome da Escola _____
10. Localização Geográfica _____
11. Data de Estabelecimento _____
12. Número Total de Estudantes _____
13. Número de Raparigas _____
14. Número de Rapazes _____
15. Língua Materna dos Alunos _____

Língua	Número de Alunos que falam esta lingual

Parte 3 – Ensino em Língua Materna/Ensino Bilingue

16. Quando é que o Programa de Ensino Bilingue foi introduzido na escola? _____
17. Quais são as línguas envolvidas? _____
18. Que línguas são ensinadas como disciplina? _____
19. Quais foram os critérios usados para a escolha da língua nacional a ser usada na escola? _____
20. De que forma a comunidade local esteve envolvida na tomada de decisão sobre a(s) línguas a serem introduzidas na escola? _____
21. Como é que a comunidade (por exemplo, os pais e encarregados de educação) reagiram perante a introdução do Ensino em Língua Materna? _____
22. Queira por favor comentar sobre a questão da formação de professores para o Ensino na Língua Materna (Ensino Bilingue). Onde decorreu esta formação? _____
23. Qual foi a duração da formação? _____
24. Que materiais didácticos os professores receberam para uso na sala de aulas, no âmbito do ensino em língua materna? _____
25. Como é que os alunos se sentem em relação ao uso da sua língua materna no contexto escolar? _____

¹⁷³ O termo Director de Escola refere-se tanto ao director geral, como ao director pedagógico e outros gestores de nível superior na escola.

26. Os alunos que se encontram agora na 6 e 7 classe já são capazes de ler e escrever na sua língua materna? _____
27. Quais são os problemas encontrados até agora com a introdução do Ensino Bilingue? _____
28. Em sua opinião, será que o Ensino na Língua Materna é benéfico para os alunos? Porquê? _____

Parte 4 – A Língua Portuguesa e Línguas Estrangeiras (Inglês)

29. Em sua opinião, qual é o papel da língua Portuguesa no Moçambique actual? _____
30. Comente sobre a importância da Língua Inglesa. _____
31. Que outra(s) língua(s) acha que deveria(m) ser ensinada(s) nas escolas Moçambicanas? Porquê? _____
32. Queira por favor acrescentar, no espaço a seguir, qualquer comentário que considere pertinente no concernente a situação da língua em Moçambique? _____

Muito obrigada pela sua atenção!

Entrevista ao Grupo de Pais ou Encarregados de Educação

1. Que língua(s) fala?
2. Que língua(s) é que fala com as pessoas adultas da sua família?
3. Que língua(s) fala com os seus vizinhos?
4. Que língua(s) fala, por exemplo, na esquadra da polícia?
5. Que língua(s) fala no centro de saúde?
6. Que língua(s) fala quando está no mercado?
7. Que língua(s) fala com os seus filhos?
8. Que língua(s) gostaria que os seus filhos aprendessem na escola?
9. Que língua(s) acha que a escola deveria escolher para ser a língua de ensino e aprendizagem? Porquê?
10. De que maneira os pais e encarregados de educação nesta comunidade estiveram envolvidos na tomada de decisão sobre que língua nacional a introduzir na escola?
11. Qual é a sua opinião sobre a introdução das línguas nacionais no sistema escolar?
12. Acha que é importante que os seus filhos aprendam a ler e a escrever nas línguas nacionais? Explique!
13. Como é que os seus filhos se sentem em relação as línguas nacionais?
14. Como é que eles se sentem em relação a língua Portuguesa?
15. Como é que eles se sentem em relação a língua Inglesa?
16. Acha que os seus filhos deveriam aprender mais alguma língua para além das línguas já usadas no sistema escolar? Que línguas? Porquê?
17. Considera que é importante aprender a falar Português?
18. Considera que é importante aprender a falar Inglês?
19. Tem algum comentário adicional que gostaria de fazer sobre a questão da língua e educação em Moçambique?

Entrevista com os Peritos¹⁷⁴

1. Nome do Entrevistado _____
2. Posição/Título _____
3. Instituição _____
4. Gostaria que falasse um pouco sobre o seu envolvimento com a Questão da Língua em Moçambique e quando é que começa esse envolvimento. _____
5. O Artigo 5 da Constituição afirma que *Na República de Moçambique, o Português é a Língua Oficial e o Estado valoriza as línguas nacionais e promove o seu desenvolvimento e crescente utilização como veículos de comunicação e na educação dos cidadãos.*
 - 5.1 Em sua opinião, considera que esta afirmação é suficiente como um documento de política linguística? _
 - 5.2 Existirá qualquer outro documento oficial sobre a política linguística no país? _____
 - 5.3 De que formas o Estado Moçambicano valoriza e promove as línguas nacionais? _____
6. Haverá algum consenso sobre o número de línguas nacionais existentes em Moçambique? _____
7. Qual é o estado da implementação do programa de ensino bilingue? _____
 - 7.1 Será que o programa já foi expandido para todo o país? _____
 - 7.2 Tem alguma informação sobre o número de línguas já usadas no ensino, do total das 17 línguas previamente seleccionadas? _____
 - 7.3 Será que o objectivo é introduzir todas as línguas nacionais ou apenas as principais línguas faladas numa determinada região? _____
 - 7.4 Quais são os critérios usados para a escolha de uma determinada língua para uso como meio de instrução ou disciplina? _____
8. Gostaria que comentasse sobre a reacção geral da sociedade no concernerente a introdução das línguas nacionais no ensino. _____
 - 8.1 Terão existido ou haverão diferenças de opinião entre diferentes círculos (pessoas escolarizadas/não-escolarizadas) e/ou áreas geográficas (urbana/rural)? _____
 - 8.2 Qual foi a reacção ao nível da comunidade? _____
 - 8.3 Será que os pais e os filhos partilham da mesma opinião? _____
9. Quem são os professores? Serão eles falantes nativos das línguas nacionais que devem ensinar? _____
 - 9.1 Gostaria que comentasse sobre a questão da formação de professores para o ensino bilingue. Quais são as instituições de formação? Qual é a duração dos cursos de formação? Outros aspectos? _____
10. Quais são os materiais usados? Quem é responsável pelo desenho destes materiais? _____

¹⁷⁴ A palavra perito se refere ao grupo de Linguístas, Planificadores da Educação, Académicos e Investigadores do INDE (Instituto Nacional do Desenvolvimento da Educação), ARPAC (Arquivo Nacional do Património Cultural) e MEC, que directa ou indirectamente estão envolvidos com as questões de planificação da língua e educação.

11. Terão havido esforços concertados por parte das entidades chave envolvidas no estudo das línguas nacionais (NELIMO e ARPAC), INDE e MEC, no concernente ao Ensino na Língua Materna? _____
12. De que forma o NELIMO tem estado envolvido na experiência do Ensino Bilingue (em termos de provisão de perícia, assessoria, ou de qualquer outra forma)? _____
13. Pode descrever o actual estágio do trabalho do NELIMO no concernente as línguas nacionais? _____
14. Qual é o papel do MEC, tanto em relação ao Ensino na Língua Materna e a uma Política de Língua e Educação? _____
15. Acredita que a Língua Portuguesa no Moçambique de hoje representa muito mais do que apenas a língua do ex-colonizador, muito mais do que apenas a língua da unidade nacional e portanto a Língua Franca, mas uma língua que representa uma verdadeira Identidade Nacional Moçambicana? Se não, qual é em sua opinião sobre o lugar da língua Portuguesa em Moçambique? _____
16. Em sua opinião, o que é que as línguas nacionais significam e representam? _____
17. Qual é a sua opinião sobre o papel da língua Inglesa no Moçambique de hoje? _____
18. Acredita que seria possível desenvolver uma política da língua de ensino em Moçambique que articule ou combine os 3 principais discursos sobre o Ensino em Língua Materna, Identidade Nacional e Globalização? _____
19. Com base na sua experiência, qual seria a Política Linguística ideal para Moçambique e porquê? _____

Appendix Eight – Pictures of a Typical Rural Classroom









Appendix Nine – Examples of Non-responses

Amo a minha mãe e o pai

13. Quando/Com que frequência usa (fala) cada uma das línguas a seguir apresentadas?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	XiRonga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Muitas Vezes ao longo do Dia	X				X	
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Dia						
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Semana						
Muito Raramente						
Nunca		X	X	X		

14. Quais são as línguas usadas (ensinadas) nesta escola? *amabizau amabizau amabizau*

15. Escolheu o Ensino Bilingue ou Monolingue? *amabizau*

16. Que língua(s) prefere falar na escola? Porque? *amabizau, elul*

17. Que língua(s) prefere falar em casa? Porque? *amabizau*

18. Que língua(s) prefere aprender? Porque? *amabizau amabizau*

19. Que outra(s) língua(s) gostaria de aprender? Porque? *amabizau*

20. De que língua(s) não gosta? Porque? *amabizau amabizau*

21. Que línguas acha que são bonitas? *amabizau amabizau*

22. Que línguas acha que são feias? *amabizau amabizau*

23. Que língua(s) a escola considera como importante(s) para os alunos aprenderem? *amabizau*

24. Que língua(s) os seus pais consideram como importante(s) para aprender? *amabizau*

25. Gosta de aprender Inglês? Porque? *amabizau amabizau amabizau*

26. Gosta de aprender Português? Porque? *amabizau amabizau amabizau*

27. Gosta de aprender a sua língua materna? Porque? *amabizau amabizau amabizau*

Muito obrigada.
(N.B. Quere por favor usar o verso para acrescentar qualquer comentário)

RUC. 11 de Abril de 2008 2

13. Quando/Com que frequência usa (fala) cada uma das línguas a seguir apresentadas?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	XiRonga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Muitas Vezes ao longo do Dia	X				X	
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Dia						
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Semana						
Muito Raramente						
Nunca	X					

14. Quais são as línguas usadas (ensinadas) nesta escola? *amabizau amabizau*

15. Escolheu o Ensino Bilingue ou Monolingue? *amabizau*

16. Que língua(s) prefere falar na escola? Porque? *amabizau, amabizau*

17. Que língua(s) prefere falar em casa? Porque? *amabizau*

18. Que língua(s) prefere aprender? Porque? *amabizau*

19. Que outra(s) língua(s) gostaria de aprender? Porque? *amabizau*

20. De que língua(s) não gosta? Porque? *amabizau*

21. Que línguas acha que são bonitas? *amabizau*

22. Que línguas acha que são feias? *amabizau*

23. Que língua(s) a escola considera como importante(s) para os alunos aprenderem? *amabizau*

24. Que língua(s) os seus pais consideram como importante(s) para aprender? *amabizau*

25. Gosta de aprender Inglês? Porque? *amabizau*

26. Gosta de aprender Português? Porque? *amabizau*

27. Gosta de aprender a sua língua materna? Porque? *amabizau amabizau*

Muito obrigada.
(N.B. Quere por favor usar o verso para acrescentar qualquer comentário)

RUC. 11 de Abril de 2008 2

13. Quando/Com que frequência usa (fala) cada uma das línguas a seguir apresentadas?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	XiRonga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Muitas Vezes ao longo do Dia	X			X		
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Dia	X			X		
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Semana				X		X
Muito Raramente						
Nunca						

14. Quais são as línguas usadas (ensinadas) nesta escola? XiRonga
15. Escolheu o Ensino Bilingue ou Monolíngue? Bilingue
16. Que língua(s) prefere falar na escola? Porquê? Português
17. Que língua(s) prefere falar em casa? Porquê? XiRonga
18. Que língua(s) prefere aprender? Porquê? Português
19. Que outra(s) língua(s) gostaria de aprender? Porquê? Inglês
20. De que língua(s) não gosta? Porquê?
21. Que línguas acha que são bonitas? Sovage
22. Que línguas acha que são feias? XiChangana
23. Que língua(s) a escola considera como importante(s) para os alunos aprenderem?
24. Que língua(s) os seus pais consideram como importante(s) para aprender? Português
25. Gosta de aprender Inglês? Porquê? Logo
26. Gosta de aprender Português? Porquê? Português
27. Gosta de aprender a sua língua materna? Porquê? XiChangana

Muito obrigada.

(N.B. Queira por favor usar o verso para acrescentar qualquer comentário)

13. Quando/Com que frequência usa (fala) cada uma das línguas a seguir apresentadas?

	Português	Inglês	Francês	XiRonga	XiChangana	Outra língua (Especifique)
Muitas Vezes ao longo do Dia				X	X	
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Dia	X					
Pelo menos Uma Vez por Semana						
Muito Raramente						
Nunca						

14. Quais são as línguas usadas (ensinadas) nesta escola? Português
15. Escolheu o Ensino Bilingue ou Monolíngue? Bilingue
16. Que língua(s) prefere falar na escola? Porquê? Português
17. Que língua(s) prefere falar em casa? Porquê? Sovage
18. Que língua(s) prefere aprender? Porquê? Português, XiRonga e XiChangana
19. Que outra(s) língua(s) gostaria de aprender? Porquê? XiChangana e XiRonga
20. De que língua(s) não gosta? Porquê? Não gosta de aprender XiChangana e XiRonga
21. Que línguas acha que são bonitas? Português
22. Que línguas acha que são feias? XiChangana
23. Que língua(s) a escola considera como importante(s) para os alunos aprenderem?
24. Que língua(s) os seus pais consideram como importante(s) para aprender? Português
25. Gosta de aprender Inglês? Porquê?
26. Gosta de aprender Português? Porquê? Português
27. Gosta de aprender a sua língua materna? Porquê? XiChangana

Muito obrigada.

(N.B. Queira por favor usar o verso para acrescentar qualquer comentário)

Appendix Ten (I) – Teacher Profiles

School 1 – ‘Escola Primária de Mudada’

1. Profile of the teachers in Mudada Primary School	
Age	With the exception of the School Director who was 38 years, most of the teachers were between 25 to 28 years of age
Gender	From the teachers interviewed, three were women and three were men
Place of Birth	They were all born in the districts of Maputo Province (Maputo, Bela-Vista-Matutuine, Magude, and Manhiça)
L1	Xirhonga was the L1 for the majority, followed by Xitsua and Xichangana
Languages Spoken/Written/Read	All of them spoke Xirhonga, Xichangana, and Portuguese. Other languages that emerged were Xitsua as well as Zulu, Swazi, Bitonga, English, Spanish and French
Education & Qualifications	The qualifications reported were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grade 9 (one teacher) - Grade 10 or an equivalent degree, that is, Grade 7 + 3 years of training (three teachers) - Grade 10 (one teacher) - One teacher did not reveal her qualifications
Type & Duration of Professional or Vocational Training	With the exception of one teacher, all the others had had a three year training prior to becoming a teacher. All of them were trained at the same institution and all of them received the same type of training: Grade 7 + 3 years
Years in the teaching profession	The period in which they had been working as teachers varied between four to seven years
Classes/Grades taught	Between Grade one to seven
Number of Classes taught	Between one to four
Total number of pupils for each teacher	Between twenty-two to ninety-four
Language Use & Frequency of Use	Portuguese and Xirhonga emerged as the languages mostly used by the teachers; they reported to use both languages many times during the day, with family members, particularly children, friends and acquaintances, pupils, colleagues, community members, etc.
Teacher Training or Preparation for MTMI	All teachers had a two week training for working with Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual Education

Materials Available	One Teachers' Book for the whole class Sometimes, one student's book also available Materials are designed by INDE
----------------------------	--

School 2 – 'Escola Primária de Mahubo'

2. Profile of the teachers in Mahubo Primary School	
Age	The teachers' ages ranged between 29 to 33 years, with the exception of the School Director who was 44 years
Gender	From the teachers interviewed, two were women and four were men
Place of Birth	They were all born in Maputo Province (Maputo, Inhaca, Manhiça and Boane)
L1	All teachers reported to have Xirhonga as their L1
Languages Spoken/Written/Read	Among the other languages spoken, written or read, the following ones were reported: Xichangana, Portuguese, English, Xitsua, Xicopi and French
Education & Qualifications	The qualification reported was: - Grade 7 + 3 years of training
Type & Duration of Professional or Vocational Training	They reported having had between two to three years of training prior to becoming teachers With one exception, all were trained at the same institution
Years in the teaching profession	The period in which they had been working as teachers ranged between six to eight years
Classes/Grades taught	Between Grade two to seven
Number of Classes taught	Between one to two
Total number of pupils for each teacher	Between twenty-six to fifty-five
Language Use & Frequency of Use	With the exception of one teacher who reported using Portuguese, Xironga and Xichangana on a daily basis with almost all groups presented under question 17, for all the other teachers, Portuguese and Xirhonga emerged as the languages mostly used during the day, with family members, particularly children, friends and acquaintances, pupils, colleagues, community members, etc.
Teacher Training or Preparation for MTE	All teachers had a two week training for working with MTE
Materials Available	One Teachers' Book for the whole class Sometimes, one student's book also available Materials are designed by INDE

Appendix Ten (II) – Basic Facts about the Schools and the Bilingual Education Program

School 1 – ‘Escola Primária de Mudada’

Total Number of Pupils	325
Number of Pupils in Bilingual Classes	104
Number of Pupils in Monolingual Classes (L2)	221
Year of Introduction of MTMI	2003
Languages Involved in the Program	Portuguese Xirhonga
Languages Taught as subject	Portuguese Xirhonga English
Criteria for the Choice of the Language of Instruction	Optional, that is, on the basis of the language spoken by the majority
Teacher Preparation & Materials Available	Teacher Training lasted for 15 Days A Book was made available

School 2 - ‘Escola Primária de Mahubo’

Total Number of Pupils	497
Number of Pupils in Bilingual Classes	154
Number of Pupils in Monolingual Classes (L2)	343
Year of Introduction of MTMI	2003
Languages Involved in the Program	Portuguese Xirhonga
Languages Taught as subject	Portuguese Xirhonga English
Criteria for the Choice of the Language of Instruction	High number of inhabitants who are native speakers of Xirhonga
Teacher Preparation & Materials Available	Teacher Training lasted for 15 Days Copies of the L1 Books for teacher’s use and bilingual education programs

Appendix Eleven – Additional Bibliography on Multilingualism¹⁷⁵

- Aarts, Rian, Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004), 'Multilingualism in the Hague'. In Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 193-220)
- Akinci, Mehmet-Ali and Jan Jaap Ruiters (2004). 'Multilingualism in Lyon'. In Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 251-274)
- Alisjahbana, S. Takdir (1984). 'The Problem of Minority Languages in the Overall Linguistic Problems of our Time'. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.) (1984). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers (pp. 47-55)
- Anders-Baer, Lars, Ole Henrik-Magga, Robert Dunbar and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (2008). 'Expert Paper on Forms of Education of Indigenous Children as Crimes Against Humanity?' United Nations Economic and Social Council. Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.
- Aronin, Larissa (2009). 'Current Multilingualism: Language Ecologies, Constellations and Policies'. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 10-12 September 2009
- Aronin, Larissa and Muiris Ó Laoire (2004). 'Exploring Multilingualism in Cultural Contexts: Towards a Notion of Multilinguality'. In Charlotte Hoffmann and Johannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 11-29)
- Awasthi, Lava Deo (2004). *Exploring Monolingual School Practices in Multilingual Nepal*. PhD Dissertation, Denmark: The Danish University of Education
- Bakker, Peter (2001). 'Romani in Europe'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 293-313)
- Baldauf, Richard B., Jr. (ed.) *Language Planning and Policy in Africa*, Vol 1: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 2004

¹⁷⁵ This additional bibliography list includes sources on multilingualism consulted, but not actually cited in the thesis.

- Beacco, Jean-Claude and Michael Byram (2003). *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe. From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division, Council of Europe
- Bell, Judith (1993). *Doing Your Research Project – A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Benson, Carol and Kimmo Kosonen (2008). ‘An analysis of Language-in-Education Policy and Practice in Southeast Asia in the light of the findings from Ethiopia’. MLE Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi, India, 5-8 February 2008
- Benson, Carol (2009). ‘Nancy Hornberger (Ed): Can Schools Save Indigenous Languages? Policy and Practice on Four Continents’. Book Review. In *Language Policy*, 8, 411-413
- Bernsten, Jan (2007) ‘English and Shona in Zimbabwe’ In *World Englishes*. Volume 13. Issue 3, pages 411-418. Published online: 23 February 2007
- Bethlehem, Jelke (2009) *Applied Survey Methods – A Statistical Perspective*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons
- Björklund, Mikaela (2009). ‘Language Development in Linguistically Heterogeneous CLIL Classrooms’. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 10-12 September 2009
- Blaxter, Loraine, Christina Hughes and Malcolm Tight (1996). *How to Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Blommaert, Jan (2006). ‘Language Policy and National Identity’. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. (pp. 238-254)
- Boletim da República (1995). Resolução no. 8/95 de 22 de Agosto. Política Nacional da Educação. Imprensa Nacional, Maputo, 11 de Outubro de 1995
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language & Symbolic Power*. Oxford: Polity Press and Blackwell Publishers
- Boyd, Sally (2001). ‘Immigrant Languages in Sweden’. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 177-192)
- Brock-Utne, Birgit (2001). ‘Education for all – in whose language?’ *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 2001 (pp.115-134)
- Brock-Utne, Birgit (2007). ‘Democracy in a Multilingual and Multicultural Society’. Keynote lecture presented at the Conference on Mother Tongue, Bilingualism and Democracy, Myths, Realities and Consensus. Copenhagen 28-30 November 2007

- Brock-Utne, Birgit, Zubeida Desai and Martha Qorro (Eds.) (2006). *Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa* (LOITASA). Dar-es-Salaam: E&D.
- Broeder, Peter and Laura Mijares (2004). 'Multilingualism in Madrid'. In Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 275-298)
- Bühler-Otten, Sabine and Sara Fürstenau (2004). 'Multilingualism in Hamburg'. In Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 163-191)
- Bühmann, Dörthe and Barbara Trudell (2008). 'Mother Tongue Matters: Local Language as a Key to Effective Learning'. Paris: UNESCO
- Busch, Brigitta (2001). 'Slovenian in Carinthia'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 119-136)
- Cameron, Barbara and Janet Kunkel (2002). 'A Sociolinguistic Survey of the Dhimba Language'. SIL: Lutheran Bible Translators
- Canagarajah, Suresh (2008). 'The Politics of English language Teaching'. In S. May and N.H. Hornberger. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education*, 2nd Edition, Volume 1: *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*, 213-227. Springer Science+Business Media LLC.
- Carder, Maurice (1995). 'Language(s) in International Education: A Review of Language Issues in International Schools'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 113-158)
- Cartwright, Don (2006). 'Geolinguistic Analysis in Language Policy'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp.194-209)
- Cenoz, Jasone (2003). 'Teaching English as a Third Language: The Effect of Attitudes and Motivation'. In Charlotte Hoffmann and Johannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 202-218)
- Cenoz, Jasone (2009). *Towards Multilingual Education – Basque Educational Research from an International Perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Christensen, Martin Kangas (2009). 'The Language of Instruction at Danish Universities'. In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp. 58-67)
- Christidis, A. F. (Ed.) (1999) "Strong" and "Weak" Languages in the European Union: Aspects of Linguistic Hegemonism,

Vol. 1 Thessaloniki: Center for the Greek Language (pp. 3-10)

Conteh, Jean and Saeko Toyoshima (2005) 'Researching teaching and learning: Roles, identities and interview processes'. In *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2005 (pp. 23-34)

Coulmas, Florian (Ed.) (1991). *A Language Policy for the European Community – Prospects and Quandaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Coulmas, Florian (2008). 'Language Choice: Economic Considerations'. Paper presented at Roskilde University. Department of Culture and Identity, Friday Afternoon Lectures at the *Forskergrupperne SCALPS og FGP*, December 3, 2008

Coulmas, Florian, Peter Backhaus and Ayako Shikama (2002) 'Monolingual Assumptions under Pressure – Perspectives on the languages of Tokyo from the points of view of the economics of language and social psychology'. In *ASIEN* (July 2002) 84, 8-18

Creese, Angela and Peter Martin (Eds.) (2003). *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies. Inter-relationships, Interactions and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd

Cummins, Jim (1995). 'The Discourse of Disinformation: The Debate on Bilingual Education and Language Rights in the United States'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.159-177)

Cummins, Jim (2003). 'Bilingual Education: Basic Principles'. In J. M. Dewaele, A. Hausen and L. Wei (Eds.) (2003). *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 56-66)

Cummins, Jim and Nancy Hornberger (Eds.) (2007). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol. 5: Bilingual Education. (pp. 3-17). New York: Springer

Cunningham, Hamish (1999). 'A Definition and Short History of Language Engineering'. In *Journal of Natural Language Engineering*, Vol. 5, 1-16

Davidsen-Nielsen, Niels (2009). 'Danish under Pressure: Use it or Lose it'. In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp. 138-140)

De Bot, Kees and Theo Bonaerts (Eds.) (1997) *Perspectives on Foreign Language Policy: Studies in Honour of Theo van Els*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Dewey, James (2002). 'Language Policy and Language Planning in Post-Colonial Mozambique'. In http://orca.byu.edu/Journals/2003%20Final%20reports/_hum/dewey.pdf

De Vaus, David (2002). *Surveys in Social Research*. 5th edition, London: Routledge

- Edwards, Viv and Lynda Newcombe (2006). 'Marketing the Benefits of Bilingualism to Parents'. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 137-149)
- Emenanjo, E. Nolue (2002). 'Language Policies and Cultural Identities.' Paper presented at the World Congress on Language Policies. Barcelona, 16-20 April 2002
- Escamilla, Kathy (2006). 'Monolingual Assessment and Emerging Bilinguals: A Case Study in the US'. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 184-199)
- Extra, Guus and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Franceschini, Rita (2009). 'Trilingualism as Potential'. Plenary Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 10-12 September 2009
- Fishman, Joshua (1985). 'Toward Multilingualism as an International Desideratum in Government, Business, and the Professions'; in *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 6, 2-9
- Fishman, Joshua (1995). 'On the Limits of Ethnolinguistic Democracy'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.49-61)
- Fishman, Joshua (2006a). *DO NOT Leave Your Language Alone – The Hidden Status Agendas Within Corpus Planning in Language Policy*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers
- García, Bernabé López and Laura Mijares Molina (2001). 'Moroccan Children and Arabic in Spanish Schools'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 279-292)
- Garrett, Peter, Nikolas Couplan and Angie Williams (2003). *Investigating Language Attitudes – Social Meanings of Dialect, Ethnicity and Performance*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press
- Gogolin, Ingrid and Hans Reich (2001). 'Immigrant Languages in Federal Germany'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 193-214)
- Gonçalves, António C. P. (2008). 'Direito à Educação – O Direito à Educação Básica e a Omissão do Estado Moçambicano'. In *Bantulândia*, 28 November 2008
- Gorter, Durk (2009). 'Three or More Languages at School'. Plenary Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 10-12 September 2009
- Gorter, Durk, Jasone Cenoz and Jokin Aiestaran (2009). 'Perceptions, Preferences and Payments in the Linguistic Landscape'. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New*

Challenges, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009

- Gorter, Durk, Alex Riemersma and Jehannes Ytsma (2001). 'Frisian in the Netherlands'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 103-118)
- Gottlieb, Henrik (2009). 'Parallelism or Convergence? The English Influence on Danish'. In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp.68-94)
- Gregersen, Frans (2009). 'Language Policy: a View from the Periphery of Europe'. In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp. 95-108)
- Grin, François (1999). 'Market Forces, Language Spread and Linguistic Diversity'. In Miklós Kontra et al. (Eds.) (1999). *Language: A Right and a Resource – Approaching Linguistic Human Rights*. Budapest: Central European University Press. 169-186
- Grin, François (2007). 'Economic Aspects of Mother Tongue and Bilingual Education'. Paper presented at the Conference on Mother Tongue and Bilingual Education. Copenhagen, 28-29 November 2007
- Guboglo, M.N. (1986). 'Factors Affecting Bilingualism in National Languages and Russian in a Developed Socialist Society'. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Gupta, Anthea Fraser (2002) 'Privileging Indigeneity'. Paper published in John M. Kirk and D'onall O. 'O Baioll (Eds.) *Language Planning and Education: Linguistic Issues in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, and Scotland*. Belfast: Cl'o Ollscoil na Bannriona, 290-299. Retrievable from at www.leeds.ac.uk/english/staff/afg/belfast.doc
- Gupta, Anthea Fraser (2009). 'Language Rights'. Paper published in *English Today* 50, 24-26, available at www.leeds.ac.uk/english/staff/afg/langpol2.doc and downloaded on April 16 2009
- Haberland, Hartmut (1991). 'Reflections about Minority Languages in the European Community'. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.) (1991). *A Language Policy for the European Community – Prospects and Quandaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 179- 194)
- Haberland, Hartmut (2009). 'English – The Language of Globalism?' In *Rask* 2009, 30: 17-45
- Haberland, Hartmut (2010). 'Ownership and Maintenance of a Language in Transnational Use: Should we Leave our *Lingua Franca* alone?' In Beyza Björkman (2010) Special Issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics*, "English as a *Lingua Franca* in the International University"
- Hamel, Rainer Enrique (1995a). 'Indigenous Education in Latin America: Policies and Legal Frameworks'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 271 – 287)

- Hamel, Rainer Enrique (1995b). 'Linguistic Rights for Amerindian Peoples in Latin America'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 289 – 303)
- Hamel, Rainer Enrique (2006). 'Language Empires, Linguistic Imperialism, and the Future of Global Languages'. Lecture Series, "The Power of Language" in cooperation with the Ludwig-Maximilians. Munich: University Munich and Goethe-Institut
- Henriksen, Sarita Monjane (2008). 'Teachers' Position on Mother Tongue Medium Instruction in Mozambique'; paper presented at the CALPIU Conference, Roskilde, December 2008
- Henriksen, Sarita Monjane (2009a). 'Reflections on the Language Education Issue in Mozambique'; paper presented at the 3rd European Conference on African Studies, Leipzig, Germany, 3-7 June 2009
- Henriksen, Sarita Monjane (2009b). 'Children and Parents' Perceptions on the languages in use in a rural school context in Mozambique'; paper presented at the Language Policy and Language Learning Conference, Limerick, 18-20 June 2009
- Henriksen, Sarita Monjane (2009c). 'The Effectiveness of Foreign Language Learning at Tertiary Level – The Case of Mozambique'; paper presented at 6th International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism, University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy, September 10-12 2009
- Herbert, R. (Ed.) (1992), *Language and Society in Africa: The Theory and Practice of Sociolinguistics*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo (1995). 'Language Policy in the United States: A History of Cultural Genocide'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995) *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.141-158)
- Hill, Lloyd B. (2009). 'The Decline of Academic Bilingualism in South Africa: A Case Study'. In *Language Policy (2009)* 8:327-349
- Holsten, James and Gubrium, Jaber. (Eds.) (2003). *Inside Interviewing – New Lenses, New Concerns*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Holten-Andersen, Per (2009). 'Language Policy at the Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Copenhagen'. In Peter Harder (Ed.) (2009). *Angles on the English-Speaking World. English in Denmark: Language Policy, Internationalization and University Teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. University of Copenhagen (pp. 133-135)
- Honey, John (1994). A Review of 'Robert Phillipson. Linguistic Imperialism'. In *Rask 1*, October 1994. Pages 117-121

- Honey, John (1995). 'Phillipson's Response to My Review: A Rejoinder'. In *Rask 3, September 1995*. Pages 141-123
- Hornberger, Nancy (2006a). 'Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp. 24-41)
- Hornberger, Nancy (2006b). 'Nichols to NCLB: Local and Global Perspectives on US Language Education Policy'. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 223-237)
- Kamwangamalu, Nkonko (2002). 'Language Policy and Mother-tongue Education in South Africa: The Case for a Market-oriented Approach'. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press
- Jaffe, Alexandra (2003). 'Talk Around Text: Literacy Practices, Cultural Identity and Authority in a Corsican Bilingual Classroom'. In Angela Creese and Peter Martin (Eds.) (2003). *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies. Inter-relationships, Interactions and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp.42-60)
- Jong, Ester de (2009). 'Two-Way Immersion: Lessons Learned'. Paper presented at the Danish Pedagogical University (DPU), Denmark, 28 April 2009
- Jernudd, Björn (1995). 'Personal Names and Human Rights'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.121-132)
- Karetu, Timoti (1995). 'Maori Language Rights in New Zealand'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 209 – 218)
- Kashoki, Mubanga E. (1982) 'Rural and Urban Multilingualism in Zambia: Some Trends'. In *International Journal of the Sociology Language* Volume (1982) pp. 137-166. Published Online: 07/10/2009
- Khubchandani, Lachman (1995). "'Minority" Cultures and their Communication Rights'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 305 – 315)
- King, Kendal (2009). 'It's all in the family: Language Learning and Language Policy'. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges*, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009
- Kirkpatrick, Andy (2009). 'English and/or Local Languages in Asian Settings: Can they survive the Globalisation of English and ELT?' Paper presented at Roskilde University. Department of Culture and Identity, Friday Afternoon Lectures at the *Forskergrupperne SCALPS og FGP* 29 May 2009
- Kontra, Miklós et al. (Eds.) (1999). *Language: A Right and a Resource – Approaching Linguistic Human Rights*. Budapest: Central European University Press

- Kontra, Miklós (1999). ‘“Don’t Speak Hungarian in Public!” - A Documentation and Analysis of Folk Linguistic Rights’. In Miklós Kontra et al. (Eds.) (1999). *Language: A Right and a Resource – Approaching Linguistic Human Rights*. Budapest: Central European University Press. (pp. 81-97)
- Larry E. Smith (ed.) (1983). *Readings in English as an International Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Long, Ethan and Llorenç Comajoan (2009) ‘Linguistic Landscape of three streets in Barcelona: the relationship between demographic composition and language visibility in public space’. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges*, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009
- Lopes, Armando Jorge (2004). *The Battle of the Languages*. Maputo: Imprensa Universitária
- Lopéz, Luis (2006). ‘Cultural Diversity, Multilingualism and Indigenous Education in Latin America’. In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp. 238-261)
- Löwstedt, Anthony (2008). ‘Rights Versus Diversity? The Accelerated Extinction of Languages and Cultures as an Aspect of Current Globalisation Trends’. MLE Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi, India, 5-8 February 2008
- Maartens, J. (1998). ‘Multilingualism and Language Policy in South Africa’. In Guus Extra & J. Maartens (eds.) *Multilingualism in a Multilingual Context: Case Studies on South Africa and Western Europe*. The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press, 15-36
- Macías, Reynaldo F. (2001). ‘Minority Languages in the United States, with a Focus on Spanish in California’. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 333-354)
- Maffi, Luisa (1998). ‘Language: A Resource for Nature’. *The UNESCO Journal on the Environment and National Resources Research* 34(4) 1998: 12-21
- Magga, Ole Henrik (1995). ‘The Sámi Language Act’. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 219 – 233)
- Magga, Henrik, Ida Nicolaisen, Mililani Trask, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Dunbar (2005). *Indigenous Children’s Education and Indigenous Languages. Expert paper written for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues*. New York: United Nations
- Martin, Peter W. (2003). ‘Interactions and Inter-relationships Around Text: Practices and Positionings in a Multilingual Classroom in Brunei’. In Angela Creese and Peter Martin (Eds.) (2003). *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies. Inter-relationships, Interactions and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (25-41)
- Matavele, Celeste (2008). *Ensino Bilingue com Bons Resultados*. Retrieved on 29 January 2009 from http://macua.blogs.com/moambique_para_todos/2008/06/ensino-bilingue.html
- McLaughlin, Barry. (1986). ‘Multilingual Education: Theory East and West’. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.) (1986). *Language*

and Education in Multilingual Settings. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mesthrie, R. (Ed.) (1995) *Language and Social History: Studies in South African Sociolinguistics*. Cape Town: David Phillip

Ministério da Educação (MINED) (1986). *Atlas Geográfico*. Estocolmo, Suécia: Esselte Map Service

Ministério da Educação (MINED). (2000). *Programas de Francês do 2 Ciclo do ESG*. Maputo: MINED

Ministry of Basic Education, Sport and Culture (MBESC) (2003). 'The Language Policy for Schools in Namibia – Discussion Document' Namibia: MBESC. Retrieved on 30 March 2009 from <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE/ministers/Namibia.pdf>

Mishra, Mahendra (2009a). 'Community Culture and Curriculum: In the Context of Tribal Education in Orissa, India', in *Language in India* Volume 9: 11 November 2009.

Mutumba, Jerome. 'Mass Participation Limited by English as Sole Medium'. Retrieved on February 5, 2009. <http://www.nied.edu.na/publications/journals/journal9/Journal%209%20Article%207.pdf>

Nelson, Keely (2005). 'Language Policies and Minority Resistance in China'. In *Languages, Communities and Education* (2005), 25-30

Neustupný, J. V. (1984). 'Literacy and Minorities: Divergent Perceptions'. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.) (1984). *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy – Language Policy Issues in Developing Countries*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers (pp. 115-128)

Ngunga, Armindo (1999). 'Literacy Campaigns in Mozambique: Why did they fail?' In *Language Matters*, Vol.30, Issue 1 1999, (pp. 147-156)

Nygren-Junkin, Lilian (2004). 'Multilingualism in Göteborg'. In Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp.133-160)

Ó Laoire, Muiris (2009a). 'The Challenge of Diversity: Implementing a Language Education Policy in Multilingual Contexts. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 10-12 September 2009

Ó Laoire, Muiris (2009b). "'All for one and one for all"! New Paradigms and New Challenges for a Languages-in-Education Policy in Ireland'. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges*, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009

Oliver, Rhonda and Nola Purdie (1998). 'The Attitudes of Bilingual Children to their Languages'. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol. 19, No.3, 1998, (pp. 199-211)

Omoniyi, Tope (2007). 'Alternative Contexts of Language Policy and Planning in Sub-Saharan Africa' In *TESOL*

Quarterly, Vol. 41, No. 3, September 2007 (pp.533-549)

- Omoniyi, Tope (2003). 'Local Policies and Global Forces: Multiliteracy and Africa's Indigenous Languages'. In *Language Policy* 2:133-152. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers
- Pandharipande, Rajeshwari (2002). *Minority Matters: Issues in Minority Languages in India*. In *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, Vol. 4, No.2
- Paulston, Christina Bratt and Kai Heidemann (2006). 'Language Policies and the Education of Linguistic Minorities'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (pp. 292-310)
- Pavlenko, Aneta (2009). 'Multilingualism and Democracy'. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Multilingualism. Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 10-12 September 2009
- Payne, Mark. (2007), 'Foreign Language Planning – Towards a supporting framework', *Language Problems and Language Planning*. Vol. 31, No. 3. 2007 (pp. 235-256)
- Phillipson, Robert (1995). 'Response to John Honey's review of Robert Phillipson. Linguistic Imperialism'. In *Rask* 3, September 1995. Pages 137-140
- Phillipson, Robert (2007). 'English in European Integration and Globalisation. Lingua Franca or Lingua Frankensteinia?' *Paper presented at the Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. 5 December 2007*
- Phillipson, Robert (2008). 'The New Linguistic Imperial Order: English as an EU *lingua franca* or *lingua frankensteinia*?' In 'Unions: past-present-future', *Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies*, Vol. 1: Issue 2, 2008, 189-2003
- Prah, Kwesi Kwaa (2002a). 'Education, Mother-Tongue Instruction, Christianity and Development of an African National Culture'. Paper presented to the International Conference on "Visionen für das berufliche Bildungssystem in Africa." Germany. 13-15 February 2002. In Lawford Imunde (Ed). *Reflections on Education Systems in Africa*. Loccumer Protokolle 05/02. Germany 2002. Retrieved from http://casas.co.za/papers_education.htm, on 05 May 2009
- Prah, Kwesi Kwaa (2002b). 'Language, Neo-Colonialism and the African Development Challenge'. Published in *TRIcontinental*, Havana, Cuba, No. 150, 2002. Retrieved from http://casas.co.za/papers_education.htm, on 05 May 2009
- Prah, Kwesi Kwaa (2003). 'Going Native: Language of Instruction for Education, Development and African Emancipation'. Paper presented at the Launch Workshop of Language of Instruction in Tanzania: 22nd to 24th April 2002. In Birgit Brock-Utne, Zubeida Desai and Martha Qorro (Eds.) (2006). *Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA)*. Dar-es-Salaam: E & D.
- Preisler, Bent (2008). 'Deconstructing 'the context of science' as a sociolinguistic entity in EFL societies: The relationship

- between English and Danish in higher education and research'. In Bent Preisler et al. (Eds.) (2008). *The Consequences of Mobility. Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones*. Roskilde: Department of Culture and Identity. Roskilde University (pp. 238-248)
- Rannut, Mart (1995). 'Beyond Linguistic Policy: The Soviet Union Versus Estonia'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp.179-208)
- Rannut, Mart and Ülle Rannut (1995). 'Bilingualism – A Step Towards Monolingualism or Multilingualism'? In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V (pp. 183-198)
- Risager, Karen (2010). 'Language Hierarchies at the International University'. Paper presented at Roskilde University, Denmark, 15 April 2010
- Romaine, Suzanne (2006). 'The Bilingual and Multilingual Community'. In Tej K. Bhatia and William Ritchie (Eds.) (2006). *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing (pp. 385-405)
- Roberts, C. (1994). 'Transferring Literacy Skills from L1 to L2: From Theory to Practice'. Retrieved on 21 August 2006 at http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE019750/Transferring_Literacy.pdf
- Rubdy, Rani (2008). 'Language Planning Ideologies, Communicative Practices and Their Consequences'. In M. Martin-Jones, A. M. de Mejia and N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 3: Discourse and Education, 211-223*. 2008 Springer Science and Business Media LLC
- Shohamy, Elana (2006a). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge
- Shohamy, Elana (2006b). 'Imagined Multilingual Schools: How Come We Don't Deliver?' In Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres-Guzmán (Eds.) (2006) *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd (pp.171-183)
- Shohamy, Elana (2008). 'Questions for Robert Cooper'. In *Language Policy* (2009) 8:89-94 (Published online: 9 November 2008)
- Shohamy, Elana (2009). 'Linguistic Landscape: A Tool for Creating Language Policies: Cases and a Critical Review'. Paper presented at the Conference *Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges*, University of Limerick, 18-20 June 2009
- Sjöholm, Kaj (2003). 'English as a Third Language in Bilingual Finland: Basic Communication or Academic Language?' In Charlotte Hoffmann and Jehannes Ytsma (Eds.) (2004). *Trilingualism in Family, School and Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 219-242)

- Skutnabb-Kangas (2000). *Linguistic Genocide in Education – or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2006). 'Language Policy and Linguistic Human Rights'. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. (pp. 273-291)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2007). 'The Importance for the Future of Humanity of Linguistic Diversity and Linguistic Human Rights'. Paper presented at the Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. 5 December 2007
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2008). 'Wrong Economics and Lack of Implementation of Research Results in Indigenous/Tribal Education: Politicians, Bureaucrats, Researchers/Intellectuals and Dharma'. Key Note Address at the MLE Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi, India, 5-8 February 2008
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Robert Phillipson (1986). *Linguicism Rules in Education*. Part 1. Roskilde: Roskilde University Centre, Institute VI, Denmark
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Sertaç Bucak (1995). 'Killing a Mother Tongue – How the Kurds are Deprived of Linguistic Human Rights'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 347-370)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Robert Phillipson (2007). 'A Human Rights Perspective on Language Ecology'. *Ecology of Language*. Vol. 9. 2nd edition. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 3-14. 20 September 2007
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and T.L. MacCarty (2007). 'Key Concepts in Bilingual Education: Ideological, Historical, Epistemological and Empirical Foundations. In J. Cummins, and N.H. Hornberger (Eds.) (2007). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Vol. 5: Bilingual Education. (pp. 3-17). New York: Springer
- Spolsky, Bernard and Elana Shohamy (1997). 'Planning Foreign Language Education: An Israeli Perspective'. In De Bot, Kees and Bonaerts, Theo (eds.). *Perspectives on Foreign Language Policy: Studies in Honour of Theo van Els*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (pp.99-111)
- Stroud, Christopher (2001) 'African Mother-Tongue Programmes and the Politics of Language: Linguistic Citizenship Versus Linguistic Human Rights'. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol 22, No.4, 2001 (pp. 339-355)
- Takala, Tuomas (1998). 'Making educational policy under influence of external assistance and national politics – a comparative analysis of the education sector policy documents of Ethiopia, Mozambique, Namibia and Zambia'. *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 18, Issue 4, July 1998 (pp. 319-335)
- Tickoo, Makhan (1995). 'Kashmiri, a Majority-Minority Language: An Exploratory Essay'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton

de Gruyter (pp. 317 – 333)

Turi, Joseph-G (1995). 'Typology of Language Legislation'. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (Eds.) (1995). *Linguistic Human Rights - Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (pp. 111-119)

Universidade Pedagógica (2004). *Plano Estratégico da Universidade Pedagógica*. Maputo: SIGA, Lda

Verlot, Marc and Kaat Delrue (2004). 'Multilingualism in Brussels' In Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (2004). *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 221-250)

Webb, V. N. (2002). 'Language Policy Development in South Africa'. University of Pretoria: Centre for Research in the Politics of Language. Paper presented at the World Congress on Language Politics. Barcelona: Linguapax Institute. 16-20 April

Williams, Colin H. (2002). 'Language Policy Issues within the European Union: Applied Geographic Perspectives'. In *Dela* 18. 2002. 41-59

Walters, F. Scott. (2008). 'Margo Gottieb and Diep Nguyen, Assessment and Accountability in Language Education Programs' (Book Review). In *Language Policy* (2008) 7:301-303

Willems, Gerard (2002). 'Language Teacher Education Policy – Promoting Linguistic Diversity and Intercultural Communication' – *Guide for the development of Language Education Policies in Europe – From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education*. Language Policy Division. Council of Europe; retrieved on 26 September 2009, from [http://scholar.google.dk/scholar?q=Willems,+Gerard+\(2002\).+%E2%80%98Language+Teacher+Education+Policy+%E2%80%93+Promoting+Linguistic+Diversity+and+Intercultural+Communication%E2%80%99&hl=da&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholar](http://scholar.google.dk/scholar?q=Willems,+Gerard+(2002).+%E2%80%98Language+Teacher+Education+Policy+%E2%80%93+Promoting+Linguistic+Diversity+and+Intercultural+Communication%E2%80%99&hl=da&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholar)

Woodward, David et al. (1994) *Rehabilitation, Refugees, Resources – Aspects of Basic Education Planning in Mozambique*. London: World University Service

World Bank (2008). *2008 Report on the Millennium Development Goals*. UN Mozambique – Delivering as One. Maputo: World Bank

Wright, Sue. (2007). 'The Right to Speak One's Own Language: Reflections on Theory and Practice'. In *Language Policy* (2007) 6:203-224

Yadava, Yogendra P. (2008). 'Linguistic Diversity in Nepal: Perspectives on Existing Language Policy'. Paper presented at the Language Development, Language Revitalisation, Maintenance and Language Policy Conference. Bangkok 1-3 July 2008

- Yagmur, Kutlay (2001). 'Languages in Turkey'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 407-427)
- Zakharia, Zeena. (2008). 'Angel M.Y. Lin and Peter W. Martin (Eds.): Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in Education Policy and Practice (New Perspectives on Language and Education Series)' (Book Review). In *Language Policy* (2008) 7:179-181
- Østern, Anna (2001). 'Swedish in Finland'. In Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (pp. 159-173)