JULACE
Journal of the University of Namibia Language Centre Volume 8, No. 2, 2023 (ISSN 2026-8297)
Submitted: 20 July 2023, Accepted: 08 June 2024, Published: 25 June 2024

Namibia in its thirties: Reviewing the choice of English as sole official language

Kristof Iipinge[1]
University of Namibia

Pierre de Galbert[2]
Brown University

Abstract
Namibia is a linguistically diverse country that attained independence in 1990. One of the most significant policy decisions at the time was to remove Afrikaans as one of the official languages, recognising English only, a monolingual official language policy that ignored the multilingual realities of the new country. The document justifying this decision was written a decade earlier and prepared by the United Nations Institute for Namibia based on eight criteria. In this paper, we critically review these criteria: unity, acceptability, familiarity, feasibility, science and technology, pan-Africanism, wider communication, and United Nations. We argue that the choice of these criteria, and the "value" attributed to European languages, compared with that of Namibian languages, were biased in a way to support the monolingual English policy. We conclude with an invitation to Namibian officials at all levels of government and local community organisations to engage in conversations to promote multilingualism more formally.

Keywords: *Language policy, Multilingualism, Namibia, local language, social practice.*

Introduction

Namibia is the home of approximately two and a half million people who are members of different communities comprising a rich linguistic diversity. Today, approximately half of Namibians speak Oshiwambo as a first language, and between 9 and 11% speak one of four other languages: Khoekhoegowab, Afrikaans, Otjiherero, and RuKwangali[3] (Eberhard et al., 2021; Iipinge & Huddlestone, 2023). Despite being spoken as a first language by fewer than 4%, English remains the official language (Steigertahl, 2019).

Prior to gaining independence, Namibia was colonized by Germany (1884-1915) and then South Africa after World War I (1918-1989). During Germany's occupation, German was used as an

[1] **Kristof Iipinge** is a lecturer in the Department of Language Development at the University of Namibia. He holds a PhD in Linguistics from the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. His research areas of interest include language policy and planning, multilingualism, teaching methods of English, and academic writing. Email: ikristof2000@yahoo.com

[2] **Pierre de Galbert** is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Brown University in the education department. His research focuses on language instruction policies in low- and middle-income countries and the association between language policies and learning in the early years of formal school. He is particularly interested in the multi-dimensional set of factors that influence both the language policy decisions and their implementation. He is also interested in educational measurement, specifically focusing on literacy acquisition in non-dominant languages. Email: pierre_degalbert@brown.edu

[3] Khoekhoegowab is sometimes referred to as Nama/Damara.

official language. Later, during South Africa's rule, English and Afrikaans were used as Namibia's principal official languages (Cluver, 1992), while German was a semi-official language (Cluver, 1990). During the South African rule, the Namibian people were severely oppressed through the apartheid system. As a result, the South-West African People's Organisation (SWAPO) was established in 1960 to fight oppression and advocate for Namibia's independence (United Nations Institute for Namibia [UNIN], 1981). Ultimately, Namibia gained independence in 1990 and one of SWAPO's immediate intentions was to replace Afrikaans and German (languages considered as an oppressor's language), with English, which was considered a language of liberation (Hopson, 2005). This decision impacted Namibians in many ways, including education. For example, English was declared Namibia's sole official language and the primary Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT) from Grade Four up to the university level (Sukumane, 1998).

Although English was declared Namibia's sole official language in 1990, this decision was taken almost ten years before Namibia's independence in Lusaka (Zambia), and it was proclaimed through a foundational document titled *"Toward a language policy for Namibia. English as the official language: Perspectives and strategies"* (Sukumane, 1998). This document was prepared by the United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN), an organisation that was established by the United Nations (UN) to support SWAPO in Zambia during the liberation struggle (Iipinge, 2018). Additionally, "the document in question was written after an international conference with strong British and American representation, which was held to consider the implications of the choice of English as an official language for Namibia", and its publication was sponsored by the Ford Foundation (Phillipson, 1992, p. 289). This process leading to English as the official language was therefore highly influenced by Britain and America from the beginning (Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2001).

More than 30 years after independence, it is pertinent to re-examine the choice of English as the sole official language with a critical perspective. Indeed, Namibia is no longer a new state emerging from years of political and military struggle for independence. It has witnessed three peaceful presidential transitions of power including one in 2024 due to the death of the sitting president, which could have led to political instability or turmoil in a more fragile country. Political stability was an important factor in discussing the language policy of the new country more than forty years ago. The rationale for choosing English as Namibia's sole official language is outlined in the fifth chapter of the 1981 UNIN document. The argument was based on eight selected criteria, namely: unity, acceptability, familiarity, feasibility, science and technology, pan-Africanism, wider communication, and the United Nations. This paper will examine these eight criteria and question the extent to which the choice of these criteria and the assessment of each language considered by UNIN was driven by the orientations of language as a right, a problem, or a resource (Ruiz, 1984). We start with a background section framing the paper in state building, language planning, and multilingualism as a social practice. We then critically review the relevance of the eight criteria used in the selection of English as Namibia's official language and present alternatives. Finally, we discuss the implications of our critical review for current language policy and practice.

Background

State Building and Language Planning

The formation of a new state is a complex process in which the role of language is key to including or excluding membership of a larger entity like the state for local communities. While the twentieth century saw the growth of the nation-state around the world, we want to clearly

distinguish the *state* and *nation*[4]. A state is the "legal and political organisation, with the power to require obedience (…) from its citizens" whereas a nation is a "community of people, whose members are bound together by a sense of solidarity" (Seton-Watson, 1977, p. 1). States can thus include several nations, or be centred around one, and nations can exist within, across, or without states representing them. The Namibian state includes many nations, some of whom, like the Herero nation, can also be found in both Namibia and neighbouring Botswana, among other states. Nations within decentralised or federal states can negotiate the role of language in public institutions, including schools, as has been done by French speakers in the Quebec province of Canada (Riddell, 2004). In centralised states such as Namibia, nations generally have fewer rights because they are less likely to have political or legislative power. Indeed, the "survival of minority nations is tenuous" (Gagnon, 2014, p. 3).

Policymakers developing language policies need to engage in three interrelated types of planning: status, corpus, and acquisition (Hornberger, 2006). Status planning, which is the focus of this paper, defines the role of languages in a nation-state or a given linguistic community. Corpus planning focuses on the language itself, whether and how it is codified and the development of its orthography. Acquisition planning includes the efforts to create or increase opportunities for individuals to learn the language(s).

An administrative authority such as UNIN can give languages a status**,** or a language can acquire status informally through its users. In addition to their formal status, languages can acquire unofficial status or power through their use and perceived value. In fact, some sociolinguists consider language status mainly as its "perceived relative value … usually related to its social utility" (Ricento, 2009, p. 5) rather than its legality conferred by the state. Enhancing the status of a language can result in an increase in the representation of marginalised linguistic communities in public spaces and promote the vitality of the language. For instance, the authors of the current South African Constitution decided to grant 11 of its languages official status with the aim of giving linguistic equality to communities that had been purposefully divided under apartheid (Alexander, 1997; Desai, 1995). In contrast, the choice of English as Namibia's only official language by UNIN and SWAPO has marginalised the speakers of other Namibian languages.

In multilingual settings, language planning for one language is connected to the planning of other languages, whether it relates to status, acquisition, or corpus. Ruiz (1984) introduced the concept of *orientations* towards language planning which he defined as dispositions toward the languages and their role in a society. Ruiz defined three orientations to policy planning and argued that policy planning nearly exclusively included two of them: language as a *problem*, and language as a *right*. An orientation toward language as a problem tends to see non-dominant languages as a barrier to national unity and integration, and links language to other social issues of linguistic minorities such as poverty or low levels of education. In contrast, seeing language as a right considers it a human right for individuals and marginalised communities to have access to services in their languages. Ruiz then called on planners to also consider language as a *resource*, building on linguistic diversity and multilingualism.

Multilingualism as a Social Practice

Multilingualism can be defined at the individual or community level. While there are many definitions of the concept, we use what Bokamba (2015, p.40) proposes after an extensive review of the African context: "Societal and individual multilingualism is the existence of three or

[4] Given the complexity and the variety of forms they have taken around the world and across time, there is no consensus on definitions of nation, state, and nation-state. In fact, Tishkov (2000) argues that the idea of a nation is a metaphor and not a politically functional category. However, we use Seton-Watson's definition to clearly separate the legal and political entity (state) from the group of individuals (nation).

more languages as media of (oral) communication by the de facto and/or de jure allocation of domains for the languages concerned." Multilingualism at the community level builds on the concepts of diglossia and plurilingualism. Societal diglossia is the community-level counterpart to bilingualism at the individual level and can exist with or without individuals speaking both languages (Fishman, 1967, 1980).

Multilingualism is regarded as a social practice when language patterns require more than a single language to perform the important functions of communication, cognition and identity for both individuals and the community (Aronin & Bawardi, 2012). Multilingualism is thus a social practice because the way in which communities and the larger world function requires more than one language. Multilingualism as a social practice supports and reinforces the functioning of important components of the social structure such as technology, finance, politics, and culture (Aronin & Bawardi, 2012). In other words, in the contemporary world, multilingualism is an integral aspect of important social and political domains (Aronin, 2017). As a result, individual multilingualism provides a competitive edge because apart from the academic and professional qualifications, prospective employers also consider fluency in relevant languages as an added advantage (Okal, 2014).

In an increasingly globalised world, multilingualism is viewed as a social practice as people come into greater contact with other languages (Ouane & Glanz, 2011). For this reason, different functions are allocated to the different languages that people speak (Ouane & Glanz, 2011). Multilingualism is thus practised and experienced every day by many individuals because multilingual language practices are embedded within the required social encounters (Banda, 2018). Multilingualism is perceived as a social practice because it treats language as a practice that relies on speakers' social experiences and linguistic behaviour (Banda, 2009).

In many countries, official language policies do not really reflect 'multilingualism as a social practice'. Further, many African countries have given preference to ex-colonial languages or the major dominant language (Batibo, 2005). In Botswana for example, the language policy planning process is centred on the ideology that language diversity is a problem and is a threat to unity, social harmony and development (Trudell, 2016). In fact, English is the official language of Botswana while Setswana, spoken by nearly 80% of the country, has been established as a national language. In contrast, the language policy gives no official status to the other indigenous languages. Accordingly, given that Botswana has about 29 languages, the language policy of this country does not embrace 'multilingualism' (Trudell, 2016).

Giving official status to multiple languages without meaningful implementation is not sufficient to claim that a state is embracing multilingualism. For example, as described in section 2.1, the constitution of South Africa stipulates that all official languages must enjoy equality of reverence and must be treated impartially (Trudell, 2016). However, Webb (2002) argued that in the early years of post-apartheid, government institutions in South Africa were becoming more monolingual (toward English) which was not in agreement with the written constitution. Closer to the spirit of the constitution, the University of Stellenbosch has recently updated its language policy to allow three languages (Afrikaans, English and isiXhosa) in learning and teaching as well as in communication (University of Stellenbosch, 2021). This is an example of the continuous work required to enact official policies that embrace multilingualism as a social practice. Meaningful power requires intentional policy and practice within institutions. Language policies thus can and should explicitly recognise and embrace multilingualism and linguistic diversity. In Africa specifically, it should be understood that indigenous and local languages play an important role in society and therefore a complete multilingual language planning policy is needed (Alexander, 1989). Monolingual policies such as the one we review in Namibia must therefore be revisited critically and modified as needed to be more inclusive.

UNIN's 1981 Criteria for Selecting English

In this study, we critically review the criteria selected to promote English as the official language in Namibia. We analyse Chapter Five of the document "Towards a language policy for Namibia. English as the official language: Perspectives and strategies" (UNIN, 1981). This document describes the principal aspects of Namibia's language policy which were formulated during the liberation struggle in Lusaka, Zambia (Brock-Utne, 1997; Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2001). The fifth chapter, "A Rationale for English as the Official Language for independent Namibia" details the eight criteria selected. This document was published in 1981 and served to formalise and rationalise the choice of English, rather than debate different options (Frydman, 2011).

In order to review the criteria, we analyse the document by critically reviewing the criteria and proposed languages. We further question the choice of these criteria and the rationale given that led to English as the sole official language. The eight criteria listed in the document are unity, acceptability, familiarity, feasibility, science and technology, pan-Africanism, wider communication, and United Nations. The languages considered in the document were "Indigenous Namibian languages, Afrikaans, German, French, and English" (UNIN, 1981, p. 38). Phillipson (1992) reviewed these criteria and languages and presented a quantitative analysis by attributing 0, 1, or 3 points to each language option. Table 1 below presents the results of his analysis. As the table demonstrates, both the choice of criteria and the assessment of the "value" given to Namibian languages supported the choice of English. In the rest of this section, we review each criterion in more detail and argue that these choices, both the criteria themselves and the value were biased in favour of European languages, especially English.

Table 1
Analysis of criteria and languages (Phillipson, 1992)

Criteria	Namibian languages	Afrikaans	German	French	English
1. Unity	0	0	0	3	3
2. Acceptability	3	0	0	3	3
3. Familiarity	3	3	3	0	3
4. Feasibility	0	3	3	3	3
5. Science and technology	0	0	3	3	3
6. Pan Africanism	0	0	0	1	3
7. Wider communication	0	0	3	3	3
8. United Nations	0	0	0	3	3
Total points	**6**	**6**	**12**	**19**	**24**

Unity

The criterion of unity was of importance because the foremost priority for the new government in post-independence Namibia was to "create conditions conducive to national unity in the realm of politics, economics, religion, culture, race or language" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 289). The main reasoning behind using this criterion to choose only one official language is that a uniform official language would reinforce nationalism and it should offer all citizens equal social chances in life (Cluver, 1990). Choosing unity as a criterion was possibly informed by the Western model of language planning. According to Phillipson (1992), the Western model of language planning seeks to replace multiple languages with one. As Bokamba (2007) argues, the status of African languages and the self-esteem of their speakers can only be elevated through introducing multilingual policies both in education and in societies in general.

Guided by the perspective that unity requires a single language, English (and French) were provided high scores. SWAPO, through the UNIN document, avoided choosing a Namibian language as official for fear of fostering tribalism and rivalries, and hence the use of a "neutral"

language like English was considered the most appropriate choice (Steigertahl, 2019). For example, if Oshiwambo was chosen over all the other local languages, speakers of the latter may have viewed this decision as discriminatory. Despite local languages being spoken by the majority of the Namibians, SWAPO did not have any plan to use these languages to foster national unity (Brock-Utne, 1997). However, this argument relies on the need for a single Namibian language to be chosen above others.

Furthermore, we argue that choosing English as the sole official language was not the best strategy to combat apartheid South Africa's divisive policies. As Steigertahl (2019) laments, it is difficult to achieve unity within the Nation through using an unknown language as an official language. Hence, perhaps the best option to promote unity was to use multiple Namibian indigenous languages as official languages because of their familiarity. Even though the use indigenous languages as official languages had the potential of fostering ethnic differences, it is unlikely that using English as an official language would curb fractionalization within the country. Consequently, we concur with Steigertahl (2019, p.107) who believes that "unity cannot solely be attained by the choice of language; economic, political and social factors such as equality of justice, wealth and health also contribute to unity in diversity".

More importantly, English was not the best choice for unity as it reproduced and reinforced a different separation. Bunyi (1999) questions whether English can really help to unify a country like Namibia because it divides groups along class lines. Far from being a source of unity, the use of English in education in many countries such as Zambia has become a source of national discord (Williams & Cooke, 2002). Therefore, the idea that European languages (including English) are neutral and therefore can create national cohesiveness among speakers of different indigenous languages is a myth (Makalela, 2005).

The criterion of 'unity' may have been an important one to include from a political perspective, but the resulting choice to limit the number of official languages, and to point to European languages as unifiers, was misplaced. The way in which unity was used suggests that multilingualism is a problem rather than a resource (Ruiz, 1980). As Sukumane (1998) argues, English might be a prerequisite for international trade, industrialization, and education. However, 'national unity' does not require the adoption of English as an official language. In contrast, as Mishina (2020) argues, multilingualism has the potential of fostering unity within a country.

Acceptability

The concept of acceptability is paramount to the choice of an official language as it represents the willingness of people to learn and use it. "For a language to meet this criterion it was to have positive rather than negative associations for the people, and therefore not be associated with oppression or injustice" (Frydman, 2011, p. 184). According to UNIN (1981), English was chosen as an official language because of its positive rather than negative associations. In other words, SWAPO wanted to adopt a language which could not be associated with the oppression and injustices which have characterized Namibian history (Iipinge, 2013; UNIN, 1981). Indeed, "the language should be accepted by the people and their positive attitudes towards it should be fostered (Steigertahl, 2019, p. 103). "Afrikaans for instance, was used on a daily basis to perpetuate attitudes of superiority and was the language in which many Namibians were resettled in so-called 'home lands' and it was also a language in which Namibians were prevented from becoming full citizens in their own country" (Cluver, 1992, p. 124). Similarly, German was used to rule Namibia illegally and was therefore associated with oppression and inequality (Frydman, 2011). Consequently, Afrikaans and German could not meet the criterion of 'acceptability'. According to Steigertahl (2019), English met this criterion because it was perceived by SWAPO as a language of social prestige, power struggle and independence. However, this ignores the role of English as a colonial language in Southern Africa, including the oppressive regime in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe).

Giving English (and French) a full score on acceptability ignores the negative role of colonial languages. In many countries, French is the colonial language and is regarded as a language used to oppress Africans (Senkoro, 2022). Similarly, English is the main language of colonialism in the world and colonialism is the main vector through which English has spread across the world (Alfarhan, 2016). For example, Namibia's neighbours in Zambia and Botswana were colonized by Britain and now use English as a result. Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir (2001) also note that English is a language built on European and Western culture. Consequently, if Afrikaans was rejected because of its association with oppression, we argue that French and other colonial languages cannot be regarded as acceptable languages. Furthermore, while Afrikaans primarily served as the language of apartheid, it was the first language of some Namibians, and the second or third language of 90% of the Namibian population at the dawn of independence (Cluver, 1990). To this community of Namibians, Afrikaans was likely an acceptable language more so than others because it was their mother tongue, or a language spoken daily at home, work or school.

Familiarity

According to UNIN (1981), "the language to be chosen was supposed to be a language with which Namibians inside and outside the country had some familiarity and with which there had preferably been some experience in the education system" (p. 38). Cluver (1992) points out that all languages were given full credit on this criterion, with the exception of French, which is problematic for two reasons: first, it overstates the extent to which Namibians were familiar with most of these languages; second, it makes no distinction between languages with vastly different levels of exposure in the country.

English and other European languages were not truly familiar to most Namibians at independence. At that time, only 0.8% of the Namibian population spoke English as their first language (Wolfaardt, 2002), and 4% spoke English as a second language (Frydman, 2011; Kisting, 2012). Further, English was rarely spoken or used in rural regions (Harris, 2011). One of the reasons English was seen as deserving the full scale for familiarity was partly because of the exposure to this language some Namibians received during their school years (Iipinge, 2013). However, the use of English in some schools did not result in widespread familiarity with the language. In Northern Namibia for example, where the majority of the population lived, most learners developed very little English, even after five years of instruction. This was mainly due to their teachers having little English knowledge and because the use of the language was restricted to the classroom (Cluver, 1992). Fewer than a quarter of children in 1990 had a "rudimentary exposure to English at best; therefore they were automatically disqualified from any activity requiring a knowledge of the official language". (Steigertahl, 2019, p. 107). The poor results of the 1989 school-leaving examinations in Namibia were also a clear indication that most students were unfamiliar with English (Cluver, 1992). Afrikaans and German were also awarded full credit in this criterion despite facing similar limitations as English. When Namibia gained independence in 1990, less than 1% of the Namibian population spoke German as their first language (Steigertahl, 2019).

Namibian languages are also given full credit in this criterion, and rightly so, but the document dismisses them quickly because of the perception that Namibians only knew one language. The main argument of the UNIN document in this section is the lack of a common language spoken by most Namibians – an argument based on a monolingual habitus. However, this ignores the role Oshiwambo had assumed as a language of wider communication for many Namibians. According to Iipinge (2013, p.14), "the experience of migrant labour and refugee in exile has probably served to make major Namibian languages, particularly Oshiwambo, more familiar to Namibians than English". Similarly, the small proportion of Namibians living in exile had developed a common language based on Oshikwanyama (a dialect of Oshiwambo) and other languages from the North (Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2001). Whether thinking in a

monolingual or multilingual framework, Namibian languages should have been considered higher on this criterion than European languages.

In addition to the limitations of giving equal value to all languages in this criterion (with the exception of French), it is important to note that grouping Namibian languages as one drastically limited the analytical process. By grouping them together, no single language could be assessed on its own. Having each Namibian language considered on its own could have presented one as a possible official language. Specifically, Oshiwambo would have been in a better position than any European language on most criteria. This is because, at independence, half of the Namibian population was Oshiwambo-speaking (Steigertahl, 2019). Besides, many Namibians who are not Oshiwambo speaking were exposed to this language through the migrant labour system (Iipinge, 2013) and others were exposed to it during the Namibian liberation struggle (Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2001). As a result, the possibility of giving Oshiwambo an official status, as well as that of other Namibian languages, was seriously impaired by their grouping.

Feasibility

Feasibility entailed considerations of the finances, logistics and administration required in the promotion of an official language. According to UNIN (1981), English met this criterion because there were adequate resources available in English for short and long-term implementation plans. At that time, the country also had enough expatriate professionals trained by UNIN who were fluent in English and were ready to be given jobs in terms of teaching, teacher training, curriculum design, educational administration and other areas crucial for any potential emergency in language development situation (UNIN, 1981). On the other hand, according to UNIN (1981), none of the Namibian languages met this criterion because it would be very expensive to prepare resources and materials in these languages. This focus on the transition to independence was incredibly short-sighted. Indeed, there are several issues with giving all languages except local languages the benefit of this criterion. First, it was uncertain whether and which expatriates were indeed returning to Namibia in large numbers to support the implementation and promotion of English (Cluver, 1992). Second, if Namibians were to be informed of the processes, all materials would need to be translated and disseminated in local languages. Indeed, different materials for government, education and administration were printed and distributed in several indigenous Namibian languages (Steigertahl, 2019).

The other important reason why the fiscal focus on English was short-sighted is the long-term benefits of using first languages in schools. Expenses used on promoting and developing English while indigenous languages were being neglected, would have long-term costs to local languages (UNIN, 1981). Importing ready-made teaching and learning materials as compared to developing them from scratch in the various indigenous languages is not inexpensive (Sukumane, 2000). Further, the funds spent on resources in English are often transferred to other countries, rather than supporting local authors and institutions. More importantly, the ideology that the cost of standardising African languages is not affordable, is problematic (Makalela, 2005). An education system investing in English at the cost of local languages excludes a large proportion of children from the possibility to “succeed in school, move up the social ladder, and participate politically and socially in the life of their communities” (Kamwangamalu, 2013, p. 332). In Namibia for example, Harris (2011) found that students want to succeed at school generally and in English in particular, but this is usually not possible because they do not understand their subjects well because of problems with the medium of instruction- English. This argument therefore shows that the issue of promoting foreign languages while ignoring local language can be problematic and expensive.

In addition, a focus on English-only also ignores the long-term benefits of promoting local languages. Cummins (1979, 1981, 2021) introduced the theories of cross-linguistic transfer and language interdependence to explain the long-term benefits of using the child’s first language to

develop literacy before introducing a second language. While most of the early empirical research on transfer took place in high-income countries, more recent studies have shown evidence of transfer in Kenya (Kim & Piper, 2019), Uganda (de Galbert, 2020), and Namibia (Veii & Everatt, 2005). This has resulted in a large number of African countries, including Namibia, turning to local languages as a medium of instruction for early primary school (Albaugh, 2014). It is thus likely that the returns to quality education for Namibia would have outweighed the initial costs.

Science and Technology

There is no doubt that the field of science and technology is highly dominated by the English language (Rao, 2019). Hence, proficiency in the English language is valuable. One might agree, then, that English, French and German would have more value under this criterion. However, this is problematic in two ways, which we develop in this section. First, it positions some languages as inherently better suited to discuss and develop science. More pragmatically, it ignores multilingualism as a means of doing scientific research.

UNIN (1981) regarded the three European languages as meeting the criterion of 'science and technology'. On the other hand, the Namibian indigenous languages and Afrikaans did not meet this criterion because according to SWAPO, they lacked scientific and technical terminology. There is no reason to believe that African languages are not suitable for science and technology (Steigertahl, 2019). In fact, "the reason that the African languages are underdeveloped in scientific and technological terminology is that they have not been used in these fields" (Frydman, 2011, p. 184). With proper corpus planning to develop appropriate terms to describe desired scientific vocabulary, they can be used successfully in the field of science and technology. Kiswahili is an example of an African language that has been developed to integrate technical and scientific vocabulary to be used by its speakers in the fields of science and technology (Frydman, 2011; Steigertahl, 2019). Restricting the study of science to English simply reinforces the unequal relations between high-income English-speaking countries and the rest of the world. Low-income countries that used English to achieve economic and social development have by and large not made great progress (Williams & Cooke, 2002).

Moreover, scientists being required to develop linguistic skills in English as part of their training is hardly a reason to make that language official. Undoubtedly, most scientists have to read and publish papers in English to share influential work and engage with advanced work (Rao, 2019). However, multilingualism is part of all major domains of social structure including science and technology (Aronin & Bawardi, 2012). Adopting English as the sole official language in a multilingual country like Namibia perceives multilingualism as a problem, not as a resource. Basic science and technology can be taught in school and discussed in popular media in local languages, letting young students contribute their scientific observations using their full linguistic repertoire and background knowledge. Individuals who pursue science as a career can undoubtedly learn English as part of their education journey which should last 16 or more years. In comparison to a monolingual language policy, a multilingual policy would give people more opportunities for academic success, as in the case of India (Sukumane, 1998). Ideally, no language should be denied the status of official language on the basis that it cannot be used in the field of science and technology.

Pan-Africanism

Pan-Pan-Africanism has its origins in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to connect struggles against racial and colonial oppression (Chipato, 2023). This movement and ideology that promotes the solidarity of African people was key in independence movements in the second half of the twentieth century at the time the UNIN policy document was being written. According to this criterion, English was chosen as the official language for Namibia because SWAPO intended to have an official language that would reinforce the growth of bonds between

Namibians and other progressive communities in Africa (UNIN, 1981). In other words, the aim was to reinforce cooperation between Namibia and other African countries, and this could be achieved through selecting a language spoken in Namibia's neighbouring countries and throughout Africa (Mazrui, 2004). Accordingly, English was seen as the best choice because it is spoken and used as an official language in most countries in Southern Africa. In contrast, focusing on citizens rather than official policies, Frydman (2011) notes that English does not meet the criterion because very few people in neighbouring countries actually speak it. Again, Frydman (2011) explains that "while four of the five countries neighbouring Namibia have English as an official language, only Zambia and Zimbabwe have only English as their official language" (p. 185).

Moreover, Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir (2001) highlight that most people in African countries do not use English as their primary language. Therefore, "the choice of Bantu languages such as Kiswahili which is spoken by more than 40 million Africans as the official language could have been considered equally as Namibia's official language and would have been more likely to have supported and promoted "Pan-Africanism" (Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2001, p. 305). While Kiswahili or Hausa are spoken by more Africans as a first language than any European language, we do not argue for them as a practical choice in Namibia because of their lack of use in different Namibian communities.

The idea of using Pan-Africanism as an important criterion for selecting the official language is questionable in itself. Most Africans being multilingual (Bokamba, 2015), pan-Africanism cannot be promoted by a monolingual policy, but rather by recognizing and uplifting multiple languages. Indeed, multilingualism is an essential element of effective problem-solving and cultural understanding (Stein-Smith, 2016). Therefore, for the majority of the Namibian people, having a single Pan-African language serve as the official language is not essential. In fact, Pan- Pan-Africanism would be promoted more effectively by the use of an African lingua franca or multiple languages.

Wider Communication

This criterion was necessitated by the fact that at independence, Namibia needed to re-position its outlook from a South African one to an international one (Iipinge, 2013). Indeed, "such outlook was already developing as members of the liberation movement pursued pre-independence personnel training and other strategies in close liaison with many countries and organisations throughout the world" (UNIN, 1981). According to SWAPO, only English and French met this criterion (Frydman, 2011). In regard to English, adopting it as an official language was to facilitate access to wider communication because, at that time, it was spoken globally as a mother tongue by 300 million people and as a second language by 373 million speakers (Cluver, 1992). Steigertahl (2020) notes that English is an international lingua franca and has the potential of reinforcing international trade, negotiations and communication. Therefore, there is no doubt then that English could facilitate Namibia's development of sea and air communications, international trading as well as negotiations at administrative, diplomatic and commercial levels (UNIN, 1981). However, this could have been achieved by developing English instruction without adopting it as the sole official status.

It is important to recognise that the criterion of wider communication was relevant because Namibia has benefited from using English (Steigertahl, 2019). English has played an instrumental role in the facilitation of trans-ethnic and trans-lingual communication in Namibia (Steigertahl, 2019). However, Iipinge and Banda (2021) question whether English can effectively facilitate trans-ethnic and trans-lingual communication for all in Namibia because the majority of Namibians still lack proficiency in English. For example, some members of the Namibian parliament do not express themselves successfully and effectively (Iipinge, 2019). Similarly, Iipinge and Huddlestone (2023) found that teachers in Northern Namibia face a number of

challenges in using English as the medium of instruction. For these reasons, Frydman (2011) argues that as long as English is the sole official language of Namibia, the country will not achieve full participatory democracy, as a large proportion of its citizens will be excluded.

To conclude this section, it is worth noting that English has facilitated communication among Namibians, and between Namibia and the rest of the world. English in itself is therefore not a problem for Namibia. The problem is having it as the sole official language. As Stein-Smith (2016) points out, society should perceive multilingualism as normal and desirable. In fact, in many African countries, a lingua franca that is not the official language is used for the purpose of interethnic and national communication (Wolff, 2020). Consequently, we argue that the Namibian government should consider multilingualism as beneficial as well.

United Nations

Given the institutional support for the UNIN document, as well as the independence movement overall, it is not surprising that the last criterion was United Nations itself. "The history of Namibia's struggle is intimately linked with the United Nations organisation (UNO) as the citizens of the country were greatly assisted by the United Nations during the liberation struggle" (UNIN, 1981, p. 38). SWAPO therefore deemed it necessary to ensure that the official language of Namibia should be one of the principal languages of the United Nations with which Namibian negotiators were then already familiar with (Iipinge, 2013). Thus, in relation to this criterion, English and French were the only two languages that could be considered to fulfil the role of Namibia's official language (Iipinge, 2013). In other words, both English and French were going to give Namibia effective access to the United Nations (Steigertahl, 2019). This criterion is very similar to the criterion of "wider communication" and therefore could have been included under that criterion (Phillipson, 1992). Rather than adding nuance to the arguments for different languages, adding this criterion simply gave French and English more weight.

Missing Criteria, Missing Languages

As we have explained in the preceding sections, we view the choice of the eight criteria selected by SWAPO, as well as the manner in which English was systematically deemed the appropriate choice, as a flawed approach to choosing the official language of Namibia. Had this policy document really been an attempt to present an unbiased comparison of language choices, additional criteria and languages should have been included, such as empowerment and ease of learning. Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir (2001) suggest that SWAPO could have considered a criterion of "self-reliance and empowerment". This criterion could have served to assess the extent to which the existing linguistic resources of Namibians could work toward laying the foundation of the new country. To better prepare for language acquisition planning, the document could have used the criterion of "ease of learning." This would have particularly helped with the successful expansion of schooling for all youth, as well as communication. Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir (2001) also suggest a criterion focused on "cultural authenticity" to ensure that the rich culture of the different communities is reflected in the language(s) chosen. Clearly, the inclusion of these criteria, or at least considering these when assessing languages would have shown how English could be an inadequate choice.

In addition to the missing criteria, the document falls short when considering additional languages. As mentioned above, if the authors of the document were interested in the choice of a widely spoken language with ties to the continent, Swahili, Hausa, or Arabic could have been considered. We do not advocate for these languages to be considered seriously but rather point to the irrelevant choice of French. More importantly, the different local languages could have been considered independently. Had this been the case, the consideration of Oshiwambo, Otjiherero, or Khoekhoegowab may have shed light on the feasibility of including one or more languages. Serious consideration of a multilingual policy could have estimated the real costs of developing resources, including school curricula, in more than one language. The document

dismisses local languages as a whole without considering them as individual possibilities. Table 2 below presents a revised analysis of the appropriateness of different languages based on our critical review. Specifically, we remove criteria we do not consider primordial and add two new criteria: ease of learning and empowerment. As becomes clear with this new lens, the choice of Namibian languages would have been preferable at independence. However, we also believe English and Afrikaans could be included in a truly multilingual policy.

Table 2
Revised analysis of criteria and languages

Criteria	Namibian languages	Afrikaans	German	French	English
1. Unity	2	0	0	1	1
2. Acceptability	3	1	1	1	1
3. Familiarity	3	2	2	0	1
4. Feasibility	3	3	3	3	3
5. Ease of learning	3	2	1	1	1
6. Empowerment	3	2	1	0	3
Total points	**17**	**10**	**8**	**6**	**10**

Conclusion

The creation of a new state is a time of uncertainty that includes a multitude of decisions meant to secure the long-term sustainability of a fragile entity. Among the main decisions to be taken at that time is the status of languages spoken in the country. Like many countries gaining independence from colonial oppression, Namibia made the choice of promoting a European language at the expense of local languages. When justifying this choice at the dawn of independence, SWAPO selected a list of criteria that made English the only viable choice. Moreover, they did not seriously consider the possibility of embracing multilingualism in the official language policy. We cannot claim to know what would have happened in Namibia if its local languages had been promoted as official, but we claim that it is relevant to review this decision at this point. Data from the Afrobarometer suggests that Namibians have felt united to the country for decades. In the 2002-2003 round of data, 86% of Namibians either agreed or strongly agreed that the country should remain united, compared to 11% who thought the country should be separated[5]. This points to the overwhelming sense of unity in the country. Similarly, at each of the Afrobarometer rounds of data collected between 2005 and 2018, Namibians strongly identified only, primarily, or equally as Namibians as their ethnicity[6]. Thirty years after independence, Namibia is no longer a new nation in need of protecting its status as a state and justifying its borders. The country has seen three peaceful transitions of powers including a transition of power from an Oshiwambo-speaking president to a Damara-speaking president, even if there has not yet been a transition to a different political party.

In this paper, we analysed the document “Towards a language policy for Namibia. English as the official language: perspectives and strategies” and focused on the eight criteria used in the selection of English as Namibia’s official language. One important conclusion of this analysis is that the choice of criteria set up English as the sole choice for Namibia’s official language. Specifically, we argue against including science and technology, the United Nations, or Pan-Africanism as criteria to select the official language of the country. While these are important

[5] Data from the second round of the Afrobarometer. 46.2% strongly agree and 40.2% agree with unity; 8.3% agree and 2.9% strongly agree with separation.

[6] Data from the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh round oscillated between 27% and 43% for ‘National ID only’; 34% and 51% for National and ethnic equal. The total for the three categories ‘National ID only’ ‘National more than ethnic’, and ‘National and ethnic equal’ ranged from 80% to 92% over these rounds.

considerations, giving them equal importance as unity and acceptability biases the choices toward languages of power. Instead, we concur with others that better criteria such as “ease of learning” or “empowerment” should have been included to facilitate the integration of official language(s) in Namibians’ lives and schooling (Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2001). Second, the ways in which different languages were assessed gave English and other dominant European languages a higher value than Namibian languages in ways that were problematic and inaccurate. For example, there are good reasons to believe that Namibian languages would be more acceptable and more familiar to Namibians than English.

More importantly, we argue that the authors of the document failed to properly consider the possibility of choosing more than one language. Multilingualism is a social practice and selecting English as the sole official language is not acceptable as it does not reflect how different communities in Namibia use language on a daily basis. That is why, in schools for example, even though the language in education policy does not allow for the use of indigenous languages in the teaching of school subjects beyond the fourth grade, ‘multilingualism’ is practised every day because some teachers use techniques such as translanguaging and code-switching in order to ensure that all learners comprehend subject content (Iipinge & Banda, 2021; Iipinge & Huddlestone, 2023; Steigertahl, 2019). When they do so, teachers use languages that their learners are familiar with. This revelation is not surprising as linguistic communication strategies such as code-switching usually develop from multilingualism (Okal, 2014). Evidently, this is a clear testimony that ‘multilingualism’ is a resource rather than a problem and therefore should be treated as such. However, by excluding these languages from official status, the policy denigrates these practices and risks teachers and learners considering them as illegitimate. That is why according to Aronin, (2017), many countries in the world are seeking to include both English and regional languages in their school curricula. Article 3 of the Namibian constitution guarantees the right to use a language other than English as the medium of instruction, and the official education policy allows for three years of lower primary to be taught in the mother tongue, but this does not always happen (Davids, 2011).

The sociolinguistic context – in which official language policies play a crucial role – is at the centre of the decision-making process leading to the choice of languages used in the classroom (de Galbert, 2021). A constitution that embraces multilingualism at all levels would allow for Namibian languages to be used in schools more consistently and provide an inclusive environment in other public spaces such as courthouses. Through this paper, we invite Namibian officials at all levels of government as well as local organisations to engage in conversations to promote multilingualism more formally. While the long-term goal may be to revise the constitution of the country to include all Namibian languages, the process can be reached through modifications in policies and practices in schools and other local institutions. As wa Thiong’o (2018) said so clearly “*Monolingualism is the carbon dioxide of culture. Multilingualism is the oxygen of cultures.”* Policies and practices should aim to provide oxygen to Namibian languages and cultures.

References

Albaugh, E. A. (2014). *State-building and multilingual education in Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Alexander, N. (1989). *Language policy and national unity in South Africa*. Creda Press.

Alexander, N. (1997). Language policy and planning in the new South Africa. *African Sociological Review*, *1*(1), 82–92.

Alfarhan, I. (2016). English as a global language and the effects on culture and identity. *American Research Journal of English and Literature*, *1*, 1–6.

Aronin, L. (2017). Conceptualizations of multilingualism. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, *5*(1), 174–207.

Aronin, L., & Bawardi, B. (2012). Individual differences in the light of new linguistic dispensation. In M. Pawlak (Ed.), *New perspectives on individual differences in language learning and teaching* (pp. 15–32). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20850-8_2

Banda, F. (2009). Towards multilingual models of education in South Africa. In K. K. Prah & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.), *Multilingualism: An African advantage: A paradigm shift in African language of instruction policies* (pp. 102–118). CASAS.

Banda, F. (2018). Translanguaging and English-African language mother tongues as linguistic dispensation in teaching and learning in a black township school in Cape Town. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *19*(2), 198–217.

Batibo, H. (2005). *Language decline and death in Africa: Causes, consequences, and challenges* (Vol. 132). Multilingual Matters.

Bokamba, E. G. (2007). Arguments for multilingual policies in public domains in Africa. In E. A. Anchimbe (Ed.), *Linguistic identity in postcolonial multilingual spaces* (pp. 27–65). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bokamba, E. G. (2015). Multilingualism as a sociolinguistic phenomenon: Evidence from Africa. In E. Zsiga, O. T. Boyer, & R. Kramer (Eds.), *Languages in Africa* (pp. 21–48). Georgetown University Press.

Brock-Utne, B. (1997). The language question in Namibian schools. *International Review of Education*, *43*(2), 241–260.

Brock-Utne, B., & Holmarsdottir, H. B. (2001). The choice of English as medium of instruction and its effects on the African languages in Namibia. *International Review of Education*, *47*(3), 293–322.

Bunyi, G. (1999). Rethinking the place of African indigenous languages in African education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *19*(4–5), 337–350.

Chipato, F. (2023). The global politics of African identity: Pan-Africanism and the challenge of Afropolitanism. *Global Studies Quarterly*, *3*(3), ksad046.

Cluver, A. D. de V. (1990). Namibia's new language policy. *Africa Insight*, *20*(3), 161–168.

Cluver, A. D. de V. (1992). Language planning in Namibia: The selection of an official language. In R. K. Herbert (Ed.), *Language and society in africa: the theory and practice of sociolinguistics* (p. 356). Witwatersrand University Press.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, *49*(2), 222–251. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543049002222

Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and Theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *The Journal of Education*, *163*(1,), 16–29.

Cummins, J. (2021). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts* (Vol. 19). Multilingual Matters.

Davids, L. (2011). San language development for education in Namibia: Progress and challenges. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, *5*(2), 126–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2011.559789

de Galbert, P. G. (2020). Language transfer theory and its policy implications: Exploring interdependence between Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and English in Uganda. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *20*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1788038

de Galbert, P. G. (2021). Language-in-education policies: An analytical framework applied to Kenya and Uganda. In C. Benson & K. Kosonen (Eds.), *Language Issues in Comparative Education II* (pp. 276–300). Brill Sense. https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004449671/BP000027.xml

Desai, Z. (1995). The evolution of a post-apartheid language policy in South Africa: An on-going site of struggle. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *5*(3), 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/0952391950050303

Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2021). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, twenty-fourth edition*. SIL International.

Fishman, J. A. (1967). Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, *23*(2), 29–38. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1967.tb00573.x

Fishman, J. A. (1980). Bilingualism and biculturism as individual and as societal phenomena. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *1*(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1980.9993995

Frydman, J. (2011). A critical analysis of Namibia's English-only language policy. *Selected Proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 178–189.

Gagnon, A.-G. (2014). *Minority nations in the age of uncertainty: New paths to national emancipation and empowerment*. University of Toronto Press.

Harris, P. (2011). *Language in schools in Namibia: The missing link in education achievement?* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Huddersfield.

Hopson, R. K. (2005). The paradox of English only in post-independent Namibia. Toward whose education for all'. In B. Brock-Utne & R. K. Hopson (Eds.), *Languages of instruction for African emancipation: Focus on postcolonial contexts and considerations*. Mkuni na Nyota Publishers.

Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning research. In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Blackwell.

Iipinge, K. (2013). *English lingua franca as language of learning and teaching in Northern Namibia: A report on Oshiwambo teachers' experiences* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Stellenbosch.

Iipinge, K. (2018). *Consequences of ideology and policy in the English Second Language classroom: The case of Oshiwambo- speaking students in Namibia* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of the Western Cape.

Iipinge, K., & Banda, F. (2021). Language ideology, policy and classroom practices in Oshiwambo speaking areas, Northern Namibia. *Multilingual Margins: A Journal of Multilingualism from the Periphery*, *7*(3), 14–32.

Iipinge, K., & Huddlestone, K. (2023). English lingua franca as a language of learning and teaching in northern Namibia: A report on Oshiwambo teachers' experiences. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *41*(3), 280–297. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2022.2127412

Iipinge, S. (2019). *An analysis of code switching in the Namibian parliament* [Unpublished master's thesis, University of Namibia]. https://repository.unam.edu.na/items/186eee58-24b4-41b1-8990-a15f6ae1a912

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2013). Effects of policy on English-medium instruction in Africa. *World Englishes*, *32*(3), 325–337.

Kim, Y.-S. G., & Piper, B. (2019). Cross-language transfer of reading skills: An empirical investigation of bidirectionality and the influence of instructional environments. *Reading and Writing*, *32*(4), 839–871. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9889-7

Kisting, D. (2012, January 10). Namibia's language policy is "poisoning" its children. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2012/jan/10/namibia-english-crisis

Makalela, L. (2005). "We speak eleven tongues": Reconstructing multilingualism in South Africa. In B. Brock-Utne & R. K. Hopson (Eds.), *Languages of instruction for African*

emancipation: Focus on postcolonial contexts and considerations. Mkuni na Nyota Publishers.

Mazrui, A. M. (2004). *English in Africa: After the Cold War*. Multilingual Matters. https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.21832/9781853596919/html

Mishina, U. L. (2020). The tension of unity and conflict in multilingualism. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, *3*(1), 7–10.

Okal, B. O. (2014). Benefits of multilingualism in education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *2*(3), 223–229. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2014.020304

Ouane, A., & Glanz, C. (2011). *Optimising learning, education and publishing in Africa: The language factor–a review and analysis of theory and practice in mother-tongue and bilingual education in Sub-Saharan Africa.* ERIC. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED540491

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of English as a global language. *Research Journal of English*, *4*(1), 65–79.

Ricento, T. (2009). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Blackwell.

Riddell, T. Q. (2004). The impact of legal mobilization and judicial decisions: The case of official minority-language education policy in Canada for francophones outside Quebec. *Law & Society Review*, *38*(3), 583–610. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-9216.2004.00058.x

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education*, *8*(2), 15–34.

Senkoro, F. (2022). The Language Question and the Choice of Africa's Lingua Franca: Is Kiswahili the Most Likely Candidate? *Nuru Ya Kiswahili*, *1*(1). https://nuru.udom.ac.tz/index.php/journal1/article/view/8

Seton-Watson, H. (1977). *Nations and states*. Westview Press.

Steigertahl, H. (2019). *English(es) in post-independence Namibia: An investigation of variety status and its implications for English language teaching*.

Stein-Smith, K. (2016). The role of multilingualism in effectively addressing global issues: The sustainable development goals and beyond. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(12), 2254–2259.

Sukumane, J. B. (1998). African languages, English, and educational policy in Namibia. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, *28*(1), 207–219.

Sukumane, J. B. (2000). Issues in language planning and policy: The case of Namibia. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, *30*(2), 199–208.

Tishkov, V. A. (2000). Forget the `nation`: Post-nationalist understanding of nationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *23*(4), 625–650. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870050033658

Trudell, B. (2016). *The impact of language policy and practice on children's learning: Evidence from Eastern and Southern Africa*. Unicef. https://www.unicef.org/esa/sites/unicef.org.esa/files/2018-09/UNICEF-2016-Language-and-Learning-FullReport.pdf

United Nations Institute for Namibia. (1981). *Towards a language policy for Namibia: English as official language: Perspectives and strategies.*

University of Stellenbosch. (2021). *SU Council approves new language policy*. https://www.sun.ac.za/english/Lists/news/DispForm.aspx?ID=8799

Veii, K., & Everatt, J. (2005). Predictors of reading among Herero-English bilingual Namibian school children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *8*(3), 239–254. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728905002282

wa Thiong'o, N. (2018, April 17). *Wrestling with the devil: A prison memoir in conversation with Mũkoma wa Ngũgĩ*.

Webb, V. N. (2002). *Language in South Africa: The role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development* (Vol. 14). John Benjamins Publishing.

Williams, E., & Cooke, J. (2002). Pathways and Labyrinths: Language and education in development. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(3), 297–322. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588415

Wolfaardt, D. (2002). Facilitating learning through medium of instruction: Namibia's language policy. In *Informing reform: Namibian research to inform education policy and practice (1)* (pp. 67–85). Ministry of Education.