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Abstract

by Nicolau Nkiawete Manuel, Ph.D.
Washington State University
May 2015

Chair: Pamela J. Bettis

Recently the Angolan government piloted a new language policy that will introduce six
African languages as media of instruction into the school system from first through third grade.
Using Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis three dimensional framework, Foucault’s discourse
insights and the theoretical tools developed in linguistic anthropology, this study conducted a
discursive and linguistic analysis of Angolan language policy discourses. The study
conceptualized language education policy as involving struggles, negotiations, and
compromise—language policy as a hegemonic, symbolic, and discursive act that is socially,
historically, and politically situated and involving various actors and social agents. The purpose
of this study was to question and problematize the above mentioned language policy and
examine the attitudes, beliefs, ideologies, and discursive practices of a variety of social agents
including parents, students, teachers, administrators and policy-makers; and the socio-historical
conditions that have shaped this policy. Another purpose of this study was, to use the findings
and the insights from best practices in second language and bilingual pedagogy to propose
alternative avenues for the ongoing language education reform. The findings demonstrated that
the various cultural and discursive practices are dynamic, locally, and contextually situated.
This dynamic created tension between the local and the global discursive practices, specifically between the discourses of national unity, English as a global language and African indigenous languages as the languages of cultural identity and heritage. The findings also revealed that the choices of language of instruction and use are embedded in economic, political, and ideological interests of the various social groups. Parents, teachers, linguists, and policy-makers alike, recognized the advantages of bilingual education. However, entrenched negative attitudes, the high status, and the prestige attached to Portuguese and English pose additional challenges for the promotion of African languages in education and social life. The findings also suggested the need to challenge positions of power and privilege that are reinforced by the use of disciplinary knowledge in the domains of language teaching and learning. In conclusion, the findings suggested that top-down and bottom up processes should work in tandem to promote an inclusive language policy towards, bilingualism, and linguistic diversity.
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CHAPTER ONE
BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Across Africa, particularly in Francophone and Lusophone (Portuguese speaking) Africa, current language education policy models have not resulted in desirable outcomes (Wolff, 2006, 2011). As a result, African nations are mobilizing to address the issue of language of instruction through bilingual language policies. Since the successful experiment named the Ile-Ife project in Nigeria (Bamgbose, 1991) there have been reports of successful mother tongue education programs in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) (Akinnaso 1993; Alidou et al., 2006; Ouane, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c). Many African sociolinguists (Alexander, 2000, 2007, 2008, 2009; Bamgbose, 1991, 2004; Omoniyi, 2007; Webb, 2009) advocate for greater use of African languages, on the grounds that successful learning takes place when students are taught in the language they understand the most (Auerbach, 1993; Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 1997) and that the consolidation of learners’ mother tongue facilitates second language acquisition (Cummins, 1979, 1999).

In Angola, despite the fact that the Portuguese language has become the mother tongue of many, the majority of Angolans continue to use African languages in everyday transactions (P. Sassuco, personal communication, January 25, 2014). Indiscriminate use of Portuguese as the only language of instruction nationwide has resulted in school failure for children whose first language is not Portuguese (Government of Angola, 2008). More recently, the government through the Ministry of Education (MoE) is promoting a language policy with an ongoing experimental project in six national languages, namely Kimbundu, Umbundu, Kikongo, Cokwe, Kwanyama, and Ngagela respectively (See Appendix B). For a country that has maintained a
monolingual education system for about 32 years, the new policy may be a milestone achievement that may lead to the consolidation of democracy and the promotion of an equitable education system in Angola.

However, despite the accumulating evidence and consensus from research and practice that additive and enrichment bilingual programs are better positioned to promote the maintenance of indigenous languages and sustainable national integration of cultural groups (Hornberger, 1998), the new Angolan language policy promotes early exit transitional bilingual education. Transitional bilingual programs consist of minority students learning through their mother tongue for at least one to three years and after that they transition into the dominant language. The main goal of this program is to assimilate students into the dominant language of instruction (Ferguson, 2006, 2013; Johnson, 2004). Given that Angola is a multilingual country such restrictive language policy may not only reinforce linguistic differentiation, but also deny certain linguistic groups the right to request that their children’s mother tongue be integrated into their public education benefiting the linguistic, cognitive and social development of the learners.

Moreover, the current language policy presents limitations that deserve particular attention. First, such policy is being promoted by the media without the participation of language educators and the communities that are supposed to benefit from it. According to Ricento and Hornberger (1996), attempts to change existing policies or implement new ones without the inclusion of the affected parties have little chance to succeed. Second, existing language statements in the Constitution and Lei de base do sistema de educação (basic education law), and other legal documents lack clear goals on what is to be accomplished through a language and
literacy policy that only intends to promote African languages with the purpose of preserving cultural heritage that has been contested (Blackledge & Creese, 2008).

I argue that bilingual language policy has not only cultural heritage values, but also cognitive development benefits and pedagogical implications (Adesope, Lavin, Thompson & Ungerleider, 2010; Cummins, 2001; Hakuta, 1986, 2011; Hakuta, Bialystok & Wiley, 2003). In a multilingual society such as Angola, any language policy that aims at promoting acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989; Haugen, 1972), cultivation (Spolsky, 2004) or language management (Spolsky, 2009), needs to take into account not only the ecology in which language use takes place, but also the underpinnings of bilingual education and its implications for learners’ cognitive development (Ben–Zeev, 1977; Bialystok, 2001, 2007; 2009; Cummins,1979, 1998, 2000, 2001; De Jong, 2002; Lanauze & Snow,1989; Kroll,1994, 2009). Obviously bilingual education alone will not solve the problems that many children are facing in schools. Apple and Lois (1983) note that the problem of education is an ideological one and it involves the struggle of forces, ideas and knowledge. As an element of social policy, language education policies are embedded in power dynamics that involve socio-cultural, economic, and political factors.

Statement of the Problem

Although, there is a vast body of bilingual education literature for SSA, literature and research on bilingual education in Angola is not extant. Further, a plethora of studies has drawn attention to the importance of language in social life, and language in education policies in Africa (Akinaso, 1991; Bamgbose, 1991; Obono, 2008; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Wolff, 2006, 2011). However, studies that address language policy, language planning and bilingual education in Angola are scarce. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes, beliefs, and
ideologies that influence language use and language education policy discourse in Angola. This study is an initiative that aims to contribute to the literature on language education policies and bilingual education in Africa, and more specifically in Angola.

**The Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

With this in mind, my goals were to examine the socio-historical, political, and ideological context that has shaped language policy in Angola, and to trace the various discursive practices, beliefs, and attitudes that shape and influence current language use and education policies in Angola. Language policies are not only constituted by official acts and texts, but also encompass unofficial interactions and discourses that work to perpetuate language statuses, uses and choices (Gumperz & Levinson, 1996; McCarthy, 2011; Myers-Scotton, 2006). Using a review of literature on language education policies and a sampling of current language policy, excerpts from the constitution, media commentary, and interviews with parents, teachers, educators, linguists and legislators, I analyzed the discursive contexts of national legislature, local debates and discourses and how various agents interpret and negotiate these policies. Empirical findings from this study provide insights that may lead to a new proposal of language policy for Angola.

Another purpose of this study is to give the events some discursive form and tease out a national debate conducive to the design of an effective, efficacious, and democratic language education program aligned to the socio-cultural, economic, and political conjuncture of the global era. Therefore my research questions are: (1) What are the discursive practices that have given rise to current educational language planning and policy in Angola? (2) What socio-historical conditions and discourses led to the current language ecology situation? (3) how do the
various discourses on language and culture impact the choice of language of instruction in Angola? (4) how do the various actors and agents (legislators, parents, language teachers, language learners, and language scholars) understand current language policies, specifically those that introduce African languages into the Angolan education system?

**Qualitative Research: Philosophical Considerations**

Depending on the goal and nature of research the assumptions that researchers make are established by certain philosophical traditions, which provide the epistemological and ontological premises that guide the research process (Chilisa, 2012; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Although these assumptions are not always evident, they nevertheless influence the whole practice of research (Creswell, 2007). My goal is to understand the complicated dynamics and discourses of Angolan education language policy. Since I operate from a critical research paradigm, my goal is not only to understand how language policy discourses operate in Angola, but also to facilitate change. Because this research project is situated in a critical discourse analysis approach, I drew from the assumptions that undergird the critical and poststructural paradigms of research. The goal of the critical research paradigm is to change society to create a more just and equitable social world. This is the goal that this research project aspires: to help facilitate a more just and equitable language policy in Angola.

Philosophical assumptions are normally combines with research paradigms (strategies) and methods that drive the research process—a theoretical framework. Qualitative research is a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research that draws from many different philosophical traditions. Ontologically and epistemologically this study builds upon the philosophical tradition of interpretivism and constructionism. Interpretivism is philosophical tradition that builds on
phenomenology and hermeneutics. Studies that draw form interpretivism seek to understand the world, people’s life experiences, and social institutions (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011).

Associating with the above philosophical currents, the author recognizes that the researcher needs to interrogate his/her own position — how his/her own ideological bias and experience might influence the research process (Lincoln, Linham & Guba, 2011). Another goal of this research is to interpret and lay bare the material practices that construct knowledge/power. In this context, language policy is viewed as a discursive and symbolic artifact that is socially, culturally, ideologically, and historically situated.

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

Although CDA is a well-established discipline within social science research, it is consensual among critical discourse scholars that that CDA is not a bounded and discrete academic discipline with ‘objective’ and fixed research methods (Fairclough, Muldering & Wodak, 2011). CDA is an analytical perspective with the focus on how “social power, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced, resisted in texts ranging from news reports, political addresses and institutional mandates to everyday conversation” (Schiffrin, 2004, p. 96), and all even mundane language that people take for granted. It should, however, be stressed that similar to Poststructuralism (Gupta & Ferguson, 2001), critical discourse analysis is not a monolithic perspective. In other words, there are many tendencies within the research that draws from critical discourse analysis understandings of language, discourse, power and society. As mentioned earlier, critical discourse analysis and poststructuralist theory are a reaction to structuralist approaches to linguistics, which foreground the view that, as a meaning-making system, language provides us with the fixed and objective understanding of the outside world;
that is a reality that can objectively be apprehended (Barthes, 1972; Derrida, 1967; Foucault, 1972).

However, the core assumptions in language/discourse poststructuralist thought is not only the deconstruction of language categories, but also the analysis of discursive formation and the field relations that emanate from them (Foucault, 1990a). In this perspective, social relations are historically and culturally conditioned. Discourse generates power and subjectivity. In other words, individuals are constituted and shaped in their conduct, thinking, speaking by the power of the discursively produced categories (Busch, 2012). This theorizing of language activity recognizes that structures exist within the difference and that they are temporarily and spatially fluid and sometimes contradictory. In doing so, poststructuralist analysis underscores the role of human agency and the fluidity of human subjectivity.

Theoretical Framework

The use of the term discourse has been an issue of concern not only among language scholars, but also among those who use discourse analysis as an area of research in social sciences (cultural studies, language policy, educational linguistics, linguistic anthropology, discursive psychology, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, etc.). Discourse is a term that has been defined in many different ways in these various areas of study. Given that the term discourse has its roots in mainstream linguistics, it makes sense to start with a definition of discourse that has linguistics flavor, to be sure, sociolinguistics. Jaworski and Coupland (1999), define discourse as follows:

- a means of talking and writing about and acting upon worlds, a means which both constructs and is constructed by a set of social practices within these worlds, and in so
doing both reproduces and constructs afresh particular social-discursive practices, constrained or encouraged by more macro movements in the overarching social formation. (p. 2)

In other words, the definition above suggests discourse as a dialectical process embedded in power relationships. It is through the interactions and actions of social agents that discursive practices are produced, negotiated and recontextualized (Bernstein, 1990; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999), sometimes giving way to new discursive practices. In this sense, discourse is seen as a reflexive practice. Fairclough (2010) notes that it is through such recontextualization that discourse enter and shape social processes and practices.

CDA provides the theoretical tools and method for empirical study and articulation of the relations between discourse and social and cultural developments in different domains of social life (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Unlike the positivist rigid conceptualization of theory and method, CDA as theory and method foregrounds the interpretative qualitative epistemologies to which I subscribe. As a method and theory, CDA foregrounds the view that discourse is a social practice which is constitutive and constituted. CDA spouses the philosophical assumptions of interpretive qualitative research which recognizes that the results of one research constitute only one interpretation among many possible interpretations (Cresswell, 2007, 2014).

I used Foucault’s discourse insights in order to illuminate how power circulates in the discursive field and problematize the socio-historical conditions of language policy creation in Angola. The strength of Foucault’s discourse insights is that, they illuminate how policy discourses are embedded in dynamic power relations that at times may produce and reproduce contradictory opinions, ideologies, attitudes, and perceptions of language policy. Foucault’s view
of discourse and power is crucial to the discursive policy analysis because it sheds light on the multiplicity of ways in which power is manifested in the policy field though discursive practices. According to Foucault (1990) power is not owned by anyone, but it is manifest in the multiplicity of relations. Power relations are mediated by and situated within the socio-cultural and discursive practices characterized by struggles, contradictions, and conflict between and within discourses (Hewitt, 2009).

According to Foucault (1972) the relations between discourse events are not necessarily of unity; rather the intertextuality formation can also be characterized by dispersion, contradiction and conflict. Intertextual analysis is grounded in social-historical context of production, reception, appropriation and (re)contextualization of discursive events. In emphasizing the sociocultural aspect of language policy “policy as discourse” (Bacchi, 2000; Ball, 1993; Johnson, 2013b), I wish to assert that discursive practices and discourse formations stem from and are embedded in symbolic and sociocultural practices that involve rituals and institutions (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999).

Moreover, intellectual insights and ideas from Foucault’s work provide the tools for carrying a multidimensional analysis of the socio-historical conditions of policy creation and how these have shaped the discursive practices and hegemonies that lead to the current sociolinguistic situation in Angola. Fairclough’s framework is perhaps the most widely used in CDA research. Although the term discourse is also used in different ways even within the CDA research, the notions of ideology, power and hegemony are shared in most critical discourse analysis research. In other words, ideology and power critique are some of the most important

Fairclough’s CDA framework is essentially grounded in historical change and how discourse serves as technologies of power that structure and restructure social life by often creating boundaries between what can and cannot be said (Ball, 1990). According to Fairclough et al., (2011), CDA is a problem oriented, interdisciplinary research field which draws from various approaches and disciplines. Foucault’s insights and Fairclough’s framework aligns with the understanding of language policy as a multilayered process in which policy text (written and spoken) is the product of language policy discourses and discursive practices that should be analyzed with the three dimensions; that is, the context (institutions) in which discourses about language use and language of instruction are situated (Johnson, 2013a). Fairclough’s three dimensional framework of discourse analysis incorporates discourse and non-discursive aspects (analysis of context, analysis of processes of text production and interpretation, analysis of text). The essential features in Fairclough’s three dimensional frameworks (Fairclough, 1992b; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002) are: (1) Textual analysis within the field of linguistics, including Halliday’s function grammar (modality, nominalization, passivization, repetitions, ellipsis); (2) discursive practices: processes of production and interpretation; (3) macro-sociological analysis of social practice, which also include the use of Foucault’ discourse theory and micro-sociological analysis.

In Fairclough’s framework, discourse helps to construct social identities, social relations, system of knowledge, and meaning. Although Fairclough does not conduct a study of language
policy using the three dimensional framework, Johnson (2013b, p. 157) explains the three dimensional framework within the context of language policy discourse analysis as follows:

Language policy texts can derive from official and unofficial language policy language (Interview transcripts, media excerpts and talk with language policy actors, personal communications, etc.). The production and interpretation of the policy texts and discursive practices is multilayered. The interpretation of policy texts is a dialogical process that involves the various interpretive resources. Such an interpretation always takes into account the institutional context in which policy texts and discourse practices emerge (Fairclough, 1995). Participants may take different discursive positions within a discursive chain or order. The analysis of policy texts and discourses through seeks to map the intertextual links between the macro-level and micro-level discourses (interviews, media commentary and excerpts from policy texts). The sociocultural context that includes the immediate situation in which discourses are produced and enacted.

In these contexts, discourses are in dialogical relation with ideologies and social norms that attempt to shape participants’ perspectives, perceptions, and attitudes about language use.

**Researcher Positionality**

The goal of this interpretive research was not only to grasp the layers of meaning that make social relation possible, but also the historical and cultural location of discursive practices (Reid, 2011). As a person whose early learning experiences were tremendously influenced by language barriers, I come to this realm with a sense of wonder and discovery. Although contribution to knowledge is the primary goal of research, practical significance is also of capital
importance. So, I am also interested in finding out how and why my own home language was never valued in my schooling. Researcher positionality is a very important aspect given the ethical issues that center on educational research that involves the use of interpretive qualitative research methods (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Eisner, 1991, 1998; Given, 2008; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Kvale, 1996; Peshkin, 1988; Seidman, 2006).

Being aware of my subjectivity may enhance my the interpretation of data in my study. In Eisner’s (1998) words, each person’s world of experience is unique to that person. In other words, the way one interpreter might perceive the phenomenon under study is particularly unique to that person. As a newcomer into the realm of interpretive qualitative research, I am acutely aware that from a poststructuralist perspective, interpretation “aims at the preservation of the inherent metaphorical richness of the text, its polyvalent surplus of meaning, in order to avoid the arbitrary reduction of polysemic meaning to a monolithic, all-embracing perspective” (Gardiner, 1992, p. 131). The interpretive qualitative research aims at demystifying the symbolic forces concealed in language and discourse in a dialogical and reflexive way. I therefore cannot assume that I can rid myself of my own subjectivity (Peshkin, 1988).

Reflexivity is one of the most important ethical issues in qualitative research (Laine, 2000). Qualitative research prompts us (researchers) to understand ourselves in a reflexive manner as individuals writing from a particular position and particular ideological vantage point (Fine, 1994; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005). Reflexivity entails being aware of my lived experiences and how they may influence and shape the results of my research. Reflexivity also encourages me, as researcher, to reflect on the ways I may be implicated in the findings of this research. Reflexivity demands that the researcher be aware not only of his/her subjectivity, but
also reflect on the types of questions, the knowledge that these will eventually produce and the interests that these may serve (Eisner, 1991; Willig, 2008). Finally, it is important to bear in mind that reflexivity is a process that the researcher should maintain throughout the whole research process from the selection of the topic to the process of writing the report. Reflexivity requires the researcher to be explicit about the relationship with the research. My understanding of reflexivity is that, as a researcher, I cannot separate myself from the discursive practices in the field of policy creation, consumption, and implementation.

My interest to carry out this study stems from my experience as a learner, teacher and a multilingual speaker. As a learner, in early years of school, I was forced to juggle between my home language (Kikongo) and Portuguese, the only language of instruction in Angola. No one was allowed to speak African languages within the school perimeter, let alone in the classroom. As far as I can recall, it was a painful experience, mainly because we were all having many difficulties in learning. My family and other families’ parents spoke only Kikongo, my mother tongue. In my own family, the only person who had the opportunity to study Portuguese until 3rd grade during the colonial time was, my father, who had passed away before my sixth birthday. In other words, bilingual experience started early in my learning career.

During my studies overseas, I went through new learning experiences. During my stay in Russian I have learned the Russian language, French and English. I mastered Spanish with my Cuban teachers. It is in the course of my studies overseas that I became multilingual. Nonetheless, I have developed a critical awareness of what learning in an unfamiliar language means during my undergraduate studies in English language teaching (TESOL). Through foundational learning theories, I learned how previously learned language or first language (L1)
affects second language (L2) learning. This process is called language transfer or linguistic interference—positive and negative transfer, to be sure. It is important to note that interference of L1 was normally portrayed as negative and undesirable in second language learning, that is, a source of incorrect syntactic and morphological formulations (Gass & Siliinker, 1983).

The significance of the study

As mentioned earlier, although research on the language question in SSA has grown considerably in the last decades, I conducted a systematic searched in the most relevant language planning and language policy journals and databases, namely the International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Journal of Language Policy, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Journal of Language and Identity in Education, ERIC database, Linguistics Abstracts, Southern African Journal of Applied Studies, Journal for Language Teaching, and I did not find any article regarding language planning and language education policy in Angola. Interestingly enough, in Current Issues in Language Planning I found Vilela’s (2002) article that discusses issues of language within the context of African countries with Portuguese as an official language. However, from Google I found only two works that address language policy in Angola. One is a master’s degree thesis and another is a doctoral dissertation. From the above, it is clear that language planning and policy research in Angola is in its embryonic stage.

Thus, this study will significantly contribute to the ongoing discussion not only on language planning in general, but also on language education policy. Moreover, although the studies mentioned above have significantly contributed to our understanding of the problems that
beleaguer the politics of language in Angola, both studies have addressed the existing problems taking different perspectives. While the former advocates for African languages without proposing alternative routes (Augusto, 2012), the latter argues for nationalization of Portuguese in Angola (Nzau, 2011). Against this background, the integrative and holistic approach used in this study may tease out a candid and inclusive national debate on language use and language education reform in Angola.

Moreover, in the context of ongoing global transformations in education, bilingual education has been mentioned to have the power to promote linguistic diversity and multilingualism as a resource (Ruiz, 1984). In addition, because of the cognitive and sociocultural benefits of bilingualism bilingual education has the power to address the consistent problems of achievement that affect many children in schools (Genesee & Gándara, 1999; Heller, 2007; Heugh, 2007, 2013; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Johnson, 2012). It is my hope that the insights from this study will eventually help to tease out a national debate that may lead to the design and implementation of sound language education programs in the country.

**Overview of the Dissertation**

Chapter one introduces the background information regarding the problem and the context of the study as well as the purpose of the study and the research questions. This is followed by the discussion of the qualitative research philosophical considerations that undergird critical discourse analysis and post-structuralist paradigms. Theoretical framework acquaints the reader with the theoretical and philosophical assumptions of critical discourse analysis. Finally, the chapter outlines the researcher’s positionality and the significance of the study.
Chapter 2 provides a critical review of the literature on language planning and policy, specifically the definitions by highlighting and contrasting the old conceptualization of LPP with the recent theoretical perspectives and developments. A critical review of literature indicated that despite the existence evidence about the importance of mother tongue bilingual education, most countries in sub-Saharan Africa continue to privilege the use of Euro-languages as medium of instruction through bilingual transitional models. In addition, literature review on the link between LPP and literacy suggested the need to shift from traditional views of literacy to critical literacy. It is argued that traditional views of literacy or autonomous models of literacy in Street’s terms, downplay the sociocultural character of language learning and reading instruction. Finally, the literature on language ideology and attitudes related to second language learning and language policy was reviewed and discussed.

Chapter 3 details the context of study and provides a critical review of LPP in sub-Saharan Africa. The literature on LPP in the Southern region of Africa suggested that most of the countries in the region continue to promote transitional models, which to some extent hinder the effective promotion of mother tongue instruction. The review of literature on the sociolinguistic situation of Angola suggested the existence of language hierarchization. Within the context of the recent language planning and policy developments, the chapter highlights the fact that the Luso-Brazilian orthographic accord which involves Angola and other Portuguese speaking African countries represents reinforces monolingual culture that may undermine the development of democratic education policy.

Chapter 4 presents the sources of data collection, methods of analysis and the procedures as well as how the validity issue was dealt with in this study. Finally, the chapter outlines the
ethical issues, that is, how they were addressed in this study as well as the limitations and the future research directions and the challenges ahead.

Chapter 5 addresses the research questions by providing a linguistic analysis of textual features of the language education policy, participants interviews and media discourses under consideration in chapter 4. This was followed by intertextual and interdiscursive analysis of language policy discourses. Finally, the discussion of the findings demonstrated that Angolan language policy discourses are influenced by colonial, transnational and global discourses. This is demonstrated by the tensions between the ideology of mother tongue and the ideology of Portuguese and the tensions between the local and the global. The chapter paves the way for chapter 6 that presents a proposal for a bilingual education framework for Angola.

Based on the research questions and findings of this study as well as the theoretical insights from research pertinent to second language learning and bilingual education, chapter 5 proposes a bilingual education policy framework that is sustained by a summary of literature that sustains the underpinnings of bilingual and multilingual education policies. Finally, the chapter provides the conclusions of the study and the implications of the findings in the context of language policy in Angola.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Language Planning and Policy (LPP)

With respect to language planning, various scholars have provided different definitions for the same thing (Baldauf, 1994; Cooper, 1989; Fishman, 1974; Haugen, 1969; Neustupný, 1974; Tollefson, 1991). Cooper (1989), for example, defines language planning as a deliberate effort of social institutions that aims at influencing the acquisition of language, language choice, and language use. For Wiley (1996) language planning is the process that mediates policy production and the selection and choice of language varieties adequate for societal use. It is also noteworthy that language planning evolved primarily as a study of language issues in developing nations (Rubin & Jernud, 1971). In fact, the whole language enterprise was originally concerned with addressing what Western colonial nations thought were language problems in developing nations. The primary concern of LPP was to find a language that would help new independent countries move toward sustainable development. While the definitions above reflect early definitions of language planning in broad terms, the main concern of this chapter is language education planning or acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989). It is relevant to stress here that while helping to describe the processes and possible steps in creating language education policies, traditional models of Language Planning and Policy (LPP) tend to assume that policy can be explained in terms of intentions, and the rational interests of those involved in policy creation (Torfing, 1999). In treating language planning as a rational endeavor, these models do not only downplay the sociopolitical contexts in which language planning takes place, but also risk perpetuating the hegemony of top-down language planning.
Moreover, there have been heated debates on whether language planning is part of applied linguistics that deals specifically with the issues of language teaching and learning. In this view, Cooper (1989) noted the controversy as to whether or not acquisition planning is part of language planning stems from the desire to set disciplinary boundaries between applied linguistics and language planning in general. Lo Bianco (2004) noted that LPP involves not only formal decisions, but also the informal everyday practices that influence language education and language use. This understanding aligns with Spolsky’s view of language policy. Spolsky (2004) views language policy as encompassing all formal and informal—family and community—activities that shape linguistic behavior. Drawing from Cooper (1989), Baldauf (1994) noted that language policy involves making explicit decisions about which languages to use for education, administration, and media in a particular society. It is widely accepted in the current LPP research that policy decisions are not ideologically free. Tollefson (1991), for example, contended that language policy is, par excellence the mechanism through which those who have power control access to intellectual and economic resources. Tollefson has suggested that language policies serve as roadmaps that social agents merely follow.

Although there are many definitions of language planning and language policy, there are commonly accepted activities that encompass all language planning activities. Corpus planning deals with activities related to language form, status planning is concerned with the function of language, and acquisition planning is concerned with language learners and users (Cooper, 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Van Ells, 2005). While these activities might be performed separately, there is a very important relationship among them. For example, the selection of language
variety, its lexicalization, and standardization, which are part of corpus planning, have immediate consequences for the prestige of excluded varieties and their functional use (status planning).

Another good example of the interrelationship of corpus, status and acquisition planning encapsulates the ideology of Standard English as a common global language. Standard English as a global language does not lend itself easily to linguistic universals only. The promotion of standards is intertwined with prestige, economic, and political interests (Ricento, 2010). Moreover, Joshua Fishman has ably demonstrated in The Status Agenda in Corpus Planning (2000), that although corpus planning is notably expressed in linguistic terms (phonology, lexicalization, morphology, semantics, etc.), it is an ideological activity often with covert status planning agendas. In this sense, corpus planning without adequate status planning is like playing an empty “linguistic game” (Fishman, 2000, p.44). In other words, status planning and corpus planning are on the continuum. Language planning does not only affect language use, but also may seek to enact and legitimize discursive practices and identity to further nationalist interests (Duchène, 2008).

Given the contested character of language in the context of globalization, the number of approaches to language policy has grown considerably in the last twenty years. Three perspectives to language policy that are widely mentioned in policy literature, which are germane to this analysis, include Critical Language Policy (CLP) (Tollefson, 1991, 2006), Ecological Language Policy (Haugen, 1972; Hornberger, 2002), and the Linguistic Human Right (LHR) approach (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008, 2010).
Critical language policy (CLP). CLP is a response to ahistorical and uncritical analysis of language within the field of linguistics, sociolinguistics and applied linguistics (Johnson, 2013a). CLP was originally epitomized in the work of Professor James Tollefson. Tollefson (1991) criticized the neo-classical approach to language planning because of its ahistorical bias, claims of scientific neutrality, and the emphasis on rational decisions of individuals. Tollefson (1991, 2006) combined insights from critical theory with an historical-structural perspective. He argued that language policy serves the interests of the dominant groups. His critique of neoclassical theory is that:

It does not include the analysis of the forces that lead to the adoption of the planning approach, the historical and structural factors that determine the evaluative criteria by which plans are judged to be effective, or political and economic interests that benefit from the failure of planning. (Tollefson, 1991, p. 28)

In his more recent work, Tollefson takes up a post-structuralist approach on language, which views power not as residing in the sovereign state; rather power does not only involve struggles, it is also mediated by the historically and culturally situated process of knowledge production (Foucault, 1972).

Another important contribution to CLP is Pennycook’s poststructuralist/postmodernist view of language policy. Pennycook (2006) takes up the Foucauldian articulation of governmentality. The notion of governmentality was articulated by Foucault (1991) and it decenters the power of the state by recognizing the agentive power and agency of various actors (Johnson, 2013b). Pennycook (2006) explores the notion of governmentality to underscore that
the production of language policy is not an enterprise confined solely to state sanctioned discourses. Rather, the production of language policies involves the recruitment of various discourses that circulate and operate at both at the macro-level and the micro-level discursive practices (Pennycook, 2006). According to Pennycook, language policy is the mechanism through which language use becomes part of language governmentality.

Pennycook suggested those language policies that promote ethnolinguistic culture and languages, are but a new form of using language as mechanism of governing. In other words, he has suggested that rather than disinveting the language conceptualization akin to the modernist project (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005), language policies that promote mother tongue education are still caught in the same modernist and colonial logic and discourse that see language as a bounded entity (Pennycook, 2006). The analytic of governmentality focuses on the multiplicity of cultural and discursive practices. In doing so, it abandons the rational views that seek for actor’s intentionality in language policy discourse and underscore a more localized focus on the conflicting and contradictory character of language policy discourse and discursive practices.

As a form of critical inquiry of language policy, CLP also examines of the processes of how institutional language policies affect the economic and cultural situation of ethnolinguistic groups and language minorities in the context of the global economic and sociocultural transformations. It is important to note that CLP lines up nicely with critical discourse analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis and CLP have a common thread in that in both stances there is an articulation of the hegemonic character of language policy and the struggle for social change as the alternative avenue for social justice.
In his later works, Tollefson (2002, 2013) theoretically relies on the power of the post-structuralist argument. In contrast to Planning Language, Planning Inequality, in Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues’ published in 2013, Tollefson puts forward a post-structuralist understanding and articulation of power. In this work, he is more cognizant of the conflicting and complex terrain in which language in education policies are enacted. In acknowledging that language is not only socially and historically situated, but it is also contested (Tollefson, 2002), Tollefson not only demonstrates his commitment to post-structuralist understanding of discourse as constituted and constitutive. He also recognizes language policy as an ideological endeavor, and that policy actors and agents have the possibility to negotiate, contest, and resist top-down language policies. This characterization of power has methodological implications because it points to the complexity of contexts in which policies are negotiated, imposed at the micro-level (e.g. in schools), resisted, put aside or appropriated.

This articulation of power also opens up a possibility to articulate human agency. In short, as in most critical language perspectives, within the CLP paradigm, language policy is inevitably a political endeavor that is contestable and negotiable, albeit within unequal power relationships. One of the goals of this strand of language policy research is to promote democratic language policies and therefore the maintenance of minority languages (Johnson, 2013). Although severely criticized for ignoring human agency (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), this line of research advocates for language policies that promote minority language through education (Tollefson, 2002).

**Ecological language policies.** Another perspective to language policy is the ecological language policy approach. Einar Haugen is credited for introducing the language ecology...
metaphor in the study of language and its interactions with the environment. According to Haugen (1972) language ecology is the study of language and the environment in which language use takes place. This can be simply explained as language is likened to a living organism whose chance for survival depends on the conditions of the environment. He goes on to say that the language environment does not refer to grammar or lexicon, but to the society that uses it. For Haugen, language ecology has two important dimensions that are intrinsically related: psychological and sociological. In other words, the psychological and sociological aspect of language manifest themselves at the level of the speakers through the act of communication. As Derni (2008) explains:

- A social correlation explains how social constraints come to control and manipulate language use, so that a sharp link is made between the language and its social context. A psychological one deals with a language as a product of interpersonal and intrapersonal motives and explains language behavior in correlation with human mind and the different psychological mechanisms (p. 22)

The above observations underscore the importance of language ecology in the process of language planning and language policy in general, and in education in particular. In fact, understanding the status, the functions that different languages perform (Sapir, 1931) and how these interact and influence language attitudes is an important condition for language planning (Choi, 2003). Hornberger and Hult (2008) noted that although the language ecology perspective is not yet widely accepted within the field of language planning, language ecology has made important contributions to the field of LPP. According to Van Lier (2004), it is a conceptual and heuristic orientation that captures the sociopolitical nature of language education policy and
helps to uncover the complex relationship between context and the situations of language contact and their overarching implications for social actions, language planning in multilingual contexts.

The ecological perspective to language policy asserts that in any particular environment, some languages have more value than others; therefore those with less value have a small chance for survival (Hornberger & Hult, 2008). This observation is of critical importance in relation to language planning and policy in Angola. In fact, language in education policy plays an important role in terms of language spread and language maintenance. Hornberger (2003) noted that language education policies can be very important to supporting language environments. Using an ecological perspective to language policy Hornberger introduces an important theorizing of language education policy through continua of biliteracy. A continua of biliteracy asserts the view that in a classroom environment the interaction between the teacher and the students is situated along a continuum. In continua of biliteracy Hornberger focuses on interactions among languages across contexts and the role of language education policies (Hornberger & Hult, 2008). Teachers who challenge coercive power dynamics may be located on one end of the continuum and those who reinforce coercive power relationships on the other.

Hornberger (2003) illustrated this when she observed that, for example, teachers who encourage bilingual publications and bilingual materials in their class challenge the monolingual ideologies that tend to suppress the use of students’ first language (L1) in class on the one hand, and the teachers who prohibit the use of leaners L1 reinforce the monolingual bias, on the other (Widdowson, 2001). In fact, her observations about how power relationships evolved in multilingual contexts, and how policies result in unplanned consequences such as the replication
of monolingual practices in schools rather than bilingualism are relevant (Cummins, 2005a, 2005b; 2007, 2008, Heugh, 2009a). The continua of biliteracy constitutes an important contribution to the study of literacy in multilingual communities because it provides pedagogical insights that are critical for literacy development in multilingual classrooms. Pedagogically, the continua of biliteracy provides a framework that can successfully not only empower the learners, but also promote biliteracy and multiliteracies.

**Linguistic human rights approach.** Another perspective to language policy takes the human rights approach (Phillipson, 1992; May, 1996; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 2008). A language rights approach is grounded in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) which was signed in 1948, and the United Nations Education Scientific, and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) Universal Declaration of Language Rights (UDLR). These international regulations outline the right for any individual to use their mother tongue in official interactions and to learn both their mother tongue and the official language of the governing state (Hornberger, 1998). The UDLR on its Article 25 states that “All language communities are entitled to have at their disposal all the human and material resources necessary to ensure that their language is present to the extent they desire at all levels of education within their territory” (Kamwendo, 2006, p. 66).

The human rights approach that draws heavily on the UDLR has been criticized (Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Makoni, 2011, 2012; Stroud, 2001). Kamwendo noted that, although the idea of language rights should be encouraged, article 25 of the UDLR seems to be unrealistic because it is not possible to expect that all languages are used in schools. However, to illustrate the relevance of LHR paradigm in LPP in Africa, Kawendo (2006) observed that despite the
difficulties and complexities that involve the implementation of rights’ based language policy, the South African language policy remains the best and exemplary model of language planning in Africa. In other words, Kamwendo has suggested that the language rights approach to language education policy remains important because it is a useful mechanism for empowering the communities and the students whose mother tongues have been marginalized in education (Cummins, 1986, 1995).

Wee (2011), noted that the discourse of language rights has gained prominence due to the threat that people perceive in the spread of English and other dominant languages such as French, Spanish, and Portuguese. Although it has limitations, the LHR approach has been recognized by many scholars in Africa (Firmino, 1995; Henriksen, 2010; Laitin, 1992) and elsewhere (Hossain & Pratt, 2008; Johnson, 2009a; May, 2012) for its power for promoting language diversity, multilingualism, and learners’ rights to be educated in their mother tongue or in the language they know better. In fact, Hossain and Pratt (2008) clearly acknowledge that the linguistic human rights perspective constitutes an important contribution to LPP in general because it encourages social equity in language planning, specifically in the implementation of national language education policies. Moreover, contrary to the views held by some critics (e.g., Makoni, 2012) scholars working on the LHR also recognize that fluidity of language repertoires in multilingual contexts. For example, May (2012), challenged Makoni (2012), by arguing that he engages in a monolithic analysis of language rights perspectives. In defense of the LHR akin to his and Hornberger’s work, May noted that language rights viewed through diachronic analysis of language education policies can better help understand the need for language
minorities to use their mother tongue in education. He goes on to say that for the critics of LHR to be taken seriously, they need to engage with the bulk of language rights literature.

In summary, while the LHR’s approach has been criticized, its usefulness in the context of the global linguistic and socio-economic transformations cannot be denied. In other words, the language rights paradigm remains an important tool in LPP research, especially within the strands akin to critical sociolinguistics and critical linguistics approaches. Given the exclusive reliance on the Portuguese language based education in Angola, the linguistic rights backed by constitutional law would significantly contribute to the greater use of students’ mother tongue in literacy acquisition, the building of a bilingual education system, and the promotion of multilingualism.

**Language policy as text and discourse.** Finally, the language policy as a discourse perspective, which is of greatest relevance to this study, asserts the multi-layered and messy character of the language policy process (Ball, 1993; Johnson, 2012; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Policy as discourse, as originally discussed in Ball (1993) is heavily influenced by Foucault’s early works, notably *Discipline and Punish*. We see the notion of policy as text (documents) and policy as discourse in Ball (1993). Ball sees policy texts as “representations which are encoded in complex ways (via struggles, compromises, authoritative public interpretations and reinterpretations) and decoded in complex ways (via actors’ interpretations and meanings in relation to their histories, experiences, skills, resources and context)” (p.11). In other words, a policy as text perspective emphasizes that agents interpret and appropriate policy texts in a dynamic ways, thus embracing a poststructuralist view of language and discourse. For
Ball policies pose problems that educators and cultural workers need to deal with in a particular context.

The enactment of policy texts relies not only the capability and allocation of resources, but also on the level of commitment, understanding, and cooperation among the various stakeholders (Ball, 1993). Thus, policies are both changing and contested as they move from creation, circulation, and recontextualization. A policy text is a result of various hegemonies, ideologies, and perspectives of its contributors. Therefore the reading of policy texts by various readers also results in the plurality readings. Yet, as Ball noted, it is important to investigate and understand the effects of policy texts on readers.

Thus, policy as discourse, emphasizes that discourses impose boundaries in what can and cannot be said (Ball, 1993). In this sense, discourses are not only about objects, but our very subjectivity is a product of discourse (Ball, 1993). Ball (1993) noted that we need to be able to illuminate and uncover the ways in which policies exercise power through the production and circulation of knowledge. It is noteworthy that policy texts and policy discourses exist in dialogic relationship, because as an object of policy analysis, policy discourses are constituted by policy texts. Policy texts and policy discourses are mutually constitutive. According to Johnson (2013b) policy texts help to produce and in turn are produced by policy discourses. These discourses are usually in a dialogical relationship with cultural and discursive practices that shape language use and behaviors. The ideological and hegemonic character of policy discourses is manifest in its capacity not only to shape, as they are shaped, but also in normalizing dominant views of language. In short, we are the byproduct of knowledge and subjectivities created through discursive practices and policy seen as a strategic and political process (Bachi, 2000).
Nonetheless, the idea that policy discourses determine what we become recognizes the de-centering of the state (Ball, 1993).

However, such an approach to discourse has been severely criticized. Bacchi (2000), for example, noted that policy as discourse approach tends to assume that some groups have more ability and power to produce discourses. In other words, there has been a tendency to focus on the power of the top-down policies as homogenizing and leaving little space for resistance. Cognizant of the criticisms against the policy as discourse perspective to language policy for having little agency (Ball, 1993, Johnson, 2013a), and to take advantage of the strengths from the above insights, my approach to policy as discourse takes up the arguments from the original project (Ball, 1993) but differs from it in significant ways. The policy as discourse perspective that is articulated in this study draws primarily on Michel Foucault works, specifically the insights from *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, and Governmentality (Foucault, 1977, 1990, 1991).

In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) noted that “discourse has the power to say something other than what actually says, and thus to embrace a plurality of meanings, a plethora of signified in relation to a single signifier” (p. 118). In other words, as a form of discourse, language policies may be rendered to different interpretations by the various agents and actors involved in the instrumentalization of language policy.

Ball (1993) acknowledged that policy as discourse has the power for redistribution of voice. In other words, Ball has suggested that, as a form of discourse, even top-down policy should not be seen as reflecting a homogeneous entity. While alert with the fact that language policy is a site in which specific language practices may gain legitimacy (Stroud, 2003, 2007b),
policy as discourse approach reflects the view that discourses (written and spoken) are the products of language policy discourse (Johnson, 2013a).

Drawing from Foucault (1972), Ball (1993) noted that discourses systematically form the objects of which they speak. In this sense policy as discourse examines not only what is said, but also what is not said. Although this statement has been used to critique policy as discourse, such criticisms are not only reductionist, but also unfounded. In fact, Foucault (1977) acknowledged that the practice of interpretation aims not at seeking an unified understanding of the the social world; rather to interpret is to reveal the dynamic and multiple nature of social experience and meaning.

The above observations encapsulate the view that policies are not amenable to ‘objective’ interpretations of the already graspable object or a phenomenon that can be fully apprehended. Rather the meaning potential of language policy resides in its surplus of meaning. As conceptualized in this study the notion of policy as discourse links to Foucault’s (1991) notion of governmentality. Contrary to rationalist perspectives, which view language policy as a craft of the government, governmentality decenters the sovereign and singular power, while highlighting how power circulates across the various contexts and within the level social and discursive practices (Johnson, 2013). It is important to note that Foucault (1972) recognizes the possibility of counter-discourse. Moreover, Foucault (1990) noted that, as an instrument and an effect of power, discourse, can also act as a stumbling block and a mechanism of resistance.

Foucault (1990) also observed that in a particular discursive formation, discourses that one deals with are connected to one another. This view is consistent with the theoretical insights from CDA that recognizes the intertextual nature of discourses involved in language policy
production, circulation, and even consumption (Thompson, 1990). Foucault’s notion of governmentality lines up with the multi-layered conceptualization of language policy in which various hegemonies and ideologies compete (Johnson, 2012). Johnson (2004) concurs that a policy as discourse approach that emphasizes discourse as an instrument of power and resistance constitutes an important way to underscore the reflexive character of social action and the power of human agency in language planning and policy. Therefore, policy as discourse recognizes the agentive role of multiple actors and arenas in evolving language policies (McGroarty, 2013).

Thus, I conceptualize Language Policy (LP) as a hegemonic and discursive phenomenon that is situated socio-historically and politically (Valdiviezo, 2013). In this sense, LP is situated in an arena where multiple hegemonies (Myers-Scotton, 2006), contradictory beliefs, and opinions struggle to fix the meaning potential of policies and discursive practices. The view of policy as having a meaning potential asserts the socio-cultural and intertextual multi-levels (Halliday & Hasan, 1985,1989) of LP discourse. Rather, than viewing LP as a road map of activities to be carried out by policy agents or governments, policies encapsulate symbolic meanings that need to be interpreted within the socio-historical context in which they are produced, received, appropriated, resisted, and eventually implemented (Thompson, 1990; Valdiviezo, 2013). Therefore, LP is a dynamic, disjunctive, and a contradictory process that involves a complex struggle for cultural and symbolic resources among the many actors who intervene in the policy arena (Fischer & Forester, 2002; Schiffman, 1996; Shore & Wright, 1997; Shore, Wright, & Pero, 2011; Stein, 2004; Levinson & Sutton, 2001).

However, it is important to bear in mind that such an approach on LPP is intended to illuminate and maintain the balance between the structure and agency and capture the
unpredictable ways in which language policy agents and actors receive and interpret language policy (Johnson, 2013b). In the spirit of Bakthin (1981) and Foucault (1977), this approach aims to situate language policy socially and historically in order to illuminate the heterogeneous nature of the ideologies that undergird the language policy process (Valdiviezo, 2013). Having discussed the language policy orientations, to contextualize the bilingual education policy discussed in the foregoing that next section presents an overview of bilingual education research relevant to the current study.

**Bilingual Education Research: Overview**

Baker (2007) suggested that bilingual education is an ambiguous term. To reduce such ambiguity, he proposed the following definition of bilingual education: Bilingual education refers to the situation where some content matter or all subject content are taught through the medium of two languages in schools (Baker, 2007). Fishman (1970) insisted that bilingual education is an important and effective means of promoting and maintaining cultural and linguistic diversity. To respond to the rapid demographic changes in the United States of America, for example, such programs were initially conceived to teach learners with Limited English proficiency (LEP). In essence the learners’ mother tongue is used to help them learn different school subject matter (Rossell & Baker, 1996; Smith & Rodriguez, 2011). Historically the chief problem in justifying the use of learners’ mother tongue and the introduction of various bilingual programs is the poor school achievement among minority students especially the Spanish speaking communities (Padilla, 1983).

There are various models of bilingual education. In bilingual education the most well recognized models are immersion, transitional (early and late exit), two way or dual medium and
developmental maintenance (Benson, 2009). Transitional models use the mother tongue only for a certain period of time, and afterwards, instruction transitions to the dominant medium of instruction; whereas development and maintenance programs use both languages to foster bi/multilingualism (Benson, 2000, 2005, 2009). Baker (2006) has made a very important distinction between the programs that aim at developing de facto bi/multilingualism and the ones which take subtractive views (weak bilingual programs). According to the research, additive or strong bilingual programs are the ones in which most effective language learning builds on L1 development. In other words, additive bilingual programs are developmental (Benson, 2009). For a detailed review of models of bilingual education and their effectiveness see (Benson, 2009; Collier, 1992; Ferguson, 2006; Lynch, 1991; Ramirez & Merino, 1990; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Trueba, 1985). Table 1 summarizes the typology of bilingual education programs according to their goals and outcomes.

Table 1

*Typology of Bilingual Education Program Models: Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilingual Programs</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submersion</strong></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Students assimilate into dominant language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional Bilingual Education</strong></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Subtractive bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Bilingual Education</strong></td>
<td>Promote linguistic pluralism</td>
<td>Develop bilingualism and biliteracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Languages are seen as a resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrichment, Two-Way, Developmental Bilingual Education</strong></td>
<td>Promote linguistic pluralism</td>
<td>Additive bilingualism and biliteracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction in two languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Roberts (1995).
The turning point in the bilingual debate, however, was Cummins’ (1979) two hypotheses. The ‘developmental interdependence’ hypothesis which proposes that the development of second language (L2) competence is to some extent related to the competence that children already developed in their L1 at the time when they start learning the second language. In other words, Cummins suggested that there is a cross-linguistic influence between the two languages (L1 and L2) involved in the bilingual education process. Whereas the threshold hypothesis postulates that “there may be threshold levels of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of bilingualism to influence his cognitive and academic functioning” (Cummins, 1979, p. 222).

Bilingual education has been a subject of heated and controversial debates over the last decades of the twentieth century. The debates center on the effectiveness of bilingual education (Begley, 2011; Collier, 1992; De Jong, 2003; Diaz, 1983; Hakuta, 2011; Tong, Irby, Lara-Alecio & Mathes, 2008; Pease-Alvarez & Hakuta, 1992; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Verhoeven, 1994; Willig, 1985). One side of the argument that questions the effectiveness of bilingual education is the side of the proponents of time on task hypothesis (Porter, 1990a, 1990b). This theory proposed that bilingual education programs have disadvantages compared to English only language instruction because the time spent on learning the target language (English) is significantly not sufficient for attaining the desired language proficiency (Rossell & Baker, 1996). Some research vouched for the time on task factor as one of the most important predictors of school achievement (Rosenshine, 1979; Wiley, 1996). Others have severely criticized it for not incorporating important variables such as the pace of instruction, classroom environment,
and curriculum content (Rossell & Baker, 1996). Other important crosscutting themes on the influence of bilingualism in second language learning are bilingualism and gender (Pavlenko, 2001); bilingualism, emotion and mind that emphasize the affective side of lexicon in bilingual learner (Pavlenko, 2008); mind and brain (Kroll, 1994); and individual differences in early bilingual and multilingual acquisition. The argument is that individual differences have great impact and consequences in language acquisition patterns and ultimate language proficiency (Genesee, Paradis, & Crago, 2004; Paradis, 2007).

Coming back to the crucial issue of the effectiveness of bilingual education, the most radical research that questioned bilingual education and the interdependence hypothesis was conducted by Baker and de Kanter (1981). They used a traditional method of research review, that is, a statistical review in which studies were accounted as significant “only if one is 95 % or more sure that it ought not to have occurred by chance” (Lynch, 1991, p. 218). While Baker and de Kanter’s review dismissed 272 studies out of 300 on the grounds that they were methodologically flawed, their own review has also been criticized for dismissing literacy in the first language, and self-esteem measures, which have been the main justification for bilingual programs for Hispanics (Lynch, 1991). According to Lynch (1991) one important outcome of Baker and de Kanter’s undertaking is that they refuted the argument that transitional bilingual education was by far better compared to other methods. Willig (1985) conducted a meta-analysis review of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education and reviewed the same 28 studies reviewed by Baker and de Kanter. Meta-analysis is said to be a more reliable method because it uses a computer analysis that helps to maintain all testable variables constant (Lynch,
1991). Willig (1985) found that “the type of program and type of tests administered to evaluate the programs were very influential in the manipulation of the results.

In general, Willig’s results showed that bilingual programs were to some extent better than submersion, particularly if the tests were in students’ first language. Students were said to have improved results in listening, comprehension, reading, mathematics, social studies, and attitudes towards school and self (Lynch, 1991). It can be argued that the interdependence hypothesis ushered the major developments in terms of research. Some of areas of second language learning against which the interdependence hypothesis is tested is the development of literacy (Blosser, 1983; Koda, 2007) age of acquisition (AoA) factor (Patkowski, 1980) composition (Friedlander, 1994; Johns, 1994), phonological aspects (Desmet & Duyck, 2007; Gottardo, Gu, Mueller, Baciu & Pauchulo, 2011), lexical and grammatical domains (Simon-Cereijido & Gutierrez-Clellen, 2009), and semantic transfer (Jiang, 2004).

In regard to the influence of language as a medium of instruction in school success Thomas and Collier’s, (1997) study on School Effectiveness for Language Minority Children provides the most cited evidence. However, although Thomas and Collier’s model is appreciated, some scholars have questioned whether such a model can be replicated in developing countries and whether the language effects persist in cases where the mother tongue is less developed than the dominant one (Walter, 2008). These and other questions are relevant in deciding on which model is adequate for a particular context. While late exit transitional bilingual education is an option for the short term bilingual education solution for Angola, in the long run it is suggested that an additive bilingual education is the most feasible model as will become apparent in the discussion of the models of bilingual education.
The decision to implement any language policy model, however, rests on the premises that bilingual education models need to be selected on the basis of the language ecology of each country, its socio-cultural reality and empirical evidence from research. This is the challenge that the government and language educators need to face. In other words, the success of any language policy that aims at maintaining or even cultivating African languages will dramatically depend on the interplay of factors, particularly the collaboration between the government and educational institutions prepared for language education, the allocation of resources, the change of attitudes (Adegbija, 1994, 2000; Baker, 2005, Lambert, 1973; Wolff, 2000) towards African languages, and training of teachers based on the cutting edge theories of second language teaching and learning.

To sum up, the success of the implementation of a bilingual language education policy will dramatically depend on the type of the program, the political maturity of the government, and its willingness to allocate resources (Francis, 2005a; Mazrui, 1996). In short, the success of any bilingual policy will also depend on the extent to which the local communities and the various agents are allowed to collaboratively participate in the literacy planning process (Chimbutane, 2011; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Trudell, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2010; Riley, 2012).

**Language Planning and Literacy**

Literacy planning is often treated as a part of acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989) or language-in-education planning (Johnson, 2013). According to Liddicoat (2007), like language planning, literacy planning involves corpus planning, status planning, and prestige planning. Each of these planning activities has its own foci and issues. In order for an effective literacy planning to take place there is a need to ensure that resources for literacy development are
available; and corpus planning is exactly the activity of literacy planning that deals with the technologies of literacy (e.g., normalization of language, orthographies, grammars, production of dictionaries, etc.). In addition, status planning involves the selection of languages of literacy (the languages that will be used for literacy acquisition) and their use as a medium of instruction in schools (Liddicoat, 2005; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004).

One of the most important aspects for developing literacy planning is, to ensure that learners’ first language or mother tongue is used for basic literacy skills. This view is consistent with the transfer hypothesis which postulates that literacy skills acquired in mother tongue or first language serve as a foundation for acquiring literacy in second language (Cummins, 1979, 2000, 2009). Prestige planning is another very important dimension of literacy planning. According to Liddicoat (2007) contexts play a very important role in determining the models and needs for particular literacy acquisition planning. Liddicoat (2007) distinguishes six contexts and perspectives that are important in pursuing literacy acquisition: (1) Literacy in a national language as a first language; (2) literacy in a national language as an additional language, national minorities or immigration groups; (3) literacy in minority language as a first language; (4) literacy in a minority language as an additional language; (5) literacy in multiple languages as first languages; and (6) literacy in multiple languages as additional languages.

The above scenarios give us a glimpse of the enormous challenges of literacy planning for promoting multilingual education policies in multilingual societies. Of course, in different polities or countries, different approaches are put in place for the purposes of literacy acquisition. For example, Galdames and Gaete (2010) conducted a literacy education policy study in Chile and noted that, although functionalist views about the relationship between literacy and
development are important, in the contexts of global social and political transformations that have exacerbated social inequality knowing to read and write should not be the only goals of literacy. Rather literacy for the 21st century should give individuals the skills and knowledge that can help them to think, critically reflect, and read the world (Freire & Macedo, 1987). This is the main goal of critical literacy.

**Critical literacy.** Luke and Dooley (2011) define critical literacy as “the use of texts to analyze and transform relations of cultural, social and political power” (p. 856). The aim of critical literacy is to help develop a critique of unequal relations of power, knowledge and social structures that marginalize minority students through discourses, language and literacy practices. The missing link in traditional approaches to literacy is the materiality part of literacy practices, that is, at what price do people become literate, and with what consequences? In most approaches, at least the ones sold in the third world under the banner of development, the consequences of ‘being literate’ in societies that are plagued by many material and social problems are often omitted at the expense of logic and development (Street, 1984). For example, Street (1984) clearly demonstrates that, in so called ‘non-literate’ societies literacy is deeply implicated not only in language learning and numeracy activities but also serves ideological purposes that have material consequences. Striking example are the campaigns of literacy that spawned out of UNESCO’s initiatives, and the literacy events in Muslim societies described by Street (1984). However well intentioned they might have been, the campaigns were in most cases primarily used by governments (not limited to them) to pursue ideological and political goals. In this respect, I concur with Street (1984) who poignantly questions the emancipatory and collaborative nature of these campaigns. Individuals’ reading of the world depends on their
capacity to interpret and make meaning from their experiences. Freire ‘s understanding of knowledge opens up a possibility for educators to unmask the asymmetric power relations in literacy practices, and recognize how such practices are implicated in the creation of subjectivities and particular regimes of truth. For example, Freire & Macedo (1987) would argue that rather than empowering, literacy policies that privilege some languages while excluding others, serve as a tool for disempowerment and marginalization.

Disempowerment means preventing individuals from fully participating in democratic decision-making processes that affect their economic, social and intellectual development (Giroux, 1988). In other words, literacy practices that do not account for learners’ socio-cultural background fail to recognize that knowledge production occurs within historical and political contexts; and as Giroux (1988) puts it literacy “ becomes the ideological vehicle through which to legitimate schooling as a site for character development” (p. 61). For example, language and literacy that privilege monolingualism not only prevent the linguistically marginalized populations from participating in democratic discourses, but also reinforce the hegemony of existing power structures at the level of the society in general and in schools in particular.

Critical literacy, as Lankshear and McLaren (1993) argued “can help us understand the danger that arises when literacy is seen as a private or individual competency or set of competencies rather than a complex circulation of economic, political, and ideological practices that inform daily life” (p.413). Language and literacy policies informed by critical approaches can help illuminate the tensions and struggles that traverse social representation and signification, and question the assumptions that underlie cultural, and social formation of
reality and knowledge, that is, “questioning what is considered legitimate and preferred meaning at any given historical moment” (Lankshear & McLaren, 1993, p. 413).

Nevertheless, given the political and ideological nature of literacy planning, the choice of language for literacy has always been a very contentious issue. Given the strict relation between education policy and the choice of medium of instruction, Tsui and Tollefson (2004) noted that the medium of instruction policy is instrumental because it affects individuals’ access to political and economic opportunities and resources. In fact, in Africa the problem of language of literacy and instruction is a most complex one. Some scholars (e.g., Bamgbose, 2000; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004, 2008), have argued that the discourses and language used in in language policies more often than not, celebrate linguistic diversity, mother tongue education, and multilingualism. However, research indicates that in Africa language policies do not go beyond the rhetoric (Adekola, 2007; Alexander & Busch, 2007; Bascia, Cumming, Datnow, Leithwood & Livingstone, 2005; Bloch, 2009; Collins & Blot, 2003; Liddicoat, 2007; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; McCarthy, 2003, 2004, 2005). Having discussed the implications of literacy practices in LPP, the next section discusses language ideology research and its relationship to LPP.

Language Ideology

The notion of ideology has its origin in France. In 1796, Antoine Claude Destutt de Tracy, a French intellectual, suggested a systematic analysis of ideas and sensations. In Elements d’Idéologie [Elements of Ideology] (1803-1813), de Tracy examined the faculties of thinking and forms of experience as aspects of logic and grammar. De Tracy was called an ideologue (ideologist) because he sought to study the origins of ideas (Nöth, 2004). However, the term ideology reappeared and gained momentum in Marx and Engels’ the German Ideology originally
written in 1846 and published in 1939 by Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow. For Marx different ideas and perceptions are the results of material, social, economic, and historical conditions. Marx and Engels viewed ideologies as false ideas that sustain the views of the ruling class and therefore served to legitimate the power of the ruling class (Marx & Engels, 1939). Althusser (1971) argued that state power is exercised through the repressive and ideological state apparatuses. This understanding of ideology has been taken up in social sciences, specifically in the ideology analysis with classical Marxism leanings (See, Poulantzas, 2000; Shaffner, 1996). Marx’s interpretations of language ideology have been reportedly criticized for being deterministic and lacking human agency (Oswell, 2006). They have been re-interpreted, albeit with a social semiotic understanding of language (Gardiner, 1992; Volosinov, 1973; Kristeva, 1981); as discursive and interpretative symbolic form (Thompson, 1990), as central to the social construction of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966), and as Ideology and utopia (Mannheim, 1979).

According to Van Dijk (2006) for the large part of the 20th century the notion of ideology continued to have a negative meaning (Billig, 1988; Eagleton, 1991). In fact, the notion of ideology has been an important aspect in the analysis of colonialism as a cultural, social, economic, and political system (Blauner, 1969), and also among the critical theorists in the analysis of relations of domination and oppression (Apple, 1996; Giroux 1997; Freire, 1970). For scholars who espouse classical Marxism, the notion of ideology is seen as false consciousness (Eagleton, 1991), and as dominant discourse for Foucault (Schieffelin,Woolard & Kroskrity, 1998). The Parsonian view sees ideology as a system of common beliefs held by a group of people or community (Woolard, 1992). The literature reviewed here consists of selected
research not only on the cultural conceptions of language ideology (Silverstein, 1998), but also the strand that emphasizes the aspects of language use, the language ideologies and linguistic differentiation (Irvine & Gal, 2000) and ideology as discursive phenomena that reflect and shape language planning and policy discourse. It is relevant to note that the concept of ideology in linguistic anthropology has been revolutionized by Irvine and Gal (2000). Irvine and Gal have developed a model for how language ideologies become enacted in language use (Hall & Bucholtz, 2004, p. 380).

Hall and Bucholtz (2004) observed that concepts such as attitudes have been used to denote socio-cultural beliefs about language. Such characterization, however, has been done at the expense of social analysis that unmask the social structures that sustain and reinforce the structuring of logics of power (Hall & Bucholtz, 2004). Couplan (2010b) concurs that, more often than not, sociolinguistic variationist analysis of language policy neglects how socio-historical and socio-cultural contexts reflect and shape the forms, use, and functions of language. It is significant to note that the issue of power as a social phenomenon situated in the socio-historical and socio-cultural contexts is central to the analysis of ideology as discursive articulation (Hall & Bucholtz, 2004; Thompson, 1990), among social scientists and linguistic anthropologist interested in the social and political meaning of language (Blommaert, 1999; Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998). Ideology as a concept has different meanings to different people. In regard to the variations in the conception of language ideology, Hall and Bucholtz (2004) mentioned that:

The conventional understanding of ideology as a process of mystification that distorts subjects’ perception of political-economic realities has been replaced in most linguistic-
anthropological research by a more nuanced view in which ideology organizes and enables all cultural beliefs and practices as well as the power relations that result from these (p. 379).

Thus, the understanding and conceptualization of ideology in this study demarcate significantly from the negative views of ideology as false consciousness and misinterpretations. Rather, my approach on language ideology relates to the hegemonic meaning potential of policy discourses. The concept of hegemony extends and enriches the notion of ideology in that, it allows envisioning plurality of forces and struggles in the policy-making arena. In educational research and linguistic anthropology ideology has been theorized in terms of the ideology of monolingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2011; Wiley & Lukes, 1996), ideology of standard and prescriptivism (Milroy & Milroy, 1999), nationalist ideologies (Wright, 2004), the ideology of accent (Lippi-Green, 1997), language ideology debates (Blommaert, 1999; Shohamy, 2006), ideology of linguistic differentiation (Irvine & Gal, 2000), language and discourse (Thompson, 1984), and ideologies and myths (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004).

Wiley and Lukes (1996) argued that the ideology of monolingualism is rooted in the views that see multilingualism and language diversity as a result of immigration. In doing so, this view sustains the ideology of standards and English only education system in the U.S. The choice of the language variety to be used as standards raises the issue of how standards are used to marginalize those who do not attain proficiency in the prescribed norms. Similarly, Blommaert (1999) noted that ideologies are not autonomous, but are socio-culturally motivated ideas and perceptions reflected in language use. Language ideologies are discursive elaborations realized in the meta-pragmatic discursive frames. Errington (2008) observed that the issues of
identity are often oversimplified and articulated in terms differentiation of accent and dialect. In doing so, these researchers disguise and downplay the ways that linguistic differentiation labels and creates social categories. Such discursive categories help to structure and shape people’s subjectivities, identities, and experiences (Leonardo, 2003). Lippi-Green (1997) studied the ideology of English with an accent in the U.S and observed that language accent differentiation—distinctive phonological production of sounds has been used as a basis for ideological discrimination and marginalization.

Irvine and Gal’s (2000) theorization of ideology is innovative because it recognizes the constitutive and dialectical character of ideology. The most relevant aspects in Irvine and Gal’s (2000) conception of language ideology are the notions of erasure, iconization a concept that draws from Piercean iconic sign and fractal recursivity in which oppositional ideology of differentiation is replicated by social structures (Hall & Bucholtz, 2004). Iconization refers to the process in which linguistic features are iconized as attributes of the identity of the speakers. Fractal recursivity reflects the way in which iconic differences attributed to the speakers are used to create an other. According to Irvine and Gal (2000) fractal recursivity can create multiple identity positions at once. In fact, these semiotic processes are very relevant in the course of disentangling colonial ideological and identity constructs that were, and still are pervasive in language education policy discourse. Language ideologies have systematically been used to assign identities based on the linguistic structure and use. McGroarty (2008) argued that, language ideology has both a societal and a personal valence. She observed that language ideologies are also politically and socially motivated. For example, the influence of linguistic ideology can be seen in language policy and planning in status planning. The selection of certain
languages and varieties cannot solely be justified on the pragmatic necessity of language use. Although individuals’ communicative resources cannot be policed, language policies play a crucial role in the distribution, circulation, and perhaps legitimation of linguistic practices.

Moreover, language ideologies are indexical because they create boundaries and assign the individuals’ social positions based on the differentiation of linguistic resources such as accent and non-standard language (Irvine & Gal, 2000). Therefore, language ideologies, as Wiley and Lukes (1996) noted, are crucial for assessing discursive practices— that is how discourses are embedded in power relationships that influence teachers’ views and language policy discourses. In this sense, as an aspect of discursive formation, ideology analysis can not be dissociated with the social-historical context of its production, circulation and reception (Blommaert, 1999, Thompson, 1990). Such an analysis presupposes understanding the discursive mechanisms by means of which language policy discourses are produced and instantiated and the value attached to them as symbolic resources (Blommaert, 1999, 2005, 2007). The analysis of language ideology has been part of a larger strategy in educational research, specifically language planning and policy and educational linguistics (Wortham, 2001). Ideologies mediate the discursive construction of social identities and have been found to have great influence on language policy and planning outcomes.

Therefore, ideology analysis and critique remains a useful and important tool for assessing the discursive construction of language policies, and how these shape individuals’ view and perceptions of language use and the construction of knowledge. The study of ideology as discourse and symbolic form concerns and presupposes a discursive analysis of the forms and relations of its specific socio-historical context in terms of governmental. Thus, ideology
analysis is not necessarily or solely articulated from the vantage point of the institutional power; rather the analysis aims to identify the participants and agents involved in the language policy debates and illuminate the how’s and why’s of particular policy discourses, opinions, perceptions and attitudes (Blommaert, 1999).

**Language Attitudes**

Languages are not objective and neutral instruments of communication or neutral media for conveying meanings. Rather language is a window through which individuals access reality. In other words, language use is connected to identities of social or ethnic groups. Thus, evaluations and attitudes towards languages and dialects have consequences for languages as well as for the speakers of the languages (Garrett, Coupland, & Williams, 2003; Ihemere, 2006). In short, language attitudes and speakers evaluations have been using interchangeably in attitude research. However, Schoel et al. (2013) have noted that speaker evaluations are complex and may reflect different attitudes. Thus, attitudes towards languages are seen as the most basic level in the language evaluation; whereas attitudes towards speakers often involve stereotyping and prejudice (Giles & Coupland, 1991). Traditionally, attitude research has been carried out in relation to second language (e.g., Gaies & Beebe, 1991; Gardner, 1959, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Garret, 2010; Loureiro-Rodriguez, Boggess & Goldsmith, 2013), attitudes towards speech communities (e.g., Diallo, 2009), attitudes and minority groups (Edwards, 1994, 1996, 2010), and attitudes to foreign languages (Bartram, 2010). Given the importance of attitudes in second language learning and language education policy, in the following sections I review the attitude research pertinent to LPP.
**Language attitudes in language education policy.** The relevance of language attitudes for educational research and language planning and language policy in particular, has been confirmed both in sociolinguistic and language planning research (e.g., Ager, 2001; Cooper & Fishman, 1974; Garret, Coupland, & Williams, 2003). A number of studies have shown that language attitudes are crucial for language education policy given their importance in influencing how social agents and actors’ language choices may shape and steer language policy initiatives in a particular direction and influence the outcomes (Bokamba, 1995). Research on language education policy suggests that inquiring of people’s experiences, opinions about and choices of language can successfully help design a language policy that satisfies the needs of the people.

In other words, by listening to the people for whom the policy is designed increases the likelihood of success and acceptance of a particular policy (Henriksen, 2010). For example, language ideologies of accent, correctness, and purity have been mentioned in attitude research as part of an evaluative mechanism that speakers may use to approve or disapprove certain language behaviors (Milroy & Milroy, 1985; Schiffman, 1992, 1996). Gogolin (1994) conducted a study from various countries and questioned teachers in respect to attitudes towards the language of instruction and found that teachers’ perceptions and attitudes are influential for the success of language instruction. In *Language attitudes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A sociolinguistic overview*, Adegbija (1994) brings what is perhaps one of the most authoritative accounts of the language situation in Sub-Saharan Africa. Adegbija’s study outlines the socio-historical, political, and economic factors that hinder African nations to successfully promote multilingual language education, linguistic diversity and democratic language policies. He reported that
negative attitudes towards African languages constitute the major problem for promoting these languages.

Heugh (2007) reported on language attitudes and choices in the context of Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB). She argued that although attitudes towards African languages are not necessarily negative, there has been a tendency toward language exclusion. She argued that, nevertheless there is a strong preference among speakers of African languages for the continuous use of both African languages and English in higher education settings. In a similar vein, Canvin (2007) conducted a study in Mali (West Africa) and observed that although the discussion of language education problems is politically framed through laws and policies, it is a truism that attitudes toward languages and speakers play a critical role in the language choices that people make. She concluded that the issue of language choice, including the choice of the language of instruction, is a pragmatic one. Language choice considerations are often driven by social and economic factors, she charged. In a study entitled *Language Policies and Attitudes Towards Frisian in the Netherland*, Hilton and Gooskens (2013) found that Dutch speakers were largely negative about Frisian, while Frisian speakers tended to be more positive for both Dutch and Frisian. The findings of this study reported that people who have been affected by top down language policies and planning for Frisian through mandatory learning and official status had positive attitudes. This insight reveals the contradictory nature of language policy and language attitudes.

Pütz (1995) conducted a language attitude study in Namibia and demonstrates that voluntarism for linguistic assimilation is propelled by external social, economic, and political forces such as the fear to be labelled or categorized as backward and the fear of being accused of
tribalism. In fact, tribalism and the danger of internal conflict is the most used arguments by the detractors of multilingualism in Africa. In their study in England, Hilmarsson-Dunn and Mitchell (2011) found that in multilingual contexts attitudes are not the sole factor that affects language use. They observed that lack of speakers in social and school contexts, weakens social networks and consequently drives that choice of language use. As far as the influence that teachers have in influencing language choice in educational settings, Lasagabaster and Huguet (2007), have concurred with McGroarty (1996), that teacher’ attitudes are influential in shaping students’ perceptions about bilingualism and multilingualism. In short, volumes of research that have been published in the last twenty years recognize that language is not an objective and neutral instrument of communication (Edwards, 2013).

People use languages in a variety of situations and researching people’s opinions, beliefs, and values about language can illuminate the attitudes that people hold about particular languages and varieties and shed light on the conditions that led to such attitudes. Although language background has been mentioned in several studies as being an important contributor to language attitudes (Baker, 1992), attitudes may be influenced by factors such as socio-historical conditions, economic, and political factors. It is, however, noteworthy that given this researcher’s theoretical, methodological, and epistemological assumptions, this study demarcates from the traditional views of language attitudes. The approach to language attitudes in this study identifies itself by a discourse analytic, which views attitudes as socially constitutive and constituted through discourse or language use (Baker, 1992; Cooper & Fishman, 1977; Henriksen, 2010; Van Dijk, 1982). Attitudes do not grow from a vacuum. Rather, they are
learned, constituted, changed, and expressed through discursive practices. Attitudes stem from various discourses that shape people’s ways of behaving, acting (Gee, 2011).

Such an approach to language attitudes marks an epistemological shift and demarcates it from an objectivist understanding of attitudes. This understanding encapsulates the view that discourses can serve not only as “an instrument and effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy” (Foucault, 1990, pp. 100-101). In other words, the discursive approach to attitudes in this study recognizes the possibility for counter discourse, which is an aspect of resistance and agency. In this sense, discourse perspectives to language attitudes take a variationist approach, which recognizes that attitudes may vary. Important to this study, however, are those factors that may motivate favorable and unfavorable attitudes towards the languages spoken in Angola.

According to Baker (1992) among the factors that influence attitudes, the most influential factors are the age of the speakers, language background, parents, and peer group effects. However, parents’ language attitudes are said to have a greater influence on the development of children’s language attitudes. It is, nonetheless, important to stress that the relationship between parent’s attitudes and their children’s is not necessarily a causal one. Rather, because children early language acquisition and socialization occurs in a family environment, parental attitudes significantly shape children’s language behavior and linguistic repertoire (Baker, 2001; Cunningham-Anderson & Anderson, 1999; Taylor, Bernhard, Garg & Cummins, 2008).

Attitudes are very important for this study because decisions about language education policy are significantly influenced by attitudes of various groups, and legal constraints including regulations, laws, and clauses in national constitutions (Christ, 1997). Moreover, the question of
the medium of instruction in most African nations is influenced by colonial ideologies, attitudes, and the discourses that persistently privilege a standard variety of languages (Adegbija, 1994; Pütz, 2005). Of course, attitudes are not the only factors that affect the implementation of multilingual language policies in Sub-Saharan Africa. The problems that hamper the effective implementation of multilingual education policies range from lack of government enforcement, lack of resources, and more importantly lack of sound attitudinal research. As a result, most African countries, whether overtly and covertly, continue to privilege the use of European languages at the expense of the marginalization of African languages, which are mainly confined to family and private social interactions.

Given that people can hold the same attitude toward an object, but have very contradictory and conflicting behavior, a discourse and variationist perspective to attitude can successfully illuminate the tensions and interests that motivate the choices that speakers make. Language attitudes are part of individual and societal linguistic culture. Given that language policy is often driven by a particular linguistic culture (Schiffman, 1996), language attitudes cannot be ignored in language education policy research. Opinions and attitudes have been dealt with discursively (Van Dijk, 1982). From a discourse analysis perspective, attitude and opinions can be subjectively evaluated from a text (policies, speakers’ conversation, etc.) as the referents of evaluation of discourse (Van Dijk, 1996).

With respect to language education policies studies, however, research that address opinions, beliefs and attitudes discursively are scant. Moreover, often than not, studies that research language education policies often ignore how languages are connected with people’s social and ethnic identities (Appel & Myusken, 1987). Thus, by exploring participants’
experiences, discourse analysis is a better suited to capture the attitudes, values, and beliefs that people hold toward the languages spoken in Angola and how these connect to social and ethno-linguistic identities (Baker, 1992). Attitudes are complex systems that are intrinsically connected to language ideologies. In other words, attitudes have political and ideological implications for language education policy of which researchers should be cognizant. This chapter presented the literature review pertinent to language policy and language education policy in particular. From the review, it is abundantly clear that the development of a bilingual education policy is contingent to an interplay of factors, particularly the attitudes, ideologies and beliefs that people hold about languages. Thus, in the context of the foregoing the next chapter provides the context for language policy development in sub-Saharan Africa and Angola. It looks at the how various linguistic ideologies, beliefs, and attitudes intersect and influence language policy discourse in Angola.
CHAPTER THREE
THE CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

This chapter provides the context of the study by situating the research problem within the general LPP context in sub-Saharan Africa and Angola specifically. The goal of this discussion is highlight how colonial language policies have influenced language education decisions and policy discourse in most post-colonial Sub-Saharan Africa and Angola in particular. I argue that LPP in Angola is influenced and shaped by both colonial and postcolonial ideologies and discursive practices. To contextualize and provide a broader picture of the influence of colonial language policies in Africa, I discuss colonial and postcolonial language policies in sub-Saharan Africa and Angola and their implication for the ongoing language education reform. To highlight the prevalence of subtractive language education programs, I present the bilingual education debate and the typology of bilingual education research in sub-Saharan Africa. I question and problematize the orthographic accord that is promoting the unification of the Portuguese language spelling system in Brazil, Portugal and the Portuguese speaking African countries (Angola, Mozambique, São Tomé e Príncipe) and discuss the implication this accord might have on democratic education reform and multilingualism in Angola. I argue that the Luso-Brazilian orthographic accord undermines linguistic diversity and prevents Angolans from developing linguistic repertoires that reflect the socio-cultural and sociolinguistic reality of the country.

Language Planning and Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa

The history of LPP in Africa would be incomplete without a brief discussion of the periods of developments in the history of Africa. It is almost a truism that the history of Africa
can be generally divided into three main stages. Likewise the history of language development, particularly the sub-Saharan part of Africa can also by the same logic be divided into three main periods, namely the pre-colonial, the colonial and the post-colonial respectively (Abdullaziz, 2003, Augusto, 2012). Given the scope of this dissertation, I am going to provide only a brief account of the language situation in pre-colonial Africa. Based on historical evidence it is commonly accepted that even in the pre-colonial Africa language use was influenced by relations of power between the rulers and the ruled. Thus, contrary to what some people might suggest, the politics of language was not as different as the western models in which language rationalization has been part of the politics of social development projects (Laitin, 1992). In respect to LPP there is an agreement among African language scholars that before the advent of colonialism the history of languages can be traced from North, West, and East Africa, where basic literacy and higher education among the Muslim communities was mushrooming (Abdullaziz, 2003).

African nations, particularly Sub-Saharan Africa, were multilingual before the inception of colonialism. Multilingualism has always been a key factor in the political, social and cultural organization of the African society (Abdullaziz, 2003; Bunyi, 1999; Heugh, 2011a; Wolff, 2003, 2011). Since the pre-colonial period the languages spoken by most sub-Saharan people were Bantu languages and some languages of non-Bantu origins (e.g., Khoesan). Following the classification made by Greenberg (1963), African languages can be divided into 5 language phyla, namely the Niger-Kongo phylum, also known as Kongo-Kordofinian (The major language family in Sub-Saharan Africa comprises of Bantu/Bandoid languages), Nilo-Saharan, Afro-Asiatic, Khoisan, Malayo Polinesian, also referred to as Astronesian represented by Malagasy
the language spoken in the island of Madagascar (Batibo, 2005; Lodhi, 1993; Purvis & Iverson, 2011).

Although the history and classification of African languages are beyond the scope of this review, it is worth noting that the denomination of indigenous languages spoken by the majority of people of sub-Saharan part of Africa, that is, ‘Bantu languages’ derives from the word ‘muntu’ or ‘ntu’ which means person. It should be noted, however, that the denomination or classification of African indigenous languages, particularly the (Bantu languages) is reminiscent of the colonial linguistic project. There are also in Africa a substantial number of Indo-European languages, chiefly English, French, Portuguese, which are a legacy of colonialism in Africa (Purvis & Iverson, 2011) and other varieties resulting from the language contact between the European and African languages (Mufwene, 2008, Thomason, 2001). To put it differently, existing social location of African languages reflects the linguistic ideologies of the colonial period to which I shall turn now.

**Colonial language policies.** LPP in Africa can be traced to language developments in the Muslim communities; however, as a development project, LPP in Africa is a consequence of the Berlin Conference in 1885 during which Europeans powers with partitioned Africa among themselves (Augusto, 2012; Bunyi, 1999; Rasool, 2007). Thus, current geographical and sociolinguistic mapping is the result of the partition of Africa by Western powers. It is also important to note here that the division of Africa by the western power was carried out without consideration of any ethno-linguistics (Abdullaziz, 2003). This fact most likely accounts for the great linguistic variability in small territories (Abdulaziz, 2003). In their civilizing mission (Ki-
Zerbo, 1990, 2005), the different Europeans powers, namely the British, the French and the Portuguese, pursued different kinds of language policy and planning.

Among the colonizers of Africa, the British language policy was more paternalistic in the sense that they encouraged the use of African indigenous languages at the lower level of education and administrative services (Abdulaziz, 2003, Spencer, 1974). The missionaries played an important role in the European civilizing mission. They were the ones who devised learning and teaching materials in vernacular languages (Whiteley, 1974). It should not be a surprise that in most cases, the teaching of indigenous languages was piously encouraged both for the purpose of inculcating Christian faith and political control of the indigenous populations. Unlike their British and German counterparts, the French based on their language politics at home, promoted French as the language of instruction and civility in Africa. As a part of the assimilationist language policy the French never entertained the idea of promoting the development of African languages, let alone the creation of orthographical systems (Abdulaziz, 2003, Spencer, 1974). In other words, France’s language policy in Africa was unequivocally the one that totally supported the idea that French should be the sole language used for the social, administrative and political life of the colonies. For example, to secure the primacy of French, in 1911 the Governor of West Africa established that all administrative paperwork, including administrative documents be printed solely in French.

The Germans were probably the most conservative in the sense that their language policy was directed toward the avoidance of Africans learning German. To this end, in East Africa, for example, the Germans promoted Swahili as the lingua Franca. The use of German was limited to settler communities, while the administration in Tanganyika was exclusively run through
Swahili. Public servants and military personnel were obliged to pass a proficiency test in Swahili before taking their duties. At play was the German Romantic idealism based on Hegelian thoughts that all peoples have a language for fulfilling their destiny (Laitin, 1992). In their efforts to protect the sacro-sanctity of the German language, the missionaries were in charge of writing grammars in Swahili and collected manuscripts from pre-twentieth century literature (Abdulaziz, 2003). Interestingly enough, in Burundi and Rwanda the Germans and Belgians encouraged the development of multilingualism in African languages through the promotion of bilingual education via African dominant language or language of wider communication (Alexander, 2009a; Desai, 2010, 2013; Kamwangamalu, 2004, 2011, 2013; Martin, 2006; Stroud, 2002; Stroud & Heugh, 2011).

The Belgians had their own struggles and wars with the use of French or Flemish languages. In the Congo, however, the Belgians had very specific goals as far as the use of languages is concerned. Drawing on Fabian (1986), Laitin (1992) observed that the Belgian state drew from the Colonial Charter of 1908, whose goal was to “avoid multilingualism, if possible, because it is a threat to the order; and if this is not possible rank all languages in hierarchically with French at the top” (p. 86). In terms of language education policies, different colonizers had different approaches; it should be noted, however, that for all of them, the main pattern was the use of African languages in the initial grades with the transition to European language (e.g., English). For a detailed account of British and German language policies in Africa (See Abdulaziz, 2003; Batibo, 2005; Laitin, 1992; Spencer, 1974).

In respect to the use of African languages, it is often argued that the Portuguese had the most intolerant language policy (Abdulaziz, 2003). In fact, in their governance and
administration of what they called the Portuguese overseas territories (Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Cape Verde) the Portuguese took very stern measures to ensure that the use of African languages in education and even administrative services was not tolerated. Missionaries who dared using African languages in education were severely punished. In fact, the Portuguese government also prohibited the use of other colonizers languages particularly English. In 1903, the Portuguese colonial government explicitly prohibited the use of English in Angolan Schools. The Portuguese language was the only language accepted for the purpose of education. In pursuing their assimilation policy, the Portuguese government totally discouraged the use of indigenous languages. The use of these European languages as the sole language of instruction has prevailed in most post-colonial Africa.

Post-colonial language policies. The literal meaning of the notion of ‘post-colonialism’ suggests the period after colonialism. In fact, it is in this sense that this term is used in the foregoing review. As I suggested at the outset, the history of LPP in Africa is divided into two distinct periods. Thus, in this section, I ruminate on the language question in post-colonial Africa. In the 1960’s Africa witnessed the wave of nationalistic movements toward decolonization and political independences. A great number of nations in Sub-Saharan Africa achieved their political independences during this period, namely Nigeria, Congo Republic of, Niger, Togo, Senegal to name a few. Decolonization of Africa took place in the spirit of optimism and hope for better a future. However, most nations were confronted with the problem of nation-building, economic and political self- determination, and of course social development (Rassool, 2007, 2013). Despite the profuse enthusiasm and optimism to develop Afro-centric
states, most African nations were confronted with the question of which language to use for
nation-building and social development.

To confront the social and political dilemmas inherited from colonialism, the heads of
African states gathered in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in 1963 to create the Organization of African
Unity (OAU), today African Union. The Union was established with the objective to strengthen
unity and solidarity in African independent states, and the liberation of African states under the
colonial rule. Guided by The *Universal Declaration of Principles of International Cultural Co-
operation adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its Fourteenth Session in 1966,*
*and within* the framework of a cultural charter for Africa ratified by the heads of African states
on 5th July 1976 in Port Louis, Mauritius, African nations were encouraged to develop language
policies, to teach and develop African languages. Part V of the Charter entitled “the use of
African Languages” in its article 17, 18 and 19 reads as follows:

Article 17. The African States recognize the imperative need to develop African
languages which will ensure their cultural advancement and accelerate their economic
and social development and to this end will endeavor to formulate a national policy in
regard to languages.

Article 18. The African States should prepare and implement the reforms necessary for
the introduction of African languages in education. To this end each state may choose
one or more languages.

Article 19. The introduction of African languages at all levels of education should have to
go hand-in-hand with the literacy work among the population. (African cultural charter,
1976, pp. 8-9)
In fact, this period coincided with the emergence of concerns with the problems of language planning in developing nations (e.g., Haugen, 1972). However, African nations did not take advantage of the research insights provided by many of the studies to devise policies reflecting the socio-cultural and political reality of Africa. After Mauritius, African leaders and scholars continued to seek changes in the status of African languages and consequently improve education in Africa. In June 1986 the OAU adopted the so called Language Plan of Action for Africa, also known as the manifesto on the language question (Alexander, 2009b). Again, one of the key elements of the manifesto was to free the African population from their dependence on the ex-colonial languages and progressively replace the European languages with African indigenous languages (Alexander, 2009).

In Jomtien, Thailand, from 5 to 9 March, 1990, at the World Conference on Education for All, participants recognized that traditional knowledges and indigenous cultural heritage have a value and validity in their own right and a capacity to both define and promote development; after Jomtien, in 1997 at the Intercontinental Conference on Language Policy in Africa (ICLPA), held in Harare, Zimbabwe, 51 out of the 54 African states gathered once again to address the language question, and in particular the promotion of language research and the implementation of viable national language policies and the introduction of African languages as a medium of instruction in schools (Batibo, 2013).

At the Intercontinental Conference in Harare the leadership of the African Academy of Languages (ACALAN) recommended to the Ministers of Culture and Education that ex-colonial languages and African languages can cohabit peacefully if managed judiciously (Alexander, 2008). This is a critical insight because as Alexander (2009) noted rather than continuing to feed
the long lasting dilemma about choosing between the mother tongue (s) and English, French and Portuguese, the most viable approach would be the adoption of a mother tongue-based bilingual education based on cutting edge research on additive bilingual education. Alexander’s comments underscore the need to approach the language question from the old discourse point of view which views the languages that Africa inherited from colonialism as antagonistic. Rather these languages have become part of African language ecology; as such these languages (English, French and Portuguese) enrich the language and cultural diversity of Africa.

In recognizing the role of ex-colonial languages in the development of African societies, we must also acknowledge the dynamic nature of language phenomenon. It is crucial, however, to also acknowledge that while recognizing the possibility of hybrid linguistic identities many indigenous people continue to view their ancestral languages as the markers of cultural or ethnic identity (May, 2005). In other words, recognizing the fluidity of identity and culture does not necessarily imply that mother tongue education is irrelevant or even unimportant (Canagarajah, 2005). This is very important given that language policy as a socio-cultural phenomenon does not serve the process of rationalization per se, but serves as a mechanism of control that legitimizes processes and determines what is viewed as valid knowledge and valuable in language behavior (Marshall, 2007).

Despite all of all the initiatives about the promotion of African languages, a bleak scenario remains as far as the role of African languages in the development of African society is concerned. In fact, it is the consensus among African scholars that the choice of language of instruction in Africa is a more a political issue than a technical one. It should, however, be noted that the sociolinguistic landscape of Africa, the Sub-Saharan part in particular, is characterized
by a complex multilingualism which made the choice of language more daunting. This fact is often mentioned to justify why most African nations ended up adopting the use of the ex-colonial languages (English, French and Portuguese) as the official languages of their respective countries and in most cases the only languages used as medium of instruction (Alexander, 2009; Bamgbose, 1991; Mazrui, 2000, 2002, 2004; Rasool, 2007).

It is also often argued that mother tongue education is expensive. However, there is evidence from cutting edge language research that in the long run maintaining the ex-colonial languages as the sole languages of instruction is little more expensive than investing in the local languages (Grin, 2005). Moreover, Brock-Utne (2001) maintained that when the costs are calculated, it is also important to factor the cost of maintaining a language education policy. The consequences of the use of European languages as the only medium of instruction in Africa are manifold. This situation has served to legitimize and reproduce the unequal distribution of power and resources between those who have full command of European languages (English, French, and Portuguese) most of whom are trained ex-colonial elites and the speakers of African languages (Mazrui, 2000).

At independence, most African countries have pursued either endoglossic language policies, that is, nations that use African national languages as official and the primary language of communication or exoglossic language policies, whereby countries have adopted foreign languages as the language used in most institutional activities, and as such the language is not spoken by the majority (Lodhi, 1993). As mentioned earlier, the inherited language situation in sub-Saharan Africa differs depending on the types of language policies pursued by each of the
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colonial governments. Abdulaziz (2003) provides a summary of language situation and typology of language policies in Africa adapted in tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

Table 2

*Countries with one African Language Spoken by the vast Majority of the Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Spoken as Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Setswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Spoken as Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Kirundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Spoken as Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Sesotho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Spoken as Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Kinyarwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Spoken as Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Somali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>Spoken as Mother Tongue</td>
<td>SiSwati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>As a Language of Wider Communication (LWC)</td>
<td>Sango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>As a Language of Wider Communication (LWC)</td>
<td>Amharic 20%, Oromo 50% native speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya and Tanzania</td>
<td>As a Language of Wider Communication (LWC)</td>
<td>KiSwahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>As a Language of Wider Communication (LWC)</td>
<td>Bambara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>As a Language of Wider Communication (LWC)</td>
<td>Wolof 35 % native speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>As a Language of Wider Communication (LWC)</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Abdulaziz (2003).

Table 3

*Countries with one Predominant African Language*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dohomi</td>
<td>Ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Ewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Mosi and More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Akan and Kwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Shona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Chichewa and Cinyanja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Abdulaziz (2003).
Table 4

*Countries with Several Indigenous African languages Competing with one Another*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Hausa, Fulani, Igbo, Yoruba and Kanuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Mende and Temme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Chiluba, Kikongo, Kingwana, KiSwahili and Lingala</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Abdulaziz (2003).

Table 5

*Typology of Language Policies in Sub-Saharan Africa*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Sango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Shingazija/Comorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Somali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French speaking countries except DRC</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>KiSwahili</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also generally accepted among African scholars that “there is a correlation between use of African languages as medium of instruction and colonial language policies that permit or encourage the teaching of African languages” (Bamgbose, 2004). The problems that result from such differing language policies in Africa are enormous, especially in countries where the distinction between national language and the official language is a dichotomous one. The national language is the LWC and national unity. In most cases national languages are indigenous African languages, with the exception in the case of Portuguese speaking nations
(Angola), Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and South Africa (Abdulaziz, 2003). For example, in the United Republic of Tanzania, Swahili is the language that is fully accepted as not only LWC, but also the official national language of the country.

The case of Tanzania is instructive because at independence, Tanzania embraced the language politics in which Kiswahili was used throughout the primary level education as the medium of instruction. It is common to see clauses or articles that address the language question in the constitutions of African countries, but surprisingly, the current constitution of Tanzania does not mention the language question (Brock-Utne & Holmarsdottir, 2004). Abdulaziz (2003) bemoans that the standards of education in Tanzania have gone down because the country has failed to promote and extend the use of Kiswahili as medium of instruction at the secondary and higher education level. Following Abdulaziz (2003) in sub-Saharan Africa, Somalia is the only country that has established an African indigenous language, both as a national language and the medium of instruction up to the level of secondary education.

Apart from the internal ideological motivations in multilingual Africa the choice of language is a political issue chiefly because choosing one ethnic language over another might generate interethnic strife. The complexity of the language problem in Africa has resulted in many issues among which education is probably the most daunting one. The reality is that post-colonial African nations have failed to implement any effective language policies, particularly the ones directed toward the use of African indigenous languages as medium of instruction. This is because as Abdulaziz (2003) stated that in Africa, language policies lack careful and objective planning because policies are often motivated by political rationalizations. While this argument seems reasonable it may be misleading for various reasons. Firstly, such an argument gives
primacy to functionalist approaches that emphasize the idea that there is one size fits all solution for language problems that affect many nations, particularly in Africa. Second, it obscures the link between the macro-economic factors and their relation to the promotion of the current state of affairs and the status quo syndrome in Africa.

The language conundrum in Africa cannot be explained only by some sort of cultural and linguistic relativity or “quasi-Whorfian” interpretation in which the will of power is expressed through the African inculcation of Western world (Mazrui, 2004). Rather, the language question in Africa should also be approached by exposing the reproduction of labor and market colonial arrangements that still prevail between the South and North, and the West’s global control of economic imperatives through international donor institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and Donor governments (Mazrui, 2000). For example, no wonder why in Somalia, the only Sub-Saharan country that uses an indigenous language as a medium of instruction to the end of secondary school, the teaching of subjects such as medicine, engineering and law at the higher education level continues to be conducted through the Italian language because the Italian government provided the facilities, equipment, including the faculty (Abdulaziz, 2003).

The above reflects only one instance of many cases in which donor countries set the policies and the conditions for development projects in Africa. In fact, there is evidence about the role that former colonial countries and institutions play in maintaining the dominance of their languages in Africa. For example, Brock-Utne (2010) provides a nuanced review of the role of the British Council in Tanzania and Namibia. She bemoans that the discourse of bilateral relations is mere rhetoric because in reality the donor countries (Britain, France, Portugal) use
development aid to strengthen their own languages as a medium of instruction in Africa (Brock-Utne, 2010). It is not surprising that the English Language is the sixth major source of income in Great Britain. This money comes from the export of teaching materials such as books, training English teachers from developing countries, students from abroad and of course the amount of money that comes from language training for tourists (Lodhi, 1993).

As an experienced international consultant in the field of education, Alidou (2000) demonstrates the complexity of the World Bank language politics in post-colonial Africa. Although the World Bank (2005), recognizes the relevance of improving the quality of education and the role that mother tongue education plays in achieving such goals, surprisingly enough, the World Bank in its economic planning does not support language provision (Bilingual education) for African countries. In the words of Alidou, the World Bank language experts have several times confirmed that the World Bank does not have any explicit and comprehensive language in education policies or financial support in view of the implications that such support would have for French language policies in Francophone former colonies. Put differently, the French language policies favor the continued use and promotion of French in post-colonial Africa to the detriment of policies that would promote the use of African indigenous languages (Alidou, 2000, 2003, 2004). In fact, the World Bank and government donor politics of language and development position for post-colonial Africa is reminiscent of colonial relations of subjugation and exploitation, which tend to incorporate less developed nations into the global capitalist labor markets (Stroud, 2007a). Another contribution that helps to understand the role that international financial institutions, namely the World Bank play in the development of language education policies in Africa comes from one the most prominent scholars and advocates for Africa
languages as medium of instruction, Ali Mazrui. Mazrui (2000) summarizes the impact of the forces that hinder the use of African languages in education as follows:

The Euro-linguistic provision of educational instruction can be seen, therefore, as part of a wider capitalist design. In essence, the World Bank’s recommendations for the language of instruction in African schools, demonstrates its continued preference for Euro-languages which create and maintain social divisions serving an economy dominated primarily by foreign economic interests and, secondly a small aspiring African bourgeoisie (pp. 54-55).

As can be gleaned from the foregoing, colonialism left behind a legacy of entrenched relations of subjugation and linguistic marginalization that ex-colonial governments and donor institutions use as assets in their will to continue to explore the post-colonial African state and its resources. This is particularly important because it illuminates the role of language in education policies in creating subjectivities among Africans and how language education policies might shape and determine access to the labor markets (Rasool, 2007). The discourse of English as a global language (Crystal, 2000, 2003) has been influential in language education policies in Africa, especially in English speaking countries. As a result, the English medium of instruction has become a powerful means for legitimating the hegemony of European languages. It is also true that the state of affairs in post-colonial Africa is not only due to global macro-forces and the capitalist and neoliberal models of development promoted by the World Bank, inter alia, the IMF and donor governments in the North (Laitin, 1992). Rather the African elites and bureaucrats have also contributed to this state of affairs. Since the end of colonialism, language policies have
been used as pawns in the elites’ quest for the preservation of economic and political power (Prah, 2000; Wolff, 2011).

In short, there is enough empirical evidence in favor of the use of African languages in education; and anthropological linguists, sociolinguists, and linguists agree that the use of language familiar to the learner has significant advantages over the use of exoglossic languages (Chumbow, 2005, 2009, 2013). However, the stumbling block for implementation of all recommended initiatives is the entrenched view that education in European languages will help solve the problems of development in Africa. Moreover, the stigma attached to African languages has relegated these languages to subaltern positions just as are the speakers of these languages. Given the absolute dominance of European languages in the African the linguistic market (Bourdieu, 1991), speakers of African languages have developed negative attitudes toward their own languages (Adegbija, 1994, 2003; Pütz, 1995).

**Bilingual education programs in Sub-Saharan Africa.** The discourse that links education to social and economic development in Africa is not new in Africa. Although the rhetoric of development has been at the center of most political projects in African countries, for many years the issue of the language of instruction has been totally neglected. It appears that in most sub-Saharan African countries, apart from other socio-political and economic factors language of instruction has been the chief culprit for school failure among the African children (Alidou, Boly, Brock-Utne, Diallo, Heugh & Wolff, 2006; Heugh & Mulumba, 2014). To confront this reality, most African nations are mobilizing to address the issue of language of instruction through bilingual language policies. While bilingual pilot projects with emphasis to mother tongue as the language of instruction have recently gained momentum, mother tongue
education programs are not a new undertaking in Africa. There are several reports of successful mother tongue education programs in sub-Saharan Africa (Alidou et al., 2006; Akinnaso 1993). One of these projects is the experiment named Ile-Ife project in Nigeria (Bamgbose, 1991). In this project classes were taught in Yoruba for 3 years. The evaluation showed that the learners excelled in all subject areas including, mathematics (Fafunwa, Macauley & Sokoya, 1989).

Another important example of successful programs in sub-Saharan Africa is the Research Project for Language Education in Cameroon (PROPELCA) (Alidou et al., 2006; Obondo, 2008).

Many African sociolinguists (Bamgbose, 1991, Mansour, 1993) advocate for greater use of African languages. Research has shown that successful learning takes place when students are taught in the language they know well (Auerbach, 1993; Cummins, 2000, 2007; Thomas & Collier, 1997) and that the consolidation of learners’ mother tongue facilitates second language acquisition (Cummins, 1979). Unfortunately, in most African countries even those in which preference is given to mother tongue instruction, transitional bilingual education is used (Küper, 2003a, 2003b). There are two different forms of transitional bilingual education programs: early exit transition and late exit transition. In early exit programs content subjects are taught in two languages; that is, the learners’ L1 and English or Portuguese depending on the language of wider communication (Alidou et al., 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Heugh, 2011b).

The purpose of this model is to gradually transition the learners from mother tongue instruction to the LWC. In this model the students’ L1 plays a temporary role; for this reason the model has been characterized as a subtractive one (Ferguson, 2006). Conversely, in late transitional bilingual programs, the transition to the language of wider communication (LWC) takes longer than in early exit models. Unfortunately, in most of sub-Saharan Africa, where
bilingual education is implemented, early exit transitional bilingual education is preferred. With few exceptions, in most programs the mother tongue is used for 3 or 4 years before the transition to the dominant language medium (Obondo, 2008).

In regard to the early exit model, research has shown that it is ineffective in Africa, particularly because “it can offer only a score of between 20% and 40% in the International Language of Wider Communication (ILWC) by the end of school and this means failure across the curriculum” (Heugh, 2006, p. 139). Multi-country studies such as the one conducted by the second Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ II) (Mothibely, 2005) revealed that:

By grade 6 more than 55% of students in 14 Southern and Eastern Africa countries have not attained the most minimal level of literacy required to remain in the school system. Only 14.6% have reached the desired level of literacy. (As cited in Heugh, 2006, p. 139)

Although education in most African countries is plagued by many social problems, including poverty and diseases, studies from settings where these problems are not prevalent reveal that students in similar programs such as early exit transitional bilingual education can only be expected to reach an achievement of 37.5% in the language of learning by grade 6 (Ramirez, Yuen & Rameys, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 2002). In this respect, a relatively recent study from South Africa are instructive. Systemic study of 6 grade learners from South Africa (Heugh, 2006) shows that the national average achievement for students in grade 6 is 38% for literacy in the language of learning, and 27% for mathematics (Heugh, 2006). The implication of the results reported above is huge in countries with limited resources such as the ones in Africa.
As mentioned in the preceding sections, the language policy project that is being carried out by the Angolan government is based on the same 3 years early exit transitional program. If such programs do not yield satisfactory results in developed countries such as the United States, the question remains, to what extent will this program cater for the hailed diversity and heritage maintenance? Although educational statistics for upper primary school in Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mauritius and Namibia, indicate serious language and literacy problems among the students who can barely read in English (Ferguson, 2006) the situation in Angola may not be different. From an insider’s perspective, I would argue that the situation is more complex than the reports recognize.

Reports from the educational reform in Angola reveal that teachers’ low proficiency of Portuguese has been one of the causes of school failures (Government of Angola, 2008). Acknowledging that language is not the sole problem that haunts education in Africa, Wolff (2006) noted that language is not everything, but education for all is not possible without a clear and inclusive language policy. In other words, given the fact that bilingual education in Angola is a new undertaking, I contend that a late exit model would serve as a springboard (short term goal) to developing an additive bilingual education, which according to many African scholars is the long term desirable goal. Additive bilingual education programs or strong bilingual form of bilingual education (Baker, 2001, 2011) aims not only to maintain, but also to enhance learners’ mother tongue (L1) while helping them learn the dominant language (e.g., Portuguese) and attain language proficiency and literacy in both languages (Ferguson, 2006). According to Alidou et al. (2006) appropriate additive bilingual education in Africa would have the following patterns:
Mother tongue throughout with official or foreign language as a subject by specialist teacher; Dual medium: mother tongue to at least grade 4-5 followed by gradual use of the official language for up to no more 50% of the day/subject by the end of the school. (p. 5)

In the same vein, for implementing additive bilingual education in multilingual Africa, Wolff (2006) makes the following remarks:

Additive bilingual education or trilingual educational systems, therefore, that would make maximal use of the multilingual competence of children and adults, need to take the prevalent communication patterns into account in the following way, i.e. the technical notion of “bilingual” education needs to accommodate local/regional trilingual instantiations with two additional L2 languages, as the situation for the children may require where the local or community/area language is not the same as the relevant national language, if such exists (p. 35)

The detractors of bilingual education in Africa, however, insist that language education is costly and that in some cases continuing education in the language of the former colonizer is financially cost effective. The truth, nevertheless, is that many African prominent scholars have demystified the resource and cost effective fallacy. For example, Bamgbose (2000) and Obanya (1995, 2003) have shown that these arguments are based more on fear about possible change and the materials consequences of social change. While there are few studies on cost effectiveness in education in Africa (Heugh, 2006), the few studies that address the myth of costs of mother tongue instruction totally refute the argument that the costs of mother tongue instruction are always higher than the instruction in the dominant language. Drawing from Grin (2005), Heugh
(2011), provides a very insightful account of costs for bilingual education programs. He aptly observed that although under certain conditions language of wider communication (LWC) may be less expensive than mother tongue (MT) bilingual education, the costs of teaching and training are the same. Conversely, MT bilingual instruction will have an edge over LWC in terms of learning outcomes in terms of higher test scores and lower dropouts. Table 6 summarizes the types of bilingual programs in selected Sub-Saharan African countries.

Table 6

*MT and Bilingual Education Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa: Selected Countries*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Name of the Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>PEBIMO (Primary Bilingual Education Experiment in Mozambique)</td>
<td>Early Exit Transitional</td>
<td>1993-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Ife Mother Tongue Education Project (Fafanwa et al., 1990)</td>
<td>Late Exit Transitional</td>
<td>1970-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Bilingual Schools</td>
<td>Bilingual (Dual Language)</td>
<td>1998-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>PROPELCA (Operational Research Project for Language Education in Cameroon)</td>
<td>Bilingual (Dual Language)</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Government Bilingual Schools</td>
<td>Bilingual (Dual Language)</td>
<td>1971-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>PRAESA Multilingual Education; Teacher Training; LOITOSA</td>
<td>Bilingual (Dual Language)</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Limpopo Literacy Project</td>
<td>Additive Bilingual Education Programs (Developmental Bilingual Education [DBE])</td>
<td>2004-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from ADEA/UNESCO (2006) and Orekan (2011).
Language Policy in Angola

Sociolinguistic overview. Angola is located in the southern region of Africa and bordered by DRC and Republic of Congo in the North and East, Zambia to the East, and Namibia to the South. Linguistically the country has many ethno-linguistic groups which are mainly Bantu and non Bantu. However, it is important to highlight the group of Bantu languages involved in the policy under study. For my purposes, I concentrate on Bantu languages, not to downplay the significance of non-Bantu languages for social development in Angola, but it is in part to delimit my discussion to the languages in the current language policy, which is the object of this study.

Genetically, the major languages spoken in Angola have their origin in Guthrie’s “Proto-Bantu” and Niger-Kordofanian sub-family in the Niger-Congo group and consequently in Bantuideo/Bantu. Guthrie’s classification divides the languages spoken in Angola in three linguistic zones, namely H (Kikongo and Kimbundu), K (Cokwe, Ngangela, Lucaji, etc) and R (Umbundu, Kwanyama, etc) (Nzau, 2011; D.P Sassuko, personal communication, September 10, 2013). Thus, in Angola the major ethno-linguistic groups are Ovimbundu whose language is Umbundu with 37% of the population, the Mbundu who speak Kimbundu, with 25% of the population and the Bakongo, who speak Kikongo, with 13% of the population, respectively. Geographically the Ovimbundu were historically concentrated in the provinces of Huambo and Bie and the central high plateau. The Mbundu were mainly dominant and concentrated in the capital and its hinterlands (Province of Bengo, Kwanza Norte and Sul), while the Bakongo were historically concentrated in the North –Western provinces of Zaire, Uige and Cabinda (Bender, 2004, Hodges, 2001). The figures above are drawn from the census of 1960 (Hodges, 2001).
Coming back to the current sociolinguistic situation, a survey conducted by The Angolan National Institute of Statistics (INE) in 1996, indicates that the number of speakers who speak indigenous languages in each ethno-linguistic group has dramatically decreased. These statistics revealed that in 1996, 30% of the population speaks Umbundu as a mother tongue, 26% of the population speaks Portuguese as a mother tongue, 16% of the populations speak Kimbundo, 8% speak Kikongo, 6% speak Cokwe and 14% other languages. These figures clearly catapult Portuguese to the position of the second most widely spoken language in Angola (Hodges, 2001). The reasons for such radical change in the number of speakers of Portuguese are manifold. First, after independence in 1975 the country adopted Portuguese both as the official language of the country and the sole official language of instruction.

Since independence in 1975, the country has had various language statements, namely in the constitution and recently in the law for education systems (Augusto, 2012). It is, however, important to stress that the first initiatives in language and literacy involving African languages took place early in the 80s. Under the Decree of the Council of Ministers of 1987 the orthographies of the six languages shown in Table 2 were standardized with their phonological transcription. Within this context, after the creation of the National Institute of Languages, the same orthographies were approved by the resolution 3/87 of 23 May of 1987 of the Council of Ministers. However, after the standardization of the orthographies, the language question was almost forgotten. As shown in table 7, despite their sluggish use in the media, African languages remained and still are at the margins in Angola.
### Table 7

**Genetic Classification of African Languages and Domains of Language Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Linguistic Group</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Domain/Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indo-European, Italic, Romance, Italo-Western, Western Gallo-Iberian, Ibero-Romance, West-Iberian, Portuguese-Galician</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>Education, Administration, Politics, Mass Media, Official activities (Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbundu</td>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Niger-Kongo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Media (Limited), and Restricted situations (Religion, traditional ceremonies, families) Government (Very limited), Literacy (Informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbundu</td>
<td>H20</td>
<td>Niger-Kongo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Media (Limited), and Restricted situations (Religion, traditional ceremonies, families) Government (Very limited), Literacy (Informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikongo</td>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Niger-Kongo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Media (Limited), and Restricted situations (Religion, traditional ceremonies, families) Government (Very limited), Literacy (Informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cokwe</td>
<td>K20</td>
<td>Niger-Kongo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Media (Limited), and Restricted situations (Religion, traditional ceremonies, families) Government (Very limited), Literacy (Informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwanjama</td>
<td>R20</td>
<td>Niger-Kongo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Media (Limited), and Restricted situations (Religion, traditional ceremonies, families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngangela</td>
<td>K20</td>
<td>Niger-Kongo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Media (Limited), and Restricted situations (Religion, traditional ceremonies, families)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Lewis et al. (2014); Diarra, (2003).
Colonial language policies in Angola. As discussed in the section of language policies in Sub-Saharan African, what was common to the colonial language politics in Africa is that, they used language as a mechanism of control. In Angola, the prohibition of African languages was legally sanctioned by the famous colonial decree no. 77 known as Decreto de Norton de Matos (Norton de Matos’ decree), of 1921, published in the official gazette of the province of Angola. Jose Ribeiro Norton de Matos was the Portuguese higher commissioner of the overseas province of Angola (Augusto, 2012, Laitin, 1992; Zau, 2011). This decree literally prohibited the use of indigenous languages in official settings. Official settings included, inter alia, schools and churches. The more explicit Articles of this decree were the 2nd and 3rd. Article 2 of this decree reads as follows: it is not allowed to teach indigenous languages in any missionary school. Article 3 stated that the use of indigenous languages is only permissible in speech, in the teaching of catechism, and at the elementary level as support of Portuguese (Zau, 2011, my translation).

In fact, the Portuguese government also prohibited the use of other colonizers languages particularly English. In 1903, the Portuguese colonial government explicitly prohibited the use of English in Angolan Schools. The Portuguese government’s assimilation policy totally discouraged the use of indigenous languages. It is significant to note that education and social privileges were granted according to the status of assimilado (assimilated). The status of assimilado was granted to Angolans under the conditions that they mastered the language of their masters. The assimilados were the ones who had the privilege to receive education, while Angolans chiefly in rural areas were deprived of the right to education (Spencer, 1971, 1974). Although, colonial language policies have had great influence on current linguistic practices in
Angola, recent developments have ushered more democratic discussions about the status of African languages as well as Portuguese.

**The status agenda in LPP debate in Angola.** Within the context of language policy debate, the discussions have centered on the role of African languages in social and cultural life vis-à-vis the hegemony of Portuguese in public life. In this respect, scholars inter alia intellectuals have shown concern about language status as provided in the basic education law and the draft of the 2010 Constitution published in the media for the purpose of collecting contributions from the public. Referring to the hegemony of Portuguese vis-à-vis the African languages, Mateus (2009) noted that “the Portuguese language has officially become the language for building the nation; this has not been done by consensus, but by imposition” (p.1, my translation). Mateus has suggested that the hegemony of the Portuguese language has been forged through institutional practices that undermine the co-existence with other languages. He noted that although rhetorically the Constitution recognizes that Angola is a multiethnic nation, the statuses conferred to Portuguese clearly override the possibility to promote the existence of a multilingual nation. Finally, he bemoans that the constitutional rhetoric of 1975 remains. Despite the commitment to promote the African languages (national languages), the non-existence of appropriate laws to regulate the status of these languages reveals the subaltern position and role they play the linguistic market.

As demonstrated in the ecology or domains of language use in Table 2, African languages continue to be confined to restrictive social functions (Diarra, 2003). The findings of this study demonstrate that African languages are restricted to family and traditional ceremonies because of the stigma attached to these languages. The dominant discourses reinforce the view
that a good command of Portuguese equals social mobility and the use of African languages leads to backwardness (Mateus, 2009). Zau (2009) questions the status of African languages vis-à-vis the language provision in the 2010 Constitution. He questioned whether the colonial language policies and the policies adopted by the state in the post-colonial time, specifically the Portuguese only medium of instruction, have positively contributed to meaningful school experiences and efficient exercise of citizenship. He noted that looking at the old Constitution, the Constitution of 2010 and the basic education law, it is clear that these texts remain unchanged.

Suffice it to say that, the new language policy constitutes a commendable effort on the part of the Angolan government. However, with the early exit program, the problem of the legal status of African languages, and the stigma attached to African languages, it is clear that the projection of these languages into the public and official life of the country will continue to be uncertain and sluggish (Katupha, 1994). Zau (2010), for example, noted that African languages also deserve official status. Although the official status alone would not solve the problem, the issue of official status is of paramount importance in the context of language equation in Angola.

There is consensus that status planning is the driving mechanism of any language maintenance and preservation efforts. Fishman (1991) sustains that the allocation of the status provides greater chances to improve societal functions of language. Cobarrubias (1983) noted that the retention of language function depends to some extent on the legal status. The problem of the status of African languages is not only confined to Angola alone. Professor Bamgbose, a Nigerian linguist, noted that what hindered the development of African languages into more powerful languages are their low status and the restricted domain of use (Bamgbose, 2011). He
noted that the argument of backwardness used against African languages is no longer acceptable within the context of modern linguistics and sociolinguistic. He charged that, all languages are well endowed with resources that can express any concept. Within this context, he proposed several alternative avenues for empowering African languages: (1) Increasing the domains of use (education, legislature, administration, judiciary system, etc.); (2) the scope of promotion should be multidimensional (local, regional, and international); and (3) medium of instruction. Cenoz and Jessner (2009) note that, the status and prestige of a language should not be ignored in language education policy; status and prestige have influence on learners’ attitudes and choice in learning a second or additional language.

To reiterate, the status debate constitutes an important contribution to the language policy issue, especially because the promotion of bilingual policy will depend not only on improving the status of African languages, but also its image and functional value in the linguistic market. The metaphor of linguistic market originally used in Bordieu (1991) captures the ecological situation of languages in Angola. In order, to guarantee parental acceptance of African languages as an efficient medium of instruction equal to Portuguese, an improvement in their status is crucial. It is also a truism that legal status alone will not inevitably guarantee the use of African languages. It has been mentioned throughout this chapter that evidence from various sites, specifically the PROPELCA (The Operational Research Project for Language Education in Cameroonian) (Tadadjeu, 2004) that bottom up initiatives are good strategies for promoting language use. If we cannot change the attitudes of the owners of the language being promoted, no legal status can be useful (Romaine, 2002, 2006). In other words, even formal instruction of African languages will be meaningless without the involvement of parents and communities.
However meaningless it may be, the allocation of official status would definitely give these language another dimension and an opportunity to compete with the Portuguese language (Cobarrubias, 1983). Looking at the current language education policy and the new Constitution, it is clear that the country has definitely shifted and departed from its past monolingual and Portuguese only policy. However, it is a common practice in African policy-making that policies are mere statements of good intentions that do not go beyond these intentions (Bamgbose, 1991, 2000). Although the statements in the current language policy do not mention the possibility of dual language instruction or bilingual education, it is the hope of this author that the current policy will pave the way toward a bilingual language education policy in Angola.

**The 1990 Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Accord and the PALOPs.** It is a truism that Language Planning and Language Policy (LPP) is an ideological endeavor connected with symbolic, political, and cultural values; and orthography or spelling reform is only one of the activities of language planning, to be sure, corpus planning (Cooper, 1989). It has been reiterated throughout this paper that it is an unnecessary mistake to regard languages merely as a means of communication; rather languages are also attached to personal and emotional expressions of their speakers, as well as to their cultural heritage and traditions (Christ, 1997). The observation above captures the character of discourses and ideologies that have shaped and influenced the debate over the promulgation of the so called Luso-Brazilian orthographic accord. As will be apparent from the discussion, I follow Garcez (1993) that the accord is termed Luso-Brazilian because it is mainly concerned with the geo-political and geo-linguistic interests of the two nations, namely Portugal and Brazil (Garcez, 1992; Zúquete, 2008). Therefore, the main concern of this section is to examine the conditions, discourses, and ideologies that surround the promulgation of the
referred orthographic accord. Although Angola has not yet ratified the accord, the accord represents an important aspect of LPP and language education reform in Angola; and therefore it deserves attention within this study.

It is important to provide a historical background of the orthographic accord or spelling reform debate globally, and specifically in Portugal, Brazil, and Angola— in order to chart the motivations, rationale, and assumptions behind spelling reform, and how these discourses from both countries have come to shape and influence people’s perceptions about spelling reform. Next, I provide the socio-historical and political context of the Luso-Brazilian accord and the nature of the involvement of the PALOP’s (African countries with Portuguese as Official language) in the accord. The PALOPs consist of six countries, former colonies of Portugal, namely Angola, Cabo-Verde, Guine-Bissau, São Tomé e Principe, and the newly independent nation of Timor Leste. Finally, I discuss the socio-cultural, economic, and political implications of the orthographic agreement for the ongoing language education reform in general, and specifically for the implementation of the current language education policy in Angola.

The debate over spelling or orthography is not an isolated event. In many parts of the globe, an orthographic reform has always been a contentious issue. An illustration of the problems at the center orthographic reform can be found in Linguistic Authority, Language Ideology, and Metaphor: the Czech Orthography Wars (Bermel, 2007), which discusses language and orthographic reform in the Czech Republic, Ideology and alphabet in the former USSR (Sebba, 2006), Spelling Trouble? Language, Ideology and the Reform of German Orthography (S. Johnson, 2005), which discusses the orthographic reform in Germany. From the studies mentioned above, we have learned that spelling reform is a contentious activity; thus an
orthographic reform constitutes a site of struggle for competing ideologies and cultural
discourses (Eira, 1998). From the reform of German orthography insights, it can be gleaned that
within the orthographic reform debates language ideologies represent not only the perceptions
and discourses about language, but also the economic, political, cultural, and traditional interests
of various actors and agents (Bow, 2013; Eira, 1998; S. Johnson, 2005).

Returning to the 1990 Luso-Brazilian orthographic agreement, the main goal of this
discussion is to give the reader better understanding of what is at stake in this accord. The debate
over the unification of the Portuguese language orthography pre-dates the existence of the
modern Angola (see Cardozo, 1944; Garcez, 1993; Zúquete, 2008). In other words, although
currently involving the PALOPs (Angola, Mozambique and São Tomé e Príncipe) the Luso-
Brazilian orthographic accord has its genesis in the history of colonialism. The negotiation of the
accord started in a historical moment when Portugal was still colonizing the so called nations of
the PALOPs. While there have been many attempts to unify the Portuguese language, according
to Cardozo (1944), the negotiations for the unification of the orthography between Portugal and
Brazil had reached its advanced stage in 1931. Although promulgated in Portugal, the resulting
agreement was never implemented in Brazil for the same reasons mentioned above; however, it
paved the way for the Luso-Brazilian orthographic agreement negotiated in 1986 and
consolidated in 1990 with the involvement of the PALOPs (Garcez, 1993, 1995).

Cultural discourses and ideological debates in Portugal, Brazil and Angola. It is
noteworthy that in three countries— Portugal, Brazil, and Angola the orthographic agreement
has raised many controversies, conflicting discourses, and opposing voices. In Portugal the
accord debate opposes two camps: those who agree with the unification of spelling (acordistas)
and those who disagree with the accord (desacordistas) (Zúquete, 2008). The proponents see the orthographic agreement as an opportunity not only for vindicating the Portuguese language, but also for projecting it geo-politically and geo-linguistically. Proponents accuse the opponents of the orthographic accords of being nostalgic to the old traditions, culture, and the fascist imperial era. On the other hand, the opponents concede that although language change is inevitable, an imposed change undermines the prospects of democracy. In addition, they observe that unification of the orthography is not inevitable. In their view, the orthography reform aims at reinforcing homogenization; in doing so the accord threatens the democratic values that undergird the principle of diversity in unity.

In Brazil the discourses surrounding the debates on the agreement hinge on the same topics and arguments. Massini-Cagliari (2004) argued that, the orthographic accord has no linguistic basis because it does not affect the structure of the language per se. Rather she argued that, the problem is a diplomatic and a juridical one, since the orthographic accord is regulated by a law in both Brazil and Portugal. She charges that given the insignificant differences in the adopted orthographic accord, the best solution would have been to give an official status or recognition of the few words that are spelled differently in both orthographic systems (Massini-Cagliari, 2004, 2006). In a similar vein, Garcez (1995) provides an outline of the sociolinguistic situation of the PALOPs, specifically the status of Portuguese in both Angola and Mozambique. However, Garcez (1995) bemoaned that, more often than not, for economic and political reasons, the PALOPs accept whatever the two countries propose (Brazil and Portugal).

Although Garcez may to some extent be right, the generalization about the PALOPs being the prey of the Brazil and Portugal does not correspond to what is happening in practice. In
fact, given the implications that the agreement might have on the ongoing educational reform in Angola, the Angolan government has not yet ratified the Luso-Brazilian orthographic accord. Moreover, such an argument undermines the agency of the people of Angola. This is an important aspect mainly when most countries within the PALOPs including Angola are still grappling with the status planning pertaining to the position of the African languages. This brings us to the issue of nurturing the Angolan variant of Portuguese to which I shall return later. It is noteworthy that the debates about the orthographic agreement are mainly found within the official discourse and intellectual circles in Jornal de Angola (the official newspaper of the country).

Similar to Brazil and Portugal, in Angola available discourses also point to conflicting and opposing views about the usefulness of the accord. In 2012, the minister of education announced that the application of the orthographic accord posed some challenges and the there was a need for corrective measures before the ratification and application in Angola (Silva, 2012). One of the aspects alluded to by the minister was that the orthographic accord posed economic challenges within the context of the ongoing educational reform. In addition, he also mentioned that the accord did not take into account the reality of African languages (national languages). He specifically observed that the spelling reform neglected the socio-linguistic reality of Angola (Simão, 2012). Some scholars have asked the Angolan government and intellectuals to rectify and reflect before even ratifying the orthographic accord (Wa-zani, 2012). Wa-Zani (2012), noted that that “a perspectiva utópica da existência de uma única grafia da língua Portuguesa, causam evidentemente, constrangimentos” (p. 1). (The utopic perspective of the existence of the unified spelling for the Portuguese languages will obviously cause constraints,
my translation). Others scholars noted that Angola might benefit from the implementation of the accord (Zau, 2010). As mentioned earlier, the constraints that may stem from the orthographic accord will affect the enormous investment that the state has channeled into the reform of school books, and manuals with possible educational consequences in the long run (Wa-zani, 2012). For example, the proposed changes of spelling in the European Portuguese spelling and the Brazilian spelling in some cases privilege and affect only the syllabic level, but not the phonemic level. From the word *acção* (action) (European Portuguese) and *ação* (Brazilian Portuguese), it can be gleaned that even with the elision of the consonant /c/ at the graphemic level the phonemic structure of the word *ação* remains unchanged. The same analysis applies to words such as *actor*, *tacto* (tact), *protector* (Protector), *sector* (sector), *selecção* (selection), *exacto* (exact), *baptism* (baptism), *exepção* (exception), to name but these few cases. Moreover, the same words have almost maintained the same spelling in languages such as Spanish (*actor*, *factor*). The example above highlights how linguistic reforms are often rooted in political and economic arguments while the pragmatic use of language is neglected.

To summarize, from the discussions on the Luso-Brazilian orthographic accord in Portugal, Brazil, and Angola, it can be inferred that the accord is seen by opponents as linguistically, socio-culturally, and historically inadequate and undermines the creativity of the speakers to highlight the richness of Portuguese as it is spoken in the PALOPs, that is, the hybrid and dynamic repertoires that characterize the sociolinguistic situation in most African countries with Portuguese as official language; whereas the proponents consider the accord as diplomatically convenient, therefore providing a life time opportunity to project the Portuguese language into the global sphere.
The challenges of the orthographic accord: The way forward. As mentioned earlier, the discourse and ideology of *Lusofonia* (Schäffner, 1997; Schäffner & Kelly-Holmes, 1996) have been motivated by many factors (Arenas, 2003, 2011; Lopes, 1998). Although theoretically meant to promote cooperation in various areas of development, including education, its homogenizing power cannot be underestimated. A striking example of its political and cultural agenda is epitomized in the orthographic agreement that has already been ratified in the PALOPs by countries such as Cape-Verde and São Tome e Principé (Morais, 2010). The promotion of an orthographic agreement upholds the monoculture ideals and undermines the promotion of multilingualism and linguistic diversity not only in Angola, but also in other Lusophone (Portuguese speaking) countries that are affected by it (Morais, 2010). In this respect, for example, Morais (2010) argued that “in theory the argument seems a reasonable plan that will function to expedite business and intercultural exchange among the Lusophone countries and promote the international visibility of the language” (p. 90). However, in promoting a unified spelling system, the CPLP downplays the fact that in Angola and other countries, the Portuguese language has been appropriated as a result of language contact with African languages.

In other words, the Angolan variant of Portuguese (Nzau, 2011) represents not only a socio-historical contribution of the Angolan people to the Portuguese language, but it also a symbol of resistance against the colonial and neo-colonial domination. This brings us to the crux of the problem, which is the language in education policy. For example, while the introduction of the letters K, W, Y in the Portuguese alphabet might help to accommodate the words from African Bantu languages, the question remains to what extent will such change help in terms of planning language instruction? Another question is, what difference would it make changing the
spelling of some words when we know that the principle of phoneme and grapheme equivalence that the accord strives to achieve is rarely achieved in practice?

To summarize, I have argued that language policies that aim at promoting African languages and bilingualism face many challenges. Despite the fact that colonial language policies have had considerable impact and influence on language policies in post-colonial Africa, current initiatives represent an important step toward the democratization of education and promotion of multilingual societies in Africa and Angola specifically. It is also important to note that bilingual education should be seen as a panacea (Hornberger, 2010), to the myriads of the problems that encumber education in Angola. Regarding the unification of the Portuguese language spelling system between Brazil, Portugal and the PALOPs, it is clear that such an accord undermines linguistic diversity, obscures the economic and political motivation behind it, and negates the dynamic character of language.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

According to Crotty (1998), identifying the methodologies and methods to be used in a research project constitutes the starting point for developing any research project. Crotty defines methodology as “the strategy, plan of actions, and process of design lying behind the choice and use of particular methods and linking the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes” (p. 3). In other words, when a researcher selects a particular research method he/she chooses some techniques to analyze the data and answer the research questions. Because I sought Angolan teachers, students, parents, and politicians’ understandings of Angolan language policies, I chose to situate my study in the qualitative paradigm of research. Qualitative interpretive research is a contextually, politically and historically bound endeavor. The goal of this approach is to gather an in-depth understanding of human experience. First, I detail the setting and the participants of this study. Second, I discuss critical discourse analysis as the method I used to analyze the data and answer the research questions. Next, the section discusses CDA as a method of analysis used in qualitative research and the criticism against it. This is followed by the presentation of data sources. Next, the chapter details CDA tools used for the analysis of the data. This is followed by the discussion of interviewing procedures and details about the coding process, validity and ethical considerations. The chapter ends with the limitations of the study and future research.

 Setting and Participants

Interview data was collected via telephone with participants in Luanda, Angola. The study involved the participation of 14 participants: two policy-makers, three linguists, and two school administrators, two students, two parents, and two teachers. One of the two teachers is a
member of the committee on African Languages at the National Institute for Development of Education (INIDE). Another teacher is an undergraduate student at the school of languages and teaches the Portuguese language at one of the public secondary schools in the capital city Luanda. Teachers age range between 23-35 years. The two learners interviewed in this study are also language students at the school of languages at the Agostinho Neto University and are in their mid-20s. The teachers and the learners have proficiency in at least two or three languages, including English. The teachers in this study work in public and private schools and teach either English or Portuguese. The parents who were interviewed are in their mid and late 40s and both have command of at least three languages. One of the parents is a woman who works in the house and the other parent works for an airline as an accountant. The linguists that were interviewed are also multilingual speakers, who have three or four languages, in their linguistic repertoire. One of the linguists was trained in England and other linguist in Russia. Both linguists are in their mid 40s. My choice of teachers, parents, linguists, and students is justified by the fact they were recommended by the potential candidates I contacted before the interviewing process. In order words, these participants were selected because they represent the social institutions that are the sites in which language policies are negotiated and enacted.

The two policy-makers (a woman and a man) represent of the national legislature of the country, and both have proficiency in three languages, including English. The policy-makers interviewed are in their mid and late 40s as well. The school administrators who were interviewed in this study have partial communicative competence of Portuguese, English and proficiency in at least one African indigenous language are in their late 30s. One school administrator works in a public primary education school and the second works in a private
secondary school in the capital city. It is important to note that, all participants are originally from the different regions of Angola and most of them suggested having partial communicative competence of Portuguese.

Table 8

Participants’ Demographic Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Work place</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>Other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguist</td>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>43 years</td>
<td>Umbundu</td>
<td>Portuguese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguist</td>
<td>Private University</td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>Kikongo</td>
<td>Portuguese, English, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguist</td>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>44 years</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>English, Umbundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Secondary Level</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>Kimbundu</td>
<td>Portuguese, French, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Secondary Level</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>Umbundu</td>
<td>Portuguese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>Kimbundu</td>
<td>Portuguese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Kimbundu, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>24 years</td>
<td>Umbundu</td>
<td>Portuguese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>Kikongo</td>
<td>Portuguese, English, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Works home</td>
<td>46 years</td>
<td>Kimbundu</td>
<td>Portuguese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Adm</td>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>36 years</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Kimbundu, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Adm</td>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>Kikongo</td>
<td>Portuguese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>National legislature</td>
<td>46 years</td>
<td>Kimbundu</td>
<td>Portuguese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>National legislature</td>
<td>47 years</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Umbundu, English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. In the table school adm. stands for school administrator*

The participants were selected using a purposive and snowball sampling method (Creswell, 2014; Reed, 2011; Seidman, 2006; Yin, 2011; Weiss, 1994). Unlike most quantitative methodologies which have strict rules for sampling, qualitative studies do not (Patton, 2002). However, this does not mean that qualitative researchers espouse a laissez-faire sampling approach. The number of participants depends on what the researcher wants to know, what will be useful, who has credibility and who is available (Patton, 2002, 2014). Regarding the number of participants for interviewing, Kvale (1996) is straightforward. He noted that researchers
should interview as many participants as needed to answer the research questions. Unlike the positivist research that seeks external validity (Generalizability) (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005), interpretive policy studies use interpretive communities as a rationale for sampling. An interpretive community is grounded in purposive and snowball sampling selection. In other words, the researcher selects key informants who in turn help to identify potential interviewees (Yanow, 2000). The interpretive policy analyst, as Yanow (2000) observed, needs to build a context in which to access knowledge. In other words, participants are selected based on shared knowledge that they may contribute in understanding the issues and questions asked in the study.

Policy makers were included in the study because they may provide insights into the socio-historical and political context and the conditions in which language policies are created. One of the participants, has for years, been part of the regional efforts for the revalorization of African languages within the context of Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) (Kamwendo, 2009a, 2009b). My main goal was to create a sample, which can help to illuminate the conditions under which the examined policies were produced, circulated, and gauge the perceptions, beliefs and attitudes of various agents involved or affected by the language policy in Angola. The participants represent a range of perspectives from diverse contexts, levels of institutional authority.

Method

In this study, I used discourse analysis methods. I primarily relied on critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 2010) and Foucault’s discourse insights (Foucault, 1972). Using interpretive qualitative methodologies, this project is an attempt to uncover the competing ideologies and discursive practices, which shape and influence the formation, negotiation,
appropriation or implementation of language in education policy in Angola. Interviewing is one of the most widely used data collection methods in qualitative policy analysis (Yanow & Schwartz-Shea, 2006; Yanow, 2000, 2007, 2011), and qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences (Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Wodak & Krzyzanowski, 2008) in particular. The purpose of qualitative interviewing is to understand the lived experiences and understanding of participants in respect to the phenomena of study (Kvale, 1996; Siedman, 2006).

The analysis of language education policy requires a multidimensional and interdisciplinary framework. In fact, some scholars have argued that language education policy should not be analyzed only from a discursive and linguistic perspective alone. Unger (2013) conducted a language policy study in Scotland using CDA. Unger (2013) drew from top-down data such as policy documents and excerpts from law and with bottom-up data collected from language users affected by the policies. He noted that the use of top-down and bottom-up data provides insights about the different levels of discourse (macro, micro, meso) and illuminates how different policy actors and the affected groups instrumentalize and interpret discourses on language use and language varieties.

Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000) have argued that the historical analysis, that is, the intertextual chain in CDA does not go far enough in exposing the historicity of the text. They noted that CDA could benefit from incorporating Foucault’s insights which provide historical theoretical insights. Blommaert and Bulcaen’s criticism of CDA hinges on issues of interpretation and context. Blommaert (2001) noted that CDA pays little attention to context and called for dynamic approach to data analysis. He noted that contextualization of data could remedy CDA problems of interpretation. In order words, Blommaert suggested that CDA
analyses texts out of context. In addition, Blommaert argued that CDA would greatly benefit by including layered analysis of social events and linguistic resources and contextualizing discourse data in order to provide a historicized positioning. Blommaert and Bulcaen go on to say that CDA is still trapped in linguistics, which prevents incorporating linguistic and non-linguistic dimensions of semiosis (apparent for instance, in the very partial interpretation of Foucault’s discourse in Fairclough’s (1989) work. In this respect, Lemke (1995) observed that although powerful, Foucault’s discourse approach is limited because it lacks linguistic analysis.

Conversely, Lemke (1995) bemoaned that the social-historical context of discourse and discourse as a form of social action have been largely ignored in discourse analysis research and called for a social theory of discourse that is critical and accounts for what people do with discourses and the consequences of the discursive practices. In addition, CDA has been criticized for being ideologically and methodologically over-determined (Widdowson, 1995). In this respect, Hammersly (1997) argued that all critical research, specifically CDA, is value laden, and that it cannot be grounded in the methodological assumptions of conventional research. In other words, Hammersley is contesting the status of CDA as research that aims to produce ‘scientifically’ based knowledge. (see Breeze, 2011; Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui & Joseph, 2005; Slembrouck, 2001; Stubbs, 1997 for review of CDA criticisms).

This study responds to these critiques, and calls for a socio-historical analysis of policy documents (Tollefson, 1991) and the policy discursive contexts of the national legislature, local discourses and how various agents (legislators, linguists, teachers, parents, educators) interpret and negotiate top-down policies from the state. Fairclough’s CDA framework and Foucauldian discourse insights provide the necessary tools and insights to respond to this call. Olssen et al.,
(2004) observe that policy documents embody discursive practices that underlie dynamic social relations. Language education policies not only regulate such practices, but also contain meanings that need to be interpreted. It should be noted that the use of interview in CDA research is less common, therefore incorporating interviews in this study represents an important contribution.

Data Sources

For the purposes of intertextual and interdiscursive analysis, the corpora of texts under consideration were constituted by the verbatim from interviews. The verbatim were used to map intertextual links between the discourses from media debate and participants’ accounts and perspectives; excerpts from 5 five sampled articles from a corpus of 16 newspaper articles from the Angolan main newspaper (The Angolan Newspaper) figuring reactions and debates (2009-2012) about the policy under analysis. The five articles were selected because they figure rich accounts of the language question and perspectives that may illuminate the conflicts, contradictions, and challenges regarding the language education policy under study.

The data also included extracts from the Angolan Constitution of 2010 containing language education provision, namely the article 19 line 1 and 2 and the article 87 line 1 and 2 respectively; the corpora also included extracts from the language policy under study, namely Article 3, article 9, article 10 line 1 and article 17 line 1 respectively. Consistent with Fairclough’s model, the data was analyzed at the three levels — the analysis of policy documents and statuses to conduct a critical analysis of textual features, textual and discursive analysis to look at the intertextual and interdiscursive relations and patterns, and the analysis of the sociocultural and historical contexts (institutions) beyond the discourse level in order to situate
the language policy arguments within the ideology critique (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012). The materials for analysis have a meaning potential that can illuminate the historical, cultural, and political connections between the various discourses and language policy production, circulation, and interpretation.

Table 9

*Data Sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Documents</th>
<th>Media Excerpts</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angolan Official Language Policy</td>
<td>2 Excerpts from public newspaper (Jornal de Angola) published in 2009</td>
<td>Interviews conducted with the 14 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Angolan Constitution of 2010</td>
<td>2 Excerpts from public newspaper (Jornal de Angola) published in 2010</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education Law</td>
<td>1 Excerpts from public newspaper (Jornal de Angola) published in 2012</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a social semiotic perspective “texts are the products or records of social meaning making practices” (Thibault, 1991, p. 230), thus constituting an important part of the data on which I based the assumptions of the constitution of social formation (Fairclough, 2010; Kress, 1993, 2001; Thibault, 1991). Critical examination and analysis of policy documents was important for this study given that, as social and cultural artifacts, documents reflect not only the interests and perspectives of their authors, but also encapsulate intended or unintended values and ideologies (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Love, 2003). In addition, policy documents are sites in which policy authors and agents make claims to power and legitimacy (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011).
Data Analysis

Along with traditional qualitative approach (interviewing), I used critical discourse analysis (Fairclough (1989, 2010; Johnson, 2011b; Wodak, 2001, 2006; Wodak & Fairclough, 2010) and insights from Foucault’s (1977) influenced discourse analytic approach (e.g., Allan et al., 2010). The data or texts under study included spoken interaction (interviews) and written texts (excerpts from newspapers and language policies). Yanow (2000) noted that documents and artifacts constitute a useful starting point for any interpretive policy study. According to this approach, language, objects, and the acts involved in policy analysis have a meaning potential that is open to interpretation by agents and actors who may be the targets of the policy (Yanow, 2000). Based on Fairclough’s three dimensional model discussed within the framework in chapter 1, the data from interview data and language policy documents were analyzed at the following three levels: (1) The analysis of language or text, (2) the intertextual and interdiscursive relationships between texts, utterances, genres and discourses, and (3) the extra-linguistic social and institutional frames of specific situations; the analysis of socio-political and historical contexts (socio-cultural).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) can successfully illuminate “the discourses within and without the language policy text and intertextual connections to other policies” (Johnson, 2009b). CDA can help to capture the relationship between the micro and macro-societal levels of language policy discourses. Relying on CDA (Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b, 2010; Johnson, 2009c, 2011, 2012), I analyzed policy documents and other available extracts of discourse primarily through textual based discourse analysis, which attended to the intertextual relations, socio-historical, and ideological context of discourse (Fairclough, 1992a). At this level I analyzed the
content of discourse and fragments of discourse (Baker & Galansiski, 2001), by identifying the use of pronouns, fallacies, topoi, and modality.

**Tools for analysis.** The use of textual features and linguistic structure as discursive strategies to position participants in a discursive field is an important ideological tool used to construct knowledge, set social boundaries, and reinforce language ideology of differentiation (Irvine & Gal, 2000). Pronouns are one such linguistic feature that is prominently used as indexical of speakers’ position within a particular interaction (Levison, 1979; Wortham, 1996). Such linguistic devices have been used in linguistics in relation to semantic analysis. However, such an approach to deixis, or pronoun usage, has been more recently criticized for leaving out the social aspects and implications of deixis in the construction of social boundaries and identities (Cramer, 2009). Levison (1979) recognized that social deixis as an important aspect of language and discourse because pronouns not only provide referential information that needs to be contextualized, but are also indexical of speakers positions in reference to the audience or reader.

Cramer (2009) argued that an important way in which participant construe social boundaries and social identities is the use of pronouns. Wortham’s (1996) mapping of deitics in teachers’ footing in interaction has demonstrated that language use creates and transforms social relations. The notion of footing was developed by Ervin Goffman. Footing is the notion that when people talk they can speak as either the authors of their speech or the as animators of other people’s words (Goffman, 2001). For example, one of the participants in this study evoked Agostinho Neto, the former president of Angola speech about the relevance of maintaining African languages. In doing so, the participant unconsciously endorsed the president’s nationalist
ideologies in which language is seen as the symbol of nationhood and culture that need to be protected in the sacrosanctity of the past (Ensibk, 1997; Schaffner, 1997).

From the intertextuality perspective, we see that the content and structure of Presidents speech is designed in such way that the participant was able to find the relevant passage and embed it into his own discourse by a means of a quotation (Sauer, 1997). This demonstrates the power of rhetoric in political discourse. Borrowing Goffman’s concept of footing, Ensink (1997), notes that politicians “perform speeches the main task of which is to establish and express a perspective which is representative for the nation” (p.5). Thus, footing stresses the various roles and functions that speakers and hearers perform in particular discursive events. Coming back to the use of pronouns Wortham noted that the use of first person plural pronoun ‘We’ refers to “the speaker and some others” (Wortham, 1996, p. 336). Drawing upon Anderson’s (1993) notion of imagined communities, Silverstein (2000) explored the use of deixis in the construction of the linguistic imaginary of nationalism. He observes that “We” aims at constructing an imaginary normative consciousness that often the speakers share with others. He notes that the use “We” has been prominently used as an umbrella for sustaining homogenous national identity and language.

Therefore, in this study I used pronominal analyses to map how the use of deixis serves for indexing individuals’ positions and identities within the language policy discourse that shape the policies. Indexicality refers to how language is used to make reference to something that is not explicitly represented in the text or discourse. The assumptions is that discursive contexts not only create, but also reveal meaning. Linguistic features (personal and demonstrative pronouns) are said to be highly indexical. In order words, indexicality illuminates how textual implied
meanings might influence the sociocultural aspects of discursive situation (Anderson, 2008). Deixis is a powerful linguistic device through which discourse operates in order to construct social reality. Consistent with CDA deixis or the use of pronouns constitutes a power discursive strategy involved in constructing not only social boundaries, but also knowledge and social identity (Hart, 2010), and the projecting of social imaginaries through discourse (Velázquez, 2013).

According to Fairclough, Muldering and Wodak (2011) topoi are sets of generalized ideas that are used as a ground for argumentative strategy. Topoi are discursive devices that are intertextually connected to the production, circulation, and interpretation of language policy discourse. Often, the production of policy text relies on the interdiscursive connections to common sense views about language and the circulating discourses that sometimes stand on the margins of the discursive chain (Johnson, 2013b). The analysis of topoi aims to capture how general topics are used to frame language policy debates. As an argumentative device, topoi are discursive and argumentative strategies that may serve to legitimatize the inevitability of particular language policy proposals. For example, the impossibility to use African languages in education or the inevitability of using ex-colonial languages in education is often justified with generalized views that European languages are by virtue of their structure and prestige the only languages that are fit for the acquisition of scientific knowledge. Yet, evidence points to the fact that all languages are equally fit and capable of being used for science. In this study the analysis of topoi may help to capture and uncover (Fairclough et al. 2011) how, for example, the discourse and ideology of development frames and shapes language policy discourse.
Fallacy is an argumentative language that frames particular types of information as common sense (Wodak & Fairclough, 2010). For example, the dominant discourse about possessing communicative ability in English or Portuguese as the inevitable avenue for social success and social development downplays the fact that success is an abstract and complex concept. The extent to which success can be measured is a problematic issue. However, as the findings of this study demonstrate, such common sense view is often used to justify certain policy positions.

Fairclough observed that mass media tend to purport to be neutral in shaping public opinion and discourse. Looking at the media excerpts data can cast light on how the mass media and the newscast articulate and shape issues of language use and language education. Finally, the analysis of modality is important for this study because modal verbs and adverbials are prominently used in legal discourse (Zelenka, 2013). Modals are verbs and adverbials (e.g., may, might, shall, should, and must) that indicate the possibility or likelihood of occurrence of an event. Modals may also indicate the speakers’ authority to advocate for certain actions (See Palmer, 2002; Quirk, Sidney, Leech & Svartvik, 1989; Zelenka, 2013). According to Stubbs (1996) modality refers to how language is used to encode meaning such as degrees of certainty, commitment, vagueness, lack of commitment, personal beliefs or knowledge that people often take for granted. In a similar vein, Martin (1997) observed that in interpersonal communication the use of modals may indicate that the position of the speakers is a source of assessment.

Although most texts constitute a mosaic of genres and discourses (Bakthin, 1986; Fairclough, 1993), legal discourse and texts such as constitutions, regulations, and agreements are referred to as frozen genres due to their conservative use of language (Connor & Upton,
Therefore, the analysis of modals may help illuminate the interpretation and understanding of the legal materials, specifically the language policy, constitution, and other materials in the data corpus. The analysis of legal discourse and language policy discourses may cast light on the sociocultural and political context of production and expand the meaning potential of language policy discourses. In short, the analysis of modals in language policy studies might tell us something about the language policy genre and how generic resources are used to perpetuate and instantiate particular sociocultural practices.

**Intertextuality and interdiscursivity.** Discourses do not exist in a vacuum. Rather, they are part of a series of interwoven texts and discourses. In a particular order of discourses or discursive chains, texts and discourses usually make reference to other discourses in forms of quotations, authors’ perspectives, themes and points of view. Intertextuality as conceptualized by Kristeva (1981) is the notion that all texts are constitutes by a mosaic of other texts, which may be assimilated, echoed or even be in contradiction to other snatches of text. One of the challenging tasks in language policy studies is making connections between language policy texts and discourse and discursive practices (Johnson, 2015). Language policies are usually linked to past policy debates and versions of the same policy documents (vertical intertextuality) or they may also be connected to various past and present discourses (interdiscursivity) (Johnson, 2015). Thus, intertextuality refers to how lexico-gramatical elements (words, phrases and specific textual features) are connected, whereas interdiscursivity refers to the linking of ideas or discourses which may be indexed in the textual features. In *Intertextuality and Educational Research*, Lemke (2004) called for the need to map and construct patterns of relationship among texts and discourses from interviews and policy documents. He noted that intertextual analysis
consists in identifying, classifying and interpreting relationships among various texts and discourses on a particular education topic or theme. When texts or discourses have the same points of view towards an audience, content or topic, they provide potential connections for considering them as “intertexts of one another” (Lemke, 2004, p. 6). The notion of intertextuality is central for critical discourse analysis.

Drawing from Bakhtin (1981), Kristeva (1981) noted any text is composed of many quotations and texts are the byproduct of a mediation between society and history. In discursive terms, discourses from top-down policies (macro-level) and discourses from the bottom up (micro-level) may be in interrelationship that is historically, spatially, and temporally situated. Intertextuality asserts the view that discourse analysis does not necessarily seek for meanings shared by two texts in a simplistic way; rather, as Thibault (1991) points out, intertextual meaning should be theorized “in terms of level of abstraction at which two or more texts are construed belonging to the same intertextuality set” (p.135). These insights are consistent with Foucault’s views about the nature and construction of intertextual formation. In short, intertextual and interdiscursive analysis of policy discourse has the potential to reveal the sometimes overlapping, opposing, contradictory, and competing ideologies that shape language policy production, circulation, and recontextualizations. Recontextualization refers to the view that the meaning potential of discourses may be suppressed or transformed by social agents in the process of circulation from one context to another. As a result, circulating discourses might acquire totally new meanings (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). In other words, language policy texts are not transparent to be simply read from the language policy statements, rather the
meaning of any policy text is formed and transformed by social agents who might as a result appropriate or resist the policy.

I used the tool of intertextuality to see the connection between the macro-level policy discourses and micro-level policy discourses. I used intertextual analysis to connect the interviews with the corpus of texts under consideration for this study. In this study, the goal of the intertextual and interdiscursive analysis was to map how discourses from the macro-level (e.g., official discourse, language policy texts) draw from and are interwoven with the circulating discourses. Another goal was to look at the various “types of complex intertextuality of texts: sequential intertextuality, embedded intertextuality, and mixed intertextuality (Fairclough, 1995, p. 15).

Some scholars have elaborated on different types of intertextuality. According to Fairclough in sequential intertextuality texts draw from one another as to create a sequence of discourses that may coalesce in a particular order of discourse, whereas in embedded intertextuality one genre of text is embedded with another (quotations). Mixed intertextuality involves the mixing of texts from different genres. This normally results in the production of hybrid texts or discourses. In other words, even one clause in a particular text may be composed by multiple genres.

As mentioned earlier, the three dimensional analytical framework from Fairclough adopted in this study is consistent with the view that language use and discourse are embedded in relationships of power. From this perspective, intertextuality is conceptualized as socially constructed resources, which serve to construct ideology and culture (Egan-Robertson, 1998). Intertextual links provided clues on how people talk about what is meaningful to them.
(communities) drawing from similar or different discourses and shared knowledge, beliefs, ideas and values.

In this study, intertextuality and interdiscursivity were used to illuminate how the policy arguments about language use and the choice of language of instruction are framed and connected within the various layers of society (institutions and communities and individuals). To this end, the analysis of intertextuality focused on references to various discourses, including academic discourse, participants’ accounts, and policy debates from the media, stories, and vignettes pertinent to the language policy under study.

Interdiscursivity is a notion akin to Bakhtinian tradition and has been studied by Foucault (1972), Fairclough (1995) and Kristeva (1981). Interdiscursivity entails the mixing of diverse texts and discourse genres associated with institutional, social meanings, and practices in one text. The result is the production of more or less hybrid text, discourse, or genre (Bhatia, 2004; Wu, 2012). According to Bhatia (2010) social actors appropriate and exploit textual, semiotic resources, and conventions to construct and interpret disciplinary and discursive practices. Discourses and texts often rely on beliefs, ideas, and speeches that stem from various orders of discourse. Participants’ accounts may also draw from disciplinary knowledge or even from entrenched common sense views to justify certain language practices, and behaviors (Bazerman, 2004). More specifically, I analyzed the intertextual and interdiscursive connections at the textual and discursive levels to look at the participants social and language experiences, that is, how they have impacted their lives economically and socioculturally (Family, school, identity, and social mobility) (Kim, 2012).
Discourses link social identities, people’s imaginaries of what is deemed as the correct use of language and what language (s) suit better for schooling. According to Fairclough (1992a) intertextual analysis is very important for understanding “discursive events as discourse practice” (p. 269). Intertextual and interdiscursive relationships involve the connection between the macro level discourse (policy texts) and the micro level discourse (interviews), the main topics (topoi) and patterns of themes (Abell & Myers, 2008; Lemke, 1995). Using intertextual links of discursive events, I analyzed the discourses by connecting them to one another so as to reach an explanatory understanding of how these texts connect to particular types of social practices (Fairclough, 1992b).

Using intertextual and interdiscursive analysis of policy discourse may illuminate and provide some answers to research questions— how the colonial language ideologies and discourses have, for example, shaped linguistic practices and people’s perceptions about African indigenous languages. The analysis of documents and selected newspaper excerpts focuses on intertextual links, co-patterning, generic links to capture the attitudes, beliefs within the socio-historical, political, and ideological contexts of language policy-making in Angola. Critical discourse analysis is recognized as a useful descriptive and interpretive framework for viewing language as a strategic meaning potential resource.

Policy texts are seen as heteroglossic (Bakhtin, 1981), that is, constituting various historical and cultural discourses that contend for fixing meaning, social representation, and power. Intertextual analysis has the potential to illuminate how, for example, the discourses of social development and nationalism reverberate and shape discursive practices related to language use and specifically language education (Saha, 1997). Intertextuality is a productive
process in which texts transform and restructure prior texts and genres. According to Fairclough (1992b) because the restructuring of texts and discourses is constrained by the relationships of power, intertextual theory needs to be complemented with the theory of hegemony. Gramsci’s (1971) theory of hegemony, he argued, would be the best match (See Fairclough, 1992a).

Fairclough (1993) noted that, the analysis of discourse and power in terms of hegemony is productive because control and hegemonic struggles over orders of discourse occurs primarily at the level of discursive practices. While Foucault’s view of power does not totally fit within Gramscian notion of ideological hegemony, Foucault’s theory is critical because it has the power to engage in struggle, to unmask, to subvert and undermine the dominant cultural and discursive practices (Troyna, 1994).

In short, intertextual and interdiscursive links allowed connecting macro-level (top-down) language policy language and the micro-level discourses that will emerge from participants’ accounts and narratives. Intertextual analysis is of paramount importance for this study because it will cast light and reveal the various ideologies, beliefs, cultural, and discursive practices that have influenced and shaped the production, circulation, and interpretation, or appropriation of current language policy in Angola.

**Interviews**

Language policy interviewing has been found to provide nuanced perspectives about how different agents and actors react to language education policy formulation (Johnson, 2012). Although there are various types of interviewing methods (e.g. face to face, mediated interviews), in this study, I use mediated interviewing (telephone interviewing). Mediated interviewing is normally conducted using technological media such as Skype, telephone or other
types of media. I chose telephone interviewing methods because as we know research involves not only time, but also resources. Lack of resources is one of the main reasons that justify my choice of mediated interviewing.

The literature distinguishes two types of mediated interviews: synchronous and asynchronous interviews. According to Tracy (2013), in synchronous interviewing methods the interviews take place at the same time, whereas in asynchronous interviewing people may conduct the interviewing at different times and places with interviewees. However, there is a consensus among qualitative researchers that face to face interviews have advantages because the researcher has the possibility to observe non-verbal behavior (e.g., Gillham, 2004; Tracy, 2013; Mears, 2009). Yet, mediated interviews have been found to be useful and valuable for conducting interviews with participants who are split apart in time (Tracy, 2013). Many scholars have also found that mediated interviewing is helpful because it lessens anxiety for an interviewee who is shy. Mediated interviews have been found to encourage engagement and more sharing, than the face to face interviews, in some cases (Tracy, 2013). Of course, there are also disadvantages in mediated interviewing. For example, Tracy (2013) noted that in mediated interviewing participants may simultaneously engage in other activities because the interviewer is not present. Distractions may cause the participants to lose focus on the discussed issues. Telephone interviewing is preferred because it has been found that computer based interviewing puts participants’ confidentiality in jeopardy (Tracy, 2013).

There are three important different structures of interviews: structured, unstructured, and semi-structured (Kvale, 1983, 1996; Siedman, 2006). Structured interviews use some sort of patterned script that is strictly followed, whereas unstructured interviews are open-ended and
more flexible. In semi-structured interviews the researcher needs more focused information, so the interviewer asks specific questions. The interviewer starts the discussions by asking questions and listens and uses probes to guide the interviewer in order to access the information (Gibson, 1998). During the unstructured interviews the researcher and the participant engaged in some sort of flexible conversation in which the researcher was willing to listen more in order to capture participant’s lived experiences and perspectives (Gebrium & Holstein, 2003; Kvale & Brinkman, 2008; Seidman, 2012; Rubin & Rubin, 2006).

Semi-structured interviews (See Appendix A) helped me not only focus on important issues in order to answer the research questions, but also allowed me to follow the lead of my participants and pursue unplanned topics. The strength of semi-structured interviews is that observational data can be gathered along with participants perspectives (Dearnley, 2005; DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Semi-structured interviewing has some advantages over structured interviewing. Unlike the structured interviewing that takes an etic approach, that is, it “describes behaviors in terms of external criteria” (Tracy, 2013, p. 21), semi-structured interviewing follows the emic approach. In other words, the events or behaviors were not described from the researcher’s perspective. The individual in-depth semi-structured interview allowed me delve into social, personal experiences, and stories (Galletta, 2013; Given, 2013; Tracy, 2013).

**Procedures**

**Semi-structured interviews.** Drawing from DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree (2006), Whiting (2008, p. 36) summarizes the key features of semi-structured interviews as follows: (1) Scheduled in advance at a designated time, (2) location normally outside everyday events, (3)
organized around a set of predetermined questions, (4) other questions emerge from dialogue, (5) usually last 30 minutes to several hours.

The semi-structured interviews lasted from 45 minutes to an hour and the interviews were conducted in a private closed room. The interviews were taped recorded using a digital recorder. Although I conducted 14 interviews, after twelve interviews many of the themes became recurrent and little or no new information was obtained with the final two interviews. The data suggested that all categories had been exhausted and a point of saturation was reached (Kvale, 1996; Seidman, 2006).

Following, Fairclough (1992, 1995; 2010) my aim was to use the different discourses and texts (e.g., policy statements, newspaper excerpts, interviews) in order to map and conduct critical discourse analysis by looking into different dimensions of analysis and illuminate how discourses are (re)contextualized when they move into different discursive contexts.

Coding

Coding is widely used in qualitative inquiry to reduce data for the purpose of qualitative analysis. Saldaña (2009) defined coding as a “word or phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing and/or evocative attribute for apportion of language-based or visual data” (p. 3). According to (Saldaña, 2009, 2013) values coding seek to uncover and illuminate values, attitudes, and beliefs that justify participants’ worldviews and perspectives about a particular phenomenon or event. While values coding (Saldaña, 2013), seeks to uncover attitudes, evaluation coding seeks to collect information about the status, activities, characteristics, and outcomes of a particular policy or program. Given that coding is a systematic process that allows the researcher to group and regroup qualitative data in order to consolidate
meaning and explanation (Saldaña, 2009, 2013), data from interviews were immediately coded after the transcription of the audio recordings.

Data analysis and interpretation involved organizing the collected data from interviews and documents. As recommended in the literature on qualitative interview research (Patton, 2002; Kvale, 1996; Saldaña, 2013; Siedman, 2006), to facilitate the coding activity in this study, I carried out the first cycle coding during the process of data collection; following the guidelines by Saldaña (2009, 2013), I transcribed my data immediately after the interview conversation (Kvale, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). As mentioned above, deciding which coding method to use is often one of the challenging aspects of qualitative research for beginner researchers (De Laine, 2000; Lareau, 1989). I chose to use Saldaña’s (2013, pp. 64-66), insights because I found them helpful as they provided a hint for making sense of the data that was generated in my interview research.

To guide coding, during the process of transcription, I keep my theoretical framework and research questions with me in order to make sense of what people were trying to accomplish, the strategies they used, and how participants talked about language learning, use, and the implementation of language policy in Angola (Saldaña, 2013). To facilitate the analysis and make sense of patterns, I reduced my data in codes, running themes and concepts. My early codes were tied to interviews questions regarding participants school experience in general and language learning experience in particular. For example, participants talked about their experience within a Portuguese only educational system and the challenges that they faced as a result. In this context, for example, the codes that emerged in most interviews were linguistic hierarchization and social boundary. Although participants did not explicitly use such words,
the language they used suggested that these codes were the appropriate match for describing the experiences narrated in the interviews. As I progressed in my coding, I highlighted relevant text, recorded the category of the participant and the pages where the codes were located. In order to look for patterns across interviews, I created an inventory where I copied parts of the text and explored their meaning. This was a descriptive process that allowed me to label or name thematic codes according to the data where they emerged.

During the process, multiple and overlapping codes emerged. Codes suggesting similar thematic link were collapsed, while those which were not relevant to my research questions were put aside. Other codes that emerged in my data were collapsed into categories such as the politics of English, Social development, assimilation, language identity, privilege, prejudice, language diversity, multilingualism as a norm, and hierarchization of linguistic field and concepts such as semilingualism, misconceptions about second language learning. For example, the connection between language, privilege and social boundaries evident in my literature review resurfaced frequently in the data. The process of data was cyclical and iterative because I found myself going back to the data. Patterns in participants accounts reflected social exclusion based on linguistic privilege. The most salient category was assimilationist view reflecting colonial linguistic ideologies and beliefs. It is important to note, however, participants experiences and discourse about language in Angola reflected some variation, contradictions and complexity in their view of language, identity and culture. Finally, salient categories that emerged from empirical data were explored in my analysis and helped me make sense of the impact of the current language policies on participants experiences and its implication for promoting multilingualism in Angola.
Ensuring Validity in Qualitative Research

Qualitative research contributors such as Guba and Lincoln (1994) and Denzin and Lincoln (2005) have dramatically influenced qualitative research inquiry in the last twenty years or so. In questioning positivist quantitative views, these scholars have challenged the concept of objectivity in qualitative research (Fischer, Miller, & Sidney, 2007). Validity and reliability are but some of many contentious concepts in qualitative research. Unlike positivist or objectivist research paradigms, qualitative researchers have developed parallel standards and criteria for assessing validity and reliability. Guba and Lincoln (1985) suggested the notion of trustworthiness which involves credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. In this study after the analysis of data, I adopted the steps recommended by Creswell (2009) to guarantee reliability and validity. According to Creswell (2009, 2014) the following activities can dramatically enhance the validity and reliability of findings: (1) Check transcripts to make sure that they do not contain obvious mistakes made during transcription, and (2) make sure that there is not a drift in the definition of codes, a shift in the meaning of the codes during the process of coding. I accomplished this by comparing the data with the codes and by writing memos about the codes and the corresponding definitions.

I used member checking to determine the accuracy of the findings. I shared the report with the participants so they could confirm or refute the accuracy of my interpretation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Siedman, 2006). Participants had the opportunity to read the my interpretation of the data generated from the interview and critically reflect on their accuracy and implication. I relied on Foucault’s (1977, 1991) insights on discourse, power, and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992, 1989, 2010) to highlight that people live in ways which are mediated by
discourse which constructs work, family, gender, sexuality and so forth in particular ways that emanate from experts attached to social systems and organizations. I triangulated my data from texts and interviews using Critical Discourse Analysis. The advantage of using different sources of information is that, it helps to ensure triangulation. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2005) define triangulation as the use of tow or more sources and methods of data collection. While acknowledging that no interpretation is repeatable, I strived to capture multiple perspectives of participants’ lived experiences (Stake, 2005).

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical issues are critical in any research that involves the study of human experiences and life. One of the crucial ethical challenges that qualitative researchers face is how to access the participants and convince them to participate in the study. In order to address ethical concerns pertinent to participants, I started by calling some of the potential participants by telephone and explaining to them the purpose of my study. I encouraged the participants to ask questions pertinent to the study. After the participant’s consent, I emailed my interview protocol with a detailed explanation about my actions and the procedures, and the actions of the participants. The details of my interview protocol focused on the confidentiality of the participants’ identity. I also provided an explanation about the actions to be carried out with the transcripts of the interviews at the end of the study. The protocol also explained that participants were free to withdraw from the study at any time in case they felt uncomfortable (See, Appendix A for more detail). It is important to note that some participants were fearful and afraid of being interviewed through computer media because disagreeing with official policies can be
problematic. In some cases, I had to provide additional explanations about the process and the use of the gathered information.

**Limitations**

It is a truism that no study can ever capture the complexity of human activity and experience. As a result, it is widely accepted among qualitative researchers that what one presents, as the outcome is only one interpretation among many possible interpretations (Geertz, 1973, 1983). In this respect, this study is not an exception. One of the limitations of this study was the number of participants. Although the sample of this study was representative of the various social agents involved in the language policy process, longitudinal ethnographic study with a greater sample including teachers and learners in classrooms would have provided a much deeper understanding of how teachers and learners interpret, appropriate or resist top-down policies. Blending ethnography and critical discourse analysis would provide the possibility for carrying an in-depth analysis of the macro-micro levels of discourse, which is important for illuminating the various layers of the language policy formation, appropriation, and recontextualization (Asfha, 2013; Chimbutane, 2009, 2011, 2013; Johnson, 2011a; Krzyzanowski, 201, Shoba, 2013; Shoba & Chimbutane, 2013).

Another limitation of this study was the use of telephone interviews. Although telephone interviewing has many advantages, its drawback is that, it does not allow for capturing non-verbal cues that are critical to the process of interpretation. Although my initial intention was the pursuit of ethnography of language policy in Angola, lack of resources has prevented me to accomplish this goal. As will apparent in chapter four the theoretical insights I used in this study still provided enough explanatory power that helped give the events and participants’
experiences possible discursive form and carve out an ideological space for understanding the issues and themes that are at the center of the debate on language education reform in Angola. The findings of this study point to different future research directions. The findings suggest that future studies need to approach the problem of how language status and language attitudes affect language use in Angola through longitudinal ethnographic studies (ethnography of language policy) and situated perspectives such as the ecology of language policy. Teacher beliefs and language attitudes is another important area for future research. Having discussed the methods and theoretical insights that undergirded this study and its limitations the chapter five provides the analysis of the data and the discussion of the findings.
CHAPTER FIVE
DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this chapter is to analyze the data collected from the interviews with participants, language policy documents, media texts, and academic discourse. I started the analysis with the micro-level analysis, specifically the analysis of linguistic and discursive features of texts which help to articulate and describe the social effects of discourse —how the various social agents mobilize ideology, hegemony, legitimation of power, and knowledge through discursive and cultural practices (Fairclough, 1992). As mentioned previously, micro-analysis is an important stage in the analysis of policy discourse because it illuminates the construction of social identity and knowledge. The analysis of linguistic and discourse features also sheds light on how social action and social struggles and change are framed and articulated through the rhetorical and argumentative devices such as topoi and fallacies, and the use of linguistic features such as modality and pronouns.

The micro-analysis of texts also looked at the participants’ perceptions, values, and beliefs about language, specifically their interpretation and understanding of the language education policy that introduces African indigenous languages in the education system in Angola. At this level, the most salient discourses that emerged from the data were grouped and analyzed by themes and categories. Although the categories that emerged were many, this analysis focuses on the most salient discursive categories (nationalism; misconceptions about language learning; language; culture and identity; the politics of English as a global language; the role of media and language conflict). The micro-analysis of the linguistic and discursive features of texts also aimed at capturing the participants’ understanding of what counts as
language and knowledge, and the implication that these understandings may have for social change.

In this context, the micro-analysis of linguistic and discursive features of the language education policy, the constitution and media discourses has provided the contextual background for the macro-analysis of policy discourse (intertextuality and interdiscursive) that looks at how various sources and texts (socio-historical) are interwoven to create meaning and understanding of the language education policy. The goal of intertextuality and interdiscursive analysis was to map the connections between the various texts and make sense how these were situated in the broader socio-historical, political, and cultural contexts. Intertextual and interdiscursive analyses also aimed at illuminating how the various textual links may be situated in particular orders of discourse—the meaning potential that the intra-textual and the extra-textual links have to shape the understanding and interpretation of the language policy discourse. Another goal of the meso-level analysis (level between the micro-level of texts analysis and the macro-level of sociocultural analysis) was to unpack the messages from the texts under consideration and see how the messages in the texts connect to the process of production—how the various discourses relate to their producers (Fairclough, 2001). In other words, this level of analysis concerns the interpretation of texts based on how and what discourse practices are connected to the broader socio-historical context, that is, to see how the themes and genres connect to the larger macro sociological context and the effects that these texts produce to sustain unequal power dynamics and inequality in education (Bauman & Briggs, 2003). The goal of such an analysis was also to illuminate how circulating discourses enter into dialogue with participants’ views to produce and reproduce meaning and knowledge, and perpetuate policy discourses. The chapter ends with a
discussion of the findings and their implication for the implementation of a democratic and inclusive language education policy and social change.

Findings

**Analysis of linguistic and discursive features of texts.** In concert with Fairclough’s three dimensional framework, the analysis of linguistic and discourse features of texts was conducted using tools from CDA and critical social theory. However, as mentioned in previous sections, I conducted the analysis of linguistic features using selected analytical tools adequate to the types of data, namely pronominal analysis, modality, topoi, and fallacy. Some of these analytical tools have been used in language policy studies (See Johnson, 2013). The section below provides the analysis of selected texts (language policy), excerpts of legal statuses containing language provision (the Angolan constitution of 2010), and media debates on language policy and participants’ verbatim from interviews.

**Official national language policies of Angola.** The new language education policy in Angola addresses the problem of medium of instruction and the study and teaching of African languages in concert with the Angolan Constitution of 2010 as follows: (1) Article 6 outlines 14 languages considered as national languages, (2) Article 9 describes the functions and domains of use for national languages (African languages), (3) Article 10 provides that African languages (national languages) be used in the national territory in all spheres of social and public life, (4) Article 17 relates to language education. This article contains the provision for the use of children’s mother tongue, specifically African languages. This article constituted one of the main objects of analysis of this study. Article 17, line 1 of the current language policy reads as follows (I translated this excerpt from the original Portuguese):
Conditions must be created within the national territory to ensure that pupils' mother tongue is used as the medium of instruction in the three first classes (1st through 3rd grade), provided that human resources allow such possibility in pursuance to article 9 of this law. (Angolan language policy, line 1, 2011)

The use of modality “must” in the first clause of the article is highly indicative of the affinity and high commitment of the policy-makers to promote African languages in education as the use of the modal verb “must” indicates an obligation. However, the second clause of the same article “provided that the human resources allow such possibility in pursuance to article 9 of this law” clearly reveals not only the tensions and contradiction in the policy text. Moreover, the statement sets a limitation for the effective implementation of the language policy. In other words, although the language policy provides for the use of children’s mother tongue in school there is no guarantee that this will be accomplished.

Furthermore, agentless use of verbs, such as “conditions must be created”, also demonstrates the ideological bias embedded in the policy. The omission of the agent responsible for the actions to be carried out is often said to be one of the generic characteristics of most legal documents. There is an emphasis on actions and an omission of the people or institutions responsible to enforce the actions. The omission maybe strategically used to justify certain actions, inactions, and transfer the responsibility of those who are accountable to provide the resources to abstract entities. In addition, the use of the phrase “provided that resources permit” in the second clause of the article 10 of the language policy constitutes what Wodak and Fairclough (2010) refer to as a discursive strategy (typical fallacy). This strategy is used to transfer blame from the government to abstract entities, in this case lack of resources. A critical
look at the Constitution may illuminate the contradictions and conflicts about the situation and the status of African languages and the prospects for the implementation of the language policy discussed above.

**Language provision in the Angolan Constitution of 2010.** Article 19 of the Angolan Constitution of 2010, enshrines education, culture, and sports as rights. In addition, article 87, line 1 and 2 provide that (1) “citizens and communities shall have the right to the respect, appreciation and preservation of their cultural, linguistic heritage, and artistic identity” and that (2) “the state shall promote and encourage the conservation and appreciation of the historic, cultural, and artistic heritage of the Angolan people” (Constitution, 2010, p. 32). Fundamentally, the constitution is in concert with most international laws (e.g., Universal Declaration on Linguistic Rights) regarding a nation’s right to use and preserve national languages as a part of cultural heritage and cultural identity. The constitution is also in harmony with the African cultural charter discussed in chapter 3. The African cultural charter constitutes one of the most important documents produced under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), whose objectives are the promotion of African languages and culture in education and social life. Yet, a close look at article 19 shows contradictions and dilemmas with respect to the role and status of African languages vis-à-vis the hegemonic position of the Portuguese language. Article 19 of the new constitution reads as follows: “[Extract 2] The official language of the Republic of Angola is Portuguese . . . The state shall value and promote the study, teaching and use of other Angolan languages, in addition to the main international languages of communication” (Angolan Constitution, 2010).
Although the official status of the Portuguese language may seem unproblematic given the role of the Portuguese language as a Language of Wider Communication, problematic and revealing is the second clause of article 19 of the Constitution. The article contains two important aspects that are not only revealing, but also have important ramifications as far as the promotion of the language policy under analysis is concerned. Article 19 of the new Constitution recognizes how vitally education, culture, and sports are for the consolidation of the nation and indicates them as rights. Paradoxically, the language provision in the Constitution does not recognize the use of mother tongue as a right. In contrast, the constitution enshrines Portuguese as the only official language in Angola. Granting education rights without language based rights is problematic because there is no education without language. Although the Constitution upholds the study and teaching of African languages, it categorizes them as “other” languages. In treating the African languages as “the other languages”, the constitution clearly creates a situation whereby Portuguese is accorded high status, while African languages are simply treated as “other additional languages”. The language provision in the Constitution also demonstrates how the creation of a linguistic hierarchy involves not only the ranking of languages, but also their categorization so that some languages are associated with prestige, privilege, and economic power. Within the context of language education and instruction the hierarchization of languages results in legitimation of certain ways of knowing and disciplinary knowledge. Moreover, this imposition of the linguistic hierarchy can also be seen as integrally tied to socio-economic boundaries, which may reinforce the political and socio-economic power of those who have good command of the dominant language.
In addition, there are stark inconsistencies between the language of the new constitution and the new language education policy. The rhetorical language of the constitution can be viewed as a declaration of intentions or what is desirable, but not what is de facto to be promoted. What is apparent from both the constitution and the language policy is an instance of conflict of interests. The language policy tries hesitantly to promote African languages, while the constitution clearly enshrines the hegemonic position of Portuguese. From the above language policy statements and constitution clauses it is clear that the creation of language education policy involves struggles, conflicts of interest, and power dynamics that are complex and dynamic. As will be apparent, ideological conflicts and contradictions at the center of the language politics in Angola are captured by the position of the participants interviewed in this study, to which I shall turn now.

**Language policy and media discourses.** From the interview transcripts the most salient categories within the participants’ discourses were: (1) language learning, (2) language, culture, and identity, (3) language and solidarity, (4) language and nationalism, (5) the politics of English and globalization, (6) language attitudes and ideologies of differentiation, assimilation, and social exclusion (7) language and conflict, (8) language, citizenship, and social development, (9) deliberative and participatory democracy, and (10) the orthographic accord and Lusophony. The data presented here constitute a corpus of media discourse extracts and participants’ verbatim extracts that were selected based on their richness and the relevance of the participants’ perspectives to the present study.

**Language policy and language learning.** In order to elicit participants knowledge of and opinions, and attitudes toward language education policy, I asked this male policy maker
what kind of policy would he personally propose for Angola if he were requested to provide an option. He explained that:

[Extract 3] This is a very interesting question. In my humble opinion the first thing is to make sure everybody is on board. Everybody must be involved. We are talking about national languages here. To outline an appropriate language policy in Angola requires efforts from everybody. These efforts will lead to decisions and contributions from other people. When we can collect data, then we can have a policy that can help.

The above extract reflects two important issues related to language and literacy policies. First, the participant underscores the need to involve communities. Second, he also acknowledges the need for research as a basis for outlining an appropriate policy. However, a close look at the participant’s response also reveals vagueness and avoidance. Avoidance is a discursive strategy used by language policy-makers and authorities in order to avert pertinent and controversial policy issues. The participant avoids answering the question by resorting to previously discussed issues. Although the question was to provide a hypothetical model of language policy for Angola, the participant insisted that “as I said in the first question, Portuguese is the language that is spoken in Angola and people who want to succeed should master it”

The above excerpt also shows that although the participant has some knowledge that could assist him to provide a plausible response to the question, he does not. It is surprising that when I asked him, whether there were any advantages in being bilingual or multilingual. He cheerfully answered:
[Extract 4] There are of course many advantages because whenever you travel you can communicate with friends, business partners. You can even shift from one language to another. There are actually many advantages. For example, I went to one of the provinces with my staff, our people wanted to talk with the local chiefs. However, the local people could speak only their local language. The staff needed a translator and I told them that I could speak the language. I served as a translator. Everybody in my staff was amazed and surprised.

Then I narrowed my question and asked whether a bilingual or multilingual education policy would be a good alternative for Angola. Surprisingly, he responded that:

Uh Uh it is not easy. It is a good idea, but you know let us recall. We have lack of resources and books in these subjects. If we have a bilingual education policy we will need two books; one in Portuguese and another in African languages. You see it takes time. It is better to start with what we have now and later they will have more scientific knowledge of what has being taught through Portuguese. ¹

Across the three excerpts we see contradictory and conflicting ideas that reflect the ideological tensions about the use of African language and the maintenance of Portuguese as the sole medium of instruction in schools. On the one hand, the policy-maker recognized the pragmatic benefits of bilingualism and demonstrated self-awareness by highlighting his own bilingual experience with his staff while visiting one of the provinces in Angola. On the other

---

¹ Extract numbers are organized based on the topic and the question being answered by the different participants
hand, although he recognizes that bilingual education may be a good idea, he is skeptical about the feasibility of its implementation given the lack of resources.

From the above, it can be gleaned that the discourse of resources from the official language policy is recontextualized in the context of bilingual education in order to legitimize the assimilationist language policy. Although the policy-maker did not explicitly state his preference for Portuguese, his appropriation of the official language policy discourse illuminates how top down language policy discourses enter into dialogue with circulating discourses to frame issues pertaining to language education and language use. In the follow up question in extract 4, the policy- maker explicitly noted that “it is better to start with what we have now and later they will have more scientific knowledge of what is being taught through Portuguese” The above observations may suggest that the legislator believes that African scholars do not have the knowledge to teach these languages. As will be apparent, this argument is very recurrent in political discourse and academic discourse in Africa and even in Angola.

I asked a linguist about what kind of policy he would propose if he was involved in language policy efforts. He responded that:

[Extract 5] This is a very provocative question. We could have a language referendum to ask all the stakeholders to voice their opinions. However, I would suggest that the use of African languages as medium of instruction start from the primary school level up to the secondary school level. This should be a policy that can promote the teaching of African languages, not teaching three hours a week. Employ people based on their knowledge and background of African languages. If we use African languages in employment, similar to Portuguese and English that should help.
The above extract can be understood from two perspectives. On the one hand, the participant highlights the need for deliberative and participatory democracy; on the other hand, he contextualizes and problematizes the current language policy. Perhaps the participant is using his disciplinary training to analyze the language policy. Although it is not clear whether the participant understood the implications of extending mother tongue education up to secondary school, what is obvious is that he understood that without appropriate status and acquisition planning, the current policy will remain a wishful thinking and that Portuguese will continue to be de facto and the sole language of instruction in Angola. Interestingly, when I asked the participant why he considered my question as provocative, he answered that “this question has political ramifications that I would not talk about here.” The participant’s perception of my question suggests that language is not only about communication, but it also is a political issue, that is, it involves the interlocking and dynamic relationships of power and knowledge.

Participants’ perspectives on language learning. The extracts presented below aim at illuminating these tensions and contradictions. I asked a teacher to tell me his views about the current language education policy. The teacher explained:

[Extract 6] I think that the policy is good, but three years is not enough time. I had this experience at the school of languages; 45 minutes have never been enough for a language class. African languages should be taught from the primary school up to the university level because people in the streets speak Portuguese all the time. To learn a national language as a foreign language, it is not going to help anyway.

Then I asked him, whether it is possible to learn two or three languages simultaneously, He responded:
[Extract 7] Yeah, for me people should be free to select the languages they want. A child can learn two or three languages. African languages should not be taught as subjects; rather they should be used to teach subject contents. On the other side, there are few people who teach these languages. We need to train people. You know when I went to South Africa, I had a classmate who could speak all languages in my class. South Africans call themselves a bold nation because they have multilingualism.

The extract highlights that the participant has an understanding of language learning based on personal transnational experience. Transnational experience is reflected in the participant’s capacity to translate a transnational language learning experience to inform a local discourse on language learning. The participant also appropriates academic discourse, specifically bilingual education research. As such, both excerpts demonstrate how language policy discourse and processes are to a varying degree shaped by global and local discourses. These policy discourses are also influenced by nationalist ideology. The fact that the participant acknowledges that ‘the South African call themselves the bold nation because they have multilingualism’ illuminates how language is implicated in the politics and ideology of nation-building. These texts also reveal that the language debate in Angola involves different views and opinions. Some participants advocate for greater use of African languages through late exit transitional bilingual programs and while others tend to promote colonial language ideologies and assimilation policies. In order to gauge participants’ attitudes toward the language of instruction and language use I asked parents their views about the use of African languages as medium of instruction in schools. This parent explained that:
[Extract 8] Three years will not help because children will not have the chance to speak the languages at home. I think that African languages should be used throughout primary school in order to give the children good background.

When I asked what prevents children from speaking African languages at home, he responded as follows:

[Extract 9] The problem is that we live in urban areas surrounded by people who think that Portuguese is the language of the civilized and educated. If you speak a language other than Portuguese people will regard you as backward. So, to avoid difficulties children speak only Portuguese. However, this has caused various troubles in the family. My mother lives with me and does not speak Portuguese at all. My children can’t speak my mother tongue because they have assimilated into Portuguese. It is the breaking of the family so to speak.

Then I asked a school administrator the same question. He answered that:

[Extract 10] I think that it is good that children will start learning in their mother tongue. I have been to Israel and there I found that children learn through mother tongue. They have a bilingual education system there. In our case, the country is vast and we have great cultural differences between regions. What people have in the South does not exist in the North. So, I think we should have regional bilingual schools. The program must be standardized for the whole country.

The texts above reflect the two points of view on the language policy debate. The parents argue that African languages should be taught beyond primary school. The administrator suggests that the complexity of the Angolan cultural landscape and underscores the need for
regional bilingual education arrangements. One remarkable aspect of these policy discourses is the fact that they recognize the relevance of the sociocultural context in language learning. To capture this aspect, the school administrator highlights the cultural differences between regions in Angola. Again, here the administrator resorts to transnational experience by specifically illustrating the bilingual education program in Israel. It is striking that consciously or unconsciously the administrator also upholds the nationalist ideology of national standards, which points to the necessity of one standardized language and curriculum. Here the tension between the local and the global language discourses is clearly manifest in the contradictions in the participant’s perspectives on the model of language education policy.

The parent’s views and perspective reflect two important aspects that influence language use and the choice of language of instruction in Angola. Most remarkable in the parent’s comments are the discourses of civility and the ideology of Portuguese as the language of civilized. A look at extract 9 reveals that because African languages have become associated with low prestige, people prefer to distance themselves from these languages and adopt the dominant language. From the excerpt, it is also clear that parents are forced to make choices in order to protect their children. The above texts may well suggest the interruption of intergenerational transmission of language, which may be an indication of assimilation and language shift. Although it is difficult to claim the continuation of colonial language policies in post-colonial Angola, the participants’ perceptions and views reveal that people have entrenched colonial language attitudes toward African indigenous languages and its speakers. In short, these policy discourses also highlight that the authority and privilege of a language are sustained by
ideologies, beliefs, and values that enter in dialogical relationship with the circulating discourses to perpetuate language education policy discourses.

To capture the different views, opinions, and perspectives of the language of instruction debate, below are presented two excerpts from the media.

[Extract 11] a ideia não passa por ministrar os conteúdos em linguas nacionais, mas inserir disciplinas com diferentes línguas do primeiro ciclo até a universidade. [The main idea is not to use African languages to teach subject contents, but to introduce them as subjects from the first cycle up to university]. (my translation). (Silva, 2011).

The above excerpt was extracted from a speech delivered by an Angolan linguist during a public event. The statement reinforces the stereotype and misconception that African languages cannot be used for teaching school subjects, say, mathematics or biology. These misconceptions reinforce the clichés and negative attitudes towards African languages and reflects a language as a problem or language as deficit orientation.

Another illuminating observation about attitudes towards African languages and their use in education comes from Angelo Feijo (2010, p. 1), an Angolan sociologist and politician. During a public address Angelo Feijo made the following comments:

[Extract 12] First of all, we have many doubts about the official teaching of regional languages (African languages). One of the doubts is: what will be the technical and scientific significance of learning regional languages? At the outset, we believe that in primary school, which is the most important stage, knowledge of Portuguese grammar must be consolidated as a basis for learning any other language and other scientific content matters. For us the vocabulary of regional languages seems too poor, and does
not match the communicative needs required for science and technology. When addressing the language question we should not lose sight of the fact that throughout the history of humanity, it has been proven that languages develop [.....] (My translation).

Although Feijo makes a very interesting proposal and asks thought provoking questions, particularly whether three years is sufficient time for the learners to acquire acceptable command of African languages, his questioning of the relevance of teaching African languages in schools asserts a modernist fallacy that social development and scientific knowledge can only be acquired through Portuguese qua Indo-European languages. Surprisingly enough, Feijo’s questioning is contradicting and conflicting to his own thesis. According to Foucault, contradictions are nothing but a reflection of illusion of unity that hides itself. He goes on to say that contradictions in discourse reveal only those ideas that can be seen, while reinforcing what it conceals. From the above, it can be gleaned that Feijo sustains his argument using the modernist discourse that connects language to social and technological development, while concealing his ideological bias grounded in the colonial linguistic ideologies.

Moreover, Feijo’s use of deictic pronouns is revealing. He constantly uses the pronouns ‘we’ and ‘us.’ The author’s use of ‘we’ is ambivalent. On the one hand, the author seems to be claiming solidarity to the nation, but on the other hand, he seems to claim allegiance with “we”—those of us who have good command of Portuguese. The use of deictic pronoun ‘we’ and ‘us’ serves to conceal and obfuscate the voice and actions of who is performing policy actions. Of course, by using ‘we’ and ‘us,’ one might have the impression that Feijo is acting as an authorized voice speaking on behalf of a particular group, when in reality Feijo is expressing his beliefs and language ideologies, and views of language entrenched in colonial topos. As the
discussion of colonial language policies in the foregoing demonstrate, Feijo’s use of ‘we’ serves to construct an imagined community of speakers with whom he purports to share a particular homogenous nationalist consciousness and linguistic repertoire. In doing so, he forecloses the possibility for envisioning heteroglossic linguistic repertoire and multilingualism.

Contrary to these attitudes and ideologies, there is plenty of evidence that even the less ‘developed’ languages can serve for acquiring scientific and technological knowledge (Hornberger, 2006). This view is based on the misconceptions about the nature of languages. From a linguistics point of view, it is abundantly clear that all languages are dynamic and creative; that is, they have the capacity to develop and adapt to new socio-cultural and communication contexts. The idea that African languages lack science vocabulary highlights the author’s bias, which is grounded in the colonial linguistic ideology and colonial discourses. Languages such as English have gone through many stages of development and have reached the current level of development through linguistic processes such as borrowing mainly from other major world languages.

Moreover, Feijo engages in what Wodak and Fairclough (2010) refer to, as the typical fallacy of sweeping generalization. While making a blatant generalization about the language situation in Angola, Feijo’s opposes the language education policy that is being piloted in schools by ignoring the government’s findings and statistics about the causes of many school failures across the country.

In order to elicit language learning perspectives, I asked two participants, a teacher and a policy-maker, whether it is possible to learn two or three languages simultaneously. The teacher responded:
Huh huh, it is possible. Children have the ability to learn languages. But when this happens the children will be no good at any of the languages. Children should learn only one or two languages. I mean that is scientific.

I asked this same question to one of the policy-makers and she responded that:

Right, children have the skills and ability to acquire languages. But it does not mean they can learn simultaneously. In my view, they must learn one language at a time. Otherwise, children can be forced and this will cause miscommunication.

When I insisted what she meant by miscommunication, she responded: “A child will be confused”.

In the above excerpts the participants make problematic assumptions about the effects of bilingualism and third language learning. These participants’ views about language learning are the result of outdated research and the monolingual bias. Monolingualist ideologies assume that the use of one language is the norm and that additional languages can cause confusion in children’s brain and cognitive development. The policy-maker’s idea that by learning three languages a child would have no fluency in any of the languages derives from bilingual education research discourse referred as semilingualism (Clegg & Afitska, 2011; Grosjean, 2008, 2011).

The choice of language of instruction has several consequences. Language provides access to resources that are crucial to individual and social development. Despite the examples cited above and participants’ misconceptions about language learning, they clearly demonstrate how circulating discourses have the potential to influence language educators. It is also clear why most African countries continue to grapple with the implementation of mother tongue
bilingual education, despite the evidence that bilingual experience leads to higher proficiency
and stronger cognitive development (Adesope, Lavin, Thopmson & Ungerleid, 2010).

**The Politics of English as a Global Language.** It is a truism that the English language
has gained a prominent role globally, both as the language of international communication and
the language of science and technology. However, the challenges posed by the spread of English
in non-English speaking African countries have not been dealt with systematically. Although the
present study was not specifically concerned with the role of English, the data that emerged from
the current study warrants the consideration of the role of English in language education policy
in Angola. In an attempt to elicit participants’ views and language learning experiences, I asked a
student what policy he would propose if he had been involved in language policy efforts. The
participant responded:

[Extract 15] You know I like English very much, but I don’t have the opportunity to
learn it well because we live in a country that does not speak English. It is when I visited
Japan I realized that English is very important for communication today.

Then I asked, what policy would you propose for Angola? The participant explained that:

The use of our languages at least until secondary school is the ideal. But who will teach
these languages. We don’t know where the teachers are. There is more publicity. At the
faculty of arts they are teaching African languages, but it is not enough.

I asked the same question to a teacher. The response was:

[Extract 16] Okay. I know it is hard. The program would be top-down. But first there is a
need to train teachers in our languages. They must train bilingual teachers in each of the
provinces. But there is a lack of political will. And English is also important.
When, I asked why *English* is important? The participant continued:

When you travel overseas you need English.

Nowadays to get a good job they require English.

The hegemonic role and status of English and its impact on language education policies in English speaking Africa cannot be denied. Yet it came to me as a surprise that the discourse of English as global language has gained such a prominence in a Portuguese speaking country such as Angola. A look across the above excerpts demonstrates a duality of global and local discourses that reflects the ideological tensions between the promotion of African languages and the role of English in Angola. These tensions are manifest at the discursive level. At one level, the participants underscore the relevance of the communicative ability of English as a language of international communication and globalization. Whereas at another level, the participants use of expressions such as “our languages” highlights the nationalist ideology. The use of “our” indexes the participants’ alliance and solidarity to an imagined ethno-linguistic community. In this sense, the participant is constructing his identity based on the sense of solidarity and belonging to a particular homogenous group. Moreover, the participants’ ambivalent position about the role of African languages and English can be seen as a counterhegemonic discourse against the Portuguese only dominant ideology.

Furthermore, the discourses also reveal how the politics of English as a global language, is inextricably connected to the global neoliberal discourse of English as the language of development. The discourse of English as the language of international communication and business obfuscates the link between English for business and Business for English. From the above it is clear that it is relevant to appreciate the pragmatic role of English in Angola.
However, it is also abundantly clear that the growing status and role of English in Angola is a process that poses many challenges to the promotion of mother tongue bilingual education. Therefore, English needs to be factored in ideological debate on language education policy in Angola.

**Language, culture, and identity.** The analysis of the extracts presented here is a synthesis of the participants’ views on language, culture, and identity. I asked the participants their views about how the command of Portuguese has helped them. One of the parents responded:

[Extract 17] If you don’t speak Portuguese you are treated as uneducated. But Portuguese is not our language. We have our culture and language. We are forced to speak Portuguese. For me Portuguese should not hamper people’s lives because many Angolans do not speak Portuguese well.

When I asked the same question to a policy-maker she responded:

[Extract 18] Well, as I have already told you Portuguese is the only language spoken in Angola before and after independence. So, people must do their best to speak and write it well. Portuguese is important in my job and English with our business partners. Of course, Portuguese has positively influenced my life in terms of social mobility.

Then I asked about those who cannot speak Portuguese at all or cannot speak it well. She replied:

You know the country is dynamic. Those who have not learned to assimilate, they have to. Otherwise, they don’t stand a chance in terms of social mobility.

I asked the same question to a student. He replied that:
We all know that Portuguese plays a great role in Angola. Language is not only a way of speaking, but it is also a way of being. I did not know there were other languages. I always thought that Portuguese was the superior language. Frankly speaking, I was born in Angola, but speak only Portuguese because of where I live. Because of that, I feel like Portuguese and act like Portuguese.\(^2\)

Across the extracts, we see three differing points of view regarding the discourse on language, culture, and identity. On the one hand, one discourse reflects some sort of linguistic relativism; on the other, there is a complex and contradictory intersection between the discourse of development and the assimilativist ideology. The third point of view captures the complexity of the relationship between language and identity. The extract 18 (p. 168), reflects an instance of linguistic relativism normally referred to as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. The participant used essentialist views of language to challenge the hegemony of Portuguese. In fact, the participant reiterates that in a country where there is only anecdotal evidence that all Angolans speak Portuguese, Portuguese should not be a guiding factor in making a living. The above discourse on language and identity illustrates how social boundaries are dynamic and unstable. In other words, the student’s interpretation of the relationship between language and identity illuminates how the complex and dynamic negotiation of speakers’ identity may lead to allegiances or ambivalent views with respect to the status of the dominant or marginalized languages.

In addition, the excerpts also highlight an instance of erasure of individuals who speak African language. For example, the participant in extract16 (p. 175), observed that “I did not

\(^2\) Extract numbers are organized based on the topic and the question being answered by the different participants
know there were other languages. I always thought that Portuguese is the superior language.”

This statement encapsulates a linguistic process called erasure. Erasure is the process in which persons who speak certain languages are rendered invisible. From the statement, we see that regardless of their background, the view that Portuguese is the most important language in Angola has become common sense.

**The Luso-Brazilian orthographic accord.** As far as the role of the orthographic accord, different views emerged in the data. Some participants believe that if Angola ratifies the so-called Luso-Brazilian agreement (Zúquete, 2008), African languages will be in trouble, while others showed hope that the agreement would boost the promotion and revitalization of African languages. One of the parents noted that:

[Extract 19] The Orthographic accord is welcome, but there are contradictions. Although we speak Portuguese, our reality is different. I don’t know if these factors were taken into account.

When I asked a linguist about his views on the agreement, he responded:

[Extract 20] If the orthographic accord is approved, African languages are in trouble.

While another linguist noted that:

[Extract 21] My own point of view is that languages are dynamic. They develop. I don’t see the point of having the orthographic accord. You know there are many Englishes. Why should there be a unique Portuguese. It is just a political question not a linguistic one. This accord will not have an impact on Angola Portuguese.

Then I asked what Angolan Portuguese meant. He continued:
You know people here don’t speak the standard Portuguese. I know that the variety of the Portuguese spoken in Angola is also being spoken in Portugal by the Portuguese themselves.

The above extracts reveal three perspectives that are to some extent in contradiction with one another. The linguist provides a complex understanding of the role of the orthographic accord. Remarkable in the student’s view is that he underscores the socio-cultural aspect of language. In fact, he underscores that language use does not arise in a vacuum. Rather, language evolves in socio-cultural, economic, and political contexts. Extract 20 provides a post-structural argument, particularly by using an academic discourse to legitimate his views. Interestingly, the perspectives in the extract 21 enact an understanding of language that not only recognizes the multi-accentuated character of discourse, but also aligns with the more recent discourses on language and identity that decenter the authority of standard language.

In respect to the role of media, most participants agreed that the media play an important role in promoting the functional domains of language use. The extracts below demonstrate how media discourses attempt to reinforce the ideology of Portuguese (Stroud, 1999) and the nationalist discourse. These particular extracts were taken from the only official local newspaper, Jornal de Angola, figuring in the language policy debate between 2009 and 2012. The figuring discourses from both extracts are part of the media debate on the status of African languages in Angola.

[Extract 22] Despite the fact that the majority of Angolans do not have a good command of Portuguese, Portuguese is the only language spoken from Cabinda to Cunene (Zau, 2009).
The Portuguese language is also our language.

The speakers of a particular language are the ones who own the language.

Across these discourses, two important ideologies emerge. First, the author deploys a nationalist ideology in order to legitimate the dominance of Portuguese. Second, he articulates an argument to sustain the appropriation of Portuguese by the Angolan people. Interestingly, the newspaper article’s author recruits disciplinary knowledge to claim authority as an expert. The use of expert discourses reminds us that in any society, the production of discourse obeys rules of selection, organization, and distribution that enact disciplinary knowledge to constitute a system of control in the production of discourse.

At a glance, it seems that these discourses are in complementarity. A close look, however, reveals that epistemologically and ontologically these discourses are in contradiction and conflict with each other. This conflict is reflected in the fact that in extract 22 (p. 141), the author deploys a nationalist ideology projecting homogenous and monolingual linguistic and discursive field through the use of the expression “the only language used from Cabinda to Cunene”. By contrast, in extract 23 (p. 141), the author recruits a post-structuralist point of view that recognizes the creativity of language through the process of appropriation. Contradictions and conflicts in discourse are the result not only of struggles of interests, but also of opposing economic and political views. Thus, by discursively reclaiming the authority of an expert position, the author attempts to legitimate his knowledge about the sociolinguistic situation in Angola as the truth knowledge. In concert with the policy discourse in extract 14 (p. 135), the above excerpts illuminate how power is articulated in the media discourse through institutional biases and ideologies in order to perpetuate language policy discourses.
**Language and conflict.** The relationship between language and conflict has been the one of the most controversial issues in language policy debates in Africa. In order to capture participants’ views on this issue, I asked teachers and policy makers whether languages can be divisive. One of the linguists responded that:

A policy-maker responded that:

[Extract 24] Coming back to the issue of school, language wouldn’t divide the people.

But each region has its language. It should be used in school. But again the problem is about people who are trained to produce materials. When I insisted that why then people think that if used in schools African languages would divide the country. She continued that: well we have to think deeper. We know that our country has many tribes.

With respect to the connection between language and conflict, a teacher educator explained:

[Extract 25] When you are unable to implement something you find an excuse. There are countries with over 400 languages, yet they use their languages in school and they don’t divide the people. In my point of view the dividing language is Portuguese. When your pronunciation is not good you are called names. These people can’t find a sounding reason. How can you anticipate that African languages will divide if you have not implemented the policy yet?³

The above extracts, capture the intricacies involved in language issues especially in multilingual contexts. In extract 24 the official language policy discourse is contextualized. The policy maker says that “But again the problem is about people who are trained to produce

3. Extract numbers are organized based on the topic and the question being answered by the different participants
materials”. In this statement the policy maker paraphrases article 17 of the Angolan language policy in order lack of resources as the main impediment to the implementation of an inclusive language policy in Angola. By contrast, in extract 25 the linguists underscores the hegemonic position of Portuguese. The statement “In my point of view the dividing language is Portuguese” suggests that language is politically and ideologically a site of contestation and struggle among various social groups. In the statement “When your pronunciation is not good you are called names” the teacher educator suggests that linguistic features such as accent are often used to demarcate social boundaries and reinforce stereotypes against those who ‘deviate’ from standards linguistic norms.

**Intertextual and interdiscursive analysis.** As mentioned throughout this paper, the main goal of the intertextual and interdiscursive analysis was to analyze the connections between the various layers of policy texts and discourses. From the extracts, it can be seen that one of the policy-makers faithfully reproduces the official discourse from both the legal statuses (language policy) and the official discourse produced by a government official in one of the most read newspapers in the country.

Although in extracts 3 and 4 (pp. 125-126), the policy-maker’s perspective about the goal of the current language policy represents a reproduction of the official and media discourse, there is no set pattern of intertextuality between the texts. What is remarkable, however, is that in extract 5 (p. 156), the policy-maker demonstrates how participants can take control over discourse content by providing their own ways of interpreting the questions asked by the interviewer. This is an important aspect of policy interviewing because it demonstrates that participants are not just respondents, but also agents and knowledge producers in their own right.
Although the policy-maker’s behavior can be characterized as a discursive strategy used to avoid responding to the question about the amount of time necessary for the study of African languages, he provided useful insights regarding the relevance of home and family in language and literacy education.

Interestingly, one of the linguists highlighted an issue that reflects the power of language in the process of subjectification and construction of identity. What is interesting in the accounts of both the teacher and the linguist, though is the fact that their discourses involve a mixing of discourse genre. The verbatim contain both conversational and academic discourse. More importantly, the texts reveal a process of recontextualization in which an academic genre has been appropriated by the policy genre. Both genres are changed and transformed, resulting in mixed and hybrid texts and discourses.

It should be noted that the data reveal how disciplinary knowledge plays a discursive role in the construction of what counts as language, what languages are deemed important for education. What is interesting in both accounts, however, is the fact that they reveal the articulation of language ideology and the power of discourse to construct particular imaginaries of social identity. Interestingly enough, the data highlight instances in which languages have been used not only as a technology of domination, but also a mechanism of management and regulation of conduct. Categorization and construction of social groups are maintained through hierrarchization of language. It is through such linguistic categorization that sociocultural and economic inequalities have been enacted in postcolonial Angola. Discourse does not only help construct identity. The creation of any language policy depends on these enacted and circulating discourses.
As can be gleaned, intertextual links were also manifest across the various texts under consideration in this study. The intertextual links between the language provision of the Constitution text and the media discourses were very apparent. For example, the Constitution considers Portuguese as the only official language. A look at the Constitution (Article 19) “the official language of Angola is Portuguese” reveals that the language provision text in the Constitution is thematically connected to the perceptions of the media discourse about the privilege and the hegemony of Portuguese in Angola. The official languages are usually the languages that are vested with high status, privilege and are used in the high societal domains (administration, education, business, etc.). The extract quoted above is in concert with Zau’s (2009), perceptions of Portuguese in Angola. In an article published in Angola’s official newspaper, Jornal de Angola, Zau (2009) acknowledges that Portuguese is not mastered by the majority of Angolans, yet he notes that “Portuguese is the only language spoken from Cabinda to Cunene” Again, although the two extracts differ structurally (language form) and at the semantic level, these texts are connected in the sense that they both attempt to frame a monolithic sociolinguistic reality and legitimate the hegemony of Portuguese in a multilingual ecology in which diverse languages are used in the different domains of social life.

Another salient intertextual link between the texts under consideration is manifest between the text in the constitution cited above and policy-makers’ perceptions about language use in Angola. One of the policy-makers felt that, those who want to succeed in Angola ought to learn to assimilate the Portuguese language and culture. Again, it can be inferred that the legislator’s discourse about language use is to some extent intertextually associated with the official discourse and the language provision of the constitution. Although at the pragmatic level
the outcome may be unpredictable, theoretically speaking both the text of the constitution and the legislator’s views envision the assimilation of Portuguese by the speakers of African indigenous languages.

Salient from the data is also the intertextual connection between the participants’ views and the language education discourse about the feasibility of mother tongue instruction. As discussed earlier, within the provision of the official language education policy, mother tongue instruction is contingent upon the availability of resources (Article 17). Surprisingly enough, some of the participants, specifically linguists and policy-makers felt that the implementation of mother tongue education depends on the availability of resources. One of the linguists, for example, noted that “we will need much resources to teach African languages” Again, while the rhetorical language in Article 17 (Extract 1) (p. 121) is not explicitly the same, both texts to some extent, suggest that resources constitute the stumbling block for mother tongue instruction in Angola. In short, the official discourse on mother tongue education intertextually links to the participants’ views about the allocation of resources for mother tongue education in Angola.

In conclusion, from the above intertextual and interdiscursive analysis, it can be gleaned how circulating discourses can potentially influence language policy recreation and its underlying cultural and discursive practices. In order to lend authority and legitimacy to their views of language and identity, participants’ accounts rely not only on official language policy discourses, but also on disciplinary knowledge and expertise. In embedding authoritative sources and common sense understandings of language in their discourses, participants produce new knowledge on how language can serve both participatory and exclusionary purposes. Having provided the textual analysis of linguistic features, media discourse, and the intertextual and
interdiscursive links, the next section discusses the findings and their implementation for
devising an inclusive and democratic language education policy in Angola.

Discussion of Findings

Language learning and cognitive development. The responses of the interviews with
parents, teachers, school administrators, and institutional participants (policy-makers)
demonstrate that these groups are not homogenous. Regarding language learning, the teachers’
opinions, views and beliefs differed significantly. Some participants felt that there is a critical
period for learning a second language. Some teachers noted that children have the ability to learn
two or three languages, while others opposed this view. In other words, some teachers believe
that learning two or three languages simultaneously will cause confusion in a child’s brain.
Another view from teachers is that in learning two or three languages simultaneously, children
will have no fluency in either of the languages (semilingualism). It can be seen that these views
represent misconceptions and myths about second and third language learning (Marinova-Todd,

A number of studies have refuted the misconception that earlier age is the only optimal
For example, in the effects of age on the acquisition of second language learning for school,
Collier (1988) noted that age is one of the major factors in the acquisition of second language.
The relevance of the first language influence on cognitive development, bilingualism, and third
language learning has been well documented (Cenoz, 2009; Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001;
De Angelis, 2007; Tokuhama-Spinoza, 2008).
Attitudes and beliefs about mother tongue bilingual education. Despite the contradicting views about language learning, the findings demonstrate that teachers, parents, and policy-makers alike, are well aware of the advantages of speaking two or three languages. Although the participants are aware of the benefits of bilingualism and multilingualism, it is surprising that the language ideological debate fluctuates between those who sustain monolingual ideologies and those who sustain the ideology of multilingualism. Considering the recent developments in language education policy and the view of teachers as policy actors (Johnson, 2013; Mencken & Garcia, 2010), the above findings have important implications in the implementation of the language education policy discussed in this study. These findings demonstrate that language education policies are often created in an environment with various perspectives that shape and influence their acceptance, negotiation, appropriation and even implementation.

Although the policy-makers participated in the study not as official representatives of their institutions, from the findings, it can be gleaned that their perspectives on language education policy are to some extent influenced by the authoritative institutional discourse. The idea that the policy is a milestone is shared by the policy-makers. This view obfuscates the assimilationist character and the consequences of this early exit transitional program in the efforts of revitalization and maintenance of African languages. Overall, the participants agreed that three years are not enough for learning and mastering a language. Kamwangamalu (2010) is adamant that language policies aimed at promoting African languages need a pragmatic and market oriented perspective that can increase the market value of these languages. The participants also felt that mother tongue-based bilingual education was important, but they
highlighted the exclusion of communities, and educators, the lack of materials and teachers as the main handicaps for successful implementation of the current policy.

Another argument that resurfaced in the debate about the language of instruction is the view that African languages are to be used as subjects only. The idea that African languages lack science vocabulary is reminiscent of the modernist discourse, which downplays the creative nature of language. Brock Utne (2012), a great advocate for the use of African languages in education, brings evidence from Asian education systems. In her study entitled *Language Policy and Science: Could Some African Countries Learn from Some Asian Countries* carried out in Sri Lanka, Malaysia, and Tanzania, Brock-Utne (2012) found that Malaysia and Sri Lanka have shifted from teaching mathematics, science, and technology in English in favor of teaching in local indigenous languages, namely Malay, Tamil and Sinhala, respectively. In Europe as Professor Brock-Utne (2012) noted, countries such as Finland and Norway, “which do not teach their children through the medium of an international language” (p. 489) are not isolated and have not lost pace with technological and scientific development as nationalist and modernist dominant discourse would make us believe.

These fallacious views coupled with the entrenched negative attitudes, prejudice, and stereotypes (Scollon & Scollon, 2001) towards African languages may have negative repercussions for convincing parents and other stakeholders about the importance of teaching African languages in schools. In respect to the impact of negative attitudes in language policy Lopes (1998), has noted that:

The educational authorities must succeed in explaining to parents, teachers and children the implications of teaching and learning through a certain medium of instruction (mother
tongue, language of wider communication, or both), and succeed in convincing them of the pedagogical and cultural advantages associated with promotion of mother-tongue education, and promotion of individual and societal bilingualism. (p.454)

Moreover, if learners and parents do not understand the “the psychological and pedagogical arguments advanced for hypothetical use” (Lopes, 1998, p. 454) of African languages as a medium of instruction, their preference will continue to be Portuguese because of its value as the language that affords them social mobility. Language attitudes towards African languages and language choice of medium of instruction in Sub-Saharan Africa have been well documented (Adegbija, 1994; Ansre, 1978; Bamgbose, 2005; Brock-Utne, 2001; Diarra, 2003; Fanfwa, 1990; Kamwangamalu, 1997, 2000, 2008, 2009, 2012; Prah, 2000; Mukhuba, 2003; Tibategeza, 2010).

**The role of media and disciplinary knowledge.** Another important finding is that the lack of information has reduced the trust between the language policy oriented institutions and the various stakeholders. This is reflected in the fact that parents believe that the policy is usually a mere rhetoric and that at the practical level, nothing will happen. This is happening, in part, because parents and other stakeholder are not aware that the policy is at its experimental stage and that the selected African languages are being taught in selected schools before the implementation of the policy nationwide. This has a bearing on the successful implementation of the policy nationwide.

The findings also demonstrate how participants recruit the discourses that circulate in the media for critical reflection about the language situation in Angola. What is also revealing is the impact of the interplay between entrenched language ideologies, beliefs, and attitudes on
language policy discourses, the construction of individual and collective identities. Interestingly
enough, although people continue to see African languages as the marker of individual and
collective identity, the finding also illuminates the complexity and dynamics of identity
construction in multilingual Angola.

**Inconsistencies in language policy.** Remarkable in the findings are the inconsistencies
and tensions between the language education policy and the language provision in the
constitution. These findings are consistent with previous language education policy studies in
post-colonial settings such as India and sub-Saharan Africa. Harmaan (1991) noted that
inconsistencies in language planning are a result not only of hegemonic struggles, but also of
conflicts of interests. Kaplan and Baldauf (2004) have investigated language policy in many
African countries, namely in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, and South Africa found that,
rather than being driven by linguistic problems, official language policy is driven by political and
ideological agendas rather than by linguistic and educational concerns.

The discourse of ‘lack of resources’ for the promotion of African languages is not a new
story within the context of language education and literacy policies in post-colonial nations and
in Africa. In *Language and Literacy Issues in Africa*, Bamgbose (2007a) noted that the language
status question is inextricably connected to the discourse of resource. Although there may be
many ideological reasons for advocating for African languages, education has been recognized
as one of the most promising avenues for improving the status of marginalized languages. In
addition, a number of scholars support the idea that the attribution of official status and the use of
a language as medium of instruction is one of the most powerful forms of intervention. Giving
the status of official language also shows the commitment and intentions of the policy-makers to
promote that language (Bamgbose, 2007a, 2011; Orman, 2008; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004).

Bamgbose (2007b) noted that the low status of African languages, owes not only to its low use in education, but also to poor funding of language instruction and linguistic exclusion.

The language status debate is at the center of language use and language education policy in Angola. The findings indicate that the allocation of status works both as a mechanism that empowers and (dis) empowers certain social groups and their languages. Although cognizant about the view that the implementation of institutional policy involves negotiations and compromise, the findings indicate that the overbearing status of Portuguese has led to what Anchimbe (2005) calls functional seclusion, a situation whereby Portuguese is at advantage because it is used in all domains of social life, including the official domain, while African languages are confined to marginal roles.

**Language and family solidarity.** The findings are mixed, regarding the view that the use and promotion of African languages through education system may cause conflicts. Most participants disagree that language can divide the country. However, one participant, a policy-maker, suggested that the presence of many tribes may cause conflicts. What is interesting is that language policy research indicates that such an argument is often deployed to perpetuate the nationalist ideology of one people and one language. There are many qualitative sociolinguistic studies and quantitative studies that have looked at the relationship between ethnicity and conflict in Africa. These studies challenged the argument that there is a correlation between allegiance to ethno-linguistic group and conflicts. Rather, conflicts are caused by the interplay of factors, some of which are unequal distribution and access to resources and power (Albaugh, 2014; Mansour, 1993; Hyden, 2006). The findings also suggest that language serves to negotiate
identity and authority. Thus, conflicts cannot be seen as essentially emanating from a linguistic point of view alone; rather there are economic issues that exacerbate internal conflicts (Tollefson, 2002).

The findings also demonstrate that parents are the guides and keepers of their children’s interests, and therefore have a great influence on family language policy—more often than not, children tend to value the language practices that have support in the home environment (Spolsky, 2009). Parents strategically ask their children to assimilate into the dominant language not only for pragmatic reasons—the pragmatic advantages of the communicative ability in Portuguese (social mobility and employment) and because Portuguese is the language of wider communication, but also to avoid social exclusion and marginalization. Although the attitudes and beliefs expressed by the participants may not necessarily correlate with their actual linguistic behavior, parental beliefs and attitudes about language use and how children acquire languages can have a great influence on children’s linguistic behavior (De Houwer, 1999). Remarkable in the findings are also the negative effects of the hegemony of Portuguese on family cohesion and solidarity. Parents highlighted how the imposition of Portuguese only ideology has fragmented and weakened family ties and solidarity. Striking is the fact that some children cannot communicate with their grandparents because in most cases, the latter do not speak Portuguese.

**The politics of English language.** It should not come as a surprise that the politics of English as a global language and the international language of communication has had a significant impact on language education and literacy policies in Sub-Saharan Africa (Bamgbose, 2011, Mazrui, 2004; Ricento, 2012). However, surprising is the way in which the politics of English has influenced language education policy discourses in a non-English speaking country.
The findings reveal that the politics of English has implications in the development of language education and literacy policy in Angola. Drawing upon their personal experiences the participants clearly showed awareness of the role of English in the context of globalization. In other words, participants view Portuguese, African languages and English in terms of complementarity — the participants recognize and sustain multilingualism and a linguistic diversity environment in which all languages must have the same consideration and respect.

The discourse of English as a global language in the debate of language education policy in Angola suggests that language policies are often influenced both by local and global discourses. The findings demonstrate how participants’ views of English are influenced not only by personal experiences, but also by the discourse of English as the language that affords people economic opportunities, albeit in an unequal way. With few exceptions (e.g., Kamwangamalu, 2010), most studies that chart the role and influence of English in language education policies in sub-Saharan Africa have dealt with the English and French speaking nations (Alidou, 2003; Brock-Utne, 2002, 2010b; Mazrui, 2004; Roy-Campbell, 2001) and scant attention has been given to language policies in Portuguese speaking Africa.

The dynamics and complex role of English in Angola constitutes an important finding because it contributes to our understanding of the global and local discursive practices and the effects of the discourse of English as a global language, language of international communication, and business on language education policy and language use in non-English speaking countries. The discourse that emerged reveal that particular languages (Portuguese, African indigenous languages, and English) are associated with distinct ideological discourses such as the discourses of English as a global language, Portuguese as a language of national
unity and African indigenous languages as the languages of national and cultural identity. In short, from the findings it can be gleaned that language form and discourses have ideological, political, and cultural meanings that serve the purposes of nation building (Madumulla, Bertoncini & Blomaert, 1999).

**The way forward.** The main goal of this chapter was to discuss the findings of the foregoing study. One of the objectives of the chapter was to gauge how language attitudes, ideologies, beliefs and values intersect the process of language policy production, circulation, and the complex way in which language policy discourses are recontextualized and appropriated by the various social actors and agents that intervene in the language policy arena (Choulairaki & Fairclough, 1999; McGroarty, 2013). The major sources of data used for the analysis were transcripts from interviews with the participants, excerpts from language policy documents, media discourse and academic discourse. The chapter provided insights that will significantly contribute to the interpretation and implementation of bilingual education policy proposed in chapter five of the foregoing. Despite the limited scope of this study, the insights of this study provide a new critical understanding of the politics of language in Angola. Therefore, chapter five proposes a model of language policy, theoretical, and pedagogical insights that would help devise an inclusive language education policy capable of promoting linguistic diversity and multilingualism in Angola. Having discussed the findings, taking advantage of the insights from the findings of this study and the theoretical insights from research on bilingual education development and language education policy literature, chapter five proposes a bilingual education policy framework for Angola and provides the concluding remarks for this study.
CHAPTER SIX
TOWARDS A BILINGUAL LANGUAGE AND LITERACY EDUCATION POLICY IN ANGOLA

The main concern of this chapter is to outline a proposal for a multilingual education policy that is sound and conducive to the promotion of both the Portuguese language and African languages as a medium of instruction in the Angolan school system. The policy that I propose here is mainly inspired by the global view of multilingualism as a resource that is necessary for social development, democratic nation-building, and the promotion of inclusive education in Africa. Moreover, the vast research on bilingual education globally and in Africa has confirmed the cognitive, psychological and pedagogical advantages of mother tongue-based bilingual education (e.g., Adesope et al, 2010; Baker, 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Bialystok, 1991, 2013; Chimbutane, 2013; Collier, 1992; Corson, 1995; Cummins, 1979; 2009, Heugh, 2013). This proposal is also grounded in the insights from the empirical findings of the present study.

As mentioned earlier, the language education policy that is in an experimental phase in Angola is grounded in the mother tongue transitional bilingual models (TBE) or what some consider weak bilingual models (Baker, 2011) that aim at transitioning students from the mother tongue medium of instruction to the language of wider communication (LWC) after three years. This model has been criticized on the grounds that it does not promote biliteracy and bilingual competence in both languages. Rather, its goal is to assimilate the students into the dominant language, a fact that has many negative learning consequences for children with a mother tongue that is different from Portuguese (Cummins, 1995; Francis, 2005b, Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995; Spener, 1988).
By contrast, additive bilingual programs or strong bilingual programs with appropriate pedagogical orientations are said to promote biliteracy, bilingualism, psychological and emotional benefits (Baker, 2008, 2011; Cummins, 1999a, 2000) and learning advantages such as enhanced cognitive control, increased attention on tasks, executive control, working memory development, and onset age advantages (Bialystok, 2001; Bialystok & Viswanathan, 2009; Emmorey, Luk, Pyers & Bialystok, 2008; Luk, De Sa & Bialystok, 2011; Morales, Calvo & Bialystok, 2013; Poulin-Dubois, Blaye & Bialystok, 2011; Smithson, Paradis & Nicoladis, 2014). The drawbacks and benefits of multilingualism and bilingualism have been extensively discussed in this paper and I will not further elaborate on them here. The following section outlines the proposed scenarios, framework, and the underlying assumptions for promoting multilingualism and bilingual education activities in Angola.

The discussion about a suitable bilingual education program in Africa has been one of the most contested issues among African sociolinguistics and educationists alike. The proposed frameworks constitute an attempt to open spaces for the promotion of democratic values, respect for universal human rights, and to consolidate pluralism, and linguistic diversity in Angola. This proposal is in harmony with recent developments in Africa, namely the Policy Guide for Introduction of African Languages and Cultures in the Education System, signed by the African Ministers of Education in Ouagadougou in 2010 (UNESCO, 2011) and the efforts of the Angolan government to valorize and maintain Angolan national languages in all areas of social life and education. I maintain that the education policy models proposed herein will help not only promote Angolan national languages and recover the intergenerational transmission processes
that are critical for the maintenance of any language (Fishman, 2001), but reduce school drop outs, failures and harmonious coexistence of different languages and ethno-linguistic groups.

Moreover, although lack of political will has been the most greatest impediment in promoting mother-based bilingual education in Africa (Bamgbose, 1991, 2011; Kamwangamalu, 1997, 2010), the situation in Angola is favorable in that, the government is cognizant of the need to promote linguistic diversity and mother tongue based education.

The use of African indigenous languages as a medium of instruction is viewed as the result of the global movement and national education reform in Africa. As a medium of instruction, African languages will be used from the Kindergarten until secondary school at least for six years in the initial phase. Contrary to the three years (early exit program) proposed in language education policy discussed in the foregoing, the long term goal of the models suggested here is to promote additive bilingualism. As proposed here, the additive approach aims at promoting both competence and literacy in Portuguese, African languages, and an international language (English) with optional languages such as French or Spanish from Kindergarten up to secondary school. This approach provides increased cognitive advantages and firm academic and cognitive development in the first language after eight years, even in schools with fewer resources (Heugh, 2006). Moreover, using a language familiar to students (Brock-Utne, 2007) beyond primary school as a medium of instruction provides a strong foundation for knowledge transfer (Cummins, 19979, 2000, 2008). Research evidence suggests that in most cases, children need at least 12 years to become competent and conversant in their first language (L1) (Ouane & Glanz, 2010).
Suggested Potential Bilingual Education Models

According to Ouane and Glanz (2010), in the African context language-in-education policy models have been extensively assessed in order to determine their effectiveness for second language (L2) learning, foreign language learning and other school subjects. The results of such assessment suggest at least three prominent models (See, Collier & Thomas, 2004; Heugh, 2006, 2011). These models are summarized as follows: (1) Mother tongue education throughout primary education and secondary school: in this framework or model students are taught using L1 (e.g., Kimbundu) as a medium of instruction and learn additional languages (Portuguese) from specialized teachers of Portuguese at least until grade 6. From grade 7 onward learners are taught using Portuguese as medium of instruction and African language continues as a subject throughout the curriculum. This model is a late exit transitional model which is practiced in South Africa (Ouane & Glanz, 2010) and is consistent with research evidence that the first predictor of long-term school success is cognitively complex on-grade-level academic instruction through students’ first language for as long as possible (at least through Grade 5 or 6) and cognitively complex on-grade-level academic instruction though second language for part of the school day (Thomas & Collier, 1997); (2) very late-exit transitional model: In this model learners are taught through mother tongue (L1) (e.g., Kikongo) for eight years and learn L2 (Portuguese) as a subject from a specialized teacher and transition to L2 (Portuguese) medium of instruction in the ninth year. The rationale for late transition is that early transition, that is, three years schooling in the L1 is abrupt and does not allow for the learners to attain the necessary threshold of L1 that can ease the transfer of complex knowledge from L1 to L2 (Cummins, 2000; Sevinç & Önikol, 2009). Very late-exit bilingual education programs are implemented in
some regions in Ethiopia (Heugh, 2009b); (3) additive bilingual education: Additive bilingual education programs aim at providing the learners with the literacy in both L1 and L2. In other words, the goal of this program is to promote bilingualism and biliteracy in Portuguese and African languages. Thus, in this model the learners are taught through MT medium of instruction up to grade 8. During this period Portuguese is taught as a subject by a specialized teacher. In grade 9 some subjects are taught in L1 and others in L2. The outcome of this program is biliterate and bilingual speakers who are proficient in both Portuguese and at least one African language. It is worthy to note that the percentages attributed to each language will considerably vary based on the established national curriculum, which will need adjustments in order to accommodate these models. However, it pivotal to underscore the need for longer periods of MT instruction. Research suggests that the longer the MT instruction the better the scores in the assessment of performance in the second language (Glanz, 2013; Ouane & Glanz, 2011). Best practices of MT bilingual education programs indicate that the percentage of instruction in MT ranges from 80 % to 90 % depending, again, on the national curricular arrangements and whether the goal is to educate biliterate and bilingual children or to assimilate them into the dominant language. However, bilingual and dual language research has shown that the bilingual programs with 90:10 and 50:50 curricular strategies are most likely to produce fully bilingual and biliterate students (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Lindholm-Leary & Molina, 2000). Curricular decisions are very contentious and complex. Therefore, the decision about the about of time allotted to each medium of instruction and subject should be carefully considered in order to design a program that is effective and conducive to learning. This consideration is
extremely important in order to maintain balance among literacy, numeracy, oral proficiency and science instruction.

**Language Education Policy Legal Framework**

In accordance with article 19 of the Angolan Constitution of 2010, Portuguese is the official language of Angola (1) and the state values and promotes the study, teaching, and use of other languages of Angola, including the languages of international communication. The education law (Lei N 13/01 of December 2001) article 9 line 2 states that: the state promotes and guarantees the human resources, scientific, technical, material conditions, and financial resources conducive to the expansion, use, and teaching of national languages (My Translation). Article 17, line 1 of the current language policy guarantees the use of a child’s mother tongue as a language of instruction. The above policy’s legal support is in harmony with the promotion of a bilingual education policy (2+1) formula proposed herein: (1) In bilingual education program to be adopted the Portuguese language is a mandatory subject throughout the school curriculum; in harmony with the ongoing higher education reform and the distribution of public higher education institutions, it is imperative to create a national bilingual education board under the supervision of the Ministry of Education (MOE) with corresponding regional boards. Regional bilingual education boards (RBEB) would function in collaboration with regional higher education institutions for the purposes of regional planning, advising, budgeting, and conducting research in order to secure an informed bilingual education implementation regionally and nationwide; (2) regional arrangements should be viewed in the context of the national language policy and legislation. Within this framework, it is suggested that a 2+1 formula be adopted. The 2+1 formula entails a language program in which mainly three languages are to be used, namely
Portuguese + African language + International language (English). The 2+1 formula is circumscribed in the efforts to facilitate the implementation of bilingual education throughout the country taking into account the bottom up approach to language policy. The bottom up approach is important because it will allow the involvement of the communities of speakers in all activities for consolidating the implementation of MT based bilingual education. The main goal of regional arrangements is to facilitate and mitigate the problems that would emerge in the decisions for making language choice. The geographical distribution of languages in Angola provides an advantage for educating bilingual learners regionally and nationally. Given the fact that the selection of the medium of instruction has always been a contentious issue, in multilingual polities, regional arrangements provide an opportunity to mitigate suspicions. The three language formula has been successfully implemented in countries such India (Meganathan, 2011) and explored in Ghana (Bodomo, 1996); (3) based on geo-linguistics insights (e.g., Chaudenson, 2004), we know that favorable geographical distribution of languages can be strategically exploited in order to bring about a language policy that responds to the needs of the people while maintaining national sovereignty and national unity within the spirit of diversity in unity. In this context, following the rationale for the regional universities initiated by the Angolan government, the Angolan national bilingual education board (ANBEB) would have six regional representations divided into each geo-linguistic region. In this context, for example, each specified region would have an African language as the medium of instruction for primary education until grade 6, Portuguese as medium of instruction from grade 7, a regional African language and English taught as a compulsory subject from grade 7 onward. Portuguese would still be the official language, but would coexist with the African languages as regional co-official
languages (Fardon & Furniss, 1994; Laitin, 1992). Local governments would have the oversight role for coordinating the activities of each RBEB; (4) in order to allow the development of contextualized sociolinguistic evidence, in phase one, model 1 presented in the section of potential bilingual models (p. 162) should serve as an experiment for a minimum period of at least 10 years in order to permit the accumulation of pedagogical insights and knowledge about African languages and allow for appropriate teacher training. In fact, research evidence shows that the duration of the program is an important factor for successful implementation of bilingual and dual language programs. Lindholm-Leary (2005) draws from the bulk of research in bilingual education (Cummins, 1981; Thomas & Collier, 1997) and notes that 6 years is the amount of time required for the learners to develop language proficiency and reach grade level achievement.

**Intervening Actors**

The theme of actors intervening in the language policy arena is recurrent in language policy research (Cooper, 1989; McGroarty, 2013; Mencken & Garcia, 2010; Kaplan, 2011; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005; Zhao, 2011). The question of who is involved in language planning and policy efforts is a key aspect in understanding the process that underlies the whole language planning enterprise. Kaplan and Baldauf (2005) have noted that for a successful implementation of any language education policy, some key elements need to be factored. Some of these elements are: access policy, curriculum policy, materials and resourcing policy, personnel policy, community policy, and teacher policy (Zhao, 2011). Therefore, successful implementation of language education policy will dramatically depend on the involvement and collaboration of the
various actors and agents intervening in the policy arena. Thus, next few sections concern the role that the various actors would play in language education policy interventions.

**Teacher Training**

Learning a new language is difficult and teaching is correspondingly a complex activity. The notions of teacher training are often used interchangeably in language education literature to refer to teachers’ preparation (Ur, 1996). For practical and philosophical reasons, in this paper I use the term teacher education to denote the activities inherent to the professional preparation of teachers. In addressing teacher education, two important issues that have practical and policy implications are worth sketching here. The nature of the teacher profession has been a subject of many heated debates within the field of education and language education specifically. Two important views emerge in the literature. One is the traditional understanding of the teacher as a technician and authoritative source of knowledge who dominates the classroom discursive field on the one hand, and the teacher as a facilitator on the other hand.

**Teacher as technician.** This perspective is grounded in the functionalist views of language and literacy that conceptualize language in terms of skills and techniques (Street, 1984, 2001). However, within the field of language education such an approach has been under attacked for downplaying the sociocultural aspects of language learning. Moreover, approach that view teacher as the only authority who provides legitimate knowledge in the classroom perpetuates power dynamics and prevents dialogue and critical reflection. Unfortunately, such views of the role of teacher continue prevalent in many language education programs. Although honing language skills remains an important aspect of the contemporary language classroom,
relevant to this discussion are the sociocultural and critical approaches to language, to which I shall turn now.

**Sociocultural approach.** This perspective is grounded in the sociocultural and cognitive understandings of language learning and literacy development (Goldenberg, Rueda & August, 2008). This paradigm encourages a child’s personal discovery and the use of a child’s background knowledge, and experience as a package that awakens the child’s cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1978). Evidence suggests that bilingual learners face L2 learning challenges because they increasingly create and envision the world through their mother tongue or L1. In this respect, a sociocultural perspective of teacher education for bilingual education is consistent with the view that teachers who neglect the use of students L1 hinder the cognitive development of the students and consequently affect the chances of their success in learning a L2 (Garcia, 2005). Preparation for bilingual teachers is a key component for the successful implementation of the proposed policy.

It is an understatement to say that teachers play an important role in promoting bilingual learning and biliteracy. Literature of teacher effectiveness and teacher preparation suggests that teacher quality is more important than any methodology and model of instruction (Westwood, 2008) in promoting multilingual literacies (Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000). To put this in a historical perspective, bilingual and multilingual literacies must be viewed and interpreted in the specific historical context of the development of language education and the philosophy of education. In this sense, bilingual education preparation programs necessitate a philosophical shift not only on the views of language, but also teaching and learning. Moreover, as Darling-Hammond (2010), notes “the demands on teachers are increasing. Teachers must be able to keep
order, provide useful information to students, and be increasingly effective in enabling a diverse
group of students to learn ever more complex material.”(p. 20). In other words, bilingual teachers
must possess the abilities, dispositions and skills to link best practices in the field of second
language education and bilingual pedagogy that promotes learning through content based
instruction (Cummins, 1999b). The two understandings of the role of teacher in the learning
process sketched above have great implications for formulating bilingual education teacher
education program.

Drawing from the discussions above, I suggest that language and teacher education
preparation institutions such as The Higher Institute of Sciences of Education (ISCED) and the
Normal Institute for Education (INE) Garcia Neto review the traditional philosophical views
about language learning and teaching. In other words, I suggest that pre-service teachers need a
preparation that would enable them to work in a bilingual mode and be knowledgeable about the
theoretical and epistemological insights that underpin the bilingual language learning and
multilingual literacies (Diaz, Whitacre, Esquierdo & Ruiz-escalante, 2013; Palmer & Martínez,
2013; Whitacre, Diaz & Esquierdo, 2013). Effective pre-service and in-service teacher education
requires support and capacity building of national and provincial department personnel. Given
the relevance of curriculum and pedagogical practices in bilingual education, the development of
pre-service and in-service education must hinge on nurturing and building appropriate
instructional plans to meet the needs of bilingual students and teachers (Pluddemann, 1999).

**Critical language awareness.** Teacher education programs need to prepare pre-service
and in-service teachers about the fact that language learning and literacy practices are always
embedded in dynamic power relationships that are not always apparent. Critical language
awareness approach underscores the view that texts or language are not monolithic, rather to varying degree they can be contradictory, that is, influences by both the centripetal and centrifugal forces that make texts heteroglossic (Fairclough, 1995). According to Fairclough much teacher training is oriented toward the inculcation and legitimation of particular discursive practices. Such discourses may serve to validate certain cultural values and meanings that have the potential of shaping social relations and identities. The notion of critical language awareness is connected to the view that texts are historical and politically situated. Therefore, teachers need to assist the learners develop the critical reflection skills and language critique capacities required for conducting a reflexive analysis of education processes in general and language learning in particular. Moreover, research suggests that learning a language is a matter of learning social languages with discourses (Gee, 2004). The notion of social languages is important because it expands from the traditional interpretation of language. Social languages encapsulate the view that language is social and that depending on the context, language acquires different interpretations. This understanding of language is useful for promoting biliteracy and multilingual literacies. In this respect, Martin-Jones and Jones (2000) note that, promoting multiliteracies entails acknowledging and accepting the diversity of readings and interpretations that evolve in different discursive practices.

Furthermore, collaborative aspects that strengthen the ability of teachers to become a community of learners are also critical for fostering a powerful bilingual education teacher preparation. Another important and challenging task to be accomplished within the teacher education reform and the mother tongue-based bilingual education (MTBE) is the alignment of teacher training with the selected languages of schooling (Plüddemann, Nomlomo & Jabe, 2010).
The need to provide bilingual and multilingual education to pre-service teachers has been emphasized in language education literature (Nieto, 1995; 2000, 2010).

Although the Angolan new language policy promotes linguistic diversity and mandates the teaching of learners’ mother tongue in the first three years of schooling, it does not mention the need for teacher education reform. Professional development for bilingual education teachers should promote policies and practices that can empower the learners and educational leaders as well as the communities (Opfer, Pedder & Lavicza, 2011). Lessons from international bilingual research in Europe, Latin America, and Africa have shown that teacher positive attitudes, beliefs and values about the learners’ mother tongue help support learners, learning, and literacy development (de Meija, 2005; De Palma, 2010; Garcia, 2009; Hornberger, 2005, 2006; Tellez & Varghese, 2013).

Accommodating and aligning learners’ mother tongue within the teacher education programs is important because evidence suggests that the ways in which teachers view the role of the mother tongue language is likely to affect their perceptions and pedagogical practices in classrooms. Moreover, the insights from cutting edge research on second language learning and bilingual education (e.g., Cummins, 2000, p. 3) confirms the usefulness of L1 as follows: (1) The level of development of children’s mother tongue is a strong predictor of their second language development. Children who come to school with a solid foundation in their mother tongue develop stronger literacy in the school language, (2) promoting mother tongue education does not only develop the mother tongue, but also develops children’s abilities in the language of wider communication, and (3) contrary to the misconceptions about bilingualism, more
instructional time spent using the students’ mother tongue does not cause any problems to students’ academic development in the language of wider communication.

Finally, as the findings of the foregoing demonstrate, successful mother tongue bilingual education will require a change of attitudes and perceptions of teachers in respect to the usefulness of mother tongue in L2 learning. Obviously, for effective teacher education reform to take place, resources and institutional support are necessary. This brings us to the second important argument of this section, which is the problem of cost effectiveness of MTBE.

In a publication entitled *Cost Implications of the Provision of Mother Tongue and Strong Bilingual Models of Education in Africa*, Heugh (2011), unravels the clichés and misconceptions that mother tongue education is very costly. Heugh’s (2011) analysis of the costs of teacher training shows that depending on the adopted language education model, the use of LWC has been the most costly language program. The early-exit or subtractive program has high costs and low value; whereas the late-exit model has medium costs and good value; strong or additive bilingual models have medium costs and high value; and the program with MT as medium of instruction (MoI) has low costs and high values as well. Research from Africa (e.g., Alexander, 2008; Bamgbose, 2000) has also shown that literacy in African languages has many advantages that make MTBE a beneficial long term investment (See Coulmas, 2005, 2013; Heugh, 1996,1999; Grin, 2005, for detail about economic considerations in language planning and language policy). In addition, bilingual education in countries such as Guatemala has been found to have long-term benefits in terms of economic return because it has reduced dropouts and repetitions, and the students developed proficiency in Spanish and native language (Patrinos & Velez, 2009).
Furthermore, as research has suggested, decentralization of teacher education through alternative teacher education programs constitutes an important step toward the democratization of education. Decentralization through alternative teacher education programs would significantly help overcome the shortage of teachers for bilingual education. Alternative teacher education programs have become one the most prominent features of teacher education in many developed nations and in the U.S in particular (Casey, Dunlap, Brister, Davidson & Starrett, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2006). Taking advantages of the insights from alternative teacher education programs, I suggest that Angola could take advantage of the great work that is being done at the Faculdade de Letras (Faculty of Arts of Agostinho Neto University and the Higher Institute of Sciences of Education (ISCED) Luanda in order to design an alternative bilingual teacher program. It is important to note that such a step would entail a fundamental change not only in the structures that govern and manage schools, but in the existing practices (Vescio, Ross & Adams, 2008). Delegating the power to school leaders and administrators is a process of school management that could enhance school principals’ accountability and instructional leadership (Ovando & Casey, 2010).

In addition, the Faculty of Arts, specifically the Department of African Languages and Literature has been preparing many young people who are conversant in both African languages and Portuguese. Given the existing shortage of well-prepared bilingual teachers, alternative teacher education seems like a viable pragmatic option. The program would attract graduates who have a passion for teaching, and who, more often than not, lack employment opportunities after graduation. These students would be prepared through the Alternative bilingual teacher
program in order to gain familiarity with the second language theory, the epistemological, and
the pedagogical insights underpinning bilingual and multilingual education.

In addition, one important aspect that needs to be incorporated within the professional
development framework is a bilingual education teacher certification program. To the best of my
knowledge, in the framework of the ongoing education reform, the Ministry of Education has an
established project that aims at implementing teacher certification that has not been translated
into practice. It is widely recognized within the field of language education and bilingual
education in particular that teachers in language education programs should have appropriate
credentials and certificates.

Research evidence indicates that teachers with certificates and credentials have more
positive attitudes towards teaching learners in dual language or bilingual programs (Lindholm-
Leary, 2005). Montecel and Cortez (2002) found that teachers with credentials and teaching
certificate worked continuously to refresh and update their knowledge base regarding the best
pedagogical practices and appropriate instructional strategies in bilingual education and second
language theory. Zumwalt (1996) noted that alternative certification eases and minimizes the
training process because its focus is on On-Job training. Darling-Hammond, Berry and Thoreson
(2001) found strong and consistent evidence that higher achieving students in mathematics and
science are taught by teachers who hold certification. Moreover, from the vantage point of
quality management, certification and accreditation is one avenue that can be used to enhance
quality of teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond, Chung & Frelow, 2002).

Literature on professional development and teacher certification is large and it is not my
intention to provide an exhaustive review of it here. Suffice it to say that teacher training,
professional development, including certification are critical aspects of successful bilingual education and education in general. Certification and endorsement will ensure that candidates who earn bilingual education credentials are educated and familiar with the research in the field of bilingual education and second language teaching. Teacher certification should be a pre-requisite for pre-service bilingual teachers and in-service teachers who will function in schools with the long-term goal of promoting developmental bilingual education characteristic of effective 5-6 years late-exit and additive bilingual programs (Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002).

Furthermore, the alternative teacher training program could also attract other candidates with bachelor’s degree in any field of education who are competent in Portuguese and conversant in any of the selected African languages. Given the opportunity for employability, such a program would be promising for supplying the need of teachers for the implementation of mother tongue bilingual instruction. Further, the need to develop teacher and learning material is a perennial issue that needs attention. The potential to develop local teaching materials will dramatically depend on the level of commitment and the allocation of resources. The materials can be produced in partnership with the communities if there are enough incentives. However, as the findings of this study demonstrate, there is a need to create space for proactive discussion. This entails, including teachers, students, parents, linguists and all stakeholders with the knowledge and experience that could possibly help in the creation not only of teaching materials, but also strategies how to connect schools with the communities.

**Cross-Regional Efforts**

Cross-border regional arrangements offer another alternative way of sharing knowledge. Cross-border committees such those within the Academy of African Languages (ACLAN) would
be a very important site for collaboration and exchange of knowledge. Given that Angola has cross-border languages, that is, languages that are shared between ethno-linguistic groups in two countries, the country would gain a lot in terms of material production, pedagogical insights from countries with some tradition in teaching African languages in schools. In fact, a number of African scholars have suggested that cross-border collaboration is an important ingredient for regional integration and development of African languages (Ndhlovu, 2013). In short, cross-border initiatives would enhance cross-cultural understanding in the region and consequently be an asset in developing cross-border languages, notably Kikongo, a cross-border language spoken in Angola, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Congo Brazzaville; Oshiwambo a cross-language spoken in Angola and Namibia and Luvale a cross-border language spoken in Angola and Zambia, to name but these few (Lusakalalu, 2007).

**Educational Leadership**

School leadership is a crucial factor in promoting learners L1 within the contexts of bilingual education programs. Effective school leaders do not only promote effective instruction and inclusive classrooms, but also promote respect for linguistic diversity and a culture of democracy (Dewey, 1916), in their schools. Vision sustains and shapes the course of actions that principals, teachers, and staff take to bring about the desired outcomes. Given that schools are not isolated from society, school leaders should be aware and cognizant of the centrifugal and centripetal forces (Bakhtin, 1981) that shape literacy instruction, teachers’ language attitudes, and educational culture in general. Therefore, effective instructional leaders are educators who are aware of the sociocultural, political, and economic force that shape and influence instruction and school culture.
Effective leaders advocate for school programs that promote equity and they act as liaison between the communities and educational institutions responsible for educational reform. In this sense, leaders who work with teachers in programs that aim to promote linguistic and cultural diversity ensure that training and professional development align with the goals and strategies of the programs (August, Beck, Calderón, Francis, Lesaux & Shanahan, 2008; Lindholm-Leary, 2005). Corson’s (2000) concept of emancipatory leader better fits the characteristics of educational leaders who work toward inclusive educational environments and social justice. According to Corson, because education policy-making involves competing interests, emancipatory leaders ensure that all stakeholders are represented in the best interests of all children. Thus, school leaders who work for the implementation of bilingual and dual language programs should have heightened awareness of the social reality of the communities where the schools are situated. So, it is crucial that the community school relationship is robust and conducive to effective collaboration not only among the teachers (Creese, 2005), but also between the school and the communities. In short, effective school leaders ensure that the planning process in place, promotes the goals of producing students who are bilingual, biliterate, and have developed intercultural communication skills and critical reasoning (Hardin, 2010; Palmer & Martinez, 2013; Saville-Troike, 1991).

In conclusion, effective leaders promote the vision and mission of building school environment, culture, and teacher development that promote the sociocultural and cognitive development of the students and strive for building school capacity conducive to equitable education opportunities for all students (King, 2002; Taylor, Yates, Meyer & Kinsella, 2011). School leaders’ support and knowledge about dual language programs and bilingual education in
general is said to be crucial for the maintenance and promotion of bilingual programs that produce fully bilingual and biliterate students (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008). Although effective leadership is crucial for developing efficacious bilingual education programs, research and institutional support plays a significant role as well.

**The Need for Research**

It is undeniable that research plays a critical role for effective and efficacious educational innovation and reform to take place (Pease-Alvarez & Hakuta, 1992). Research is important because for more than a decade the debate around bilingual education has been influenced mainly by popular opinions and myths, rather than by expert and research (Hakuta, 1986a, 1986b; Hakuta & Garcia, 1989) as demonstrated in this study data. Decades of research have attempted to demystify these beliefs and opinions about bilingual education, the optimal and onset age for learning a second language (Baker (2001; Bialystok & Feng, 2009, 2011; Bialystok, Luk, Peets & Yang, 2010; Bialystok et., al. 2011; Butler, 2013; de Bot & der Hoeven, 2011; Singleton, 1989; Wei, 2013).

The bulk of research cited in the foregoing has been conducted in different contexts and under varying socio-cultural, political, and economic conditions. It has been mentioned earlier that, from a sociocultural perspective language learning is situated and mediated process. In this sense, research is crucial for producing localized and situated understanding of the factors that influence the linguistic structure and form, the consequence of contact between African languages and Portuguese, and how these may influence language learning at the level of phonology, morpho-syntax and semantics. Sociolinguistic interdisciplinary research is better equipped in delivering language planning and policy scenarios that can illuminate the nature and
character of ecology (Deumert, 2009). As discussed in section above, the insights from research would help take informed policy decisions and the accumulation of theoretical and pedagogical insights pertinent second language acquisition (SLA) and bilingual education.

Furthermore, research capability remains one of the problems for implementing effective education policies in most developing countries (Lin Lin, 2003). Therefore, in this paper I suggest that the investment that is being made for higher education and general education reform is commendable, but not enough. The government needs to empower the existing higher education institutions in order to stimulate research.

Thus, in the context of the proposed scenarios and the insights from the findings of this study, it is suggested that studies aimed at informing policy and pedagogical decisions be aligned with the research as follows: (1) Comparative and contrastive linguistics research: this type of study would compare the linguistic systems of Portuguese and the African languages involved in the experimental project, (2) sociolinguistic studies and surveys: large scale surveys would provide insights about the various factors that affect language use and the choice of language of instruction (large scale language attitude surveys), and (3) longitudinal ethnography of language policy: aims at providing insights form localized studies in schools about how various agents involved in education policy react and interpret current language policies.

In summary, although the bulk of research cited in this study illuminates our understanding of the issues of bilingual education, localized and contextualized research is crucial for successful implementation of bilingual education program in Angola. Moreover, it is a truism that bilingual education and the choice of language of instruction are politically and ideologically laden issues (Cummins, 2009; Hamilton, 1991; Prah, 2000). Consequently, the
results of localized research would also shed light on the various factors and competing interests that shape the language debate in Angola.

**Institutional Support**

It has been mentioned throughout the foregoing that, language policy is not a neutral endeavor. Lack of political will has been mentioned in many African language policy studies as being the main hindrance for implementing language policies that would promote linguistic diversity and multilingual language education in schools (Alexander, 2008; Bamgbose, 2000). Research in Lusophone Africa (Augusto, 2012; Lopes, 2004) and Anglophone Africa (Brock-Utne, 2012; Heugh & Mulumba, 2014) has demonstrated that institutional support from local and global institutions plays a crucial role in the quality of bilingual education programs. Successful bilingual programs such as the ones in Latin America (Bolivia) and Africa (Cameroon), specifically the program for professional development in bilingual intercultural education for the Andean countries (PROEIB Maestría) and the operational research project for language teaching in Cameroon (PROPELCA) owe their success to strong institutional support both from the local and global institutions such as UNICEF and UNESCO (Téllez & Varghese, 2013; Tadadjeu, 2004). Language and literacy policies that support bilingual instruction and the development of biliterate students require that the central government and the agency responsible for education reform, establish clear benchmarks of what to accomplish and provide human and financial support necessary for successful implementation of education policies (Olson, 2005).

Institutional support is crucial for ensuring that teacher education programs, both the traditional university based programs and the alternative fast track programs receive appropriate funding and resources in order to develop curricular materials designed for bilingual education.
and literacy development. Such responsibility should not be confined to institutions such as the current national institute for investigation and development of education (INIDE); rather, in the context of the proposed national board for bilingual education (NBBE) all concerned parties should contribute to ensuring that produced materials meet the established benchmarks for bilingual education. In this sense, the decentralization of activities and delegation of authority to provincial governments, educational agencies, and Regional Boards for Bilingual Education (RBBE) would be aligned with the program established by the national board for bilingual education and the MoE in order to avoid disharmonious implementation of bilingual education nationwide.

Decentralization is a complex notion that involves the articulation of activities and goals for social, political, and economic purposes. Decentralization of education system in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is a recent and an ongoing process. Although the research on decentralization remains controversial, it is a truism that in SSA central governments through the MoE continue to play a central role in the management, administration, and funding of educational systems (Naidoo, 2005). However, given the complexity involved in the decentralization process, in the implementation of the proposed policy frameworks decentralization of services needs to be approached with care in order to avoid inconsistencies in policy implementation. In this respect, the case of Ethiopia is instructive. For example, Ethiopia has extended MTBE to years within the regional framework. However, because of lack of supervision and follow up from the central educational authorities different regions have produced and adopted non-uniform language programs (Heugh, 2009b).
Based on the research on bilingual education in Africa, UNESCO (2011, pp. 12-13) outlines the responsibilities of the local and provincial authorities for promoting bilingual education programs, as follows: (1) Participate in preparatory missions on the sites in which the multilingual basic education continuum is located; (2) monitor activities relative to the setting up of infrastructure, (3) recruitment of students, (4) assist educational institutions with resources in order to conduct comparative assessments between bilingual schools and between bilingual schools and normal schools, (5) mobilize grassroots communities to support the language initiatives, and (6) collaborate and cooperate with teacher unions and syndicates in order to provide them with timely information and support.

Of course, as the planner and coordinator of national budget for education, the central government, plays a crucial role in enforcing accountability and responsibility in the context of site-based and decentralized education system. It is also the government’s responsibility to provide funds to help launch preparatory works and to mobilize all interested parties, including NGO to actively participate in the process. As the institution with the monopoly of mass media communication, the government should ensure that existing programs and activities that aim to promote African languages are carried out both within the public and private media. My use of the term media here encompasses both written, spoken, and images, specifically media such as television broadcasting, radio, internet, and other electronic online media (Coronel-Molina, 2012).

**The Role of Media**

A number of language policy studies in multilingual contexts have underscored the role of media in education policy in general and language policy specifically (See, Anderson, 2007;
Bell, 1995; Blommaert, Kelly-Holmes, Lane, Leppänen, Moriarty, Pietikäinen & Piirainen, 2009; Callaghan & Schnell, 2001; Cormack, 2004; Karam, 1974; Kellner & Share, 2005; Kelly-Holmes, Moriarty & Pietikäinen, 2009; McKay, 2011; Shahanan, McBeth, Hathaway & Arnell, 2008). Suffice it to say that the media is an important aspect of language policy studies, specifically the research using critical discourse analysis (Blackledge, 2005; W. Wright 2005). For my purposes, I wish to highlight the role that media plays in the context of language educational reform in general, in increasing linguistic awareness, and promoting bilingual education policy initiative specifically.

In the context of language policy under investigation in this study, media is important because it has the potential to better inform the public opinion about the usefulness of the ongoing language education reform and the pedagogical advantages of MTBE for school achievement and cognitive development. Moreover, the press can play an important role in the efforts to clarify the reason for introducing African languages into the school system and encourage language policies that would promote equal opportunity and equity in education. Media can potentially serve as an alternative mechanism for empowerment and social transformation.

Although the mass media diffusion of African languages through television broadcasting and radio programs already exist, the findings of this study reveal that the extension of mass media coverage for African languages is very limited both in scope and breadth. Thus, it is suggested that more media coverage be given to African languages. The creation of programs that can compete with those shown on commercial channels such a Zimbu and the Angolan television (TPA 2) may probably arouse more interest on the part of the youth to learn African
languages. Additionally, language policy scholar such Spolsky (2009) have recognized the relevance of linguistic landscape in language policy and literacy efforts. Linguistic landscape perspective concerns the study language in the landscape signage, names of places, advertisement in urban areas (Spolsky, 2009). So, written media such advertisement shown in different languages is revealing of a landscape with multilingual practices (Shohamy, 2009; Shohamy & Gorter, 2009; Spolsky, 2009). The contribution of mass media in the revival of languages has been documented (Kloss, 1969; Obeng & Adegbija, 1999).

In summary, there are various ways that media resources can be of use for the promotion of African languages and the maintenance of linguistic diversity. I have argued that media play an important role in shaping language attitudes and public opinion about what counts as language and the linguistic practices that are included while others are excluded. Mass media, specifically television and radio have served in the past and will continue to serve as the mechanism through which language attitudes and public discourses about social issues and language use can be successfully be changed. In spite the lack of firm evidence about its effectiveness in language maintenance and revitalization efforts, mass media remains a powerful mechanism for language policy that aims at reversing language shift (Fishman, 2001) and linguistic diversity (Moses, 2007).

Parents, Communities, and the Civil Society

Unsurprisingly, there has been a lot of emphasis on the role of parents, teachers and communities in language revitalization, maintenance efforts and bilingual education policy. The reasons for such appeal to parents and community involvement in education policy efforts are manifold. There have been two important philosophical thoughts on how a child ought to learn a
language and literacy education. The first view advocates that parents ought to create the conditions that help expose children to literacy learning at home. The second view holds that children with parents who are less educated and with low socioeconomic status come to school with disadvantages because the home environment does not provide the conditions and the opportunities to develop the basic skills required for school (Keislar & Stern, 1968). These views are much contested in sociolinguistics and linguistics because they take the deficit approach, which attributes learners failure to their community background or to the students themselves. In doing so, they fail to question and problematize the role of institutional power (schools) in children school failure. Although involving parents and communities is important, equally important is the value of the community’s cultural resources (See, Heath, 1983; Snow, 2014).

The term bottom-up (micro-language policies) is widely used in LPP research in order to differentiate the policies that stem from government agencies (top-down or macro-language policies) and those that involve the community efforts for language maintenance and revitalization (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004; Hatoss, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Omoniyi, 2007).

Micro-language policies include the role of various actors and agents, including parents, communities and non-governmental organizations. Within the context of this study, I have thus far argued that involving the parents and communities in the language education reform effort is a critical step because children learn their first language behaviors at home with the family and the community. Moreover, as Snow (2014) notes, language acquisition is context bound activity and literacy is learned from caregivers, teachers, and parents. Thus, parents and the home environment propitiate the development of socio-emotional development required for successful
literacy development in early-childhood. This is critical because the research evidence on early-childhood development has demonstrated that literacy skills (reading and writing) acquired in early-childhood (from birth to age 5) constitutes a strong predictor of child’s literacy development in later stages (National Institute for Literacy, 2008) and parents play a crucial role in this process (Baldauf, 2005, 2006; Curdt-Christiansen, 2002; Friedman, 2012; Gerena, 2011; Grant & Wong, 2004; Greenwood & Hickman, 1991; Luke, 1995; Spolsky & Shohamy, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Warriner, 2011).

Although research on parent involvement remains controversial, sociolinguistic research on bilingualism (Garcia, 1991; McGroarty, 2009; Mesthrie, 2006, 2011; Mesthrie & Leap, 2009), psycholinguistic approaches to language policy (Baker, 2006) and bilingual education and biliteracy development (Baker, 2000, 2011; Goldenberg, Reese & Rezaei, 2011; Pérez, 2004) have demonstrated that school-family cooperation is crucial for building the school environment conducive to effective and efficacious learning and contribute to successful bilingual and multilingual education (Baker, 2003a, 2003b; Cenoz & Genesee, 1998; Montecel & Danini, 2002; Tucker, 1996, 1998, 1999; Sevinç & Önkol, 2009; Wei, 2001, 2008). In addition, as the finding of this study indicate lack of knowledge and information on the part of communities may contribute to parents and community dismissal of bilingual education efforts (Alexander, 2008) and marketing the benefits of bilingualism to parents and communities may increase the chances for successful implementation of bilingual education programs in schools (Edwards & Newcombe, 2006).

In respect to Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s), it is noteworthy that in the context of current global economic transformation characterized by neoliberal market
arrangements in education (Carnoy, 1999; Rizv, Lingard & Lavia, 2006; Zajda, 2005; 2010), NGO’s have increasingly become valid stakeholders both in the provision of services and resources. As a result, to cater for the bilingual education provision in schools, many countries have relied on the assistance from NGO’s. Although NGO’s are often seen as representing the lucrative interests of transnational corporations, they cannot be dismissed as they provide invaluable assistance to governments that have become more reliant on the market and the apparently illusive weakening of the welfare state (Green, 1997). Many successful bilingual education programs in South America are supported by NGO’s (De Mejía, 2005).

To reiterate, the advantages of involving parents and communities in language learning and literacy efforts have been well documented (Chabata, 2013; Christ, Wang & Chiu, 2011; Goldenberg, Reese & Rezaei, 201; Minami, 201; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2006; Semali, 1999). In short, parents and community involvement in language education efforts is multidimensional and constitute an important contribution to the maintenance of bilingual and multilingual education programs that aim to promote biliteracy, multilingualism, and linguistic diversity in education. Parents, communities and NGO’s can significantly contribute to language policy bottom-up strategies.

**Concluding Remarks**

This dissertation analyzed issues related to the discursive and ideological construction of the current language education policy in Angola. The goal of discursive and ideological examination was to chart the socio-historical conditions, the discursive and ideological configurations that have shaped the language education policy that aim at introducing African languages as medium of instruction into the school system. I have argued that, despite the
empirical evidence about the usefulness of children’s mother tongue in the learning process, language ideologies that view linguistic diversity as a problem persist in many Sub-Saharan African countries, specifically in Angola. The main argument of this study was that, for the successful maintenance, consolidation, and development of African language to take place, there is a need to change the linguistic ideologies and attitudes that have been used to perpetuate the hegemony of Portuguese and marginalization of African languages.

Moreover, the study showed that Portuguese and African languages can co-exist in the regime of complementarity as both Portuguese and national languages represent the sociocultural identity of the Angolan people. Given the relevance of these languages in the construction of the Angolan nation, a further argument was that language planning and policy in Angola needs to factor not only the communicative value of Portuguese, but also the need to bolster the market value of African languages and project them into the official domain of use. One of the participants felt that the formulation of an inclusive and democratic language education policy would benefit more by implementing a deliberative democratic process in which all the stakeholders, specifically the parents and communities are consulted and actively involved. The success and failure of any language education policy, will to some extent, be determined by the ideological positions and attitudes of the communities and parents who send their children to school. The findings of this study revealed that language policy creation is a dynamic and multilayered process that involves not only the struggle of ideological and economic interests, but also negotiations, contradictions and compromise.

Unlike the previous language policy studies that conceptualized language policy as the work of the institutional forces, the findings of this study suggested that language education
policy is a dynamic and complex process—language policy is a hegemonic, symbolic, and a
discursive act that is socially, historically, and politically situated. In other words, language
policy is a product of governmentality—a multilayered process involving various actors and
social agents. To build my argument, I reviewed and discussed the theoretical perspectives and
recent developments in language planning and policy by contrasting the old language planning
and policy theory that viewed language planning in rationalist perspective (solving problem)
against the current developments in language palling and policy. The findings of this study
corroborate the view that in the context of the local and global governmentality, nationalist
discourses have been recruited to sustain neoliberal agendas expressed in terms of national and
technological development (Harvey, 2005). To sustain my arguments for the proposed bilingual
education policy, in chapter two, I conducted a critical review of the literature on bilingualism,
second language learning, linguistic ideologies and language attitudes. In order to contextualize
my discussion of language policy in Angola, I also reviewed relevant literature on language
planning and policy in Sub-Saharan Africa. Literature on the prevalent models of bilingual
education in sub-Saharan and their implication for the educational purposes was also discussed.

On the basis of the review, I have argued that rather than viewing multilingualism as a
problem, multilingualism should be viewed as a resource that can be harnessed for the promotion
of an inclusive and democratic language education policy. Previous studies did not consider the
role of the media, attitudes, and the impact of the current language planning, specifically the
orthographic accord that establishes the unification of orthography in countries with Portuguese
as an official language. As the findings and the literature review indicated, the orthographic
accord may pose challenges to the development of an inclusive language education policy.
The literature review of language education policy suggested that there is a need to take the orthographic reform into consideration in the language education policy debate. Thus, the study also paid attention to the discursive and ideological motivations and interests for promoting a unified orthography in a multilingual country such as Angola. The findings reported in Chapter 5 confirm that, more often than not, language issues are subordinated to political and ideological motivations than to linguistic considerations. The findings also revealed that despite the difficulties that exist in promoting multilingualism, people are aware of the advantages of maintaining a mother tongue-based bilingual education. Nevertheless, in order to implement a mother tongue-based bilingual education system there is a need to promote language awareness campaigns at the grassroots level. The findings also revealed that linguistic differentiation and subjectification do not exist in a vacuum. Rather, they exist under particular historical, economic, and political conditions. In the particular case of Angola, as the findings suggest, linguistic processes have been shaped and influenced by the colonial linguistic ideologies and the contemporary discourses of social development and globalization. Moreover, the study also reveals the complex intersection between language ideology and media discourse, and how they influence the debate concerning language and identity (Heck, 1980; Milani & Johnson, 2010).

Popular language awareness may significantly help change the entrenched negative attitudes and beliefs towards African indigenous languages. The study also revealed weaknesses in the legal framework that sustains the use of African languages as medium of instruction, particularly in respect to the allocation of resources. I argued that if there is no guarantee for resources, then, the implementation of the current language policy can be seen as a manifestation of intentions and a wishful thinking that cannot be materialized. In respect to the relationship
between language and identity, the findings revealed that although most people continue to view African languages as a marker of individual and collective identity, some of the participants showed ambivalent identity positions. This was an indication that identity formation is a dynamic and complex process in which individuals take various subject positions.

Another important aspect of this study is that, the findings revealed how local discourses about language use and language education are influenced by global and transnational discourses and experiences. The discourse of English as a global language is the case in point. Although the participants were able to critically reflect on the pragmatic and creative role of English, the findings also suggested that the growing status of English in non-English speaking countries, poses additional challenges to language policy that aim to promote African indigenous languages. In order words, language education policy approaches need to have a clear position about the status and role of languages, including English, particularly in the context of complex global social configurations.

Regarding the status of Portuguese and African languages, I have argued that national languages and Portuguese (the Angolan variety of Portuguese) constitute the markers of sociocultural Angolan identity and as such they should be accorded the same value and status. I concur with Alidou (2003b) that the Angolan variety of Portuguese (AVP) should be recognized as an Angolan language imbued with an African identity. Moreover, the promotion of AVP is congruent with the current epistemological and theoretical shifts in the field of language studies (Blommaert, 2010; Coupland, 2010; Duchêne & Heller, 2012; Pennycook, 2012), language policy (Spolsky, Inbar-Lourie & Tannenbaum, 2015) and the need to rethink and reinvent what people consider as the Portuguese language within the context of current socio-cultural global
transformation in the Lusophone Africa (Moita-Lopes, 2015). As the findings of this study revealed, the concession of the status of co-official languages to African indigenous languages (national languages) would be the confirmation of the value of both in the construction of unity in diversity and the preservation of its cultural heritage. Therefore, the regional bilingual formula (2+1) proposed in Chapter 6 would be the most appropriate way to approach language education in Angola. Teacher training, the involvement of all stakeholders, including the civil society organizations is of paramount importance.

In conclusion, despite the conflicts and contradictions that emerged from the findings of this study, it is clear that in Angola the language ideological debate involves two extremes. On the one hand, those who insist on maintaining the monolingual ideology of Portuguese and those who call for the politics of complementarity and coexistence of Portuguese and African indigenous languages on the other hand. This study aligns with the latter position. Moving beyond the gaps and weaknesses of the current language education policy, the findings demonstrate that there has been a significant change of discourse regarding the usefulness of African languages. What it is clear is that, despite the insufficiencies, the new language policy paves the way to a new era in the debate of the language question in Angola. It is also clear that the policy opens up an ideological space that can be explored creatively to further the agenda of promoting linguistic diversity, bilingualism, and multilingualism in education. The findings of this study also suggest that the language education debate in Angola is situated in distinct discursive fields. This diversity of perspectives suggests that language questions in SSA, specifically in Angola requires a shift of paradigm—rather than viewing languages from the deficit and oppositional perspectives, languages and language varieties can thrive in
complementarity regime based on their functional and pragmatic domains of use (Fardon & Furniss, 1994). The findings corroborate the view that the choices of language that lead to the sociolinguistic hierarchization of language cannot solely be viewed from a pragmatic perspective. In other words, individuals’ choice of language are shaped and influenced by an array and interplay of factors (Djité, 2011). Therefore, a successful implementation of the bilingual and multilingual education framework proposed herein, will greatly depend on how much compromise the government is willing to make and the ability of the various stakeholders, specially the commitment of the community of speakers of African languages to build a momentum and use the available legal statuses for furthering advocacy activities in favor of a democratic integration and multilingual education (Matsinehe, 2013).
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Interview Protocol

Washington State University, Pullman
Department of Teaching and Learning

Title of the study: Language and Literacy Policies in Sub-Saharan Africa: Towards a Bilingual Language Education Policy in Angola.

Interviewee:

Name:____________________
Title:____________________

Interviewer: Nicolas N. Manuel

Survey section used:

A. Interviewee language background
B. Socio-historical: language attitudes and ideology
C. Institutional and educational perspective

Introductory protocol

To facilitate our note taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. For your information, only researcher on the project will be privy to the tapes which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. Thank you for agreeing to participate. I have planned this interview to last no longer than one hour. During this time, I have several questions that I would like to cover.
Introduction

You have been selected to speak with me today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about language teaching and the value of Africa languages for social development, the maintenance of linguistic and cultural diversity. My intention is to learn more about people’s attitudes and views about the introduction of African languages in the school system and the issues that may arise in the process in order to determine what kinds of knowledge and research is needed for effective language policies and planning. I am more interested in learning from you, by getting your opinions and thoughts about the current language policy.

A. Interviewee Background

Would you tell me about your language experience in school?

Probe: Apart from Portuguese what other languages do you speak?

How long did it take you to learn the languages you speak?

Briefly describe your learning experience.

B. Socio-historical: language attitudes and ideology

1. Since independence Portuguese has been the official and the only language of instruction in Angola.

a) What does it mean to you to have Portuguese has the only language used in schools

Probes: How has this situation affected you and your family?

b) To what extent do you think you have learned Portuguese well?

c) What are in your opinion the other factors that may have prevented the implementation of bilingual or multilingual language policy in Angola?
d) What do you think about the introduction of African languages in schools?

e) What is your personal view and attitude towards the people who like or do not like to speak African languages in public places (schools, workplace, and public transportation)?

f) What does it mean to you not to have a good command of Portuguese in Angola?

g) Some Angolan intellectuals argue that African languages are poor, backward and lacking vocabulary; therefore they cannot be used in schools, and nor can they serve for social development. Would you please comment?

A. Institutional and educational perspective

1. The new language policy approved by the Angolan parliament stipulates that African languages be taught in schools as subjects from 1st grade until 3rd grade. What do you think of this policy?

2. What is in your opinion the main objective of the new language policy?

3. What role should language educators and communities play in the negotiation, design, and implementation of language of instruction policies in Angola?

4. The Angolan government has not ratified the acordo ortográfico “the orthographic accord” in the context of the Comunidade dos Paises de Lingua Portuguesa (CPLP) (Community of Portuguese Language Speaking Countries). What do you think about this orthographic accord?

5. Tell me how Portuguese has facilitated or not facilitated your life in general.

6. Do you think that communities (parents, traditional authorities, NGO, religious institutions) could positively contribute to the success not only of teaching of African
languages in schools, but also to the maintenance and revitalization of African languages? Are communities involved this project?

7. What pedagogical and psychological advantages are there in learning African languages?

8. What are in your opinion the kinds of activities that can help promote the use of African languages?

9. If you were involved in language education policy efforts, what would in your opinion be the appropriate language policy for Angola?

10. Is it possible for children to learn two or three languages simultaneously? Would you comment?

11. Are there any advantages in speaking two or three languages?

Thank you. I highly appreciate your time. Remember that the thoughts and ideas you shared with me today will be used to evaluate the current language policy, to propose the design of a better and inclusive language policy in order to improve the school achievement of our children in schools. Remember that your identity will remain confidential. Should you have any concerns or questions do not hesitate to contact me at

Cell: 509-3369869
Office: 5093358681 Fax: 509-335-6959
Email: nmanuelima@yahoo.fr; nicklima68@gmail.com; nicolau.manuel@email.wsu.edu;
Home Address: 1650 NE Valley Road, Apt B22. Pullman, Washington, 99163, USA.
Entrevistado:
Nome:...............................  
Título:...............................  

Entrevistador: Nicolas N. Manuel, Assistente e doutorando em estudos culturais e pensamento social na educação

Secções de pesquisa utilizada:

A. Informações básicas sobre o entrevistado
B. Sócio-históricos: atitudes de linguagem e ideologia
C. Perspectiva educacional e institucional

Introdução
Para facilitar nossas anotações, eu gostaria de áudio gravar nossas conversas hoje. Para sua informação, apenas os pesquisadores deste projeto terão acesso as fitas que serão eventualmente destruídas depois da transcrição das mesmas.

(1) todas as informações serão mantidas confidenciais, (2) sua participação é voluntária e você pode desistir a qualquer momento, quando você sentir-se desconfortável, e (3) eu não pretendo causar qualquer dano. Obrigado por concordar em participar.
Tenho planeado esta entrevista para a uma duração de pelo menos uma hora. Durante este tempo, tenho várias perguntas que eu gostaria de fazer para ajudar melhorar o ensino das línguas Africanas em Angola.

Breve Nota

Fostes escolhido para conversar comigo hoje por ter sido identificado como alguém que tem conhecimento sobre o ensino de línguas e o valor das línguas Áfricanas para o desenvolvimento social, a manutenção da diversidade linguística e cultural. Minha intenção é aprender mais sobre atitudes, ideais, e opiniões sobre a introdução das línguas africanas no sistema de ensino Angolano, e as questões que possam surgir no processo de implementação da actual política linguística, a fim de determinar os tipos de conhecimentos e pesquisa necessárias para um planeamento e políticas linguísticas eficaz. Estou interessado em aprender convosco para obter suas opiniões, ideas, e pensamentos sobre a actual política línguística no país.

A. Informações básicas sobre o entrevistado

Conta-me um pouco sobre sua experiência escolar?

Sonda: Para além do português que outras línguas você fala?

Quanto tempo levou para aprender as línguas que você fala?

Descreva brevemente sua experiência de aprendizagem da língua português

B. Contexto sócio-histórico: atitudes de linguagem e ideologia

a. O que significa para si que o Português tem sido a única língua usado nas escolas

Sondas: Como esta situação afectou você e sua família?

b. Em que medida você acha que domina a língua portuguêsa?
c. Em sua opinião quais foram os factores que terão impedido a implementação de uma política línguística bilíngüe ou a introdução das línguas Africanas no ensino em Angola?

d. O que você acha sobre a ideia de que a introdução das línguas africanas nas escolas pode ser um factor de divisão entre os angolanos?

e. Qual é a sua opinião pessoal e atitude para com as pessoas que gostam ou não gostam de falar línguas africanas em locais público (escolas, local de trabalho e transporte público)?

f. No contexto da realidade sócio-histórico e político do país, o que significa para você não ter um bom domínio da língua portuguesa?

g. Alguns intelectuais angolanos alegam que as línguas africanas são pobre, atrasado e faltando de vocabulário; portanto, não podem ser utilizados nas escolas, e nem podem servir para o desenvolvimento tecnológico e científico. Qual é a sua opinião acerca disso?

C. Perspectiva educacional e institucional

a. No quadro das iniciativas do governo para uma política linguística democrática, o Parlamento angolano aprovou o Projecto Lei Sobre as Línguas Nacionais que prevê que as línguas africanas devem ser usado como meio de instrução da primeira classe (1 classe) até terceira classe (3 classe) do ensino primário. Qual é a sua opinião sobre esta nova política linguística?

b. Qual é na sua opinião, o principal objectivo da nova política línguística?
c. Qual e o papel que os educadores (professores, linguistas, etc) e comunidades podem desempenhar ou tem desempenhado na consecussao, negociação, e implementação da nova políticas de língua de instrução em Angola?

d. O governo angolano não ractificou o acordo ortográfico no contexto da Comunidade dos Países de Lingua Portuguesa (CPLP). O que você acha sobre este acordo ortográfico?

e. Diga-me como a língua Portuguesa tem facilitado ou não facilitado sua vida em termos de emprego e de mobilidade social.

f. Você acha que as comunidades, ou seja, encarregados de educacao, instituições religiosas, autoridades tradicionais, ONG, podem contribuir positivamente para o sucesso não só do ensino das línguas africanas nas escolas, mas também para a manutenção e revitalização das mesmas?

g. Quais são as vantagens pedágogicas e psicólogicas da aprendizagem das línguas Africanas?

h. Em sua opinião que tipo de actividades podem ajudar a promover o uso das línguas africanas a nivel social, educativo, tecnologico, e cientifico?

i. Se você estivesse envolvido em esforços de política de ensino das línguas em Angola, qual seria sua opção para uma política linguística apropriada em Angola?

j. Em sua opiniao é possível para as crianças aprenderem duas ou três línguas simultaneamente? Comenta por favor

k. Há alguma vantagem em falar duas ou três línguas?

l. Qual e valor e importancia de falar um lingua Africana para si pessoalmente?
Obrigado. Agradeço muito pela paciência e sua disponibilidade.

Lembre-se de que as ideias e opiniões que você compartilhou comigo hoje serão usados para avaliar a política linguística actual, e propor um programa de ensino de linguas melhor e inclusiva, a fim de melhorar o desempenho escolar de nossas crianças e promover o respeito pela diversidade linguística.

Lembre-se de que sua identidade permanece confidencial.

Se você tiver dúvidas ou perguntas, não hesite em contactar-me em

Célular: 509-3369869

Ecritório: 5093358681

E-mail:nmanuelima@yahoo.fr; nicklima68@gmail.com ; nicolau.manuel@email.wsu.edu

Endereço para correspondência: 1650 NE Valley Road,

B22 Apt, Pullman, Washington, 99163, EUA.
Appendix B

The People and the National Languages of Angola