Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA)
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)
UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE)

PROCEEDINGS

of the

Regional Conference and Expert Meeting on

BILINGUAL EDUCATION
AND THE
USE OF LOCAL LANGUAGES

Windhoek Country Club Resort
Windhoek, Namibia
August 3-5, 2005

Ministry of Education
Republic of Namibia

FINAL REPORT
15 March 2006

Original Language: English

Acknowledgements

Contents

Summary of Conference

During the 2003 Biennale Meeting of ADEA in Mauritius, one of the major themes discussed was the need to adopt curricula with regard to the use of African languages. The aspects of bilingual education and the use of local languages as medium of instruction within African classrooms raised great interest from the different stakeholders in education. In response to that ADEA decided to commission a major study on the state of the art of mother-tongue education and bilingual education in African countries in order to develop a clear argumentation based on scientific research that will help decision makers to facilitate the most effective policies around the use of African languages in the education systems.

Under the supervision of the UNESCO Institute for Education six international researchers studied and analysed cases from African countries such as Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, Ghana, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia, and compiled their findings in a *Stocktaking Report* on "Optimizing Learning and Education in Africa: The Language Factor". This document served as the background paper and frame of reference for the conference and expert meeting which took place from 3-5 August 2005 in Windhoek, Namibia.

Jointly organised by the *Association for the Development of Education in Africa (*ADEA), the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit* (GTZ), the *UNESCO Institute for Education* (UIE), in conjunction with the *Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie* (AIF) the conference was hosted by the *Ministry of Education (MoE) of the Republic of Namibia.*

During the three days conference more than 60 international experts and officials of African Ministries of Education - representing about 20 African countries – came together to critically reflect on an issue, which - as Hon. Nangolo Mbumba, the Namibian Minister of Education underlined in his opening speech - *is vital for the development of relevant and effective African education systems,* and to prepare the grounds for discussion on bilingually-oriented languages-in-education policies at the next ADEA Biennale Meeting in Gabon in March 2006.

It was the objective of the conference to provide a scientifically profound feedback for the revision of the *Stocktaking Report*, which in the long term shall serve as an evidence-based and theoretically sound document advocating bilingual and multilingual education in Africa, containing a message which is both accessible and acceptable to the political decision makers.

Within a set of four plenary sessions with presentations from experts and country discussants, each one followed by discussion groups, and a round table session at the end of the conference, the meeting's overall theme was discussed from four main perspectives.

According to structure and contents of the *Stocktaking Report* there was firstly the opportunity for reflection on the international and national framework of bilingual education and the use of local languages with special focus on the aspects of language policy and financial aspects.

Ekkehard Wolff, from the University of Leipzig in Germany, and Kathleen Heugh, a researcher for the Language and Literacy Study Unit of the South African Human Science and Research Council opened the discussion with summaries of their report chapters.

Wolff argued that there is a general understanding of the importance of education for development, however little is actually known about the exact nature of this relationship. Wolff in this regard called for scientific clearance about the relation between development, education and language and suggested to see the African language diversity as a natural asset and a resource rather than a problem.

Against common misconceptions amongst many of the African stakeholders in education, Kathleen Heugh illustrated through a cost-benefit analysis that the use of bilingual education actually offers enormous benefits for the African countries from an economical as well as an

educational point of view. She cited several recent studies supporting her argument and highlighted that the source for the general perceptions in this regard lays the focus on the input or direct costs of implementing bilingual education programmes, instead of looking at the actual costs. Those will in fact be offset by the financial savings and social benefits within less than 7 years. Heugh emphasised that *there is NO evidence that the early exit models which are currently used by the vast majority of African countries work or are cheaper. However, there is evidence that African Language Education is cost-effective and beneficial for social development.*

The financial savings through implementing bilingual education and the use of mother tongue instruction in African schools would be related to lower repetition rates caused by language difficulties (short term) and lower drop out rates (medium and long term). Furthermore, there can be savings expected through lower incidents of HIV infection which several studies related directly to longer school attendance.

The second topic discussed at the conference drew attention to the situation of learners and teachers in most African classrooms. The discussion was opened with presentations from Hassana Alidou, from the Alliant University, USA, on "The impact of the language used as medium of instruction on the teachers' performance and teaching practices" and the Norwegian researcher Birgit Brock-Utne's summary on the impact of the language used as medium of instruction on the learners performance and learning practices.

Based on classroom observational studies conducted in several African countries both researchers argued that, as Brock-Utne stated: *Learners learn better if they understand the medium of instruction. As a fact many African learners don't understand it.* The use of unfamiliar languages forces teachers to use ineffective and teacher-centred teaching methods which undermine the teachers' effort to teach and students' effort to learn. Teachers do most of the talking while children remain silent or passive participants during most of the classroom interactions. Because children do not speak the language of instruction, teachers are forced to use ineffective teaching techniques such as chorus teaching, repetition, memorization, recall, code switching and safe talk. The situation described accounts largely to the school ineffectiveness and low academic achievement experienced by pupils in Africa.

In countries and schools where languages used as medium of instructions are familiar to the learners, studies indicate that teachers and learners show real interaction and communication resulting in an overall better performance.

The discussions and expert comments on the second topic of the conferences circled mainly around the problem of teaching and teacher training and can be summarized best with a statement given by Adama Samassekou, president of the Académie Africaine des Langues (ACALAN): *Teacher quality leads to learner quality.* Experts and discussants expressed general concerns about the current state of teacher training in African countries as well as mutual agreement about the urgent need for the development and implementation of quality teacher training programmes that reflect the particular needs of bilingual education and the use of mother tongue within African classrooms. Furthermore, the participants discussed the issue of competency-based curricula that reflect the circumstances of African learners in terms of languages and contents integrating indigenous knowledge systems. There were also repeated demands for further scientific research on the aspects of literacy and literacy development from early childhood on as well as educational aspects of bilingualism and the use of mother tongue as medium of instruction.

The third aspect with regard to bilingual education and the use of local languages might be seen as the heart of the conference by many participants. It was the presentation of and the discussion about the most appropriate "Models for mother tongue education and Bilingual Education in Formal and Non Formal Education".

Kathleen Heugh, summarizing her second chapter of the *Stocktaking Report* used her presentation to strongly advocate **additive bilingual models** as the most effective models to be used for African education systems. Other than the early exit models, currently implemented by most of the African countries with bilingual education systems, the additive bilingual models promote balanced bilingualism through using the mother tongue as the language of instruction as long as possible, combined with learning the official language as second language. Heugh

argued that this model not only promotes better learning outcomes in content based subjects but also better conditions for second language acquisition. The best way to ensure that children learn the second language well is for it to be taught by very competent language teachers who have been well trained in the methodology and pedagogy of second language teaching. The early exit models used require almost all teachers to be second language teachers despite the fact that they have not been trained as second language teachers. A more economically and pedagogically sound approach would be to invest resources in people who have been identified as good second language teachers.

To round up the theme of bilingual education and the use of local languages in Africa the conference also reflected on the conditions for creating a multilingual learning environment in terms of publishing in local languages as well as strategies and tools for the promotion of educational changes such as the change of languages used as medium of instruction.

The availability of reading, teaching and learning materials in African languages is essential not only for the conservation of the African heritage of (oral) literature but also for the development of children's literacy in the respective languages which impacts directly on the quality of teaching in a bi/multilingual education system. As Carole Bloch from the PRAESA Project of the University of Cape Town stated*: All children need to be exposed to a lot of very rich and varied encounters with books for their literacy to develop. It is one of the characteristics of good spellers that they read a lot.*

Yaya Satina Diallo, Director General of Editions Ganndal, Guinée, and Peter Reiner, Publishing Manager for Gamsberg Macmillan, Namibia, spoke on behalf of many of the African publishing houses that undertook the challenge of publishing in local languages. They outlined the current situation as well as the obstacles and constraints that hinder the development of local publishing in African languages. Those include high costs for editing and publishing per unit, an increasing competition with publishers from overseas, a lack of skilled authors, editors, graphic designers and translators for the local languages and insufficient support from and collaboration with the national authorities also related to the absence of urgently demanded language and textbook policies.

Presenters and discussants emphasised that for the promotion of African languages in education, it is essential to have attractive print materials available. They also agreed on the necessity to create a network of collaboration of all stakeholders involved in print material development, publishing and distribution. Furthermore, there was a common understanding about the long term goal of developing an African culture of literacy throughout all levels of society.

With regard to strategies for the promotion of the idea of bilingual education and the use of local languages in African education systems, Alfred Opubor, Coordinator of the ADEA Working Group on Communication very relevantly asked: *How can we make educational reforms understood, widely accepted and effectively implemented?*

Answers to that and also to the question of how to generally stratify educational management and communication structures may lay in what Wolff introduced under the controversial term of *Social Marketing*. This approach should be understood as a tool for leadership support rather than a leadership concept in itself. It could be utilised for establishing better management and communication structures within African Ministries of Education in order to transform the educational sector into a "sector of partnership" that involves all stakeholders. In democratic societies reforms must be based on public discourse and consensus. Therefore, the transition to bilingual education and the use of local languages needs not only governmental support but also the willingness and collaboration of the public, including parents, teachers and the learners.

We are now, Adama Ouane, Director of the UNESCO Institute for Education, commenced his conclusion on the outcomes of the conference, *conscious of what has been done and the way forward, and we now need to know how to go forward. We have the wisdom and the capacity. We are unusually optimistic, seeing that the situation is ripe, and we have the power to do this.*

Finally, Mamadou Ndoye, ADEA's Executive Secretary, summarized the massive support to the research findings presented at the conference. He focussed on some lessons learnt and

referred frequently to the *additive model*, which promotes balanced bilingualism as an objective that all African countries should strive to achieve, and highlighted the general agreement on the following points amongst the conference participants:

1) Emphasis on the *additive language model* as the objective for everybody as it focuses on the critical link between the home language spoken by children and educational success. If the language (medium) of instruction is not known *well* by the children, then the obstacle to learning will be insurmountable; therefore, if we want to optimise learning, we must teach subjects in the mother tongue and *insist* on the additive model as a critical component of a beneficial learning environment.
2) *Language policies* cannot be separated from the challenges of addressing poverty and development and democratisation. While language is not the only factor, within the diversity of factors there exists an important link with language.
3) *Colonial-monolingualism* should not be replaced by *African-monolingualism.* The emphasis should be on bilingualism and multi-lingualism. African countries should take advantage of their great resource of linguistic diversity and each should choose the model that provides the best option to the country in question.
4) *Institutional frameworks* must be developed that will allow for the positive reform of language-in-education policies in Africa. These frameworks should provide a positive context for addressing the complex array of factors that must be taken into consideration, including the choice of languages in a multi-lingual context, and the link to L1 and L2 choices, the deployment of teachers in a multi-lingual context, and the challenges facing publishing in African languages.
5) Open and clear *communication* between experts, policy-makers, the public, and other stakeholders is critical. The question of language can raise fear and suspicion, leading to resistance to language-in-education approaches that are actually in the best interest of all parties. All present at the conference are aware of the underlying problems and agree on practical solutions; now it is time for everyone to begin to work to promote them.

Although it is clear that additive bilingual and multilingual policies must be drawn up and implemented, Ndoye also warned that this will require a process of change - and this transition will present some challenges. We should expect to face political obstacles, resulting from political opposition and also from an administrative point of view. Other obstacles will include funding and other financial obstacles; cultural prejudices and other social obstacles; resistance from specific bodies who have vested interests in the status quo; technical obstacles and a general lack of capacity. He noted that these obstacles often present themselves in Africa in other sectors, and educational reform will face them as well. Specific obstacles and challenges related to the choice of languages, the development of teaching tools, teacher training, and the development of an educated environment outside the education sector will also need to be surmounted.

Although these challenges might be difficult, the ADEA Executive Secretary expressed a firm conviction that the approach to language-in-education issues recommended by the conference are absolutely necessary, and also that they can be achieved through a sensitive, informed and collaborative approached.

It was agreed that the Stocktaking Report will be revised and finalised incorporating the recommendations of the conference. The African countries which expressed their interest in bilingual education will strive to apply the lessons learnt during the conference. ADEA and its partners will prepare the message that should be presented to the Ministers of Education at the next ADEA Biennale Meeting in Gabon in March 2006. Furthermore, ADEA will make contact with the African Union and NEPAD for the organisation of a major ministerial conference on the issue of African languages and their use in education systems.

Opening Ceremony

The Regional Conference and Expert Meeting on *Bilingual Education and the Use of Local Languages* in the African Education Systems was officially opened in Windhoek on Wednesday, 03 August 2005 by the **Honourable Minister of Education in Namibia, Nangolo Mbumba**. The conference was organized by the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA), German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and the UNIESCO Institute for Education in Hamburg, Germany (UIE), in conjunction with the Agence Intergouvernmentale de la Francophonie (AIF - Intergovernmental Agency for French-speaking Countries) and the Government of Namibia. Delegates from about twenty African countries were present, as well as representatives from multilateral and bilateral cooperation agencies, experts, and professionals from a variety of fields.

In his **opening address**, **Minister Mbumba** stressed the importance of multilingual education. He illustrated his point by explaining the Namibian government's challenge at Independence to unify an education system that had been segregated along ethnic lines under the apartheid government. Under this system the allocation of resources for education to the different ethnic groups was unequal and undemocratic. This had an impact on the educational performance of learners of the different language groups reaching far beyond Independence. Although the choice was made to use English as an official language and a unifying factor, the richness of linguistic diversity was also recognized and the decision was made to use mother tongues as languages of instruction for the first four years of schooling with a gradual shift to English. The use of local languages in education systems, he said, is a vital factor in enhancing the relevance, efficiency and quality of education in Africa. In opening the conference, he expressed the wish that it would generate a widely shared understanding of the challenges and strategies of bilingual education and at the same time increase the advocacy for mother tongue education directed towards both policy makers and the general public. Another objective of the conference, Minister Mbumba said, is to prepare the grounds for discussions on bilingually-oriented education policies at the next ADEA Biennial Meeting in Gabon 2006, which explore in greater depth the factors that determine the effectiveness of schools and adult literacy programmes as well as successful and affordable initiatives for early childhood development.

The Executive Secretary of ADEA, Mamadou Ndoye, provided the official welcome on behalf of the main organizers. He expressed appreciation for the research and work that has been done thus far by the researchers in the *Stocktaking Report*. He also reflected upon the objectives of the conference, and the difficult obstacles that will be confronted in trying to realize them. Language issues provide the foundation for development in Africa, including technological, social, and educational development. The conference should provide recommendations for how to develop African languages in a way that furthers the goals of democracy, development, and a peaceful society. He identified the primary aim of the conference as the preparation of an interface between research regarding the economic and social benefits of MTE, and educational policy. The credibility of the message to the politicians is thus critical, and Ndoye made several important points regarding the presentation of the message to policy makers:

> The message must be both accessible *and* acceptable. Research is often presented in a language that is not accessible to politicians and the public, and one aim of the conference must be to bridge this gap.
> The message must confront and contradict the fears of using mother tongues in education.
> The message must also take into consideration the different situations in different countries, and find ways to promote the general goals in ways that fit individual, historical, economic and social circumstances.
> The message must distinguish between *scientific research* and *assumptions* about language.

The representative from the **Agence Intergouvernmentale de la Francophonie (AIF), Anand Rumajogee**, noted the link between linguistic diversity and cultural diversity, and the inseparability of both of these issues from education in Africa and thus the productivity of African countries. He emphasized that it is not necessary to choose between languages in education, but that the *functions* of languages must be clear. The language that a child learns at home should be the language of instruction, while access to languages of wider communication must also be provided. He pointed out that there is an ethical aspect to the question of MTE as children have a right to learn in their own language. Ensuring this right for the Francophone African countries is a priority of AIF. At the same time, Rumajogee expressed optimism about collaboration with other institutions working with language and education in Africa.

Mekedes Edjugayehu, who spoke on behalf of the **UNESCO Cluster Office in Windhoek**, also welcomed the collaboration among the various organizations. She emphasized that the role of language in education is very delicate, and that it will be important to provide the research evidence to policy makers in a way that can help them to make the right decisions. She also expressed the commitment of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) to follow up on outcomes and recommendations of the conference.

The **German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)** was represented by the **Country Director in Namibia, Christiane Kalle.** In her address she emphasized the unique collaboration between ADEA, UNESCO, the Ministry of Education in Namibia, and GTZ in bringing together experts in bilingual education and representatives of various government and non-government agencies to provide for reflection on a subject that is crucial for the development of education in Africa. She noted that Namibia provides a good setting for discussions on linguistic variety and mother tongue education, as it is home to speakers of three European languages, and more than 10 African languages. While the official language policy in Namibia promotes MTE, there are still many obstacles to be overcome before this is a reality for all Namibians. GTZ has been supporting the Namibian Ministry of Education for over 10 years in efforts to improve the education system and enhance the use of African languages in education. The *Basic Education Programme* (BEP) started in the Kavango Education Region to establish a more efficiently organized decentralised education service delivery system which is now in place in all 13 regions. Since 2000, the *Upgrading African Languages Project* (AfriLa), in cooperation with the National Institute for Educational Development (NIED), has been supporting the implementation of the *Language Policy for Schools in Namibia* and producing teaching and learning material in various African languages for mother tongue education in the Lower Primary phase.

Overview of Conference

The Director of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE), Adama Ouane, whose Institute co-ordinated the research and ground work of the *Stocktaking Report*, provided an **overview** of the conference background and its objectives. He explained that the report, compiled by six expert researchers in the field, would now be placed in front of other experts and key stakeholders for critical analysis and additional input. The purpose of the expert meeting is to solicit recommendations as to how best to present the research findings in a consolidated document that will help political decision makers to facilitate the most effective policies around the use of African languages in the education system. He noted that the current document provides strong evidence that language is a crucial factor for educational efficiency stressing that the focus was not on languages per se, but on how local languages would contribute to the goals of empowering learners through lifelong learning and the improvement of education for all. The document seeks to provide *evidence based on research* that will further the advocacy for MTE and bilingual education.

Adama Ouane called on the participants to engage in critical reflection and to make proposals and recommendations for improvement, using the *Stocktaking Research on Mother Tongue and Bilingual Education in Sub-Saharan Africa* as their frame of reference. With this in mind, he announced, the conference would focus, in both **plenary sessions** and **discussion group sessions**, on the following four topics:

1. The national and international frameworks: language policies and the issues of cost and financing.
2. Improving classroom interaction through active teaching and learning practices.
3. *Models* for the use of local languages and bilingual education in both formal and non-formal education that promote the two critical dimensions of additive bilingualism; namely the use of MTE for better provision of educational content and also improved access to international languages in wider communication.
4. Publishing in African languages and the creation of literate environments, along with the necessary *social marketing* to present language-in-education issues accurately to the public.

Adama Ouane concluded by describing the over-arching goal of the conference: to provide an *evidence-based* and *theoretically sound* argument advocating bilingual (and multilingual) education. This document must also be made accessible to policy makers and be used as recommendations for language-in-education policy.

Plenary Session 1: The National and International Framework – Language Policies and Finance

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION   *- Day 1 Panel 1 -*

Language is not everything in education, but without language, everything is nothing in education. – Ekkehard Wolff

Chair: **Andreas H. Schott, GTZ Basic Education Programme Namibia**

Presenter: **Ekkehard Wolff, University of Leipzig, Germany:**
                 Summary of Report Chapter 2: *Background and History – Language and Language-in Education Policies in Africa: Problems and Prospects*

Respondents:
1. **Hon. Becky Ndjoze-Ojo, Deputy Minister MoE Namibia:** Expert Discussant
2. **Alassane Ndiaye, MoE Senegal:** Country Discussant
3. **Kathleen Heugh, Human Sciences Research Council, South Africa:** *Cost Implications*

The Chair of the first plenary session, on Wednesday, 03 August 2005, **Andreas H. Schott (GTZ)** reminded the plenary in his introduction that an important aim of the conference is to advocate for *additive bi- (or multi-) lingual education* in African education systems. This model, defined more precisely by Kathleen Heugh in Chapter 3 of the *Stocktaking Report*, was promoted throughout the conference as the standard to which educational policies should conform.

Ekkehard Wolff from the **University of Leipzig** presented his chapter from the *Stocktaking Report*, entitled *Language and Language-in-Education Policies in Africa: Problems and Prospects.* In his presentation, he emphasized the relationship between language, power and social change, arguing that the issue of language goes beyond education, and is a critical factor in development in general. Addressing issues of language in education is a starting point that will have widespread effects in society. However, there are factors that impede the formulation and implementation of adequate and socio-culturally integrated language and language-in-education policies, including political resistance to change. Wolff argued for the need for *language activism* to address negative language attitudes.

Wolff pointed out that there is an absence of discussion about *language* in mainstream development discourse, including that involving education. As an illustration, he presented the relationship between Language, Education and Development as it is usually understood as a "triangle" - but not a *balanced* one. He noted that *Education* is accepted as a requirement for *Development*, although there is little understanding of the exact nature of this relationship. The relationship between *Language* and *Education* is even weaker, and little is understood outside expert circles. The relationship between *Language* and *Development*, he said, is largely ignored. Thus, he argued, the importance of African languages for development purposes is vastly underestimated and largely misunderstood.

Wolff sought to establish the *normality* of multilingualism for the majority of children and adults in Africa rather than considering African multilingualism as a *problem*. Wolff advocated for a new paradigm that embraces language diversity as an asset and aims to encourage and build upon this resource.

Taking such an approach would be a step towards empowering the masses through the use of African languages. However, such language policies often fail, and Wolff suggested two basic reasons why this is the case.

The first barrier to change in language-in-education policy reflects an absence of political will. Changing language policies could undermine the power base of the current African elite. This might make them hesitant to endorse a language policy that embraces African languages. Quoting Neville Alexander, Wolff called this the *Status Quo Maintenance Syndrome.*

The second barrier is the perception that using African languages as languages of instruction will be too costly - another misconception addressed by Kathleen Heugh in her presentation of the cost implications below. Both barriers are part of a complex *conspiracy of factors* impeding the formulation and implementation of adequate language policies.

The quote by Wolff at the beginning of this section was repeated frequently during the conference, and summarizes the approach of the conference regarding the issue of language in education for Africa. It is a very critical issue that will extremely compromise education, if the language of education is not understood by the learner (or the teacher). Thus addressing issues of language in education is fundamental to providing quality education in Africa.

Hon. Becky Ndjoze-Ojo, Deputy Minister MoE Namibia:
Expert Discussant on Language Policy

In her response to the opening paper, Ndjoze-Ojo praised its coverage of a wide range of topics, and emphasized the definition of African linguistic variety as a resource. She asked: *why*, if multilingualism is the norm in Africa, is it not reflected in the school system? She also emphasized that access to languages of wider communication will not be *sacrificed* by using MTE, but rather *enhanced* within the embrace of a multilingual environment.

Ndjoze-Ojo described as one weakness of the Stocktaking Report that specific language policies and cases were not outlined; such an inclusion would be interesting and useful for comparative purposes. She suggested in particular that Southern African examples would provide an interesting case study as the region is emerging from the apartheid situation where language was used as a divisive and oppressive element. This not only affects the way that language issues now take shape in the region, but also provides interesting perspectives on cross-border languages, language policy and multilingualism.

Although language is a resource and one of the most important factors in the learning process, Ndjoze-Ojo suggested that dependencies have been created around language. Referring to Kenneth Kaunda, the founding president of Zambia, she suggested that the spiritual dimension of language in Africa should also be included in discussions of the relevance of African languages to education and to development in general.

Alassane Ndiaye, MoE Senegal:
Country Discussant on Language Policy

Ndiaye described the current state of language-in-education policy and planning in Senegal. Although there are many progressive policies in place, there are also obstacles and constraints in realizing them. The *Constitution of 2001* is very progressive in terms of national languages; all 14 codified languages are national languages. At the community level there are also a lot of possibilities, and from 2002-2005 seven new languages were codified. In the *Constitution* a lot is said about the future orientation of the education system, emphasising the linguistic factor. For the informal sector and in literacy programmes, there are also many options and resources that can be mobilized. The use of national languages in education policy, research and the curriculum is also taken into consideration in the *Constitution*. There is a project for the establishment of a Senegalese Institute for the Development of National Languages. Thus the formal situation in Senegal places preference on education in the national languages.

In Senegal, the ultimate goal is to encourage a situation in which scientific research accompanies what is happening on the ground. Efforts are underway to formulate a common approach to applied research, working in partnership with universities. The Linguistics Department of the University of Dakar has already begun to encourage such research among its students. Another necessary aspect is to develop pilot projects in which we can begin to implement the results of research on language in education. There is also a need for a

coordinating mechanism to allow for optimal results, and to integrate research findings and collective experiences into language and education policy.

Kathleen Heugh, Human Sciences Research Council:
Cost Implications for Language Policies: The Economics of Effective Language Models

As Wolff pointed out, one of the primary reasons given for not providing extended education in African languages is the cost factor. In her presentation, Kathleen Heugh confronts the argument that developing African languages for education will be *too expensive*, and, through a cost-benefit analysis, illustrates that such an approach will actually have enormous benefits in the long run, both economically and socially.

The current *early exit model* adopted by the vast majority of African countries means that both teachers and learners are forced to work in a language that neither of them knows well. Heugh pointed out that it would be illogical to think this is economically efficient. The reason for this misconception, she argued, is that focus is usually on the *input*, or the costs, of running a system through one (colonial) language as opposed to several languages. However, if we look at the *actual* costs, we find that they are offset by the additional benefits of using African languages in conjunction with dominant European languages. She cited several recent studies supporting her argument including recent South African studies which have found that national education departments will require a negligible amount to run the system through a multilingual framework, and figures at national and provincial departments are both less than 1 percent. Studies in Senegal and the Gambia (1999) found that introducing mother tongue education would require less than a 10% increase on a portion of the education budget, including teacher education and the production of materials. She pointed out that in South Africa, this translates to 0.7% of the education budget. Finally, she presented a cost-recovery analysis by the Swiss economist Grin (2005) which showed that even if the initial cost is 5% more, this is likely to be recovered in 5-7 years.

Heugh compared these figures with the amount of extra money spent on children who repeat years in school. Across Africa there is a very high repetition rate; this has been closely linked with language difficulties. The short term savings resulting from lowering the repetition rate and the medium to long term savings of lowering the drop out rate will result in enormous savings over time. In addition to the direct costs and benefits relating to investment in the school system, there will also be additional social and developmental savings, including, for example, lower incidences of HIV infection, which have been directly correlated with children remaining in school. Furthermore, the initial costs will decrease over 5-7 years.

Heugh asked the critical question: what is the cost of NOT investing in African languages? The answer must include the social and development costs - including the health consequences, education issues, and disgruntled youth who have been failed by the schooling system versus the benefits of successful education. The education impact of investing in MTE in African languages will be a higher through-rate for primary education, as well as better results at secondary level. This is important, as development experts are increasingly saying that primary education is not enough and there is a need to increase enrolment in secondary education. The economic impact will also be favourable. Students who remain in school longer will have higher potential earnings, which will result in higher potential taxes.

Most African countries are following an *early exit model*, which in Heugh's analysis is the MOST expensive; furthermore, even if it were implemented well, research indicates that it will work much less well than the other models. The most cost-effective model is the additive bilingual model, which uses the L1 all the way through school, with the L2 taught as a subject.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

Chairs: Anand Rumajogee (Bilingual Group)
Cathal Higgens (English Group)

One set of issues raised during the discussion groups involved calls for more information backing up the claims of the *Chapter 2*. Concern was expressed that the research methodologies used in the studies cited were not indicated, and that not enough data is presented to support the findings and the conclusions of the chapter. Another suggestion was that there needed to be more "depth" to the discussion of the use of African languages in the education systems. It was also suggested that country profiles describing existing language policies in African countries should be included in the document.

The response to these concerns was that some issues were necessarily summarised superficially, or left out altogether, in the interest of keeping that document to a reasonable length, but that the supporting evidence for the arguments does exist and is well-documented. The question of whether this document should be broadened to be more complete, or kept short and concise for ease of access, was debated but no conclusion was drawn. It was noted, however, that the length of the report and presentation of issues should be guided by its intended purpose as a reference document for policy makers.

Shifts in emphasis in the presentation of the information were also suggested. One request was that Wolff's emphasis on the link between the use of African languages and respective language policies on the one hand, and wider issues of social development on the other, should be made much stronger. Discussion also centred on the connection between development and the use of African languages, and the political change inherent in the implementation of language policies - changes in language policy could change power relations. Linking it to political aspects means the change of class structures. This point, in turn, was linked to the concept of *African Renaissance,* and the suggestion from the discussion groups was that this connection must also be made stronger and clearer. Another point of emphasis was the cost analysis made by Heugh; it was felt that this approach will be very persuasive to policy makers, and should be highlighted in the report. A related point was that in general, where statistics are available, they should also be included as they can illustrate points in a way that is accessible to politicians.

There was a very strong point made that the arguments for revising language policy must be presented in a way that is both *accessible* and *attractive* to policy-makers. A concern was that if the information was presented in a way that was overly critical, this could alienate the very people that the report is seeking to win over. The suggestion was made that positive examples of existing policies and implementation efforts should also be included; this will also help officials from Ministries of Educations to see the wider picture. Furthermore, there was a call for more *specific recommendations* as to what policies should look like. One suggestion for the report was that there should be an appendix where a list of existing language policies and short analyses could be included.

A further suggestion was that it is not only language policies by country that should be examined, but also cross-border policies. It was noted that the core problems cannot be solved at national levels alone, but should be addressed at regional levels, by national governments working together. The charters of international institutions that are dealing with language issues should also be brought into the discussion. One area in particular that would benefit from cross-border agreements is orthography. Possibilities for sharing materials across borders, which would broaden markets and help encourage African publishing efforts, will depend upon the standardization of orthographies for languages that cross borders.

The point was also raised during discussions that educational policies are often shifting as governments change. One way to deal with this would be to keep a continually updated database that reflects what is happening with language policies in different countries.

Finally, there is a need for more information to the public in order to emphasise the point that the use of MT will improve access to languages of wider communication and not replace them.

Recommendations from Plenary Session 1:

The link between the use of African languages and respective language policies on the one hand, and wider issues of social development and social change on the other should be strengthened.

The report should include specific recommendations of how language policies should look like highlighting positive examples of existing policies and their implementation.

Cross-border language policies should also be addressed.

Country profiles would be useful in the final *Stocktaking Report*; if this is not possible, a database on existing policies and their implementation should be developed and continuously updated.

The cost-benefit analysis must be revisited and presented as a sound calculation in order to be used for advocacy purposes.

The completion of the *Stocktaking Report* will not be an end in itself, but a beginning; it will have to be continuously followed up so that it will be both accessible and attractive to policy makers.

Plenary Session 2: The Classroom – Teaching Practices and Active Learners

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION   *- Day 1 Panel 2 -*

Chair: **Ayo Bamgbose, University of Ibadan, Nigeria**

Presenter: **Hassana Alidou, Alliant International University, USA:**
                    Summary of Report Chapter 4: *Experience I - Teaching Practices: teaching in a familiar language*

Respondents:
1. **Samba Traoré, MoE Mali:** Expert Discussant
2. **Lucy Moyane, MoE South Africa:** Country Discussant

Presenter: **Birgit Brock-Utne, University of Oslo, Norway: Summary of Report Chapter 5**: *Experience II - Active Students: learning through a language they master*

Respondents:
3. **Carole Bloch: PRAESA, South Africa:** Expert Discussant
4. **Santosh Kumar Mahadeo, MoE Mauritius:** Country Discussant

Hassana Alidou summarised in her presentation the main points of Report Chapter 4 of the *Stocktaking Report*, focusing on the relation between teaching practice and language used as medium of instruction. *Although*, she argued in regard to the subject, *changes have been intended, practice did not really change.*

Based on classroom observational studies she pointed out that in most Sub-Saharan African countries where the official language is prescribed as MoI, the low quality of teaching is mainly related to the fact that teachers are obliged to use a language which - in fact - is unfamiliar to both, teachers and learners. The teachers' lack of language proficiency leads to preference for teacher-centred approaches and traditional teaching techniques. In order to cope with the learners' insufficient language proficiency, teachers "unofficially" use strategies such as *code-switching* (switching between students' home language and the official MoI) and *safe talk* (fake interaction through chorus repetition).

These communication problems, Alidou urged, have already impacted the outcome of Sub-Saharan African education systems tremendously. They can be seen as the main obstacle for functional literacy development, the backbone of quality teaching and efficient learning in all other subjects. They can, furthermore, be held mainly responsible for the high rates of class repetition, high rates of school drop outs and illiteracy in most Sub-Saharan African countries, which *are among the most ineffective ones due mainly to the language factor,* as Alidou underlined.

As an alternative to the described situation in monolingual education systems, Alidou then drew attention to Bilingual/Multilingual Education Programmes. She talked about the main objectives and benefits of those programmes and mentioned some of the implementation problems.

The aim to Africanize the curricula, not only in terms of language, but also content- and structure-wise, was highlighted by Alidou as one of the main goals in order to respond to the educational needs of the target group. In regard to that the intention of Bilingual/Multilingual Education Programmes is to develop bilingualism as well as bi-literacy for both, African languages and the official ones.

Alidou explained that the promotion of a MoI which is familiar not only to the teachers but also to the learners creates a better environment for communication and interaction within the classroom. Teachers are encouraged to promote positive cultural values and feel more confident using use learner-centred teaching approaches and teaching techniques. This, in reaction, will help children to develop functional literacy in their First <u>and</u> Second Language. Furthermore, the use of a common language in school sets the frame for increased involvement of parents and community members, especially in rural areas.

However, there are also some obstacles to the successful implementation of Bilingual/Multilingual Education Models that Alidou briefly summarized at the end of her presentation. These are related to language and education policy issues, questions of adequate education models, teaching approaches, the management of bilingualism and bi-literacy, the need for teaching and learning materials in African languages, teacher training as well as adequate assessment and evaluation methods and instruments.

Samba Traoré, expert discussant from Mali, described his country's experiences with the change to bilingual education as a positive example. He then added some further comments on conditions for the successful implementation of bilingualism in the education system and outlined general problems with regard to teaching practices in African classrooms.

With reference to first evaluation results, Traoré commented very positively on the changes implemented in Mali's education system. He explained that teachers as well as learners have shown better performance with more communication and more interaction while using an African MoI. Regarding necessary conditions for the implementation of bilingual education he emphasised the importance of competent teachers and elaborated teacher training measures. In this context he briefly described Mali's initiative to support teachers and education inspectors in the development of local textbooks and learning materials.

In addition to Alidou's list of obstacles, Traoré also mentioned overcrowded classrooms with up to 60 students a common problem that impacts negatively on teachers' practices and performance. In such a classroom situation teachers are no longer in a position to sufficiently pay attention to each and every learner. They, as the discussant argued, therefore tend to focus mainly on oral literacy, neglecting the importance of writing, which leads to an even more unbalanced literacy development.

Traoré agreed with Alidou that it is crucial to develop adequate student assessment methods that suit the special aspects of bilingual education. In his final recommendations the representative from Mali suggested a cooperative approach to the elaboration of a joint teaching method for the African continent. He acknowledged the work of ADEA and GTZ in creating a database and thanked Adama Samassekou for his support in the Mali reform process.

Lucy Moyane, country discussant from South Africa, used her presentation to address several additional issues in regard to teaching practices and language. Firstly, she talked about the importance of language and education policies and how they influence teaching practices. Secondly, she discussed the contexts of urbanisation and the situation of rural areas that also impact on teaching practices.

Moyane agreed with her co-presenters about the need to develop new curricula based on new approaches, which can cater comprehensively for mother tongue, second language as well as for the acquisition of foreign languages.

In the last part of her presentation, Moyane briefly discussed aspects regarding teaching and learning materials. With regard to the issue of availability and accessibility of teaching and learning materials, she particularly noted the shortage of textbooks in African languages for special content subjects.

Moyane closed her presentation by once again emphasising the interdependence between a teacher's language competency/confidence and his/her teaching capacity. She labelled the problem of non- and/or under-qualified teachers as one of the major obstacles for many African education systems and therefore explicitly called for qualitative support of teachers through in-

service programmes. The South African representative gave examples of the Western Cape Education Department as positive role models for teacher support, and the promotion of African Languages as MoI for special content subjects.

Birgit Brock-Utne introduced the topic of her presentation with the general statement that *learners learn better if they understand* followed by the fact that *many African learners don't understand.* Adding to Alidou's presentation earlier on, Brock-Utne in her summary of Report Chapter 5 of the *Stocktaking Report* focused on the situation in African classrooms from the learners' perspectives and the relation between learning and the language used as medium of instruction.

In accordance with Alidou's arguments the researcher from the University of Oslo brought attention to common coping strategies which are used by students forced to learn in a language which is unfamiliar to them. Such strategies are remaining silent, repeating and memorizing instead of understanding and trying to guess instead of thinking. Consequences include that learning results appear rather unintended and are in fact undermining the objectives set in the curricula. Learners are discouraged and cannot fulfil the requirements of common education standards. Teachers often respond to the learners' unsatisfying communication skills and performance with outdated methods of punishment for using the "wrong language".

With reference to the results of a classroom observation experiment, Brock-Utne then illustrated figuratively the difference language can make within a classroom. For the experiment conducted by Brock-Utne in Tanzania in 2005 (and presented in detail in Chapter 5.1. of the *Stocktaking Report*) the same teacher was asked to teach the same topic to two different classes, using English as MoI for one class and Kiswahili for the other one. While in the lesson with English as MoI students as well as the teachers demonstrated the above mentioned strategies and behavioural patterns that are associated with a lack of understanding, students and teacher in the Kiswahili class showed positive interactions, joy and an overall better performance.

Against the background of this example of what African learners learn (in a monolingual education system) and can learn (through using their mother tongue as medium of instruction), Brock-Utne then expressed her belief that every country in the world has the right to learn in the mother tongue. As positive role models she named Iceland and Sweden, where - despite the small population – education takes place in the mother tongue but students also very quickly and efficiently learn English from teachers who know how to teach a foreign language. Brock-Utne closed her presentation by briefly addressing the issue of the curriculum-language-culture interrelations that need to be reconsidered in most African education systems as well as assessment and evaluation methods used.

Carole Bloch, expert discussant from the PRAESA Institute, South Africa strongly called for pan-African collaboration and networking on behalf of quality education. She emphasized that although mother tongue education is not the only factor, it is a critical one for getting children learn.

She recommended that the message from the conference should not set mother-tongue education against the importance of learning additional languages, and introduced the PRAESA term "*mother tongue based bilingual education*" as a terminological alternative for expressing the equal importance of both mother tongue and official language.

In addition to the debate on models for bilingual education and with regard to the experiences and results of a PRAESA language acquisition research project, Bloch remarked that – besides existing assumptions - children are very well capable of learning to read and write simultaneously in their mother tongue and the official language.

Regarding the issue of how to actually teach active learning, the South African researcher argued that *teachers need to understand how children learn* and that practical examples and demonstrations of the process of active learning are crucial for teachers and teacher trainers in order to understand the underlying concepts and mechanisms.

Bloch agreed on the positive impacts of the use of African languages in schools for the involvement of parents and community members and that active learning in bilingual schools facilitates an atmosphere of trust between teachers and students. Both links, Bloch underlined as exceptionally important in order to bring concerns and interests from home into school and to stimulate writing among children and their teachers as a meaningful social practice.

Addressing the issue of assessment for the first years of literacy learning, Bloch drew attention to the fact that in multilingual societies, children have developed competencies in interpreting and translation that ought to be addressed just like reading, writing, speaking and listening are. She also spoke against the tendency of measuring African achievements directly against the achievement in the northern part of the world. Bloch ended her presentation by stressing one more time that – in order to develop profound literacy skills - *children need to have access to a variety of reading materials* in the language(s) they are familiar with.

Santosh Kumar Mahadeo in his presentation discussed the importance of teaching and learning in the context of poverty alleviation. As country discussant for Mauritius, Mahadeo firstly gave a brief overview over the current situation in Mauritius where the English, French and an Asian language are used as the official medium of instruction in schools.

According to the Mauritius Examination Syndicate on examinations at the end of primary level the results currently range from 30% A to 10 – 8% D in all three languages. However, the average quality of writing skills obtained after six years of schooling is a serious concern. Acknowledging the positive potential of mother tongue education, Mauritius has since July 2005 implemented a pilot project for the use of children's mother tongue as a medium of instruction in the Lower Primary phase, which is financially and technically supported by UNESCO. Because of the pilot's early stage, Mahadeo noted, there can, however, be no conclusion drawn yet.

After the overview, the representative of the MoE in Mauritius then turned to the curriculum issue, declaring that Africa has been too timid about its indigenous wealth. Mahadeo claimed that the mother tongue used as medium of instruction can be a means for the poor to better access to and quality of education. However, depending on the level and scope of poverty in a country, an average of 30% of the socio-economically disadvantaged would benefit from any improved (Africanized) curriculum in any foreign language.

Curricula need to ensure the acquisition of competencies and must reflect the needs and experiences of children. They are, as Mahadeho illustratively stated: *the engine* to which *pedagogy is the fuel.* Without pedagogical skills and knowledge, teachers will reduce all newly designed competency-based curricula and accompanying learner-centred approaches to what they can do with it. The idea of active learners only works with an interactive teacher whose teaching time includes time for learning.

With regard to the situation in Mauritius, Mahadeo brought back the problems of poor teaching and learning outcomes to teacher training, which, as he argued, is often *amateurish and inadequate.* Without improvement in this chain of education, modern theories about education, teaching practice and learning will remain just words.

Mahadeo highlighted four aspects of implementing mother tongue education: (1) indigenisation/Africanisation of the curriculum, (2) breaking the gap between the traditional school and the home environment, (3) making the child feel comfortable in an unfamiliar environment and encouraging his/her interest in communication and (4) combating poverty through broader socio-linguistic inclusion.

Poor assessment methods were another issue that Mahadeo identified as a *factor causing poor performance.* He emphasised that assessment methods and instruments need to validate the total learning experience of the child rather than assessing only his/her cognitive skills. Mahadeo closed his presentation by summarizing the three factors (1) child-friendly curriculum, (2) inclusive pedagogy and (3) assessment methods that seek to validate the total learning experience of the learner as the necessary framework for efficient mother tongue education.

DISCUSSION GROUPS

Chairs: Alassane Ndiaye (Bilingual Group)
Henry Chilora (English Group)

From the presentations given in Plenary Session 2, there were several main points discussed further within the two groups.

The fist point might be summarised best under a statement given by Adama Samassekou that *teacher quality leads to learner quality.* In accordance with and addition to the presenters' statements, most of the participants used the group discussions to express their concern about the current state of the quality of teacher training in African countries. There was a general agreement on the urgent need to improve the quality of teaching trough the development and implementation of adequate teacher training programmes that reflect the particular needs of bilingual education and the use of mother tongue within African classrooms. Improvement strategies should address the teachers' language proficiency as well as the development of pedagogical skills. They should include early childhood education, provide adequate methods for literacy teaching and the development of functional literacy, strategies for efficient classroom management and lesson preparation. The improvement, however, should start with the teacher trainers by including personal classroom practice and experience into their qualification requirements. Furthermore, the importance on lifelong learning was noted as well as the need for training management and evaluation instruments.

Another main issue within the discussion groups referred to the curriculum debate that had been already discussed within the presentations. There was a common agreement that the contents of the curricula should be relevant to African classrooms and the needs and experiences of African learners. The curricula should furthermore be competency based and developed according to predefined educational aims and objectives (finality of schooling). Different perspectives were given on the extent of cross-border collaboration and the development of standardised African curricula. While some participants called for joint efforts in this regard, others insisted on the importance of specific national curricula.

Further issues that arose within the discussions concerned the need for specific *learner-centred teaching* approaches that cover the aspects of bilingual education and the use of mother tongue as MoI. The need for teaching and learning materials (reading materials in particular) in African languages was addressed and the importance of developing a culture of African and Africanized literacy.

Several participants called for more terminological clarification about the concept of "literacy" and the differentiation between pedagogy and teaching methodology. The potential for further scientific research was mentioned in relation to the concept of (bi-) literacy, particularly early literacy as well as early childhood education.

Recommendations from Plenary Session 2:

The implementation of bilingual education programmes for the Lower Primary phase in African education systems.

Comprehensive reform of teacher training programmes with regards to the special needs of bilingual education and the use of mother tongue.

Development and implementation of curricula that are competency-based and reflect the needs of African learners in terms of language and contents, related to that development there must be a definition of appropriate learner-centred teaching approaches and techniques as well as assessment methods and instruments.

Inclusion of early childhood as a phase into the several aspects of education (teacher training, curriculum, pedagogy and methodology).

Further scientific research on the aspects of literacy and literacy development from early childhood on, educational aspects of bilingualism and the use of African

mother tongues as medium of instruction, teaching methods for teachers <u>and</u> teacher trainers that suit the needs and conditions of African education systems.

Development of National Language in Education Policies.

Plenary Session 3:
Models for MT & BLE in Formal and Non-Formal Education

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION　　　　　　　　　　　　*- Day 2 Panel 3 -*

Chair:　　　　　**Alfred Ilukena, Director NIED, MoE Namibia**

Presenters:　　**Kathleen Heugh, Human Sciences Research Council, South Africa:**
　　　　　　　　　　Summary of Report Chapter 3: *Theory and Practice – Language Education Models in Africa: research, design, decision-making, outcomes and costs*

　　　　　　　　　　Aliou Boly, traDE, Burkina Faso: Summary of Report Chapter 6:
　　　　　　　　　　Experience III – Cross-fertilisation: Non-formal and Formal Education

Respondents:
1. **Magdeleine Chatry-Komarek, GTZ, Germany:** Expert Discussant
2. **Blasius Chiatoh, ANACLAC, Cameroon:** Country Discussant
3. **Abdou Mijnguini, MoE Niger:** Country Discussant

Kathleen Heugh: Evaluation of Language education models in Africa

In her presentation on Report Chapter 3 of the *Stocktaking Report*, Heugh asked why it is that Africa seems to be converging on a particular model of education, the *early exit model*. Across Africa, countries have moved from either no African language in the education system at all (Francophone countries) or a *late exit model* (Anglophone countries) to *an early exit model* phasing out African languages by end of grade 3. Heugh argues strongly that this model, despite its ubiquity and the commitment and good intentions of people implementing it, is designed for failure. *Early exit models*, she argues, *only work for about 10% of children*. She emphasizes that not a single model based on early exit has shown to be effective educationally, or cost effective.

Heugh describes a complex interrelated network of influences that lead African countries towards *early exit models*. Among these are *international expectations* or learning models developed throughout the world based on L1 learning that are expected to work in Africa - but *in a language that neither students nor teachers know well.*

Another problem, she notes, is a conceptual one; people confuse second language acquisition theory with applied linguistics and misunderstand the ability of children to *transfer* skills learned solidly in ones mother tongue to another language, with the notion that children can easily *transition* to a foreign language as LoI without having learned it well. Heugh emphasises that it is important not to confuse teaching the L2 as a second language with being able to teach complex subjects *in* that language. Learning mathematics and science, for example, is extremely complex, and learners need to understand every nuance. If a student is trying to learn these subjects in a language where he doesn't understand the nuances, he will not succeed in the subject. Furthermore, she pointed out that a confusion of terms and concepts has led to *early exit models* being promoted as *additive bilingual models*. For a programme to be additive, the L1 must be kept throughout the curriculum as the (or a) primary language of teaching and learning.

An important argument in favour of the additive model relates to efficiency and effectiveness of teacher training, and has implications both in terms of successful learning of English and other International Languages of Wider Communication (ILWC), and also in terms of educational costs. Heugh argued that the best way to ensure that children learn the L2 well is for it to be taught by a very competent language teacher who has been well trained in the methodology and pedagogy of L2 teaching. The current system requires almost *all* teachers to be second-

language teachers, despite the fact that not everyone is able to teach a language well (especially one that is *their* second language). A more economically and pedagogically sound approach would be to invest resources in people who have been identified as good L2 teachers. Heugh argues that when you cost all of the factors, it is much cheaper to invest in some very good teachers of L2 and then divert more resources into preparing the other teachers to teach content through a familiar language.

Heugh provides some partial answers as to why *early exit models* continue to be used despite all the evidence against them. One reason is that programmes are evaluated too early; within the first three years, there are improvements as the mother tongue is still used as the primary LoI. However, by grades 4-5 differences begin to appear, and by secondary school it becomes evident that the use of the official language as LoI is no longer allowing for success in the education system. Furthermore, Heugh points out that well-resourced programmes will show improvement over dysfunctional programmes, even if they are not the best models. When compared with a true additive model, however, it becomes very clear that *early exit models* disadvantage a large number of students.

Heugh made a strong plea for experts to provide responsible advice to governments and others, and for everyone to share a sense of collective responsibility for changing an approach that has shown to be detrimental to the continent's children, communities, and economies.

Madeleine Chatry-Komarek, expert discussant for GTZ from Germany, suggested that perhaps time is ripe to confront decision makers in Africa about functional vs. dysfunctional language models. Heugh's paper is a huge step ahead in the discussion and can be an important working instrument for many people.

The discussant also emphasized the notion of responsibility, but she pointed out that experts are responsible for the research and presentation of findings, not for the implementation - that is up to the government. Rarely are language experts able to impact decisions directly. They are responsible for the quality of their recommendations, but the ultimate decision lies with the government.

She also suggested that there should be a distinction between international organizations those who are managing money, and the bilateral agencies. The priority of the World Bank is often a smooth management of credit rather than educational outcomes; a difference should be made between financial experts, and those who are experts in the field of education in Africa.

Chatry-Komarek also noted that in the past there has been a strong resistance on the part of the African power elite to MTE. Under such circumstances, the open plea for the extension of the use of African languages beyond grade 2/3 would have been counterproductive in a certain number of African countries as the time was not yet ripe. The consensus of many at the conference, however, was that the time is now ripe, and that African language policy and practice can now move towards additive bilingual models.

Blasius Chiatoh, country discussant from Cameroon, explained that in Cameroon, although the constitution promotes MTE, little is done concretely and government has not taken it up as a responsibility. He described the Oral Language Usage Programme in Cameroon, which is a private initiative not encouraged by the government, noting that the programme is still experimental after many years of active research in the field. While education officials publicly state that the additive model should be implemented, in private they claim that it cannot be done.

Based on the experience of Cameroon and the chapter and presentation by Heugh, Chiatoh highlights some important points that need to be defined and exemplified:

> There is a need for more examples of weak models in Africa to know what is going wrong; if weak models are faced with problems of implementation, how will the strong models be tackled?
> There is also a need to look at working models; where transition models are strong this should be emphasized.
> In some contexts, countries may have to move towards a **tri-medium approach**.

There is a need to look at the strength of *oral use of L1* in the models, as **effective learning is both oral and literate** - this should also be emphasised and there should be focus on oral communication as a resource.

It should be made explicitly clear that the reason for the present lack of additive bilingual models lies in the **lack of officially supported plans** - we need to insist upon this. This is critical for official support and ownership of success, and acceptance of the conference recommendations.

The **contribution of donor agencies to the problem** must be better understood and emphasized. Donor agencies need to reconsider their responsibility and their actions.

Finally, there is a need to clearly state that the **success of models involves children**, who are the target groups - how can they also be brought into the process?

Aliou Boly: Summary of Report Chapter 6 on Non-formal Education

In his presentation, **Aliou Boly** discussed the use of languages in non-formal education (NFE) and proposed what he termed cross-*fertilization* between non-formal and formal education. He argues that NFE has arisen from the failure of formal education to meet the needs of the public, and from the desire of NGOs to develop competence in reading, writing, and mathematics for vulnerable sections of the population. Although there have been some successful models, the impact of NFE overall is limited and satisfaction is only partial. He asks what are the factors limiting the impact that we could have with NFE?

Boly presents two types of non-formal educational models: those that are closely linked with the formal system (Model 1); and those that evolve outside of, or parallel to, formal education (Model 2). The use of language is also very different in these two models. In Model 1, NFE is considered a bridge to the formal education system, with the goal of allowing students who otherwise would not go to school to enter into the formal system. This type of model generally is a joint initiative formed by governments and NGOs. Although the programmes are inspired by formal education, they also strive to be flexible and to adapt to the reality of the community, who plays an important role in the educational process. Their duration is generally shorter than formal education, with an age range of 6-14 years. The languages used in this model of NFE are in most cases the official languages; or, if a mother tongue is used, it is quickly replaced by a language of wider communication.

In Model 2, NFE is viewed as an alternative to formal education. In general, this model is developed according to the competencies of the child, with the aim of allowing him to professionalize his economic contribution in a specific area. In this model, the language of instruction is usually the mother tongue, or another African language; however transition to the official language within the first few years is also usually incorporated into the programme.

Boly notes four primary factors that contribute to success of NFE models:

The involvement of communities in the construction and development of the programme.
The physical closeness of the school and the community.
Flexibility of hours, taking into consideration the need for the children to fill other functions in the community as well.
The use of local African languages as the MoI.

Boly notes, however, that despite initial enthusiasm, innovative approaches and local successes, NFE has not led to a large-scale successful NFE movement in Africa. He outlines the factors contributing to the disappointment with NFE, as the models fail to fill expectations:

The difficulty of training teachers for the majority of models: need to at least train the teachers in the logic of the programme that they are engaged in.
Poor resources for equipment, employment, and other needs.
Use of the official language as the language of instruction in most cases.

The success of NFE efforts, according to Boly, is determined by results *as they are perceived by the students and their communities*. Using the mother tongue as a medium of instruction is important in many ways; an important one is that it permits greater participation by the community, thus contributing to the success of projects.

Another obstacle to successful NFE programmes is the lack of a clear vision. Should the final goal of the research be "education for all", or to provide support for children who choose not to enter into formal education? What are they being prepared for? Boly notes that instead of offering an alternative to the formal system, NFE efforts often push for the entry of more children into the formal system. However, although some may continue on to formal schools, the majority will not, and those who become active in the local economies find themselves still with insufficient technical training.

In order for NFE to become more effective the reason for its existence will have to be redefined. Its role should not be to increase the statistics of children in the formal education system. Rather, NFE must be seen as a legitimate way to permit children to realize their potential and become active actors in the economy and agents of social change.

Madeleine Chatry-Komarek, expert discussant for GTZ from Germany, pointed out that as NFE affects a very large part of the African population, it is a critical topic and she welcomed the idea of 'cross-fertilization' into the debate on education. She also encouraged the questioning of whether the goal of NFE should be only for the students to enter into the formal system, whether it goes towards professionalisation of the learner, or towards well-defined aims at joining the formal education system. However, although she expressed support for the approach of the chapter, Chatry-Komarek expressed concern that the main message about mother-tongue education might get lost amidst the wealth of other information presented. The choice of language in NFE is critical and this should be underlined and made very clear.

Chatry-Komarek argued that a more clearly defined reference framework and focus on multilingualism in Africa is needed; also a clearer indication about what should be defined in linguistic policy. Then NFE should be able to go beyond this, as it has more latitude in terms of language of instruction and is more open to innovation. This latitude should be examined and further understanding should be gained about how decisions are made. A final suggestion was that more detail and depth could be added to the chapter, illustrating the multiplicity of frameworks and the various elements involved; these could then be systematized into a more accessible document.

Abdou Mijnguini, country discussant from Niger, replied that, while the chapter is a good critique of NFE, it should also recognize that the state goes through a lot of efforts to put such programmes in place and it is important to recognise these and not only to complain. Niger is one of the few countries in the region that has a training school that caters for NFE and focuses on literacy. This school includes the training of trainers for literacy work, and a centre for the community training of trainers. He provided input based on Niger's experience.

He pointed out that as the sub-sector of NFE becomes a credible element in education systems, both civil society and technical partners can be motivated to take NFE into consideration as an important educational component. Although there are difficulties, the potential for impact is very strong, especially as African cultures are largely based in the rural areas and economies. Furthermore, using national languages is crucial. He also emphasized the importance of *community involvement* and *flexibility* to the success of NFE efforts, noting that those who are out of school are important for community economies.

Mijnguini strongly emphasized the need for better training, including developing better training-of-trainers programmes, better trainer profiles and more clarity on how training centres function. Learners have to understand that there are dynamics linked to languages; the more vocabulary they have the better they can express themselves. There is dire need to fertilize the ground, to find a common framework for NFE, in order to fully appreciate the educational potentials for NFE for communities.

Plenary Session 4: Creating a Multilingual Learning Environment – the Publishing Sector and Social Marketing

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION   *- Day 2 Panel 4 -*

Chair: **Mamadou Ndoye, ADEA, Paris, France**

Presenter: **Yaya Satina Diallo, Editions Ganndal, Guinée:**
                  Summary of Report Chapter 7: *Publishing in African Languages and the Development of Bilingual Education*

Respondents:
1. **Peter Reiner, Gamsberg Macmillan, Namibia:** Expert Discussant
2. **Mariana van Graan, NIED, MoE Namibia:** Expert Discussant
3. **Laurinda Moisés, MoE Mozambique:** Country Discussant

Publishing Sector

Yaya Satina Diallo, commenced his presentation on Report Chapter 7 of the *Stocktaking Report* by stating that creating an environment of literature in African languages is only possible, if the production is sufficient in quantity and quality and if the books produced are accessible to a diverse reading public.

Diallo argued that it is important to create publications in African languages which match the same editorial standards as publications produced in foreign or official languages. Obstacles and constraints that hinder the development of local publishing in African languages are (1) political ones, such as the absence of language and book policies in most African countries; (2) economical ones, which are mainly related to insufficient funding for local publishing houses and last but not least (3) technical problems like underdeveloped human resources and outdated printing equipment.

As positive examples and role models for the progress in Africanized publishing, Diallo named the Universities in Ghana, Cameroon, South Africa and Kenya, which amongst others offer diploma courses in publishing. He recommended including those universities into the research on and the development of publishing in African languages.

With regard to recommendations for the decision makers, Diallo emphasized the importance of language policies that can guide respective book policies, the promotion of cultural and linguistic initiatives. Furthermore, Diallo called on the national authorities and development partners to liberate the conditions for access to the school book market, to support the reinforcement of capacities for the publishing sector and to permit tax relief for local publishing. Local publishers should get a place within the national book market as well as facilitation for the access to the international book market. Finally, Diallo added, it should be ensured that the international conventions on intellectual property (Florence and Nairobi) are applied. On national level, Diallo highlighted the necessity to facilitate the development of public and academic libraries with publications in African languages officially included as well as the development of a more frequent culture of literacy, including media and arts.

Diallo finished his presentation by expressing his belief that strategies and actions coming out of this conference may bring a new spirit to the African publishing sector and the development of an African culture of literature.

Peter Reiner opened his presentation with the remark that *books are not the end at all; a good teacher can cover for a bad book, but not via versa.*

The expert discussant from Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers, Namibia, discussed the conditions, constraints and chances of publishing in African languages from a mainly commercial point of view. Reiner highlighted that local publishing not only promotes issues of language and education, but also of local economy. Amongst the complexity of benefits he in this regard listed the establishment of an industry and job creation, local value addition, retention of foreign currency as well as independence from other suppliers. As the necessary prerequisites he listed: (1) political stability; (2) national language and book policies that need to be not only adopted but also in place; (3) guided language development for terminology that should be coordinated by national authorities; (4) a free market system that helps to regulate prize and quality; (5) copyright issues need to be addressed, specifically for the African continent and lastly (6) there is a need for standardised language orthographies.

Other constraints, Reiner noted, are related to the perceived inferior status of African languages, financial constraints, shortage of trained personnel, inadequate computer software and impeded cross-border trade. Concluding his presentation, Reiner expressed his belief that publishing in African languages is possible and can be conducted as a viable, profitable and sustainable commercial activity. African language publishing, he emphasised, has a role to play in personal uplifting as well as national and regional development; and this role should not be underestimated.

The contribution of publishing in African languages lies not only in the creation of new employment opportunities, but also in the fact that it can help to produce a larger pool of better qualified human resources through a better understanding of learning matters and a wider dissemination of a larger body of knowledge, thereby contributing to the development and uplifting of the nation as a whole. What is essential there, Reiner concluded, is that we need to realize what we have to do with ourselves and not rely on someone else to do it for us.

Mariana van Graan, expert discussant from Namibia, opened her presentation with the question, why parents prefer to send their children to schools with English as MoI rather than to schools where the child is educated in the mother tongue.

One of the reasons, she then suggested, could be the lack of attractive teaching and learning materials in African languages. This situation is attributed to inadequate funding for textbooks and inadequate policy and institutional capacities for managing textbook development and provision.

Regarding the issue of translation, which has been discussed in **Chapter 7** of the *Stocktaking Report* as one of the aspects of local publishing, van Graan added that within the Namibian context it has been proved that translating readers from one language to another can potentially lower the unit price of the books as the text is overlaid on an already formatted page. Furthermore, translation can contribute to the development of African languages through enhancing the process of standardising orthographies and coining of terms.

The second issue van Graan addressed with regard to the issue of publishing was related to economic issues and challenges. She stressed the aspect of cross subsidising practices for books with different economic scales as a strategy to lower the costs per unit for small African languages.

The last aspect, van Graan drew attention to, was the importance of policies on book development and provision as already stated in the presentations, which however will only enhance the publishing and provision of titles in African languages, if a supporting Language Policy is in place.

Laurinda Moisés, country discussant from Mozambique, gave an introduction to the education system in Mozambique with regard to local textbook development. She explained that in her country, 7,6% of the population consider the official language Portuguese as their mother tongue, 39% speak Portuguese as a second language and 94% have one of the 20 Bantu languages as first language. The development of the Bantu languages and the standardisation of their orthographies began only at Independence in 1988. The bilingual education programme that has been implemented there also includes the production of didactic materials in

cooperation with local publishers. Moisés described the experiences with regard to the development processes as very positive.

Group Discussion on Publishing

Chair: Alfred E. Opubor, ADEA WG COMED, Nigeria

After the first presentation of Plenary Session 4, the participants brought up several issues with regard to local publishing and publishing in African languages and discussed them further. The discussion reflected on two aspects of publishing in the African context: local publishing markets and publishing African languages.

With regard to the first aspect, discussants representing the publishing industry underlined the complexity of problems that come along with publishing in African languages. Problems like high costs for editing and publishing per unit were mentioned as well as increasing competition with international/overseas publishers and a lack of skilled authors and editors for African languages. It was noted that there is also an unfortunate lack of network mechanisms within the African publishing industry, which hinders the development of joint strategies for quality improvement and cost reduction.

Regarding the issue of publishing and production of reading materials in African languages, it was argued that the development of language policies which indicate the regulations for language development and recognition of local languages is crucial also in that regard. Everyone agreed on the necessity to develop a reading culture for African literature within and beyond classrooms. This, several discussants stated, can be done through providing relevant, interesting and attractive books in African languages for various levels. Some urged the need for collaboration in terms of content development and the development of the respective languages.

Recommendations from Plenary Session 4 regarding Publishing:

Collaboration of all stakeholders (publishers, authors, government, donor agencies, public etc.) in order to create self sustaining local publishing industries that promote the development of print materials in African languages.

Developing National Language Policies **particularly with regard to bilingualism and the use of mother tongues.**

Developing Book Policies **that outline the regulations for the core aspects production, printing and distribution of materials in African languages.**

Financial and technical support for local authors and (emerging) publishing houses in order to create sustainable national capacity.

Support to and encouragement of local and cross-border networking structures for African publishers in order to share ideas and use the possibilities of cost reductions.

Development of an African culture of literacy throughout all levels of society.

Developing long-term, medium and short-term goals and strategies for the development of local publishing industries, local markets and the treasure of African literature.

Presenter: **Ekkehard Wolff, University of Leipzig, Germany:**
Summary of Report Chapter 8*: Outlook and Conclusion - Language-in-Education Policies in Africa: a Task for Integrated Social Marketing*

Respondents:
1. **Mariana van Graan, NIED, MoE Namibia:** Expert Discussant
2. **Alfred E Opubor, ADEA WG COMED:** Expert Discussant

Social Marketing

Ekkehard Wolff gave a short introduction to the concept of *Social Marketing* in his presentation. He underlined that the chapter is normative rather then descriptive in terms of what could be done to use *Social Marketing* as a tool for improved professional management, marketing and controlling. Wolff claimed that the concept of *Social Marketing* is needed for the purpose of human resource development and poverty alleviation in Africa in order to successfully devise and implement language planning in general and language-in-education policies in particular.

As Wolff noted, *Social Marketing* should be understood as a tool for leadership support rather than a leadership concept itself. It can, he added, help strategic planning and evaluation through defining target policies, distributional policies, communicational policies as well as economic policies.

In reference to Bruhn/Tilmes 1994, Wolff distinguished between two different perspectives within *Social Marketing*:

(1) An institutional perspective which looks at the realisation of social goals from the perspective of a given institution and serves basically as a leadership concept for those institutions;
(2) A problem driven perspective of *social marketing* that focuses on the question as to what kind of techniques, methods and tools could be used for solving social problems. This happens irrespective of which organisations would be responsible for the execution of such programmes.

As the main focal points for the issue of *Social Marketing* in respect to education, Wolff named the African Ministries of Education, which as he said are the responsible agencies to address this task.

Mariana van Graan, expert discussant from Namibia, in her comments on the concept of *Social Marketing* agreed with Wolff on the need for a comprehensive and analytic management and controlling strategy that Ministries of Education can use to promote mother tongue education.

With regard to Wolff's presentation, she argued that from her perspective a problem-driven marketing model would be more relevant than the institutional one. Illustrating the potential of the concept, van Graan explained that in the case of the conference the "social product" to be marketed would be the use of mother tongue education throughout primary education. This, she continued, could potentially happen through a marketing team that works across sectors and has immediate access to policy makers. And even though, truly integrated marketing strategies might not be possible in highly bureaucratic institutions, a step by step strategy towards *Social Marketing* might be a starting point.

Van Graan ended her comments with some questions to promote further development of the issue:

> Are we ready to fully adopt a *Social Marketing* strategy to address social problems?
> Are we more ready for a step by step approach?
> Do we presently have the competency and the human resources to deal with this kind of innovation?
> Are we ready for a bottom up approach, rather than a top down one as a controlling phase of *Social Marketing*?

If we do not yet have reached the level of professionalism needed, how do we plan to get there?

Alfred E Opubor, expert discussant representing the ADEA WG COMED, in his comments focused on the communicational aspects of *Social Marketing*. He opened his presentation with the question: *How can we make educational reforms understood, widely accepted and effectively implemented?*

The sector of education, Opubor argued, involves many stakeholders (parents, students, teachers, unions, development partners, ministries). Even though the MoEs have institutional responsibility they must realise that there are other players amongst them. Realising that implies also the need for collaboration and networking strategies in order to define, execute and achieve mutual objectives.

As a matter of fact, Opubor explained, the internal and external communication strategies of African ministries of education are rather poor. People in lower hierarchies are often uninformed. There is no clear corporate identity and existing communication units are usually understaffed, unstructured and aligned within the hierarchy of ministries of education.

Against this background, ADEA has developed a communication strategy suitable for the needs of MoEs that includes many ideas found in the *Social Marketing* approach. Components of the communication strategy are profound research as the backbone of any measures undertaken, which also implies taking into account the cultural context at all levels. Methods considered should be participatory, including those for monitoring and evaluation. The utilisation of all kinds of media is central as well as the necessity to cater for human resource development.

Opubor finished his comments by pointing out that the African ministries of education need to move towards establishing efficient communication units and developing communication polices in order to support education polices such as policies on bilingual education and the development of education in Africa in general.

Group Discussion on Social Marketing

Chair: Beans Ngatizeko, MoE Namibia

Already within Plenary Session 4, the discussion was marked by a debate about terminology used to address the issues of educational management, marketing and controlling. The issue centred mostly around the term "marketing" as some objected to the idea of education as a product.

There was, however, a general agreement of the importance for improving educational management structures within African ministries of education, especially the need for revised communication and network strategies that serve to bring all stakeholders in education together. It was talked about building "sectors of partnerships", "promotion of dialogue" and "dynamic partnerships". Most African ministries, are as the discussants admitted, very weak in terms of communication. Management should, therefore, consider changes through capacity building, institutional and structural reforms. Awareness building campaigns amongst the ministries about the importance of networking seemed crucial in this regard.

One main question that was raised, asked how the communication should be structured (top down, bottom up?). Another one was about the reforms that would be needed in order to establish a culture of dynamic dialogue amongst the stakeholders in education. It was understood by everyone that the development of the "African world of education" needs strong partnerships and a common vision. Both can only exist on the basis of functioning communication and participation structures.

<u>Recommendation from Session IV regarding Social Marketing:</u>

Developing the African education sector into a "sector of partnership" through "dynamic partnerships" and the "promotion of dialogue" amongst the stakeholders in education".

Reforms of communication strategies of ministries of education are needed on the basis of concepts and ideas of an integrated approach on *Social Marketing*.

The tools of *Social Marketing* should be utilized for awareness building campaigns and creating a network amongst the stakeholders in education.

Plenary Session 5: Reporting Back from Parallel Discussion Groups

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION   *- Day 3 Panel 5 -*

Although we must present our arguments strategically to the decision-makers, the goal itself - to promote the additive bilingual approach to language in education - is the same and we should not lose sight of it. - Ayo Bamgbose

Chair: Adama Ouane (UIE, Hamburg, Germany)

The Chairperson welcomed all groups to the Plenary Session 5 and emphasised that there was a need to consolidate reports from different discussion groups in this session. Participants and expert discussants were invited to ask questions where necessary and clarify where possible.

DISCUSSION GROUP 1: Presented by Andreas Schott, GTZ, Namibia

Language Policy and Finance

Mr. Andreas Schott presented the feedback from the groups discussing **Chapter 2**. He noted that the original Chapter 2 was much longer and more elaborated than the version in the *Stocktaking Report.*

The following points were highlighted:

1) Prof. Wolff emphasised the link between the use of African languages, respective language policies and development issues. The function of MTE as an instrument to address developmental issues should be strengthened.
2) The connection between development and the use of African languages and the political change inherent in the implementation of language policies was also noted as these issues could also change power relations. If it is linked to political aspects, it would mean a change of class structures which is linked to the notion of African Renaissance.
3) It was also pointed out in this context that if it is the opinion of this conference to link such issues to these political aspects, then we should strongly express this at the beginning of that chapter. The chapter should go further and make recommendations for what policies should look like. It was also recommended to consider including an appendix where this could be included, i.e. a list of language policies and a short analysis thereof.
4) The existing policies and positive implementation efforts should also be noted.
5) Cross-border language policies should also be addressed.
6) Another suggestion was that country profiles would be useful information to include in the final stocktaking document. It was therefore recommended that a running database on existing language policies and their subsequent implementation should be kept.
7) It was suggested that figures, including cost benefit analyses and other statistical illustrations should be more clearly presented in the report, as this will increase its appeal to policy makers and other politicians.
8) Lastly, it was felt that we should use the document as a stepping stone to continuously follow-up such issues.

The Chairperson of this session then commented on the editorial work to be done, saying that Chapter 2 is actually too long, and authors should follow the discipline of putting forward main arguments in a reasonable size. He confirmed that some critical arguments and quotations were, indeed, left out, but remarked that these will be recollected back into the final report during the restoration process. There was little discussion following this presentation and no further comments.

DISCUSSION GROUP 2: Presented by Alassane Ndiaye, MoE Senegal

<u>Active Learners and Teaching Practices</u>

The content of the discussion around Plenary Session 2 was divided into two groups, one about the role of local languages, and the other one about the improvement of the quality of teaching and teacher training.

The following recommendations were given by the discussion groups:

<u>A. Follow up of report</u>

There should be procedures to further communicate with the authors of the study about assumptions and shortcomings in the conceptual framework, including experiences of and figures from other countries.

<u>B. On the style of the report and mode of comparison</u>

The style of the report should better represent positive situations.
Choose better modes of comparison for the countries.
Be more specific and provide evidence for the elements of comparison in the presentation of results between bilingual classes and classes in the colonial language.
Take into consideration to compare only bilingual experiences with each other for clearer variables and results.
The issues and results on second language and foreign language use should be more specific and should have a more precise approach.

<u>C. On the training of trainers</u>

The study could deepen the interest in the training of trainers and the place that it occupies in the discussion with the following points:

The level of specialization required for teaching in a second language should be noted.
The importance of initial training and continuing training should be stressed.
Including references to the current training-of-trainers in the countries, their current capacity and preparations as well as the issue of bilingual and multilingual training.
The role training-of-trainers could play in the dynamics of social partnerships that would contribute to the success of bilingual teaching.

<u>D. On the elements of reference for further research</u>

An analysis of the differences within different education systems (assessment regulations, education programmes) could clarify certain questions and facilitate the engagement of political decision makers.
Theory and social practice should go together.

<u>E. Main points of the discussion</u>
Learning from the perspective of the learners.
Teaching practices in schools.
Social knowledge and scientific knowledge about the modalities of language adaptation.

One suggestion following this presentation was that the two chapters on teaching methods and on active learning be merged into one. Other participants noted that a primary issue at hand is actually teacher management issues, and it was suggested that a more holistic approach should be taken to address these, with the goal of improving education overall. This would involve linking issues such as initial teacher education, pre-service and continuing professional development, and the management of teachers in order to improve the quality of teachers, especially in using multilingual strategies. If the point is to change the education management system, then there is a need to look at all these factors holistically.

Further comments from participants on Discussion Group 2:

Hassana Alidou (AIU, USA) made reference to the TOR for the *Stocktaking Report* that only focused on 9 countries. There is a need to collect all studies available for meta-analysis. Since literacy is not just practice but also an issue of methodology, it is important to look at HOW children learn, and it is also critical to ask questions related to that. There is also a need to make arguments very clear in order to convince decision makers. Agreeing that the issue of methodology needs to be taken further as one method cannot develop literacy, she noted that the study talks about frameworks that include methodology and mentioned that literacy is at the centre of teaching and learning. She questioned why up to now teachers are still not able to develop critical literacy and how the topic of literacy could be addressed. She noted that literacy is still the weak point within teacher training. She questioned why that is and what could be done to improve the situation. With regard to teacher training, she emphasised that there is a gap between official changes in the curricula and a status quo situation in practice. She noted that in most countries literacy is not really part of the curriculum and asked for a language-based curriculum. Referring to studies from UNESCO (2002) and ADEA (2003), she remarked that early childhood education is virtually not in existence.

Wilfried Görtler (GTZ, Malawi) commented on the focus of the methodology used for the study. He questioned the comparability of case studies chosen for the review, with the focus on Grade 1 learners only who have not yet reached the end of their literacy development. He remarked that if different strategies were used, there would also be different results.

Carole Bloch (PRAESA, Cape Town, South Africa) emphasised the need for a reflection or revision of methods and methodology of literacy teaching and the nature of literacy development. The point is that there is not ONE method. It is content related and there is a call for clear positioning with regard to the method of teaching. The question is: "What do children need in order to become literate?" She noted that teachers are not trained in literacy development. There was a need to look into the content of teacher training with more focus on teacher training contents. The problem is that there are always new studies with new aspects, and there is a need for coherence about what needs to be done.

Alassane Ndiaye (MoE Senegal) wanted to know whether there were valid comparison factors available to help compare the situations. He also asked about the role of teachers, the instruments that should be used, the methods, and the duration of such education. He noted that the attitude for change is missing amongst teachers and stakeholders in education. He also identified that there are blockages and a lack of flexibility. He further noted that the orientation documents are there, but what is needed is their implementation.

Adama Samassekou (ACALAN/Mali) said that is important to situate the context, also the aims and perspectives, and defining the aims and the types of teacher training. He noted that very few countries reflect on the FINALITY of schooling. The importance of training should be viewed in terms of structural and financial problems as well as defining priority areas. **Teacher quality leads to learner quality and not the other way around.** The teacher is the key element, and we should focus on the whole philosophy behind teaching, while respecting the national curricula; and in this context also to address the issue of language in education.

DISCUSSION GROUP 3: Presented by Beans Ngatjizeko, MoE Namibia

Formal and Non-Formal Education

Issues discussed in Plenary Session 3 included Formal and Non-Formal Education, which the Chairperson suggested should be regarded as equally important. He also noted the clarification that this conference is focussed primarily on education for children, although education initiatives, especially non-formal ones, can also learn from adult education.

There was a long discussion around the approach of the conference to the current use of early exit models. It was strongly argued that such models are detrimental to African children as they are multilingual and should be changed; another perspective was that early exit models should be seen as the foundation for a transition, and should be presented positively as such. Although there was not full agreement on this issue, all present did agree that the additive bilingual

approach is clearly the best way to improve education for African children and communities and that as such it is absolutely necessary to work towards implementation of *true* bilingual models.

Other key points made during this discussion include:

The attitude of parents towards the education of their children and the impact it has on the choice of language-in-education. The group also looked at the dropout rate of children and the factors that contribute to such dropout. Considering the attitudes towards schooling as part of the explanation for high dropout rates, it was noted that there are many reasons why children drop out, as language is but one and not the only factor.

The importance of differentiating between the concepts of transfer of skills as opposed to transition from one language to another was emphasised. The question is whether there is a distinction between transfer of skills and transfer of concepts. Transfer, it was noted, is about a cognitive process, and the relationship between learning, language and thought. And when it is linked to a type of language programme, the use of the word 'transfer' should not be used out of context to mean something else. This issue should not be confused with the 'transitional model' of moving from MT to L2.

The need for well-trained L2 teachers in order to increase pedagogic and economic effiency of education programmes.

Given the goal of this conference to prepare for the biannual meeting of ministers, the final report should take into consideration what is practical and possible given the constraints of the political positions.

The discussion of strategy also included the issue raised elsewhere – the current efforts should be acknowledged and praised, while emphasising the need to go further towards additive bilingualism. One should not ignore the contributions of some countries (e.g. Burkina Faso) that are going from nothing to something.

The need for a *point of rupture* was also emphasised in this session, a point where governments recognise that the current language-in-education structure is in nobody's interest.

It was also commented that there is a need for a high-level report to the ministers of education. In such case there is no need to rewrite the original report, but take something out of it to fit when it is going higher up to the people who are making the decisions. A further comment related to the way the report should be re-written, looking at the positive achievements, commending those who have started and showing why they have to go on. Also, the section on *Costing* is very important as Ministers like responding to that, including some practical examples from the classroom.

Although it was agreed that the focus should be Ministers of Education as policy makers, in practice it is also donors who need to be convinced. The challenge is that we should communicate with politicians, donors and parents. There is actually a whole network of stakeholders that influence decision making, and we must collectively take responsibility and address all the stakeholders.

Further comments from participants on Discussion Group 3:

Mamadou Ndoye (ADEA Paris, France) pointed out that there is a clear message that must be presented to the Ministers of Education – the promotion of the *additive bilingual model* for language in education. The use of MT for instruction must be presented as a matter of efficiency and the urgent need for a continent-wide change must be expressed. He used figures to emphasise this argument, noting that research shows that on average in Africa, only 60% of students finish schooling, and of these only 50% show even *minimal* achievements on tests. He asked, how can MTE change the situation? Ndoye expressed strong support for the *additive bilingual model* as presented by Kathleen Heugh, and blamed current educational problems in part on the *early exit models* currently in use.

Ndoye also expressed concern that the message should be very precise. One issue that he identified as an area of confusion is that "on one hand we are saying that bilingualism and multilingualism does not present a problem for the children, but on the other hand we are saying that learning in the L2 (from the first 3-4 years) is a problem". He concluded by saying that this issue must be clarified in the final report (to the Ministers of Education).

Wilfried Görtler (GTZ, Malawi) commented that the *additive bilingual model* is clearly the agreed-upon ideal. However, he pointed out that its success also assumes well-resourced schools, but the reality in Africa is different. The language factor is only *one* of many factors. We should not convey the message that it is the *only* or even the *most* important factor. It correlates with other factors like poverty, cultural related factors as well as social factors. A comparative review of studies conducted worldwide on the economics of education would indicate the relative weight of the language factor in different countries and would complement the studies currently cited in the report. The report suggests that language is still important, but we should include those studies that actually reflect the realities in African countries. The main point is the fact that results are dependent on a variety of factors, and these vary from country to country.

DISCUSSION GROUP 4:

Chair 1: Presented by Santosh Kumar Mahadeo, MoE Mauritius

Social Marketing

The discussions of this group focused on the problems of communication in education, and how it applies to the central theme of this conference. Although there had been some debate about the use of the term *Social Marketing*, the Chairperson set the stage by stating that the group discussion was not going to revolve around semantics. The crux of the debate was about improving communication where current networks in the education sector were weak.

The fundamental question addressed by this discussion group was on how to build reforms into a productive dialogue that involves all stakeholders. The following points deal with this issue and how the overarching goal may be achieved:

> There was a need in Africa for a more integrated approach to different stakeholders in education in order that they might meet to exchange ideas and to promote dialogue and ownership of reforms proposed.

> There is a need to build better partnership while respecting the place and role of all actors. In other words, a dynamic partnership has to be created to come to a common vision.

> As education is a societal problem affecting everybody, there is a need for research results to be presented in a language that is easily accessible for the general public, so that findings can contribute to progress at grassroots level which is currently not happening.

> An important need is for models of management that will yield communication that will actually spearhead the dissemination and acceptance of new ideas.

In the discussion following, it was noted that the idea of *Social Marketing* was a managerial concept to enable and encourage stakeholders to talk about educational issues of common concern. The theory of marketing goods has moved considerably from the world of profit making to the area of social services like health. However, there was a suggestion made to replace the word "sell" with another term as education is not a product.

There was emphasis on the need to communicate with parents and to foster the understanding among parents that education in the mother tongue produces better results, including in the learning of the official languages.

A related point of emphasis was that those making recommendations and decisions have the responsibility of involving parents in the decision-making processes and in the support of decisions related to education reform.

One participant argued that the Ministries of Education must lead in the exercise of advocacy; there is a need for ADEA, and for governments to initiate dialogues with stakeholders and partners. It is the responsibility of experts (researchers) to be well-prepared when they take proposals to policy makers to advice them on these issues. There was general consensus for a participatory dialogue among stakeholders.

DISCUSSION GROUP 4:

Chair 2: Presented by Paula Gains, Molteno Project, South Africa

<u>**Publishing**</u>

The Chairperson asked what we could do to improve levels of publishing in African languages. The group highlighted six areas:

1. The long term overarching strategy is **to develop a reading culture in Africa**. This can be done through providing a variety of reading materials, not just textbooks for a variety of ages: young children, older children and adults.

2. There is a need **to develop a national capacity for publishing** by encouraging smaller publishing houses and local authors as well as increasing the capacity of local printers.

3. **Strengthen national policies** and make them clear, including:
    Language Policies with respect to bilingualism/multilingualism, so publishers know in what language to publish.
    Book Policies that outline who should write, who should print and who should distribute.
    Protecting local publishers against the dominance of multinational publishing groups.

4. **Need to understand the implications of bilingual education**: what is needed, how capacity can be increased to meet the needs and how publishers can contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for mother tongue literacy.

5. **Collaboration and partnerships among various stakeholders** such as ministries of education, publishers and printers in different countries so that research in published and non-published materials can be shared and a network for sharing ideas is established. One special aspect would be the harmonisation of orthographies for cross-border languages.

6. There is a need **to develop ways to deal with the flood of overseas materials**, including the need to develop quality control and to screen for cultural appropriateness and language use in order to discourage the dumping of unwanted materials. This includes lifting taxes on printed materials and textbooks to facilitate local publishing.

The discussions also emphasised the need to develop long, medium, and short-term plans to avert what the publishing experts termed *a current crisis*.

<u>Further comments from participants on Discussion Group 4:</u>

Mamadou Ndoye (ADEA Paris, France) talked about the aspect of professionalisation of the field of publishing in African languages. Francophone countries are trying to house actors involved in this field. There is work to do to really professionalize the use of national languages and the publishing in these languages.

Adama Ouane (UIE, Hamburg, Germany) illustrated the potential for developing African-based publishing with the example of a joint project between the UIE in Hamburg and the University of Botswana that involves publishing a series of textbooks on adult education. All African universities are currently using textbooks published elsewhere, which amounts to recycling textbooks from the UK and other Western countries. There is a great need and potential to create African materials and this requires training the authors. Adama Ouane suggested that publishers also need to participate in the professional development of authors.

General Discussion

Adama Ouane (UIE, Hamburg, Germany) elaborated on the discussions at hand by asking how to present the message that is apparent from the conference. He emphasised that the approach must focus on the fantastic work being done, while also drawing on research evidence to support the argument in favour of *additive bilingual education*. He again noted the idea of creating a *rupture*, and the need for much bolder decisions regarding MTE. He cautioned against polarising the discussion, suggesting instead that arguments should concentrate on the main message and imagine what we want to do. He asked: "How can this message be put in a strategic way without complacencies or alienating the ministers?"

Adama Samassekou (ACALAN/Mali) agreed that it is now necessary to have a clear perspective that can be presented to the decision makers. We should keep in mind that the things being said at the conference are not new, and that efforts to increase the use of African languages in the education systems could still take some time to see results. It is only recently that Africa emerged from a colonial system and African countries still need time to find their own strategies.

Ayo Bamgbose (University of Ibadan, Nigeria) returned to the point that the many variables influencing education must be taken into consideration, but argued that even when adequate account of other factors has been taken, language is still a critical matter. This has been demonstrated by a huge amount of work and experience in a number of countries. The goal of additive bi-/multi-lingualism must be kept firmly in view. Although we should commend efforts in this direction, even where they have not been able to attain that goal, we should also be clear when these efforts are not enough. Although we must present our arguments strategically to the decision-makers, the goal itself is the same and we should not lose sight of it.

Alfred Ilukena (NIED, MoE Namibia) added a further comment of agreement to Bamgbose, noting that language is a 'socio-political-cultural-economic issue'. But it seems that the curriculum becomes something that is supposed to take care of everything. He added that education should not be seen as the answer to everything, but must also be understood within the wider context of development, and other problems must also be addressed. There must be a systematic approach. In the final analysis, education makes an important contribution, but changes must occur at many levels and all other elements need to be addressed.

ROUND TABLE:
Principal Lessons Learnt out of the Expert Meeting and Recommendations for Finalising the Stocktaking Report

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION   *- Day 3 Panel 6 -*

Chair: Adama Samassekou (ACALAN/MALI)

The Round Table discussions were made up of representatives from each group of participants: This included six groups: a Team of Researchers, Ministries of Education, Other Experts, Bilateral and Multilateral Organisations and Organisers.

Team of Researchers: Represented by Hassana Alidou, Alliant University, USA

The representative began by indicating that the team knows they need to document research results and provide access to this research. She said that although efforts have been made to try to reflect the prevailing status as it is in each country the lack of availability of current data in some places explains why some countries are represented in the *Stocktaking Report*, while others are not. The next step is to see how to integrate certain countries and experiences into their recommendations.

The following important points were highlighted:

1) The appreciation of progress should be included in the final *Stocktaking Report*. The representative of the research team assured participants that contribution of colleagues present at the conference will be taken into consideration in a sustainable way.
2) This meeting was a platform of opportunity, and the *Stocktaking Report* should also revisit terminology used. Sometimes terms are confusing; we need terminology and documentation that is more readable and concise.
3) The objective of the team of researchers was mainly to listen to participants and colleagues present made contributions that were well received. The team of researchers has now to decide how to include them. The researchers need access to scientific data and articles, especially on key issues. Something more than just recommendations are needed, like the background evidence and documentation – especially about internal evaluation and independent evaluation of projects.

Ministries of Education: Represented by Dr. Blasius Chiatoh, ANACLAC, Cameroon

The representative explained that the group set out to examine the various chapters and to determine whether Ministries of Education are adequately represented, and to ensure that the report is in a language that is easily palatable at the level of policy makers.

The following issues were identified:

1) *Chapter 2* needs to more clearly illustrate the recommended model of mother tongue-based bi- and multilingual education.
2) The *Stocktaking Report* should include copies or drafts of language policies of some countries, in order to provide examples and in order to cross-check and to possibly improve existing policies in other places.
3) The recommendations should clearly recognise and appreciate positive achievements so far, while clearly stating the need for the *additive bilingual model*.
4) The *Stocktaking Report* should clearly indicate and describe the different models and their expected outcomes in order to encourage governments to work towards the desired model. It should be noted here that some governments may not have been working

towards the desired model, but it is better to start with a weak model than not at all. However, the model desired or used should be clearly described.

5) *Chapter 3* should clearly state the costs in order to illustrate the cost-effectiveness of MTE. The *Stocktaking Report* should say WHAT makes them cheap, and WHY and HOW they are cheap compared to other models.

6) *Chapter 4* should give a clear model for what it takes to have good teachers for bilingual education. What is meant by "a good teacher" and how they are cultivated, should be clarified and emphasised.

Other points relating to the entire *Stocktaking Report* highlighted are as follows:

1) After each chapter recommendations should be clearly stated.
2) The *Stocktaking Report* should capture good practices and point out positive achievements and progress governments have made over the years.
3) The choice of language should be carefully crafted and balanced, and the final document should endeavour not to marginalize those to whom it is intended.
4) In presenting the recommendations, there is a need to stress the crucial link between acquisition of literacy skills and poverty alleviation.
5) The *Executive Summary* should focus more on the factual information that decision makers can easily understand and not on scientific debates.

Other additional notes presented by members within the group of Ministries of Education are as follow:

Alfred Ilukena (NIED, MoE Namibia) emphasised that comments like "it is not surprising" should be eliminated from the *Stocktaking Report*, as they give the impression that the results were pre-planned and pre-judged. Researchers should remove themselves (be neutral) when making statements.

Tracy C. Mudzi (SADC Secretariat/Botswana) suggested that the final *Stocktaking Report* should take cognisance of what organisations like NEPAD, AU, SADC and others are saying about language. These organisations also have respective platforms and discussing these local, regional and international issues.

Lucy Moyane (MoE, South Africa) mentioned that there is also a need for the final *Stocktaking Report* to differentiate between critical issues and "nice to haves", specifically in *Chapter 5*, where it lacks evidence to substantiate the recommendations and conclusions we are drawing. She said that either the part should be beefed up with evidence, or the entire chapter should be removed.

Other Experts: Represented by Prof. Ayo Bamgbose, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Bamgbose praised the collaboration among the various groups that have joined hands to organise this conference and also expressed the hope that organisations like ACALAN will be included. Secondly, he thanked the organisers for inviting resource persons as they have enjoyed the conference in the sense that they had a chance to interact with researchers, Ministries of Education officials and other experts in the field.

The group highlighted aspects that were considered very important and that could eventually form part of the recommendations that would be included at the end of each chapter of the final *Stocktaking Report*. These aspects are as follows:

1) **Language Policies and Finance**
   The group endorses the universal consensus that African languages should be used as medium of instruction (MoI) as long as possible in education.
   Whereas some African countries have defined and implemented language policies regarding the use of African languages in education, the majority of African countries have no defined or clear language policies or have not implemented clear language policies.
   It is a fallacy to assume that MTE will be more expensive than traditional education in a foreign official language.

There is a need to emphasise that MTE does not exclude learning/teaching a foreign (European) official language, either as a subject or as MoI.

2) **Teaching Practices and Active Learners**:

There is a need for teacher training in bilingual and multilingual education contexts as well as EC (Early Childhood) literacy development. Specifically, it is recommended that teacher training should include pre-service, in-service and ongoing support in the classroom.

A foundation of a familiar language and an appropriate pedagogy are essential for active and good teaching practices.

A familiar language ensures that there is improved retention, maintenance of cultural values and parental participation (involvement) in the education of their children.

3) **Models of Formal and Non-Formal Education**:

An additive bi-/multilingual model is the necessary goal of education for African children. All other models, involving the use of African languages should be considered as transitional steps towards increasing the use of African languages in education.

4) **Publishing/Social Marketing (Communication**):

Governments should create an enabling environment for African publishers to provide publications in African languages as well as bilingual publications.

Stakeholders need to collaborate on the creation of a larger body of literature in African languages for use in school and other domains.

Issues of education reform in respect of MT-based or bilingual education must be tackled by creating dynamic partnerships based on a multi-stakeholder approach in order to facilitate communication.

Finally, the group observed that although superficially it would appear that there are differences of views and disagreements, there is actually a lot of agreement and the differences are only in strategies (methodology) of how we approach tackling the problems or presenting these to policy makers.

Bilateral and Multilateral Organisations: Represented by Mathews Makgamatha, MoE, South Africa & Irish Development Cooperation

The following points were outlined:

The role of researchers should not be downplayed in our quest for quality education – we should value their role.

The report needs to be revisited as part of the quality agenda and it should highlight the importance of a coherent language policy.

There is a need to review various models of multilingualism.

There is a need to move towards a more ambitious additive language policy to improve learning outcomes. The group realises that language alone is not the only factor, but as research shows, it is important to take on the challenges that languages present to us.

Pilot initiatives should be seen as learning opportunities and their limitations should be recognised.

Need to give priority to more generic approaches in developing initial literacy.

Efforts in the area of L2 learning should be focussed on building the capacity of a carefully selected team of potential language teachers as not everybody can be a (good) second language teacher.

The group recommended the following:

The final *Stocktaking Report* needs careful editing to acknowledge the process to date and indicate the immense challenges ahead.

The language of the final *Stocktaking Report* should avoid terms like "colossal failure" as this downplays all efforts that were made in good faith.

The current state of knowledge about language in education should be disseminated to Colleges of Education.

There is a need to develop communication to reassure parents that MTE and the continuum of that is not meant to keep their children out of the economy/markets.

There should be less romanticizing of the pluralities of African languages and acknowledge the greater attention paid to the use of English in IT, international communication and trade.

Organisers: Represented by Andreas Schott, GTZ, Namibia

A group, including representatives of GTZ, ADEA, UNESCO and others, was charged with organising a forum to listen to the responses of various stakeholders to the *Stocktaking Report*, and to consider suggestions for how best to promote policy recommendations coming from the conference.

The organisation and planning of the conference was designed to facilitate communication, interaction and cooperation between Anglophone and Francophone Sub-Saharan countries. Interpreters helped to bridge the communication gap, and the result was an affirmation that the problems and recommended solutions are very similar across the continent. This recognition will help to strengthen the recommendations coming from the conference.

For the organisers, the most important result is the agreement that a strategy must be developed to achieve the goal of offering effective bi-lingual education for as many learners as possible. The development of such a detailed strategy will require the active cooperation of many different agents in the field working to promote and support bilingual education. Only then will it be possible to implement an effective strategy. Other stakeholders not represented at this meeting, such as parents will need to be brought on board in order for the strategy to succeed.

We already have a good foundation for a document to present recommendations to the Biannual Meeting of Ministers of Education in Gabon in March 2006, which will now be an even stronger document after the conference. The proceedings of the conference will be produced by the editorial team here in Namibia and made available as soon as possible. The proceedings will document recommendations that have come from this conference, and will solicit feedback from a variety of stakeholders.

One thing we do not find helpful is to single out specific groups of stakeholders for failures or inadequacies in the implementation of bilingual strategies. All groups here are struggling to implement the goal of effective bilingual education. Only through effective communication, honest interaction and respect for each group and even their limitations can we move forward with a strategy for effective implementation of bilingual education. We have to be aware, though, that this will be a long-term process.

Comments on the Principal Lessons Learnt out of the Expert Meeting

Anand Rumajogee (AIF, Paris, France) commented that a *Memorandum of Understanding* (MoU) signed by all Francophone Ministries in Mauritius in 2005 states that we as Francophone countries agree that we need the ministries as facilitators to maintain the continuity of the role of the state. Even though the Minister may change, the state will continue its role and ministers must make sure that information is passed on to those who take over.

Lucy Moyane (MoE, South Africa) pointed out that the educational case for MTE has been made for many years, and now it is time to go beyond education. In Africa, the key issue now is alleviation of poverty, and we need to link MTE to poverty alleviation. Arguments that present literacy and education as a tool for combating poverty need to be highlighted. The chairperson noted that Ekkehard Wolff's chapter dealt with the issue raised here.

Abdou Mijinguni (MoE, Niger) suggested that *Chapter 1* should be reformulated as an introduction to all chapters to ensure that it is representative and not just a synthesis of what we are trying to advocate for. Mijinguni also noted the issue of gender disparity in education and society, and suggested that the relationship between MTE and the improvement of gender equality should also be brought more to the forefront. The Chairperson responded by noting that the advantages of MTE should perhaps be made clearer in many areas, including gender issues.

Cathal Higgins (Irish Cooperation) commented that a challenge now will be to communicate the message of the conference and to keep language on the agenda; we know from experience that many organisations do not want to embrace it. There are also problems with some models and we should communicate these harsh realities and the effectiveness of those models. The Chairperson in turn pointed out that the research that has been done so far cannot only be expressed in books and articles, but must be revisited to see what data is still relevant to the current situation. What is needed now is more communication and updated information.

Concluding Remarks of the Round Table Session

The Chairperson, **Adama Semassekou,** closed the session by highlighting the financial and technical dimensions at play. He requested that the recommendations make clearer the role of the financial partners. They accompany governments, and must also be at the heart of the process. For example, he pointed out that GTZ, Ireland, UNESCO and Francophonie were all represented at this conference. We have to talk about money, and we know that it exists and now we have to see how we can strengthen learning on a bilingual level. He then thanked the excellent initiative of ADEA, UNESCO and GTZ for their efforts and the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Namibia for the overwhelming welcome in Namibia.

He further mentioned that we have a clear vision and a perspective for the way forward in Africa. We have to understand where we come from as we are talking about the African Renaissance. The new perspectives are there, and can easily be summarised. Political willingness is expressed in legal terms through instruments such as the AU Charter, the Declaration of UNESCO and others.

The chair noted that there is tremendous political willingness across the continent, and recommended that we should look to the charters of organisations such as the AU to better understand what kind of support is there. The African Academy of Languages (ACALAN) will be formalised at the beginning of next year and will soon be a Pan-African structure. This is another development that should be followed. He also noted that the input of academics and intellectuals into policies is a new development that should be encouraged by government bodies and others.

The year **2006 will be the Year of African languages**, beginning at the Addis Ababa Summit of the AU in January 2006. Language problems are at the heart of this effort, and we need good recommendations to take advantage of this momentum. Africa is fortunate to have multilingualism on its soil and the question is how can we now develop an education system that is entrenched in the real culture and simultaneously open to the international world. UNESCO has as one of its main goals that every child should have access to education in its mother tongue. In the education system we must favour intercultural learning as a process, and update the position of UNESCO accordingly and provide cultural exchange.

The Chairperson finally thanked all partners who have accompanied the African Academy of Languages, especially UNESCO. He concluded by saying that we have to take into consideration not only languages but their cultures as well. The ball, he said, is in the African court, and we are hoping that our partners will accompany us as well playing it.

Closing Ceremony

The closing ceremony included presentations by Namibia's Deputy Minister for Education, Hon. Dr. Becky Ndjoze-Ojo; the Executive Secretary of the ADEA, Mr. Mamadou Ndoye; the Director of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE), Mr. Adama Ouane; and Mr. Georg Mades, representing the GTZ.

The closing ceremony offered the occasion for the representatives from the ADEA, the UIE and the GTZ to thank those who had helped to organize the conference, particularly the Government of Namibia, and to report on the results of the conference.

GTZ: Represented by Georg Mades (Basic Education Programme – AfriLa, Namibia)

Mr. Georg Mades stated that the GTZ was honoured to have collaborated with ADEA and the UIE in organizing the conference. He mentioned that as a supporting agency active in the education sector, GTZ is proud to contribute to the use of local languages in African education through a number of projects. The Basic Education Programme Namibia (BEP/AfriLa) convinced colleagues in the GTZ Head Office in Germany to bring this Conference to Namibia, because they believe this country had something to show with respect to mother tongue education and the use of local languages. He then thanked the organisers of the conference behind the scenes, in particular Mr. Robert Munganda (NIED, MoE Namibia), Mr. Andreas Schott (GTZ, BEP/AfriLa, Namibia) and Joris van Bommel (ADEA Paris, France) for ensuring that this conference was a success story.

UIE: Represented by Adama Ouane (Hamburg, Germany)

The Director of the UIE, Mr. Adama Ouane, declared his satisfaction over the experts' massive support for the research findings presented at the conference in Windhoek, which have been corroborated by the experience of those working at ground level. He also noted the existence of a core of competent, committed African experts specializing in the issue of languages in education, and of a new momentum for the revitalization of Africa. He placed the language issue in the context of Africa's participation in global knowledge creation, which requires a good command of the international languages as well as the need to enhance the image of African languages and of traditional know-how and knowledge.

The Ministry of Education of the Republic of Namibia: Represented by Hon. Dr. Becky Ndjoze-Ojo, Deputy Minister of Education

The Deputy Minister of Education, the Hon. Becky Ndjoze-Ojo, emphasized the fact that the language of instruction is a key factor in improving the effectiveness of learning processes, and that the choice of language also had an impact on efforts to reduce poverty. She also called on the media to participate in efforts to promote local languages by producing African languages editions. She registered her appreciation that all participants in the conference were on the same wavelength, expressing agreement with many of the points made in the summaries presented at the previous session.

Ndjoze-Ojo cited the phrase "information is power" and called for the empowerment of African Ministries of Education by making accessible necessary information on the issue of mother tongue education and bilingualism. Experts must take on the responsibility of providing very clear information about critical issues, such as the difference between *Language Acquisition* in relation to *Language Learning,* so that policies are not based on misinformation and misunderstandings. They must also provide clear and specific guidelines to facilitate good policy and implementation. Ministries of Education, on the other hand, should not isolate themselves, but must also welcome the input of academics and other experts. Furthermore, African governments should not be working in isolation but be part of the process in order to

strengthen each other. The print media should also be involved, she said, and cited the daily newspaper *The Namibian* as a good example of how the print media can include African languages in their publications.

Ndjoze-Ojo also emphasized that *language* cannot be separated from the messages that it carries. Language issues are thus also related to other social issues, including those having to do with gender equity and health issues such as HIV and AIDS. Communication and information dissemination around these and many other issues of social development will be greatly improved through the expanded use of African languages in education, and also more widely in social development programmes.

ADEA: Represented by Mamadou Ndoye (Executive Secretary, ADEA Paris, France)

In his address, Mamadou Ndoye especially thanked the researchers for the quality of their work, and for supplying the analysis and data to feed the dialogue and debate. He focussed on some lessons learnt and referred frequently to the *additive model*, which promotes balanced bilingualism as an objective that all African countries should strive to achieve.

In this context he highlighted the following major issues:

1) He placed strong emphasis on the ***additive language model* as the objective for everybody**. This message is essential to everything else, as it focuses on the critical link between the home language spoken by children and educational success. If the language (medium) of instruction is not known *well* by the children, then the obstacle to learning will be insurmountable; therefore, if we want to optimise learning, we must teach subjects in the mother tongue. Given this, he emphasised, we should *insist* on the additive model as a critical component of a beneficial learning environment.
2) **Language policy cannot be separated from the challenges of addressing poverty, development and democratisation**. While language is not the only factor within the diversity of factors there exists an important link with language.
3) He stressed that *colonial-monolingualism* should not be replaced by with *African-monolingualism.* The **emphasis should be on bilingualism and multi-lingualism,** and African countries should take advantage of their great resource of linguistic diversity and each should choose the model that provides the best option to the country in question.
4) **Institutional frameworks** must be developed that will allow for the positive reform of language-in-education policies in Africa. These frameworks should provide positive contexts for addressing the complex array of factors that must be taken into consideration, including the choice of languages in a multi-lingual context, and the link to L1 and L2 choices, the deployment of teachers in a multi-lingual context, and the challenges facing publishing in African languages.
5) Finally, **open and clear communication** between experts, policy-makers, the public, and other stakeholders is critical. The question of language can raise fear and suspicion, leading to resistance to language-in-education approaches that are actually in the best interest of all parties. All present at the conference are aware of the underlying problems and agree on practical solutions; now it is time for everyone to begin to work to promote them.

Although it is clear that additive bilingual and multilingual policies must be drawn up and implemented, Ndoye also warned that this will require a process of change - and this transition will present some challenges. We should expect to face political obstacles, resulting from political opposition and also from an administrative point of view. Other obstacles will include funding and other financial obstacles; cultural prejudices and other social obstacles; resistance from specific bodies who have vested interests in the status quo; technical obstacles and a general lack of capacity. He noted that these obstacles often present themselves in Africa, and educational reform will face them as well. Specific obstacles and challenges related to the choice of languages, the development of teaching tools, teacher training, and the development of an educated environment outside the education sector will also need to be surmounted.

Although these challenges might be difficult, the ADEA Executive Secretary expressed a firm conviction that the approach to language-in-education issues recommended by the conference are absolutely necessary, and also that they can be achieved through a sensitive, informed and

collaborative approached. Towards this end, he outlined the work that will be undertaken following the conference:

> The *Stocktaking Report* conducted by academics and presented at the conference is to be finalized, taking into consideration the recommendations of the experts' meeting.
> The countries interested in the issue of bilingual education, brought together by ADEA to form "inter-country quality nodes", will strive to apply the lessons drawn in Windhoek in their own countries.
> ADEA and its partners will prepare the messages to be presented to the Ministers of Education at the next ADEA Biennial Meeting, to be held in Gabon in March 2006.
> ADEA will make contact with the African Union and NEPAD with a view to organizing a major ministerial conference on the issue of African languages and their use in education systems in order to put into place a framework of reference for African counties with regard to Language Policy.

He concluded his remarks by thanking many people including organisations like GTZ, the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Namibia, UNESCO, the research team as well as the Francophonie.

With these remarks the Regional Conference and Expert Meeting on *Bilingual Education and the Use of Local Languages* was officially closed.

Separate Working Groups

1. Summary of inter-country quality node on Bilingual Education and Use of Local Languages

<p style="color:red; text-align:center;">[Summary to be included by ADEA]</p>

2. Summary of UIE/Researcher Meeting

The team of researchers and UIE met after the conference in order consult about the rich feedback obtained from the participants of the conference. On the basis of the manuscripts and documentation of the discussions received, each chapter will be revised by the researchers. Additionally, the UNESCO Institute for Education will prepare a shorter advocacy document.

APPENDICES

1.   Agenda of the Regional Conference and Expert Meeting

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND THE USE OF LOCAL LANGUAGES
Stocktaking Research on mother tongue and bilingual education in Africa

Wednesday, 03 August 2005

9h00-10h00   OPENING CEREMONY
Mr. Mamadou Ndoye Executive Secretary of ADEA, Paris
Mr. Anand Rumajogge Representative of Agence Intergouvernmentale de la Francophonie (AIF)
Ms. Mekdes Edjigayehu Representative of the UNESCO Cluster Office Windhoek
Ms. Christiane Kalle Country Director of GTZ Namibia
Hon. Nangolo Mbumba, Minister of Education, Namibia

10h00-10h30   CONFERENCE OVERVIEW by **Adama Ouane**, Director UNESCO Institute of Education, Hamburg

10h30-11h00   Coffee Break

11h30-13h00   PLENARY SESSION I
The national and international framework: Language Policies and Finance
Chairperson: Andreas Schott, GTZ

　　　　1. **Ekkehard Wolff, University of Leipzig:** Summary of report chapter on Language Policies (10 min.)
　　　　2. **Becky Ndjoze-Ojo, Deputy Minister MoE Namibia**: Expert discussant on Language Policy (15 min.)
　　　　3. **Alassane Ndiaye, MoE Senegal**: Country discussant on Language Policy (10 min.)
　　　　4. **Kathleen Heugh, Human Sciences Research Council, South Africa**: Cost Implications (10 min.)

13h00–14h30   Lunch Break

14h30-16h00   PARALLEL DISCUSSION GROUPS I
The national and international framework: Language Policies and Finance
Chairpersons: Anand Rumajogge, AIF and Cathal Higgins, Irish Cooperation

16h00-16h30   Tea Break

16h30-18h00   PLENARY SESSION II
The classroom: Teaching Practices and Active Learners
Chairperson: Prof. Ayo Bamgbose, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

　　　TEACHING PRACTICES
　　　1. **Hassana Alidou, Alliant International University, USA:** Summary of report chapter
　　　　 on teaching practices (10 min.)
　　　2. **Samba Traoré, Education Expert, Mali:** Expert discussant on teaching practices (15 min.)
　　　3. **Lucy Moyane, MoE South Africa:** Country discussant on teaching practices (10 min.)

　　　ACTTIVE LEARNERS
　　　4. **Birgit Brock-Utne, University of Oslo:** Summary of report chapter on active learners (10 min.)
　　　5. **Carole Bloch, PRAESA, South Africa:** Expert discussants on active learners (15 min.)
　　　6. **Santosh Kumar Mahadeo, MoE Mauritius:** Country discussant on active learners (10 min.)

19h00   Cocktail Reception by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Namibia

Thursday, 04 August 2005

08h30-10h00   PARALLEL DISCUSSION GROUPS II
Teaching Practices and Active Learners
<u>Chairpersons</u>: Alassane Ndiaye, MoE Senegal and Henry Chilora, MoE Malawi

10h0-10h30   Coffee Break

10h30-12h00   PLENARY SESSION III
Models for MT & BLE in formal and non-formal education
<u>Chairperson</u>: Alfred Ilukena, Director NIED/MoE Namibia

1. **Kathleen Heugh, Human Sciences Research Council:** Summary of report chapter on formal education (10 min.)
2. **Aliou Boly, traDE,** Summary of report chapter on non-formal education (10 min.)
3. **Magdeleine Chatry-Komarek, GTZ:** Expert discussant (30 min.)
4. **Blasius Chiatoh, ANACLAC, Cameroon:** Country discussant on formal education (10 min.)
5. **Abdou Mijnguini, MoE Niger:** Country discussant on non formal education (10 min.)

12h00–13h30   Lunch Break

13h30-15h00   PARALLEL DISCUSSION GROUPS III
Models for MT & BLE in formal and non-formal education
<u>Chairpersons</u>: Abdou Mijinguini, MoE Niger and Cathal Higgins, Irish Cooperation

15h00-15h15   Tea Break

15h15-16h45   PLENARY SESSION IV
Creating a multilingual learning environment: the Publishing Sector and Social Marketing
<u>Chairperson</u>: Mamadou Ndoye, ADEA Paris

PUBLISHIING
1. **Yaya Satina Diallo, Editions Ganndal:** Summary of report chapter on publishing (10 min.)
2. **Peter Reiner, Gamsberg Macmillan:** Expert discussants on publishing (15 min.)
3. **Mariana van Graan, NIED/MoE**: Expert discussant on publishing (15 min.)
4. **Laurinda Moisés, MoE Mozambique:** Country discussant on publishing (10 min.)

SOCIAL MARKETING
5. **Ekkehard Wolff, University of Leipzig:** Summary of report chapter on Social Marketing (10 min.)
6. **Mariana van Graan, NIED/MoE Namibia:** Expert discussant on Social Marketing (15 min.)
7. **Alfred E. Opubor, COMED:** Expert discussant on Social Marketing (10 min.)

17h00-18h30   PARALLEL DISCUSSION GROUPS IV
The Publishing Sector / Social Marketing
<u>Chairpersons</u>: Blasius Chiatoh, ANACLAC, Cameroon and Santosh Kumar Mahadeo, MoE Mauritius

19h00-20h00   CONSULTATIONS OF EACH GROUP OF PARTICIPANTS OF ROUND TABLE REPRESENTATION PREPARATORY MEETING

Friday, 05 August 2005

9h00-10h30   PLENARY SESSION V
Reporting back from Parallel Discussion Groups
Chairperson: Adama Ouane, UIE Hamburg

10h30-11h00   Coffee Break

11h00-12h30   ROUND TABLE
*Principal Lessons Learnt out of the Expert Meeting and Recommendations for
Finalizing the Stocktaking Report*
Chairperson: Adama Samassekou, ACALAN

Representatives of each group of participants:

1.   **Hassana Alidou,** Team of researchers
2.   **Blasius Chiatoh**, Ministries of Education
3.   **Prof. Ayo Bamgbose**, Other experts
4.   **Matthews Makgamatha,** Bilateral and multilateral organisations
5.   **Andreas Schott**, Organisers

12h30-13h00   Closing Ceremony
Georg Mades, GTZ Namibia
Adama Ouane, UIE Hamburg
Mamadou Ndoye, ADEA Paris
Hon. Becky Ndjoze-Ojo, Ministry of Education of the Republic of Namibia

13h00-14h30   Lunch Break

14h30-16h00   **Separate Working Groups:**
1. A*DEA inter-country quality node with partners*: evaluation of the meeting and planning of the next steps
2. *The team of researchers, UIE*: evaluation of the meeting and strategy for finalising the report

End of the Regional Conference and Expert Meeting

2.   Terms of References for Stocktaking Report

Background to the study

One of the major themes discussed during the 2003 Biennial meeting was 'Relevance: Adapting Curricula and the Use of African Languages'. The contributions on mother tongue education (MTE) and bilingual education (BLE) created a momentum for further discussion.

Therefore, ADEA seized the opportunity to intensify the policy dialogue on the subject by presenting a report on the state of the art of MTE/BLE with emphasis on its situation in Africa South of the Sahara. Given their experience and interest in the subject The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) and the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) received the mandate to organise and co-ordinate the study together with ADEA.

Objectives of the study

The analytical review aims at presenting evidence-based recommendations for language-in-education policies and language use in education in order to support policy-makers and other stakeholders to take informed decisions.

The main objectives of the study are
1) to document and analyze scientific and empirical evidence from research in African countries with regard to the use of African languages as the medium of instruction and the adaptation of curricula to local context and culture;
2) to explore the state of the art of MTE/BLE with emphasis on its situation in Africa South of the Sahara;
3) to facilitate policy dialogue regarding the use of African languages and bilingual education.

Methodology of the study

A desk research of studies and experiences on MTE/BLE in Sub-Saharan Africa was conducted by six experts. The report of their stocktaking research is organised around six central themes. The foundation of the data is a pool of studies from a selection of African countries whereby the final selection of African countries was driven by the availability of documents and the researchers' expertise. Two principles underlie the final choice of studies: (1) studies which are supported by sound theoretical and empirical evidence were given priority, and (2) internal evaluations and evaluations paid by the programmes' stakeholders were consulted, however, independent evaluations were given greater weight.

The researchers reviewed studies of existing formal and non-formal educational programmes and language policies with a **focus on language use and its implications on the quality of learning and education**. Thus, they analysed the studies for findings on learning achievements, and elements of successful implementation strategies but also elements of failure and the technical, financial, linguistic, institutional, political and social reasons given. Additionally, aspects of cost-effectiveness, equity and equality were taken into consideration.

3.   List of Participants

TEAM OF EXPERTS

▪ Ms. Hassana ALIDOU
*Professor, International Teacher Education and Cross-cultural Studies, Graduate School of Education,
Alliant International University*

9494 Carroll Canyon Rd. 151
San Diego, CA 92126, USA
Tel: 001 858 578 7506, 001 858 610 0634
Email: hassanatou@yahoo.com
       halidou@alliant.edu

▪ Ms. Kathleen HEUGH
Researcher and Head, Human Science Research Council, Language and Literacy Studies Unit, Assessment and Technology

1213 Plein Park Building, Plein Str.
Cape Town, 8001, South Africa
Tel: 0027 21 4667841
Email: kheugh@hsrc.ac.za

▪ Mr. Aliou BOLY
Managing Director, traDE

P.O. Box 1118 Bobo Dioulasso
Burkina Faso
Tel: 00226 20973430 / 00226 20971948
Email: bolytrade@fasonet.bf

▪ Mrs. Birgit BROCK-UTNE
Professor,   Institute   for   Educational Research, University of Oslo

P.O. Box 1092 Blindern
0317 Oslo, Norway
Tel: 0047 2285 5395
Fax: 0047 22854250
Email: birgitbono@yahoo.no
       Birgit.brock-utne@ped.uio.no

▪ Dr. Ekkehard WOLFF
Professor, Institute for African Studies, University of Leipzig

Institut für Afrikanistik, Beethovenstr. 15,
04107 Leipzig, Germany
0049 341 9737048
Email: wolff@uni-leipzig.de

▪ Mr. Yaya Satina DIALLO
Director General, Editions Ganndal

P.O. Box 542 Conakry, Guinée
Tel.: 00224 295379
Fax: 00224 463507
Email: yayasasatina@yahoo.fr
       ganndal@mirinet.net.gn

REPRESENTATIVES OF AFRICAN MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION

Cameroon

▪ Dr. Blasius CHIATOH
Association Nationale des Comites de langue camerounais (ANACLAC)

P.O. Box 2905, Yaounde, Cameroon
Tel: 00237 231 9143
Fax: 00237 791 8397
Email: bchiatoh@yahoo.com

Mauritius

▪ Mr. Santosh Kumar MAHADEO
*Director, Communication,
Ministry of Education*

Riche mare, C. Rlay, Mauritius
Tel: 0060 5227 6869422
Email: smanadeo@mai.gov.mu

Mozambique

▪ Ms. Ester Fernanda TINGA
*International Cooperation,
Ministry of Education*

No 167, CP-34, Maputo, Mozambique
Tel: 00285 420700
Email: etinga@mined.moz.gov

▪ Ms. Laurinda Moisés
*Educational Advisor,
National Institute for Educational Development*

4653 Maputo, Mozambique
Tel: 00258 21 321701
Fax: 00258 21426797
Email: neuchachel@yahoo.co.uk

Namibia

▪ Hon. Dr. Becky NDJOZE-OJO
*Deputy Minster of Education,
Ministry of Education*

Private Bag: 13391, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 2706310
Fax: 00264 61 254145
Email: florianahansen@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. Beans NGATJIZEKO
Director, Adult Basic Education,
Ministry of Education

P.O. Box 12033, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 2933188
Fax: 00264 61 2933913
Email: bngatjizeko@mec.gov.na

- Mr. Alfred ILUKENA
Director, National Institute for Educational
Development (NIED)

Private Bag 2034, Okahandja, Namibia
Tel: 00264 62 502446
Fax: 00264 62 503640
Email: ailukena@nied.edu.na

- Ms. Nathalia GOAGOSES
Deputy Director, Khomas Education
Region, Ministry of Education

Private Bag 20086, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 2934364
Email: nathalia@iway.na

- Dr. Wilfried H.G. HAACKE
Professor, Department for African
Languages, University of Namibia

P.O. Box 11585, Klein Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 2063845
Email: whaacke@unam.na

- Ms. Mariana VAN GRAAN
Senior Research Officer,
National Institute for Educational
Development (NIED)

Private Bag 2034 Okahandja, Namibia
Tel: 00264 62 504404
Email: mgraan@nied.edu.na

- Mr. Paulinus HAINGURA
Education Officer Rumanyo,
National Institute for Educational
Development (NIED)

P.O. Box 993, Okahandja, Namibia
Tel: 00264 62 502446
FAX: 00264 62 502613
Email: phaingura@nied.edu.na

Niger

- Mr. Abdou MIJINGUINI
Directeur des Programmes
d´Alphabetisation et de Formation des
Adultes, Ministère de l`Education de Base
et de l`Alphabetisation

P.O. Box 2838, Niamey, Niger
Tel: 00227 72 4093
Email: mijinguini@yahoo.fr

Senegal

- Mr. Alassane NDIAYE
Directeur de l'Alphabétisation et de
l'Education de Base

23 Rue Calmette – P.O. Box 15743
Dakar-Fann, Senegal
Tel: 00221 842 24 82/842 24 83/658 50 03
Fax: 00221 842 24 83
Email: alassand@yahoo.fr

South Africa

- Mr. Aron MOTSOALEDI
Ministry of Education and Culture,
Limpopo Province, South Africa

Tel: 0027 15 9870013

- Ms. Lucy MOYANE
Chief Director, Curriculum and
Assessment, Ministry of Education

P.O. Box X895, Pretoria 0001, South Africa
Tel: 0027 12 3234001
Email: moyanel@doe.gov.za

- Ms. Onica DEDEREN
Chief Director, Department of Education,
Limpopo Province

96 Plein Street, Polokwane 0699,
South Africa
Tel.:015 2978013
Fax: 015 297 7338
Email: dederenko@edu.norprov.gov.za

- Mr. Michael MALIAVUSA
Programme Manager DCI

P.O. Box 4478, Polokwane 0700,
South Africa
Tel: 0027 15 2975334
Email: m.maliavusa@mweb.co.za

Mr. Mboni NEMATANGARI
Deputy Chief Education Specialist for
Languages, Department of Education

Private Bag X895, Pretoria 0001,
South Africa
Tel: 0027 123125217
Fax: 0027 123254001
Email: nematangarim@doe.gov.za

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER ORGANISATIONS/INSTIUTIONS/AGENCIES

Agence Intergovernmentale de la Francophonie

- Mr. Anand RUMAJOGEE
Project Coordinator

13 Quai André, 75015 Paris, France
Tel: 0033 1 44377189
Email: ramsamy.rumajogee@francophonie.org

UNESCO

- Ms. Mekdes EDJIGAYEHU
UNESCO Cluster Office Windhoek

Brahms Street, 5, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 2917202
Email: m.edjigayehu@unesco.org

SADC

- Ms. Tracy C. MUDZI
Senior Officer Education and Training,

SADC Secretariat
Private Bag 0095, Gaborone, Botswana
Tel: 00267 3951863
Email: tmudzi@sadc.int

Académie Africaine des Langues (ACALAN)

- Mr. Adama SAMASSEKOU
Président d' l´ACALAN

P.O. Box 10 Koulonba, Bamako, Mali
Tel: 00223 2238447
Email: acalan@timbagga.com.ml

Irish Cooperation

- Mr. Cathal HIGGINS
Consultant, Development Cooperation Ireland

7 Glenbrook Park, Rathfarnham,
Dublin 14, Ireland
Tel: 0035 3 86 8183955
Email: cathalhiggins@ireland.com

- Ms. Flavia BAKUNDANA
*Development Cooperation
Embassy of Ireland, Uganda
Programme Coordinator, Support to
Primary Education Reform*

P.O. Box 7791, Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 00256 78 920405
Fax: 00256 78 344353
Email: fkebirungi@yahoo.co.uk

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, NORAD

- Ms. Hilde THYNESS
Higher Executive Officer, NORAD

P.O. Box 8034 Dep., NO-0030 Oslo,
Norway
Tel: 0047 22 240392
Email: hit@norad.no

GTZ

- Dr. Wilfried GÖRTLER
*Team Leader, Basic Education
Programme, GTZ Malawi*

P.O. Box 31131 Lilongwe, Malawi
Tel: 00265 1 755000
Email: wilfried.goertler@gtz.de

- Mr. Henry CHILORA
*Senior Curriculum Specialist,
Malawi Institute of Education*

P.O. Box 50, Domasi, Malawi
Tel.: 265 1 536 300
Email: mie@malawi.net / lac@malawi.net

- Ms. Magdeleine CHATRY-KOMAREK
Eduction Specialist, Consultant

Kleindeinbachstr. 28/1,
73527 Schwaebisch Gmuend, Germany
Tel.: 0049 7171 72674
Email: kurt.komarek@t-online.de

Human Science Research Council, South Africa

- Mr. Matthews MAKGAMATHA
*Researcher, Human Sciences Research
Council, South Africa*

ATEE, Private Bag X41, Pretoria, 0001
South Africa
Tel: 0027 12 3022320
Email: mmmakgamatha@hsrc.ac.za

RESOURCE PERSONS

- Dr. Ayo BAMGBOSE
*Professor for Linguistics, University of
Ibadan, Department of Linguistics, Nigeria*

Tel.: 00234 2 8104017
Email: bamgbose@skannet.com

- Ms. Carole BLOCH
Early Literacy Specialist, PRAESA, University of Cape Town, GTZ Consultant

PRAESA, UCT, Room 14, Art's Block, UCT, Private Bag, Rondebosch, 7700 Cape Town, South Africa
Tel.: 0027 21 6504013
Email: cbloch@humanities.uct.ac.za

- Mr. Peter REINER
Publishing Manager, Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers

P.O. BOX 22830, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 232165
Email: gmpubl@iafrica.com.na

- Mr. Francis SAMPA
Principal Education Officer, Zambia Primary Reading Programme

Teacher Education Department, P.O. Box 50093, Lusaka, Zambia
Tel: 00260 1 251654
Email: fsampa@zamnet.zm

- Mr. Antonio Mizé FRANCISCO
Programme Officer, CIDA

P.O. Box 2425, Maputo, Mozambique
Tel.: 00258 21 499889
Email: mize@cida-psu.com

- Dr. Samba TRAORE
CNE, Ministére de l´Education Nationale

P.O. Box 1583, Bamako, Mali
Tel: 00223 220 26 79
Fax: 00223 679 8513
Email: sambatraore52@yahoo.fr

- Ms. Paula GAINS
National Training Manager, Molteno Project, South Africa

P.O. Box 30696, Braamfontein, 2017, RSA
Tel: 0027 11 339 6603
Fax: 0027 11 3393555
Email: paula@molteno.co.za

ADEA WORKING GROUPS

- Ms. Amina OSMAN
Coordinator, WG NFE

UNESCO Institute for Education, Feldbrunnenstr. 58, 20148 Hamburg, Germany
Tel: 0049 40 448041-20
Email: wgnfe@yahoo.co.uk

- Ms. Ulla KANN
Consultant WG ESA

P.O.B. 23815 Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 228910
Email: ukann@iafrika.com.na

- Ms. Debbie BOTHA
Education Material Developer, READ-ADEA

P.O.Box 30994, Braamfontein, Johannesburg, South Africa
Tel: 011 496 3322
Fax: 011 4963445
Email: debbieb@read.co.za

- Mr. Alfred OPUBOR
Coordinator WG on Communication for Education and Development (COMED)

P.O. Box 378 - Cotonou, BENIN
Tel: +229 31 34 54/31 58 87
Fax: +229 31 54 61/31 29 70
Email: alfredopubor@yahoo.com
           comed@wanad.org

- Mr. Djessido Latévi LAWSON
ABEA WG on Communication for Education and Development (COMED)

01 BP 378, Cotonou, Benin
Tel: 00229 31 3454
Fax: 00229 315461
Email: comed@wanad.org

ORGANISING TEAM

ADEA Paris
Website: www.adeanet.org

- Mr. Mamadou NDOYE
Executive Secretary, ADEA

7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France
Tel: 0033 1 45 03 77 65
Fax: 0033 1 45 03 39 65
Email: m.ndoye@iiep.unesco.org

- Mr. Joris Van BOMMEL
Programme Specialist

7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France
Tel.: 0033 1 45 03 77 79
Fax: 0033 1 45 03 39 65
Email: j.vanbommel@iiep.unesco.org

- Ms. Thanh Hoa DESRUELLES
Publication & Communications Officer

7-9 rue Eugène Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France
Tel: 0033 1 45 03 77 69
Fax: 0033 1 45 03 39 65
Email: th.desruelles@iiep.unesco.org

UNESCO Institute of Education

- Mr Adama OUANE
Director UIE, Hamburg

Feldbrunnenstr. 58,
20148 Hamburg, Germany
Tel: 0049 40 44804116
Email: aouane@unesco.org

- Ms. Christine GLANZ
Project Coordinator, Associate Researcher, UIE Hamburg

Feldbrunnenstr. 58,
20148 Hamburg, Germany
Tel.: 0049 40 449140-23
Email: c.glanz@unesco.org

GTZ Namibia

- Mr. Andreas H. SCHOTT
Coordinator, Upgrading African Languages (AfriLa), GTZ Basic Education Programme Namibia

P.O. BOX 90546, Klein Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 61 2933306
Fax: 00264 61 2933304
Email: andreas.schott@gtz.de

- Mr. Georg MADES
Team Leader, GTZ Basic Education Programme Namibia

P.O. Box 8016 Bachbrecht, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00264 81 1240558
Fax: 00264 61 2933304
Email: georg.mades@gtz.de

- Ms. Yamina EHRT
Project Intern, GTZ Basic Education Programme Namibia

P.O. Box 8016 Bachbrecht, Windhoek
Tel: 00264 81 1240558
Fax: 00264 61 2933304
Email: ehrtyamina@yahoo.de

- Ms. Jennifer HAYS
Consultant, GTZ Basic Education Programme Namibia

P.O. Box 3945
Swakopmund, Namibia
Tel.: 00264-(0)81 2273749
Email: jenn@mweb.com.na

Namibian Ministry of Education/National Institute for Educational Development (NIED)

- Mr. Robert MUNGANDA
Education Officer Thimbukushu, National Institute for Educational Development (NIED)

P.O. BOX 2034, Okahandja, Namibia
Tel.: 00264 62 502446
FAX: 00264 62 502613
Email: rmunganda@nied.edu.na

- Mr. Laurentius DAVIDS
Education Officer Khoekhoegowab National Institute for Educational Development (NIED)

P.O. BOX 2034, Okahandja, Namibia
Tel.: 00264 62 502446
FAX: 00264 62 502613
Email: ldavids@nied.edu.na