OPERATIONALIZING KISWAHILI AS A SECOND OFFICIAL LANGUAGE: EXAMPLES FROM CANADIAN AND SOUTH AFRICANS LANGUAGE POLICY FRAMEWORKS

Miriam Osore and Brenda Midika

Abstract

In the last decade, Kenyans became extremely aware of the issue of language and language usage in the country. This awareness led to the recognition of Kiswahili as one of the official languages of Kenya. The Kenyan 2010 Constitution recognizes that the national language of the Republic of Kenya is Kiswahili while the official languages are Kiswahili and English (Chapter 2, Section 7 (2)). Previously, English was used as the official language and language of instruction in education sector while Kiswahili was the national language. This paper is anchored around the success of the Canadian and South African models of promoting two or more official languages. The paper seeks to borrow from the language policies of the two nations and make recommendations on how the new language policy can be operationalized in tandem with the spirit of the new constitution promulgated in 2010. The paper seeks to isolate the strengths of bilingual language policy as exemplified by both Canadian and South African language policy models that can effectively contribute to the promotion of Kiswahili as an official language in Kenya.

Introduction, Theory and Method

This paper aims at identifying the steps that need to be taken by stakeholders and the Government of Kenya to operationalize Kiswahili as a second official language since the promulgation of the Kenya Constitution in 2010. The paper examines the Canadian and the South African language policy frameworks with a view of isolating some of the key strategies that have been adopted to ensure bilingual and multilingual language policies respectively.

In order to engage the topic more fruitfully, it is important to understand that operationalizing any language policy requires language planning. Kloss (1967, 1969 as quoted in Mesthrie, Swann, Deumert, and Leap, 2000) distinguished two basic types of language planning: corpus and status planning. Corpus planning is concerned with the internal structure of the language while status planning refers to all efforts undertaken to change the use and function of a language within a given society (Mesthrie, et al., 2000). The paper addresses the latter i.e. status planning which essentially refers to allocation of new functions to a language. In this case, Kiswahili has been accorded a new function, that of becoming the second official language of the Republic of Kenya. This means that both Kiswahili and English are recognized as legally appropriate languages for all politically and culturally representative purposes on a nationwide basis. According to Stewart (1968), the official function of a language is specified constitutionally.

The allocation of new language function often requires change in the linguistic system such as the development of new styles and lexical items to provide terms for various specialized fields. This paper envisages Kiswahili being in such a scenario whereby new lexical items need to be developed in order for it to function effectively in its new status. According to Mesthrie, et al., (2000), there are two dimensions of language planning: prestige planning and acquisition planning. Prestige planning is directed towards creating a favourable psychological background which is crucial for the long-term success of language planning activities (Haarmann, 1990, as quoted in Mesthrie, et al., 2000). This prestige planning is vital when the promoted language has previously been limited to low-cultural functions (as in the case of Kiswahili) in order to make the promoted status changes socially acceptable. Therefore, prestige planning is a prerequisite for status planning. Efforts to spread and promote the learning of a language are described as instances of acquisition planning. For example, efforts of cultural institutions such as British Council, Alliance Francaise, Italian Institute of Kenya.

This paper is guided by Haugen's (1966, 1987) framework for the description of the process of language planning. He isolates four stages which are typical of language planning. These are: selection, codification, implication and elaboration. According to Haugen, language planning begins with possibility of selecting a linguistic alternative form or language and promoting them as being the norm. Selection means choice of a language to fulfill certain functions in a given society, e.g. official language. In most cases, this language is deemed to be the most prestigious.

Codification refers to the creation of linguistic standard or norm for a selected linguistic code. It is often administered by language experts who are involved in selecting a writing system and formulating rules of grammar among other roles. The socio-political realization of the decisions made in the stages of selection and codification is called implementation. Implementation includes the production of books, pamphlets, newspapers or textbooks in the newly codified standard variety as well as its introduction into the new domain. The implementation process is normally done by the state. It involves marketing techniques to promote its use including bonuses for civil servants and awards for authors who publish in the new standard language (Haugen, 1983; Cooper 1989). Implementation also means encouragement to the citizens to use the language as well as actively supporting its use.

The last stage of language planning is elaboration. This is sometimes referred to as modernization. It involves terminological and stylistic development of a codified language to meet the continuing communicative demands of modern life and technology. The area of language elaboration is the production and dissemination of new terms and often different strategies of lexical enrichment are used simultaneously. Elaboration is an ongoing process in every language as there is never ending need to develop new terms, to talk and write about new ideas, concepts and inventions. The steps could be summarized as shown below:

	<i>Form</i>	<i>Function</i>
<i>Society</i>	Selection	Acceptance
<i>Language</i>	Codification	Elaboration

Source: Haugen (1972)

This paper explores the last two stages of language planning which are geared towards ensuring that a selected language is acceptable to society in its new status and all possible strategies are employed by the

state to ensure that it functions effectively in its new status. The methodology used is based on a critical examination of the Canadian and South African language policy frameworks with a view of suggesting workable strategies which the government needs to undertake to operationalize Kiswahili as a second official language of the Republic of Kenya.

Bilingual Official Language Policy in Canada

Canada, like Kenya, has a rich linguistic diversity based on the founding cultures. French culture is dominant in Quebec Province and English culture is dominant in other parts of Canada. However, there are indigenous cultures which existed before the onset of European immigrants. Therefore, language policy and language relations are conducted between the two dominant linguistic groups; the French speaking Canadians and English speaking Canadians.

Language policy in Canada is administered by the federal system that allocates separate powers to the federal government and provincial and territorial governments. There are 10 provinces and three territories legislated by the federal government. The federal government caters for the minority population and the administration of the territories while the provincial government is in charge of the education and taking care of delivery of services at the provincial level. Language policy is therefore administered by the federal government in conjunction with the provincial governments.

Development of the official language policies in Canada has been a deliberate effort to bridge the gap between the French and English speaking population. The struggle between the identification of the French, English and indigenous languages is recorded since the 18th century. During the 19th century, the legal rights of struggle between the French speaking and the English speaking people were based on the legal rights that majorly focused on achieving religious rights (Commissioner of Official Languages, 1989). There was little about language. During the 20th century, there was increased secularism and industrialization encouraging massive immigration. This state led to increased legislation favoring English, leading to a movement known as the 'Anglo-conformity'. The movement included policies such as using English as the language of instruction in schools in most provinces which were part of conforming to the Anglophonic status. The French and the indigenous languages were isolated.

In Quebec, which is predominantly French, the church, school and socio-political institutions continued using French. This created a big gap where English was used for official purposes in Quebec while French was used in many social institutions. There was no government commitment to addressing this divide. The federal government superficially recognized the equal status of French and English in parliament.

According to Beaty (1989), in 1945 with the advent of industrialization, immigration, and a low birth-rate among Francophones, the French population in Canada was threatened with most migrants choosing English as their second language. Therefore, English became the most dominant language of large businesses in Quebec. This according to Wardhaugh (1983) disadvantaged the area because Quebec was predominantly French yet most social and economic activities were carried out in English.

The Quebec government acted swiftly and steadily. In 1963, the Quebec government created the Ministry of Education that emphasized the use of French as a medium of instruction in schools. This step put pressure on the Canadian Federal Government to consider the status of French language seriously. From 1963-1971, the government established the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The

commission looked at the political, cultural and economic issues of all languages in Canada paying little attention to the indigenous languages. Impacts of the commission were felt from 1973, when there was language training for public servants. The training of public servants led to a public debate on assessment of the working of English and French equitably as languages of work in the federal service.

One of the recommendations of the commission was to ensure that provinces were working towards using French as a language of instruction besides English. Parents also took measures by encouraging an English school in Montreal to teach their children through French so that they could learn a second language faster and more effectively. This gave birth to 'French immersion' programs across the country, which is still a common practice of the Canadian public education.

As a consequent of The Royal Commission Inquiry on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the *Official Languages Act* of 1969 was one of the recommendations. The Act made English and French Canada's official languages. According to Beaty (1989), the Act did not only introduce French and English as official languages but also the Commissioner of Official Languages:

“ In addition to declaring that English and French are to have 'equality of status and equal rights and privileges' for all the purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada, the Act specifically imposes duties on all federal institutions to provide their services in either English or French: in the National Capital Region and in such 'bilingual districts' as might be subsequently designated, at their head offices, and in any other locations where there was 'significant demand' for such services. The Act also created the position of Commissioner of Official Languages to oversee its implementation and generally act as official languages ombudsman,” (Beaty, 1989, p. 185-186).

Beaty (1989) observes that there were main programs supporting the *Official Languages Act* which encouraged respect and support for Canada's official languages in other jurisdictions and in Canadian society as a whole. The Royal Commission also recommended that the federal government supports the provinces to provide English education for English speaking population in Quebec and French education for French speaking population in the other provinces. Although the *Official Languages Act* declared French and English as official languages, there were no mechanisms to enforce the Act. Provinces were to regulate themselves. New Brunswick Province for example, declared itself bilingual and more provinces took initiatives to promote the status of French. Such initiatives were controversial, for instance, in Quebec, parents refused having their children educated in other languages other than French.

Lack of clear guidance on the state of French especially in Quebec led to calls for separatism and a referendum for Quebec to secede from Canada. Quebec government lost in the 1980 referendum but became a 'sovereignty association'. There were calls for more urgent reforms. The constitutional changes added the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* that promoted the development of languages since the early 1960s. In 1988, the government revised the 1969 statute on official languages and replaced it with a bill, the *Official Languages Act (OLA)*. The 1969 *Official Languages Act* lacked enforcement but in 1988 parliament made *Official Languages Act (OLA)* enforceable. This created a state called 'official bilingualism', which meant that citizens did not need to be bilingual but the organs of the state must be bilingual in order to accommodate the needs of the unilingual citizens of the two official languages groups.

Implementation of Bilingual Languages Policy

The *Official Languages Act* of 1988 was a revision of the 1969 *Official Languages Act* that had not been enforced. According to Hudon (2013), Canadian Parliament took a role of ensuring the working of the *Official Languages Act, 1988*. The *Official Languages Act, 1988* requires the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the president of the Treasury Board to report to Parliament on the respective responsibilities concerning official languages. Parliament is also required to strike a parliamentary committee that is responsible for following on the implementation of the *Official Languages Act* and its accompanying regulations and instructions and the implementation of reports by the Commissioner of Official Languages. Hudon (2013) stipulates the three broad principles with respect to the official languages and federal public service according to the *Official Languages Act 1988* which 'include: the public should be served by the federal institutions in the languages of choice of those being served, the right of employees of federal institutions to work in the official language of their choice and the government's commitment to provide equal opportunities to English speaking and French speaking Canadians in federal institutions. The Official languages policy in Canada has been followed to the latter and is implemented in the following ways:

- (i) Commitment from the Government: The Canadian government has shown commitment towards ensuring that the *Official Languages Act* is implemented to the latter. Through a series of parliamentary legislations, there has been introduction of courts for the parties dissatisfied with the Act. There has also been a step by the government to increase funding to institutions that enhance the *Official Languages Act* to meet its objectives. The Federal government in Canada for example has increased its funding for provincial and territorial governments that want to create new services to improve existing services in the minority languages and promote greater understating between the country's two linguistic communities (Hudon, 2013).
- (ii) The federal government has co-operated with the provinces to allow French speaking Canadians living in English dominated and English speaking Canadians in French dominated areas to study in their own language and to enable young Canadians learn French and English as second languages. In addition, the Federal government reimburses the provincial and territorial governments for the additional expenses they incur to provide education for these groups.
- (iii) The government has also established an accountability framework for the implementation of the 1988 version of the *Official Languages Act*. The accountability framework reports to the government of how it can make the official languages to be more prioritized for the government and public service in receiving and delivering service.
- (iv) In 2003, the Canadian government renewed its commitment to the *Official Languages Act*. A minister responsible for the official languages issues was named in the cabinet. The minister has set up an Action plan for the languages – which revolve around education, community development and the federal public service. Through the efforts of the minister, additional funding was announced in 2012 for second language learning, minority languages education, languages industries, economic development, assistance for community, strengthening bilingualism at all levels of the federal and public service (Hudon, 2013).
- (v) The Canadian constitution stipulates that either the English or the French Language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the

Legislature of Quebec. Both English and French according to the constitution are used to write the records and journals of those Houses. Either French or English can be used by any person in the pleading process and either of those languages may be used by any Person or in any Pleading or Process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec. The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both Languages.

Canadian federal, provincial and territorial governments have continually showed and renewed their commitment to the *Official Languages Act*, 1988. Whereas the 1969 *Official Languages Act* declared French and English as official languages in Canada, revisions to this statute in 1988 through an act of parliament ensured enforcement this act. The Canadian Parliament and series of legislation have continually renewed support to enhancing French and English are implemented as official languages. Unlike the Canadian language policy that has only two official languages; the South African scenario is different in the sense that it has eleven official languages.

Multilingual Official Language Policy in South Africa

Language policy in South Africa has been modelled around the problems that exist in a multilingual society just like Kenya. Before the independence of South Africa, language policy was centered on the development of English and Afrikaans as the only official languages in South Africa. As a result of this, policies that uplifted English and Afrikaans as official languages were promoted while many African languages in the country were marginalized. This situation is reflected in most African states like Kenya due to colonization. In an effort to address the existing language inequalities the South African government declared 11 official languages. The decision was influenced by the fall of apartheid and the independence of the South Africa (Ngcobo, 2003). The aim was to accommodate the South Africans as far as possible.

Official Multilingualism in South Africa

Language policy in South Africa begun as far as 1822 when the British authorities in Cape colony issued a formal declaration based on language use. English was declared as the only official language (Lanham, 1978). According to (Ngcobo, 2003) the Dutch speaking community resisted this policy. The resistance laid a foundation for the language planning during the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 (Ngcobo, 2003). Later on as the British settled in South Africa, English and Afrikaans were declared the official languages of the republic. English was more preferred yet Afrikaans remained in the periphery.

The legislated usage of English highly contributed to the Boer articulation for Afrikaans as an official language. The policy also gave rise to a generation of racist and ethnic Afrikaans which was as a result of language, religious and descent orientation. The Boers struggled for the recognition of their language, Afrikaans, as an official language as English but they did not achieve this during the British colonization. However, the interaction between English and Boer White Afrikaans led to a superiority complex that was as a result of the Afrikaans version of English due to the two languages interacting. On the other hand, Afrikaans speaking people still continued to fight for the recognition of Afrikaans as an official language.

According to Ngcobo (2003), the divide and rule politics in South Africa were also as a result of the language policy by the colonialists. The marginalization of the indigenous languages and the elevation of English as an official language created a small section of black teachers, preachers, interpreters, clerks and other professionals which the colonial system gave rise to those who viewed proficiency in the English language as their passport to upward social and economic mobility. As quoted by Alexander (1989), Dr.

Abdurahman a mission educated middle class South African representing the African People Organization says this about the issue of language in 1912:

Now this problem of language concerns our people and I think it should be the aim of all our members to seek to cultivate the English tongue wherever and whenever practicable or possible. Why so large a proportion of our people, who, to my knowledge, have facility in English fall into the habit of talking to one another in Cape Dutch, I cannot understand. Such a habit is not conducive to progressive thought and it should be discouraged. Remember that our South African nation must be composed of various races of different colours; and all the talk about racialism indulged in by the Europeans concerns only that spirit of deadly antagonism that exists between British and Dutch. Language is being used by one section as the means whereby that bitterness may be perpetuated and yet I have no hesitation in saying that even the most violent enthusiast for the Taal would admit the superiority of the English language; but the Dutchman ... is urged ... to cling to his language, and the motive behind it all is to accentuate the narrowness and the bitterness of a racial bias that moves the Boer so deeply. (Quoted from Alexander, 1989, p. 28)

The African languages were not given attention. The Boers continued agitating for the elevation of Afrikaans as an official language leading to the establishment of a more strict English- Afrikaans language policy which caused resentment from the indigenous people and resulted in the Soweto youth demonstrations against Afrikaans in 1976. In the fight against colonialism, the Boer were more vocal for the recognition of the language as an official language, yet the Africans failed to fight for theirs. Failure of African political organizations to address the language question in Apartheid regime reflects the state of the African perception that indigenous languages do not have the power to develop into languages of power (Alexander, 2003).

There have been explanations as to why black people in South Africa could not fight for their languages. Firstly, the black people in South Africa, were fighting against racism and the apartheid leadership. This sidelined the social, cultural and language issues. Ignorance of cultural politics created a gap that is evident through the current generation of politically literate adults. The political elite as Alexander (ibid) mentions have little or no proficiency in any African language. Secondly, the creative and scholarly materials in African languages still do not have significance in South Africa. The emphasis of English in schools and missions disadvantaged the African languages. The colonial regimes paid more attention to English and Afrikaans thus creating the Official Bilingualism state that had a high percentage of mission educated blacks who were fluent in either English or Afrikaans, or in both languages.

Even as the politics of English – Afrikaans language policy went on, there was recognition by some black Africans about the importance of indigenous languages in South Africa. In 1944, the headmaster of Wilberforce Institute, Jacob Nhlapo a member of ANC in his pamphlet 'Bantu Babel: Will the Bantu Languages Live?' suggests that the spoken varieties of Nguni and Sotho be standardized in a written form. He terms this as the first step towards the standardization of the indigenous African languages, in order to help to overcome tribal and ethnic divisions. In response to his claims, Peter Raboroko an ANC activist, suggested that Kiswahili became the *Lingua Franca*, not only for South Africa but for the whole of Africa if there was any development to be achieved when it came to promoting indigenous culture. From the 1960s with the rise of the Black Consciousness Movement led by Steve Biko, there was a cultural awakening among the black South Africans.

Implementation of the Multilingual Language Policy in South Africa

After the independence of South Africa there arose difficulties on language planning decisions. This compelled the South African elected government in 1994 to reach a compromise about the language question. The Language Action Task Force Group (LANGTAG) was formed by the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology. LANGTAG compiled reports and made recommendations for the work of Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB), which serves as an Advisory Panel for language development. In 1996, the constitution granted PanSALB constitutional powers to ensure that all languages are developed and properly represented in the language policy. Due to the efforts of PanSALB, the final draft of the National Language Policy was completed and submitted to the Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology who then submitted it to parliament for the necessary Legislative action. The language policy represents a co-operate effort involving members of the Advisory Panel and all interested bodies. The participation of all the interested groups ensures that the language policy is consistent with political developments in the country, especially regarding the notions of democracy, equality, and rights. The language policy enacted in parliament had been implemented in the following ways:

- (i) Several policy documents have been produced since the beginning of the debate around the language question. The National Language Policy Framework (NLPF) is the major document and it binds all government structures to a “multilingual mode of operation” (Mesthrie, 2002).
- (ii) South Africa has an Implementation Plan document that focuses on the implementation of the NLPF. The Ministry of Education issued the Language in Education Policy document in 1996. This document emphasizes the performance, assessment and promotion of the official languages. On the role of official languages in higher education, the Ministry of Education has another document called the Language Policy for Higher Education. This document gives the Ministry of Education powers to determine the language policy in higher education.
- (iii) Provinces have also taken initiative about the official languages. The Western Cape Province passed the Western Cape Provincial Languages Act in 1998. The document acknowledges English, Afrikaans and isiXhosa as the languages of the province.
- (iv) In addition to the documents about the language policy, The National Language Service (NLS), a department of The Ministry of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology focuses on the practical issues of translation, interpreting and language technology.
- (v) There are 14 National Language Bodies, which have the task of overseeing the development of the respective languages. PanSALB also has a provincial language body in each of the provinces.
- (vi) The aims of the language policy go hand in hand with the constitutional provision Chapter 1, Section 6 Sub-section (5) of the South African Constitution which states that a Pan South African Board established by national legislation must:
 - Promote, and create conditions for, the development and use of:
 - (a) All official languages;
 - (b) The Khoi, Nama and San languages; and
 - (c) Sign languages; and
 - Promote and ensure respect for:
 - (a) All languages commonly used by communities in South Africa, including German, Greek, Gujarati, Hindi, Portuguese, Tamil, Telugu and Urdu; and
 - (b) Arabic, Hebrew, Sanskrit and other languages used for religious purposes in South Africa aimed at the creation and strengthening of national identity in close association with national political power. It is argued, however, that the successes of the policy to date have been symbolic rather than material (Mesthrie, 2006, p. 151).

Language policy in South Africa is aimed at maintaining ethnic diversity. A country with many interests, multilingual language policy aims at creating and strengthening the national identity of the South Africans. In addition, language policy formulation in South Africa considers the linguistic diversity of the nation. In South Africa, all languages are considered as national resources that need to be preserved and developed for the good of the native speakers.

The above section has discussed the origin of bilingual and multilingual language policy frameworks in Canada and South Africa respectively. This has revealed that language policy issues are issues that not only touch on the people but on government commitment towards making language policy workable. The section also mentions implementation strategies that the individual countries took to ensure the language policy frameworks are working.

Implementation of Bilingual Language Policy in Kenya

Drawing from the Canadian and South African experiences, the Kenyan government has a central role to play in the implementation and operationalization of the bilingual language policy. Kenya has over 60 different spoken languages, with Kiswahili and English as the official languages of the republic according to Chapter 2 of the Constitution. After over fifty years of independence, there has been an agitation for linguistic diversity with Kiswahili as another official language.

Language policy formulation in Kenya, like many African states, evolved around the coming of missionary education and colonial administration objectives. Before Kenya became a British colony, the United Missionary Conference of 1909 adopted the use of mother tongue in the first three classes in primary while Kiswahili in the middle two classes and English for the other classes. When Kenya became a British colony, language policy issues were approached through commissions of education that took the mandate to determine the interaction of English, Kiswahili and other local languages. Language policy was driven by the needs of the colonial government versus the missionaries. Missionaries wanted to evangelize while colonial administration wanted to run administrative tasks and train clerical workers to mainly work as semi-skilled labourers.

There were several commissions of education which discussed language and education in the country. In 1924, the Phelps Stroke Commission recommended Kiswahili to be dropped in the education curriculum except in areas where it was spoken as a first language. The Beecher Report of 1949 set up English as medium of instruction in intermediate classes and in lower primary schools. By 1952, Kiswahili had been removed as an optional medium for examination and students were forced to take their examinations in English. At independence in 1963, English was declared as the official language. It was to be used in all important government sectors including education. Kiswahili was declared a national language while the other local languages were restricted to the home and informal settings. This *status quo* promoted negative attitude towards Kiswahili and other African languages.

The English *status quo* in education was questioned. This is because Kiswahili was spoken by many in the country yet they could not be served by their government in their language. In 1964, the Ominde Commission was set up and it recommended English to be used as a medium of instruction from primary class one. However, this was challenged especially by bureaucratic attitudes and the public and private institutions that tend to take ad hoc decisions that negate the implementation of the recommendations

from the commission of education. Kiswahili and other languages still lagged behind in the education system after 1964. In 1981, the Mackay Commission recommended that English remains as a language of instruction and Kiswahili be made a compulsory subject in both primary and secondary education. This recommendation was implemented in 1985 with the establishment of 8-4-4 system of education. The status of Kiswahili was greatly uplifted through strategies to meet the needs of the 8-4-4 system. There was an increase in the Kiswahili material production and increased debates around its status in national development.

As earlier stated, the 2010 Constitution of Kenya retained the status of Kiswahili as a national language and elevated it to the official language status in addition to English (Chapter, Article 7). This is especially supported by other clauses in the constitutions including the Chapter 2 Article 7 (1 and 2) which states that the state has the obligation to develop and promote the languages. Chapter 8 Article 120 stipulates that the official languages of the Parliament of Kenya are Kiswahili, English and Kenya sign language and the business of parliament may be conducted in English and Kiswahili or Kenya sign language. Chapter 4, Article 44 states that every person has the right to use the language and to participate in the cultural life of the person's choice, a person belonging to a cultural and linguistic community has the right like other members of that community: to enjoy that person's culture and use of the person's language. There are other relevant provisions pertaining to language matters elsewhere in the constitution including the freedom of expression (Article 33 (1)), access to information (Chapter 4, Article 35), fair hearing (Chapter 4, Article 50) and persons with disabilities (Chapter 4, Article 50). Through these relevant provisions in the constitution, there is a need to promote use of both English and Kiswahili as official languages. However, Kiswahili has been lagging behind in terms of usage and development in various fields in government operations.

The government has a constitutional mandate to ensure that the public has access to information and services in the two official languages. This can be done if the government steps up measures to promote the growth of Kiswahili to get to be at par with English. The government needs to work hand in hand with the language stakeholders to develop a national language policy that will promote the national, official and indigenous languages and respect of the language rights as enshrined in the Constitution of Kenya 2010. The policy should aim at promoting the national language of Kenya, promoting equitable use of the two official languages, facilitating the equitable access to public service, knowledge and information and ensure that there is affirmative action for indigenous languages as well as sustaining an intense dialogue on multilingualism. In addition, the policy should aim at encouraging the learning of Kiswahili and other indigenous languages to promote national unity, linguistic and cultural diversity as well as promote effective language management and use of efficient public service administration to meet the expectations of the citizens. National Language Policy is one step towards ensuring the working languages are at par with each other and that the public can have access to facilities and services in either language. This policy will also bind the government structure to a bilingual mode of operation

Parliament through a series of legislations can also promote the development of both English and Kiswahili as official languages. An act of parliament that promotes the use of Kiswahili as a national language and use of both official languages is necessary. This bill should ensure that Kiswahili and English are respected as official languages and given equal rights and privileges as to how they are used in public institutions, proceedings in the legislature, administration in relation to justice and communication within government organs. The bill should also ensure that there is support, development and promotion

of Kenya's linguistic diversity. This act of parliament will give the government impetus to ensuring the working of both Kiswahili and English as official languages.

Through parliamentary legislation, journals and other government records should be made, kept, printed and published in the two official languages. In the same vein, all acts of parliament need to be enacted, printed and published in both official languages. Apart from this, it is mandatory for Kiswahili and English to be used in the judiciary. All the proceedings in the judiciary could be conducted in both official languages. Likewise, the Kenya laws beginning with the Constitution, should be available in both official languages. The legislation should also ensure that a member of the public has the right to receive services from all state organs in both official languages.

The Cabinet Secretary in charge of culture also needs to be empowered to ensure equal status and use of the two official languages throughout the country. Through legislation, the Cabinet Secretary should encourage and support the learning of English and Kiswahili in Kenya, foster acceptance and appreciation of both English and Kiswahili in the public, lobby the government to support the development of English and Kiswahili and encourage the business community and other organizations to provide their services in both English and Kiswahili.

There is need to establish a National Council of Languages that will address the use of official languages, if the government has to achieve official bilingualism. The National Council of Languages will address all issues pertaining to official languages such as: promotion and development of official languages in the country. It should also promote high standards in the use of national and official languages. In addition, it would link up and develop a comprehensive method for the use of official languages. It will also ensure that a Quality Assurance Team is established to ensure the use of national, official, indigenous and other communications meet the expected standards.

The government should dedicate funds to the development of official languages. This financial allocation should be provided through parliamentary legislation. The funds should be allocated to the council that shall be created to operationalize use of both languages. The fund would cater for the payment of administrative and training costs for the council members and other stakeholders. In addition, the funds should also be allocated for the training of service providers in government organs as well as the development of in-service training for government officials.

The government could collaborate with the county governments to ensure that the Language Policy is adhered to. There should be a County Language Council in each county that ensures that the national language policy is adopted. The boards should ensure that county services are provided to the public in both Kiswahili and English. The national government should allocate funds to the county government to ensure that the service providers are well trained in both languages so as to ensure that the public is served in a language they can understand. The county governments can take initiatives to develop Language Policy Documents in the respective counties. It is hoped that this will guide language use in the counties.

There is need for an accountability framework that will monitor and evaluate the development and use of both official languages. The accountability framework should report to the government how the official languages are being used and recommend steps to strengthen their use and development. The framework could also advise the government on how it could prioritize the development of the official languages.

A board should be established through government funding to oversee the development of the respective languages in terms of vocabulary development, translation, interpretation and training of translators and interpreters. This board could ensure that translated materials and documents meet high standards. Institutions of higher learning could also be funded to train translators and interpreters.

Conclusion

The paper has described the successful implementation of bilingual and multilingual language policy frameworks of Canada and South Africa respectively. It is clear that Kenya can learn some lessons in its journey of implementing bilingual official language policy. The onus is on the government to strategize on how to ensure that the spirit of the 2010 Constitution is realized. Although nothing much has changed in the use of Kiswahili as one of the official languages of the republic, it is mandatory that the government takes serious and planned steps to ensure that this becomes a reality. Apart from putting structures in place as a kind of affirmative action for Kiswahili, it needs to set aside funds to support development of vocabulary and train experts in the areas of translation and interpretation. The government needs to move with speed to ensure that relevant legislation is enacted to enhance the use of English and Kiswahili as official languages. Consequently, it needs to liaise with county governments to encourage and sensitize the public on the official language policy. Monitoring will also help the government to put measures in place to make sure that citizens receive services in both languages and that all the government documents are available in both languages. These steps will ensure that the spirit of the constitution promulgated in 2010 is met.

References

- Alexander, N. & Heugh, K. (1999). 'Language policy in the new South Africa'. *Culture link Special Issue 1998-1999. Cultural Change and Development in South Africa*. (edited by A. Zegeye and R. Kriger). Zagreb, Institute for International Relations.
- Alexander, N. (ed.). (2005). *The Intellectualisation of African Languages*. Cape Town: Praesa, University of Cape Town.
- Alexander, N. (1989). *Language Policy and National Unity in South Africa*, Azania. Cape Town.
- Alexander, N. (2002). 'Linguistic Rights, Language Planning and Democracy in post-apartheid. South Africa'. In Baker, S. (ed.), *Language Policy: Lessons from Global Models*. Monterey, CA.: Monterey Institute of International Studies.
- Alexander, N. (2005). 'The impact of the hegemony, of English on access to and quality of education with special reference to South Africa'. (Lecture delivered at the Language and Poverty Conference, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14 October 2005).
- Alexandre, P. (1972). *An Introduction to Languages and Language in Africa*. London, Heinemann.
- Beatty, S. (1989). 'A New Official Languages Act for Canada--Its Scope and Implications', in P. Pupier & J. Woehrling (eds.), *Language and Law: Proceedings of the First Conference of the International Institute of Comparative Linguistic Law*, Wilson and Lafleur, Montreal, 185-193. Buchu Books.
- Commissioner of Official Languages: (1992). *Our Two Official Languages Over Time* (revised edition), Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, Ottawa.
- Commissioner of Official Languages: (2003). *Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages Performance Report for the Period Ending March 31, 2003*, Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, Ottawa.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Haugen, E. (1966). 'Linguistics and Language Planning' in W. Bright (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference*. 1964. The Hague, Mouton.
- Haugen, E. (1983). 'The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice', in Cobarrubias, J. and Fishman, J. A. (eds), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*, Berlin: Mouton Publishers.
- Haugen, E. (1987). 'Language Planning' in U Ammon, N. Dittmer and J. K. Matheier (eds) *Sociolinguistics. Handbook of Science of Language and Society. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache Und Gesellschaft* Vol. 1. Berlin and Newyork: de Gryaler.
- Hudon, Marie (2013). *Official Languages in Canada, Federal Policy* (Background Paper), Library of Parliament, Ottawa, Canada.
- Lanham, L. (1978). An Outline history of the languages of Southern Africa. In L. Lanham, & K. Prinsloo, (Eds.) *Language and communication studies in South Africa*. (pp. 13-28). Cape Town: Oxford University Press
- Mesthrie, R. (ed.). (2002). *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mesthrie, R. (2006). Language, transformation and development: A sociolinguistic appraisal of post-apartheid South African language policy and practice." In *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 24, (2), 151-163.
- Mesthrie, R. Swann, J., Deumert, A. and Leap, W. L. (2000). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*, Edinburgh, University Press.
- Ngcobo, M. (2003). *Language planning and the politics of compromise: A critical analysis of the South African language policy*. (Dissertation) UMI: Proquest.
- Republic of Kenya. (1964). Kenya Education Commission Report Part 1 (Ominde Report). Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya. (1981). Second university: Report of the presidential working party (Mackay Report). Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya. (2010). *The Constitution of Kenya*. Nairobi. Government Printer.
- Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1967). *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism: General Introduction and Book I, The Official Languages*, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa.
- Stewart, W. (1968). 'A Sociolinguistic Typology for Describing National Multilingualism' in Fishman, J. A. (ed.) *Reading in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague, Mouton.
- Wardhaugh, K.(1987). *Language in competition: Dominance, diversity and decline*. USA: Basil Blackwell.

About the Authors

Dr. Miriam Osore is faculty Department of Kiswahili and African Languages, Kenyatta University while Brenda Midika is a PhD candidate in the same department.