

1. Introduction

Since the democratisation of South Africa in 1994, English has almost become the only language of science (LoS) in the country, i.e. of teaching, research, community service and administration (even at management meetings of the historically Afrikaans universities - HAUs). Languages other than English (LOTE¹) have, in practice, almost no role in these contexts.

In a multilingual country with a constitution that stipulates linguistic equality and parity of esteem, commits the government to the development of all the official languages and undertakes to preserve the diversity of the country, this state of affairs is, of course, unacceptable. It is unacceptable, firstly, because it is un- (even anti-) constitutional, but also because of the following reasons:

- a) It is in conflict with South Africa's Language Policy for Higher Education (2002) which: "acknowledges the current position of English and Afrikaans as the dominant languages of instruction" (15.1)², stipulates that "consideration should be given to the development of other South African languages for use in instruction" (in the long term)" (15.2), and "recognises the important role of higher education in the promotion of multilingualism for social, cultural, intellectual and economic development" (18.2).
- b) Secondly, in so far as language is a factor in educational development,³ the dominance of English/the use of only English as language of teaching and learning seriously impacts on students' academic performance and thus their development. Language, as we know, is the mediator in cognitive development (acquisition of knowledge and understanding, internalising concepts, developing reasoning skills), affective development (emotional security, self-esteem), and social skills development. South African students for whom English is a second language (ESL students) generally do not have the required academic language proficiency in English.⁴ Further support for the negative impact of ESL on student achievement can be demonstrated by looking at

¹ In this paper LOTE refers to the 10 other major (official) languages of the country, which, together with English, are spoken by more than 99% of the country's 45 million people. L1 speaker percentages, in descending order of size, are as follows: Zulu 23.8%, Xhosa 17.6%, Afrikaans 13.3%, Northern Sotho 9.4%, English 8.2%, Tswana 8.2%, Southern Sotho 7.9%, Tsonga 4.4%, Swazi 2.7%, Venda 2.3% and Ndebele 1.6% (2001 census statistics).

² As regards Afrikaans as such, the Language Policy for Higher Education states that it "acknowledges that Afrikaans as a language of scholarship and science is a national resource", "fully supports the retention of Afrikaans as a medium of academic expression and communication in higher education, and is committed to ensuring that the capacity of Afrikaans to function as such a medium is not eroded" (15.4)

³ The language factor obviously does not necessarily provide a sufficient explanation for differences in academic performance. Linguists who have discussed the role of language in academic success, including Angélie-Carter (1998), agree that it is difficult to be specific about the contribution of the language factor to learning, emphasising that there are many other factors of equal or greater importance involved in the process. In South Africa, apartheid is a self-evident central causal factor, through the inferior education it provided to black learners, the inadequate provision of educational resources of all kinds, the isolation of black learners from the dominant language communities in the country (mainly English), the disruption it engendered in schools for black learners over many years (expressed in the protest slogan: "liberation before education"), and so on.

⁴ Research conducted on behalf of PanSALB in 2000 found that only 22% of the 2016 respondents involved were able to follow government speeches in English. See also Webb 2002a, 2002b and 2002c.

the linguistic distribution (using first language as opposed to a second language as medium of instruction) of pass-rates in selected subjects of study:

Percentage students per course registration who passed selected first-year courses in 1999 at the University of Pretoria, by language used as medium of instruction (MoI)

	% Pass	
	First language used	Second language used
Statistics 110 (N = 1939)	68	45
Public Administration 110 (N = 72)	73	45
Education 110 (N = 302)	71	34
Psychology 110 (N = 1000)	74	57
Information Science 111 (N = 583)	81	65
Sociology 110 (N = 327)	80	40
Traditional Law 110 (N = 679)	53	40
Commercial Law 110 (N = 1001)	79	53
Private Law 110 (N = 634)	71	44
Physics 131 (N = 575)	75	57

Source: University of Pretoria Student Data Bureau

It is likely that ESL students will be found to perform 10% or more below their potential. This situation is clearly unfair to ESL students and, also, constitutes an unjust advantage for students whose primary language is English.

- c) It will lead to the demise and/or the non-development of LOTE, as in the case of Afrikaans which has undergone both serious functional restriction (gradually losing its high-function capacity) and lexical loss (losing its technical terms through their non-use). Ultimately, such a development will be threatening to an important component of the country's pluralism, its linguistic diversity, which is said to be regarded as a national treasure.
- d) It could contribute to restricting access to the rights and privileges of the country's (future) citizens and to the continuance of poverty, exclusion, inequity, disadvantage and discrimination.

The dominance of English as LoS, is, of course, strengthened by its social, economic and political power and its consequent dominance in public life, trade and industry in South Africa. The a-symmetrical power-relations between the country's major languages is further seriously exacerbated by the South African government's language policy practice, which is monolingually English.

The consequences of this development are quite clear: the strengthening of English is becoming hegemonic⁵ and leading to the greater marginalisation and inferiorisation of LOTE, which, in turn, means that these languages will be used even less as a MoI in schools, which will further contribute to continued poor educational development, and thus, poor economic performance. Ultimately it means that the current situation of (selective) disadvantaging, marginalisation, inequality and poverty will be maintained.

⁵ Two remarks (a) the dominance of English is not considered a problem, and (b) the value of English is not denied. Support for the development of LOTE must not be interpreted as implying that it is considered unimportant that South African learners acquire English to the maximum of their potential.

Clearly, thus, LOTE seriously need to be maintained as LoS (as in the case of Afrikaans) or developed in this capacity (as in the case of the African languages⁶). The question is: how.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss this process with reference to the University of Pretoria.

2. Background information

Three points need to be considered as language political background information:

- a) As already stated, English is the major language of public life in South Africa, Afrikaans can be said to be a minority language in public life and the African languages, though generally numerically larger, can be said to be minoritised languages.
- b) In 1994 there were 36 higher education (HE) public institutions in South Africa, of which 21 were universities and 15 institutions for technical training (called *technikons*). Two universities were bilingual (the former University of Port Elizabeth and the University of South Africa/Unisa) and nineteen monolingual: five Afrikaans and fourteen English. Today, after the recent mergers and amalgamations of HE institutions, there are eleven universities and five universities of technology. Nine of these institutions are monolingually English and seven are bilingual.⁷ There are no longer any wholly Afrikaans institutions of HE and none that use a Bantu language for tertiary teaching or research (du Plessis, 2005).
- c) Before 1994, Afrikaans and English were the only LoS in South Africa, with the African languages not used in this function at all. Since 1994, the criteria for the admission of students to tertiary institutions were changed so that access to HE may not be denied on the basis of language, that equity be ensured and that the results of past racially discriminatory laws and practices be redressed. These decisions have meant that the demographic character of formerly white South African institutions of HE has changed dramatically, as will be shown later with reference to the University of Pretoria. The government has also indicated that it prefers parallel or dual-medium institutions since such institutions will enhance inter-group contact and promote diversity. Single-medium Afrikaans universities were discouraged.⁸

3. The reasons for promoting LOTE as LoS in South Africa

⁶ In South Africa, what are called *Bantu languages* internationally, are called *African languages*, for political reasons. In this paper, the South African term will be used.

⁷ It needs to be pointed out that the concept “bilingual institution” in South Africa does not have the same meaning as it has in the case of the classically bilingual universities in Europe or Canada, where bilingualism is regarded as a “university ethos” and is seen as “an educational and cultural benefit and resource” (Brink, 2004). In South Africa it refers mainly to universities that use two languages for administrative and teaching purposes.

⁸ This, obviously, has not happened in the case of single-medium English universities, leading many concerned Afrikaans academics to suspect that the government has an anti-Afrikaans agenda (a suspicion strengthened by the national and provincial education departments’ attempts to force single-medium Afrikaans schools (but not single-medium English schools) to become dual or parallel medium schools - even through court cases).

Besides the five reasons already mentioned (the constitutional imperative, the language policy for HE, the facilitation of students' academic performance and educational development, the demise or non-development of LOTE as LoS, and the need to establish access to rights and privileges, equity and the prohibition of discrimination, manipulation and exploitation (disadvantaging), there is also the following consideration:⁹

In developing countries, universities have a serious moral obligation to contribute to the cultural, social and economic development of societies. Besides training people from these societies to function effectively in knowledge-based institutions (including industries and businesses), universities should also facilitate the development of black communities',¹⁰ self-esteem, self-value and intellectualisation. As we know, languages are important symbolic entities in national life, and the development of the social and economic value of the African languages in South Africa will contribute to the wider socio-political and socio-cultural development of these communities. As Goosen (2004) points out, cultural factors are important conditions for economic development in a society: economy, ecology and culture are part and parcel of the same world and cannot be divorced from one another. Bastardas (2002), similarly, supports the opposition by societies to "the great ... global codes of communication, in order to advance in their economic and cultural development", arguing that the "preservation of linguistic diversity and the maintenance of distinct collective identities (is) a way of avoiding the poverty and anonymity that are the destination of the traditional subsistence ecosystem". If the nine African languages of South Africa remain marginalised, a very large part of their speakers will remain poor and disadvantaged. Thus: if universities contribute towards the promotion of LOTE as LoS in South Africa, they will be fulfilling their social responsibility.

4. Language political character of UP, 2005

In order to discuss the issues relevant to the promotion of LOTE as LoS, the University of Pretoria is used as case study. It is therefore necessary to take note of the language political character of the university.

a) Academic character

Faculties	Acad. depart.	Teaching staff	Study areas	Modules
9	147	1275	613 (289 u/grad)	4015 (2988 u/grad)

b) Student profile

Student numbers (June, 2005)

Undergraduate	Post-graduate	TOTAL
28 252	10 247	38499

⁹ Given the context of inter-group suspicion that exists in South Africa, especially regarding white Afrikaans-speaking South Africans, it is necessary to point out that the argument in favour of maintaining Afrikaans (as an LOTE) as an LoS, is not directed at regaining power and control by white South Africans, at reinstating segregation in some way, or at attempting to protect any particular version of a supposed "Afrikaner cultural identity"; nor is it based on any version of sentimentality. In fact, the argument presented in this paper is not presented as a primarily linguistic, cultural or political issue, but as an academic issue.

¹⁰ According to the SA institute of Race Relations (2001), 23.3% of the black population had no educational training in South Africa, 18.59% had completed some primary school and 6.9% has completed primary school training. 48.7% of this population thus had no training at secondary school level.

Student numbers (June, 2005) by race

Black	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White
13 184	646	1 708	22 961

% Increase in student numbers since 1996 by race

Black	Coloured	Indian/Asian	White
250%	252%	430%	None

Language distribution of students, 2005¹¹

Language	Undergraduate	Post-graduate	Total
Afrikaans	12393	3979	16372
English	6789	2722	9511
Afrikaans/English	157	130	287
Setswana	1790	633	2423
Sesotho sa Leboa	1557	546	2103
Sesotho	1310	229	1539
IsiZulu	1187	344	1531
IsiXhosa	470	233	703
Xitsonga	519	182	701
Siswati	561	115	676
Tshivenda	360	179	539
IsiNdebele	421	79	500
French, German, Other	738	876	1614

As is clear from this table, at least 11 479 students (29.8%) at the University use English as a second language, being, therefore, potentially disadvantaged academically in comparison with the other students. Additionally, these students do not, in practice, have any choice regarding MoI.

Comparison of the language character of UP, Tshwane metropolitan region and the Gauteng Province (2002/2005), %

	Afr/AE	English	Tswana	North. So	Sotho	Zulu	Tsonga
UP	43.3	24.7	6.3	5.4	4	4	1.8
Tshwane	21.3	6.5	17.1	22.1	3.96	7.6	9.98
Gauteng	14.4	12.5	8.4	10.7	13.1	21.5	5.7

A comparison of the language distribution of the University with that of the region from which draws its students (the Tshwane metropolitan region) clearly shows that, except for Sotho (generally called Southern Sotho), the University is linguistically not representative, and an increase in students who speak Tswana, Northern Sotho, Zulu and Tsonga can be expected. At the same time, student enrolment from the Afrikaans community can be expected to decline, maybe even rapidly.

¹¹ The major languages (as L1s) in the **Gauteng Province** are: Zulu 21,5%, Afrikaans 14,4% and Southern Sotho 13,1%, and the major languages of the University's main source of students, the **Tshwane metropolitan region**, are: Northern Sotho (Sepedi) 22,1% (439 651), Afrikaans 21,3% (422 930), Tswana 17,1% (339 932), Tsonga 10% (198 166), Zulu 7,6% (151 256) and English 6,5% (129 942). Total: 1 985 985.

With most black students expected to elect for English as MoI, the position of Afrikaans can be expected to weaken in the immediate future. Given the importance of Afrikaans in the promotion of the African languages (also as LoS), the language issue at the University needs serious consideration.

c) Language political history

The University of Pretoria was formerly an almost exclusively white, Afrikaans-medium institution. However, from the early 1990s, with the abandonment of apartheid and the insistence of the post-1994 government that the inequities of the past (discrimination, disadvantaging) and affirmative action be addressed, increasing numbers of non-Afrikaans-speaking black students were admitted to the University. As a consequence, the University has adopted a language policy making it a “bilingual” institution, with Afrikaans and English as official languages. Today, slightly more than a decade later, only 42.8% of the University’s students are Afrikaans-speaking, with 43.3% selecting Afrikaans as MoI.

d) The UP’s language policy

The University of Pretoria’s current language policy specifies that:

- i. The official languages of the University are Afrikaans and English (par. 2.1)
- ii. Academic instruction will be provided in either Afrikaans or English, or in both these languages depending on the demand for training in these languages and depending on whether the programmes concerned are academically and economically feasible (2.2)
- iii. Afrikaans and English will be used as academic languages and developed in order to establish excellence in academic communication (2.3), and
- iv. The University undertakes to promote other languages

e) MoI/Language policy practice

In 2002, 83.4% of the academic staff were reported able to teach in Afrikaans, 12.5% were not, whilst 95.7% reported being able to teach in English, whereas 0.4% were not.

Change in ratio of students electing for instruction in Afrikaans as opposed to English, 1995 – 1999, 2001, 2004 and 2005 in percentage points

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2001	2004	2005
Afrikaans	70.8	65.5	62	59.1	57.3	53	42.8	43.3
English	29.2	34.5	38	40.9	42.7	47	57.4	56.7

Source: University of Pretoria Student Data Bureau

The MoI to be used for each of the 4015 modules taught at the University is specified in the university’s brochure for admission requirements. For the 152 undergraduate programmes offered, 94 (61.8%) indicate that they will be taught in both Afrikaans and English, 42 (27.2%) only in Afrikaans, and 16 (10.4%) only in English. Teaching in “both Afrikaans and English” means, theoretically, that such programmes are either taught in both languages in every class (dual-medium) or twice – once in Afrikaans and once in English (parallel medium). Given the likelihood that a significant number of students in a particular course are not proficient in Afrikaans, that practically all Afrikaans-speaking students are reasonably proficient in English, and that lecturers are understandably loathe to duplicate courses, students are most likely urged to

agree to be taught in one class (and to accept study guides and reading matter in English only), which would then probably mean that the 94 programmes are, in practice, taught mainly in English. If this is so, it would mean that 72.2% of the programmes are taught in English, which would indicate an enormous turn-around in MoI – from only or mainly Afrikaans, to mainly English, in a period of 10 years.^{12,13}

f) What UP does to promote LOTE as LoS

UP provides the following institutions and programmes directed at language promotion:

- A unit for the development of Afrikaans and English language skills
- Courses in Afrikaans, Zulu, Tswana, Northern Sotho and Ndebele, German, French, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and, of course, English; a language laboratory
- Didactics of language teaching
- Applied Language Study – language policy development, translation, lexicography, terminology and editing
- The National Lexicography Unit for Ndebele

Except for the lexicography unit (which was in any case not established at the initiative of the University), these programmes and courses were available even before the University developed its current language policy. This means, of course, that the University has, in effect, done nothing specifically to protect Afrikaans or to promote the African languages as LoS in terms of its own language policy.

g) More specific criticisms

- i. Despite the stipulations of their language policy (“Afrikaans will be developed”), the University has allowed the position of Afrikaans as a LoS to deteriorate to a serious degree. One of the reasons for this is that the University followed a strategy recommended by a former vice-chancellor, namely that of supply and demand regarding the MoI issue (“depending on the demand for training”). The University clearly totally over-estimated the strength of Afrikaans. Given the demographic changes in the student profile, the enormous strength of English and the negative social meaning of Afrikaans, the demise of Afrikaans as LoS was completely predictable. An additional aggravating factor in this regard was its focus on the economic factor (to the exclusion of its social and cultural responsibilities) – “economically feasible”. Furthermore, there is a lack of commitment from academic staff, particularly in the engineering departments to protecting Afrikaans (and, of course, promoting the African languages). Clearly, statements of intent are not enough.
- ii. The University has done nothing to promote the African languages as LoS; in fact, the African languages are not even referred to specifically in the language policy. This is probably linked to the fact that there are nine of them, to the underdeveloped state of these

¹² The School for Social Sciences has officially opted for a dual-medium approach, which, in practice probably also means that most courses are taught only in English.

¹³ An audit of what the actual language use practice is in classrooms (as opposed to published information in University brochures) regarding, for example: whether courses are taught only in Afrikaans, only in English, in both languages at the same time, or duplicated in the other language, in which language(s) study guides, reading material and question papers are available and whether students may answer question papers in both languages, would probably reveal a strong bias towards English.

- languages for use in academic contexts, and to the fact that the speakers of these languages generally regard them as inappropriate for use in high-function formal contexts.
- iii. The University management has, seemingly, not considered language policy development and language policy implementation to be a complex matter, assuming that administrative managers untrained in language planning are capable of handling the language issue, and that the co-operation of language planning scholars is unnecessary.
 - iv. Until recently, the management of the university also did not seem to take the language issue seriously, showing little inclination to facilitate a public debate on the matter. Recent actions by Afrikaans activists (a protest march, a memorandum to the university management on the neglect of Afrikaans and the Anglicisation of academic programmes as well as the alleged discrimination against Afrikaans students in university residences) and the subsequent media coverage have led to a public call by the University for a national conference on the MoI issue and the funding of bilingual universities by the government.
 - v. The University has not developed a plan of implementation for their language policy
 - vi. Nobody has been appointed by the University to drive the language promotion process, to undertake the necessary research, to conduct information and awareness campaigns, etc.
 - vii. The University has not expressed any commitment to bilingualism or multilingualism as a feature of institutional culture

5. Proposals for the promotion of LOTE as LoS

Obviously, in order to determine what needs to be done to promote LOTE as LoS at the University of Pretoria, one needs to take close note of the obstacles to such a process.

5.1 Obstacles to the maintenance and development of LOTE as LoS at the University of Pretoria

- a) There is a non-supporting language environment at the University

Three dimensions of this factor are relevant:

- There is no ethos of multilingualism at the University. The classically bilingual universities of Europe and Canada are situated in communities in which bilingualism (including knowledge of and appreciation for the Other) is a way of life, providing a supportive infra-structure for operating bilingually. Furthermore, the social status of all the languages of these universities is high: English and French in Canada, French and German in Switzerland, Finnish and Swedish in Finland and Dutch and French in Belgium. This is not the case in South Africa. Although the South African constitution prescribes linguistic and cultural pluralism, the South African community, including the source community of the UP, is a long way from giving meaning to this philosophy. In fact, the South African government demonstrates no commitment to multilingualism, and public life is becoming increasingly monolingual.
- The low social and economic value of LOTE in South Africa.
 - In contrast to the high social and economic value of English, Afrikaans is regarded as having only local value, whilst the African languages are only of value for low functions (i.e. personal and private use).
 - Knowledge of the African languages and even of Afrikaans are not regarded as serving people's economic, social or political interests and needs, with only a knowledge of English viewed as giving graduates a competitive edge,

nationally and internationally, providing international mobility and ensuring access to and participation in the international labour market, the international market place.

- Practically all the information people need, e.g. educational material, is available in English, with some also in Afrikaans (and Dutch), but nothing in the African languages.
 - Finally, the linguistic capacity of the African languages, e.g. as fully-fledged standard languages, has not been adequately developed.
 - The language knowledge/proficiency of students in more than two languages is not at the required levels. Although all South African learners have a compulsory exposure to at least 2 languages during their entire school programme of twelve years (English and their L1, or Afrikaans and English), they generally are not adequately proficient in English or Afrikaans, do not have the expected linguistic skills in their L1, and generally also have an objection against Afrikaans because of the language's direct association with apartheid. Establishing a bilingual university in the classical sense of the term in Afrikaans and English, or Afrikaans and an African language, or English and an African language does not make much sense in South Africa. In any case, the power-relationships between the South African languages is a-symmetric to such a degree, and the playing field is so unequal that a culture of bi- or multilingualism will be difficult to bring about effectively.
- b) Unlike universities such as those in Catalonia, Spain,¹⁴ bilingual universities in South Africa (in the South African meaning of the term), that is, mainly the HAUs, are not subsidised for the extra teaching load they have to carry and the fact that their academic staff consequently have less research time available (with which they could also have earned state subsidy).
- c) A third obstacle is the fact that the language debate is subject to the power dimension:
- First of all, the University has to operate within the context of the government's language policy practice of English monolingualism. The linguistic regimes that political regimes put in place, have a strong impact on the language beliefs and behaviour of citizens, and bi- and multilingualism are clearly not a strong consideration of the South African government.
 - Secondly, there is the fact that the language debate is conducted within the framework of social, political and economic forces, and is thus strongly affected by the hegemony of English (that is, the overt or covert imposition to further own ends through the use of English). Globalisation and technologisation, the stress on being internationally competitive, and the need for internationalisation, are strong, inhibitive factors. Linked to this, as Brink (2004) points out, universities in the (post-)modern era are no longer self-sufficient autonomous institutions, responsible only unto themselves and their own academic beliefs. The boundaries between the state, the private sector, industry and the civil society are becoming smaller.
 - Thirdly, there is also the uninformedness of the majority of the academic staff. At the UP, for example, members of the engineering departments argue that their first priority is to be world-class departments and to be internationally competitive, and

¹⁴ In the Catalan-speaking areas of Spain the Language Policy Act stipulates that the Government and the universities must adopt the necessary measures to encourage the use of the Catalan language in every sphere of teaching, non-teaching and research activities" (p. 60) and provides government support for the language services they offer and for the publication of university textbooks.

that (only) English will allow them to accomplish this aim. They obviously do not understand that the language issue can easily be an obstruction to producing internationally competitive graduates.

5.2 Tasks to be performed by the University of Pretoria

In order to establish an academically responsible language situation at the University, and to bridge the obstacles to the maintenance and promotion of LOTE, at least the following tasks need to be performed:

- a) Enter into discussion with the government on additional funding for bilingual universities, on the basis of arguments which are academically sound, economically substantiated and justifiable in the context of the politics of language.
- b) Revise the language policy and include a statutorily binding commitment to maintain Afrikaans as MoI in a meaningful and a practicable way. (This is a proposal made by the registrar of the University: that core modules in each study programme be identified and that these courses be offered in both Afrikaans and English.); include, also, a binding commitment to promote locally relevant African languages as LoS. (In this regard it needs to be kept in mind that a central task in the general development of the African languages is the promotion of their economic and social value. If the University succeeds in making them LoS, it will obviously contribute to both their social standing and their economic value, and more students will be interested in pursuing the study of these languages.)
- c) Develop an appropriate plan of implementation, including a list of specific tasks and a time-frame.
- d) Decide on a MoI model that will support LOTE as LoS. (It is argued by some that both the dual-medium and the parallel-medium approach will eventually lead to English or to assimilation to English. Du Plessis (2005:31), for example, argues that parallel-medium education is very costly, increases the workload of staff, is complex to manage (re timetables) and is challenging to maintain at all costs. Obviously, such problems need to be sorted out.
- e) Promote the locally relevant African languages (Northern Sotho, Tswana and Zulu) of the University as LoS in a gradual, incremental way – beginning in a small, low-cost manner. Possible strategies in this regard could be:
 - Using these languages in symbolic functions, for instance in university brochures, letterheads, street signs, names of buildings, graduation ceremonies, and so forth
 - Instructing academic staff to include lists of technical terms in African languages in their study guides, and appoint tutors and teaching assistants who can speak a Bantu language
 - Establishing programmes for the development of Northern Sotho, Tswana and Zulu, e.g. for technical terminology and dictionaries, their standardisation, the development of learning and teaching materials
 - Requiring staff to acquire basic proficiency in these languages
 - Making proficiency in these languages compulsory in the study programmes of students who will have to communicate with their clients in their later professional capacities, such as students in medicine, teaching, law, criminology, social work, psychology, etc.
 - Requesting academic staff to establish tutorial groups in their courses in which a Bantu language can be used for academic discussions

- Providing funding for research projects, publications, conference participation, the translation and editing of scientific articles in LOTE, and development projects (such as the development of school textbooks in the African languages)
- f) Ensure that library acquisitions, including journals, are also in LOTE.
- g) Accepting that multilingualism is a reality which will not go away, that it has the potential to develop into a problem and that universities need to learn to manage it, the University must decide on ways in which it can establish a multilingual language milieu, a spirit and culture of multilingualism, on campuses of the University, with the aim to facilitate and promote understanding between persons of different linguistic communities and cultural backgrounds, a knowledge of and respect for each other's languages, and the promotion of cross-cultural communication skills and cross-cultural dialogue
- h) Conduct intensive information and awareness campaigns about the importance of language in academic as well as public life among staff and students.

5.3 A strategic plan¹⁵

- a) Language policy development and language planning, as well as the ensuing programme(s) for language development, is, as we know, an extremely complex exercise, and can only achieve success if it is based on accurate information and is conducted within a coherent, integrated language planning model such as proposed by Donnacha (2000). Since there is insufficient reliable information available about the UP, the first task to undertake is to collect the required information through extensive research¹⁶.
- b) Given the availability of the information required for proper language policy development, the various possible policy options need to be debated
- c) Comprehensive cost-estimates for each policy option to be considered by the University need to be undertaken, noting that such cost-benefit estimates must include, in addition to measurable costs and benefits, also immeasurable costs and benefits: the cost of poor training (e.g. graduates who are not productive contributors in the labour market and who are not competitive in the modern knowledge-era)
- d) Select the policy option best suited for the vision and mission of the University (revise the current policy), and work out a detailed plan of implementation
- e) Establish effective co-operation with other institutions, such as departments of Afrikaans and African Languages at other universities, and other bilingual universities

¹⁵ A strategic planning approach requires describing the current state of affairs and defining the existing problem in a comprehensive way; determining the internal and external environments which impact upon the problem, collecting information relevant to resolving the problem, determining exactly where the institution wishes to be in terms of its vision and mission, defining general and specific goals, developing a precisely specified plan to attain these goals, and defining measures for the control of the process of implementation and the evaluation of its effectiveness.

¹⁶ Information on the language distribution among the students and the academic and administrative staff, their proficiency levels in the relevant languages and their language attitudes, patterns of usage, preferences; standards of language to be used; classroom practices regarding the MoI actually used; the resources available for the implementation of the language policy: language planning expertise, staff, funds (in particular the fact that university funding by government is partially determined by student success rates), and commitment; the support available from parents, the community and community-based organisations; measures to control the implementation of language plans and the ways in which the success of their implementation is to be determined (for example by requiring regular reports and on-site inspection).

(former HAUs, but including overseas universities) who need to solve the same problems

- f) Since language planning cannot be ad hoc, with unfocused actions directed at questionable or uncertain outcomes, non-sustainable programmes, a laissez faire approach, unstructured and with uncontrolled measures, a **centre for language policy implementation** directed at driving the programme must be established, to:
- Ø oversee implementation
 - Ø handle information and awareness campaigns
 - Ø arrange staff and student seminars
 - Ø undertake research
 - Ø manage language learning courses, and
 - Ø provide language services (interpreting, translating, editing, terminology creation).

6. Conclusion

It is true that language planning is a complicated field of work with uncertain predictable outcomes, and that even scholars in the field express pessimism about its success rate. However, the language question is an important (and quite easily a very emotional) issue which simply has to be managed. Universities (and governments, of course), need to realise that language development and language management are co-determined by a large variety of disparate variables, that it is a slow and long-term process, and that it requires patience. But, one needs to take a first step at some or other stage.

Fundamental to the whole matter in South Africa, however, is that use of LOTE at tertiary level is non-negotiable.

References

- Angelil-Carter, S. 1999. *Access to success*. Cape Town: UCT Press
- Bastardas, Abert. 2004. Paper read at the Xth Linguapax Congress on *Linguistic Diversity, Sustainability and Peace*, Barcelona, May
- Brink, Chris. 2004. Language-conscious universities: Case studies. Unpublished report. University of Stellenbosch.
- Department of Education. 2003. Education Report. Generalitat of Catalonia.
- Du Plessis, T. (In press/2005). From Monolingual to Bilingual Higher Education: The repositioning of historically Afrikaans-medium universities in South Africa.
- Goosen, Danie. 2004. 'n Afrika van selfrespekterende gemeenskappe: Die FAK en die Afrika waarvan ons droom. *Die Vrye Afrikaan*.
- Mac Donnacha, Joe. 2000. An integrated language planning model. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 24 (1), 11-35
- Ministry of Education. 2002. Language Policy for Higher education.
- Pan South African Language Board. 2000. *Summary of the findings of: A sociolinguistic survey on language use and language interaction in South Africa*. Pretoria.
- Statistics South Africa. 2001. *Census in brief*. Pretoria.
- Webb, Vic N. 2002a. Using English as a second language in academic training in tertiary institutions in South Africa: The situation at the University of Pretoria. *World Englishes* 21(1): 49-62.
- Webb, Vic N. 2002b. *Language in South Africa: The Role of Language in National Reconstruction, Transformation and Development*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Webb, Vic. 2002c. Problems with language proficiency assessment in vocational training.
Unpublished paper presented at the Canadian Association for Applied Linguistics,
Toronto, 25-28 May