Bringing the outside in: attitudes towards multilingual competence in Zambia and Tanzania

Reilly, C.; Gibson, H.; Kula, N.C.; Costley, T.; Mapunda, G.; Mwansa, J.; ... ; Ferrara, L.

Colin Reilly, Hannah Gibson, Nancy C. Kula, Tracey Costley,
Gastor Mapunda and Joseph Mwansa

Bringing the outside in: Attitudes towards multilingual competence in Zambia and Tanzania

Abstract: Language-in-education policies in many African countries are heavily influenced by a monolingual mindset and monoglossic conceptualizations of language. This policy situation does not accurately reflect the multilingualism which characterizes language use within communities nor the linguistic repertoires of individuals in these communities. This chapter focuses on the tensions between multilingual repertoires found outside of the classroom and the seemingly monolingual policies within them. We discuss findings from linguistic ethnographic research carried out in Zambia and Tanzania. We examine individual attitudes towards language and how children acquire their communicative competence, and compare the language practices that are found and valued outside of schools, with those found within schools. Our findings show that adults and children engage in sophisticated translanguaging practices as a natural part of their everyday lives outside of educational contexts. Multilingual practices are seen to emerge organically from the necessity to communicate in different contexts within the community. This informal practice sharply contrasts with the language education provided in formal educational contexts where an artificial monolingualism is enforced and where multilingual practices and skills are often not welcomed or valued. We conclude with recommendations for utilizing the multilingual practices which are acquired outside of the classroom to enhance learning within the classrooms, thereby strengthening communicative competencies across formal and informal contexts.

Keywords: multilingualism, language attitudes, language policy, Zambia, Tanzania

Colin Reilly, University of Stirling
Hannah Gibson, **Tracey Costley**, University of Essex
Nancy C. Kula, Leiden University
Gastor Mapunda, University of Dar es Salaam
Joseph Mwansa, USAID Transforming Teacher Education in Zambia

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110794670-008

8.1 Introduction

Language-in-education policies in many African countries are heavily influenced by a monolingual mindset and monoglossic conceptualizations of language (Erling, Adinolfi and Hultgren 2017; Erling et al. 2021). This is a consequence of coloniality (McKinney 2020) and does not accurately reflect the multilingualism nor the language use practices which are found in individuals' repertoires and within communities (Makoni and Mashiri 2006; Reilly 2021; Gibson and Reilly 2022). In this chapter we report findings based on a recently completed project entitled *Bringing the outside in: Merging local language and literacy practices to enhance classroom learning and achievement* (BTOI 2020–2022). This project was a Global Challenges Research Fund supported collaboration between the University of Botswana, University of Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), University of Essex (UK), and the University of Zambia.[1] The project sought to investigate the extent to which the multilingual repertoires of students and communities are visible and welcomed within formal educational spaces. It is based on our belief that the Medium of Instruction (MoI) plays a central role in any education system; but that there are contrasts in terms of what is valued between the language and literacy practices which occur outside of the classroom, and those that occur within the educational space. The sophisticated multilingual competencies which individuals acquire informally and make effective use of in their homes and communities are not necessarily welcomed within educational spaces which tend to promote formal education through monolingual interactions which can in turn have serious consequences for educational experiences, engagement and attainment.

In this chapter, we discuss findings from linguistic ethnographic research carried out in communities in the Nakonde District and Kasama District in Zambia and in the Tabora and Ruvuma Regions in Tanzania. The research involves interviews and focus groups with primary school students, teachers, and community members, as well as field notes from participant observation and classroom recordings carried out by the research team. In both countries, as across the continent, learners and their daily interactions are predominantly multilingual and learners acquire these multilingual repertoires informally with ease. We focus on attitudes towards language and language learning, and compare findings related to language practices inside schools (i.e., in formal learning spaces) and language practices found outside schools (i.e., in informal learning spaces). We consider the informal language learning contexts to be spaces such as the home, the broader

1 For more information on the Global Challenges Research Fund visit the relevant page of the UK Research and Innovation website https://www.ukri.org/what-we-offer/international-funding/global-challenges-research-fund/

community and in public spaces such as markets. Within these contexts, we address the following questions:

1) What language practices are found, expected, and valued outside of schools?
2) What language practices are found, expected, and valued inside schools?
3) How are the language practices found outside schools acquired or developed?

We show how language learning is influenced by prevailing language ideologies which focus on the separation of languages, and how these ideologies are perpetuated within language-in-education policies. We illustrate hostile language learning environments which are created by language rules in school settings, and how this leads to boundaries between language use in educational and community settings.

The chapter is structured as follows: Section 8.2 presents a short overview of the policy and linguistic contexts within each country. Section 8.3 discusses our methodological approach. In Section 8.4 we present key themes that emerge from our data, and which help us to address the three overarching questions. In Section 8.5 we close with some discussion and recommendations for educational practices which we believe will more effectively accommodate individuals' full linguistic repertoires – and communicative competencies – irrespective of whether these are learnt formally or informally so as to ensure a closer alignment between policy and practice.

8.2 Language-in-education policies in Zambia and Tanzania: An overview

8.2.1 Language-in-education policy in Zambia

Zambia is a multilingual country which is said to have 73 languages and dialects (CSO 2012; Banda and Hambaba 2017). Within this context, there are seven languages which have regional language status. These regional languages are used as the languages of local courts, media and political mobilization in their respective regions. These regional languages – Chinyanja, Chitonga, Chibemba,[2] Kiikaonde,

2 In this chapter we use "Bemba" and "Chibemba" interchangeably to refer to the same language since this is common among speakers. Practices vary in terms of how to represent the names of many African languages when writing in English and in some instances, this is a highly politicized issue. We do not adopt a prescriptive approach to the representation of language names in this paper, again to reflect this fluidity.

Lunda, Luvale and Silozi – are also used as the MoI in the first four grades of primary school (Kula and Mwansa 2022).

The history of language policy in Zambia, and particularly regarding the medium of instruction, is in many ways not that dissimilar from the language policies in many other African countries. Before Zambia's independence in 1964, there were four named regional languages included in the language-in-education policy, namely Sikololo, Chitonga-Chiila, Chibemba, and Chinyanja (Ohannessian 1978). From 1927 to 1964, there was a three-language policy in which children began their education in a so-called "mother tongue" which was the local language of the area in which the school was located, in the first two grades of primary school. In the third grade, they transitioned to one of the four regional languages if this was not their mother tongue and in the fifth grade, English was introduced as the MoI. However, in the 1966 Education Act, the independent Zambian Government introduced English as the MoI from the first grade but allowed Zambian regional languages to continue as subjects in the education system up to the seventh grade. It was also after independence in the 1970s that three more regional languages from the North Western province namely, Lunda, Luvale and Kikaonde, which had remained unrepresented in the education system during the colonial period, were introduced.

In the present day, the country has partly reverted to the pre-independence policy of providing initial education in the first four years of primary school in regional languages although this time involving seven Zambian languages. The current education system allows for one year of pre-school and seven years of primary education (Grade 1–7) and this is followed by five years of secondary schooling (Grades 8–12). A national exam in Grade 7 determines progression to Grade 8 and secondary school. The use of regional languages in the first four grades of primary school is yet another intervention by the Ministry of Education to arrest the perceived falling literacy levels in the country (CDC 2013). The introduction of English as MoI from Grade 1 in 1966 led to a rapid decline in literacy levels of the learners in the country. According to Kelly (2000: 7), the use of English as MoI in the first three decades after independence had resulted in a "schooled but uneducated generation". He was commenting on what were considered to be dismal results from a national baseline study of reading levels in grades 1–6 conducted in the country.

The current policy states that the regional languages be used for the first four years of schooling. However, there is often a difference in practice in rural versus urban areas, with the regional languages much more widely used in rural contexts than in (often multilingual) urban primary schools (Kula and Mwansa 2022). This policy is, in practice, observed mainly in government schools, as is also seen in Tanzania below. In privately owned schools, literacy in English is introduced

earlier in grade two and teachers often move between the regional languages and English as they teach. Moreover, children who arrive at school speaking languages other than the seven regional languages found in Zambia must learn through a second (or third) language. This is the reality for vast proportions of the population and impacts a high number of learners – and their teachers. The acquisition of yet another language to facilitate education necessarily has an impact on literacy and overall educational progression, as well as learners' experiences of formal education.

8.2.2 Language-in-education policy in Tanzania

Tanzania is a multilingual country with approximately 150 languages (Languages of Tanzania Project 2009). However, the official language of Tanzania is Swahili and this is the only language for which formal provisions are made in administrative office and education throughout the country. While Swahili is spoken by some 100 million people across much of East Africa and has long played a role as a regional lingua franca, the majority of Swahili-speakers (in Tanzania and across the region) have Swahili as an additional language (Mapunda 2022).

Swahili therefore adopts the role of a language of wider communication, and means that in much of the country, multilingualism is widespread. The exception to this is perhaps the coastal region which was traditionally home to the Swahili community. Although communities continue to shift and move around the country, there are still differences that can be perceived between areas where Swahili is the main language of the community and those where Swahili is an additional language (Rubagumya 1990: 9–10). This also has repercussions for education and differences in acquiring communicative competence given that Swahili is the MoI in primary school.

In Tanzania, children typically enter primary schooling aged 7. Prior to this, some learners may complete two years of pre-primary school (aged 5–6) depending on the local context. Primary school lasts for seven years (Standard 1–7). During this time, pupils complete a national examination in Standard Four and again in Standard Seven. While the fourth-year exam is a formative assessment, the Standard Seven exam (the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE)) serves as an entry examination for secondary school.

The MoI in all government primary schools is Swahili. At secondary level, the MoI changes to English. However, the Primary School Leaving Examination which determines the pupil's continuation to secondary school is conducted in English. As Mapunda and Gibson (2022) note, when pupils take the PSLE in the final year of primary school, many are not proficient in English and so their attainment in the

PSLE often reflects their ability to sit the exam in English. The shift from Swahili to English between primary and secondary school represents a barrier for many learners.

English remains the MoI throughout secondary and tertiary education, serving to elevate the role of English as it is associated with higher levels of learning and education. As a result of the shift from Swahili to English in Tanzanian Secondary schools and the perceived importance of English competence for educational purposes, there are also increasing numbers of private primary schools in Tanzania where the MoI is English. The market for these schools reflects the central role played by language in education in the country, as well as parents' and learners' concerns about their abilities to acquire the necessary linguistic competence to be able to fully engage with their studies and to ensure progression throughout formal education. Opportunities to gain competence in English in informal settings remain limited as the dominant community languages are Swahili and other Tanzanian languages. This puts further onus on more formal educational spaces for the development of English competencies.

The *Sera ya Elimu na Mafunzo* (Education and Training Policy of Tanzania) acknowledges that "Lughaya Kiswahili ni lugha ya Taifa inatumika kama lugha ya kwanza au ya pili miongoni mwa wananchi wengi" (JMT 2014: 36). That is: 'Swahili is the national language and it is used as the first or second language among many citizens' [translation is our own]. However, the policy also acknowledges that, among the many challenges faced by the education system, teachers and students have not mastered the medium of instruction at different levels of education (JMT 2014: 3). Students have difficulties with the MoI in English at secondary school but, importantly, many students also struggle with the Swahili MoI in primary school. This means that these policies put teachers in a position in which they themselves are trying to teach in languages that they are unfamiliar with, rather than being able to use languages of the wider community that they (and the students) are much more familiar with. This not only puts teachers and students at a potential disadvantage but also undermines the value of community languages for teaching and learning. Previous research blames the absence of community languages in Tanzania's education system for educational underperformance (e.g., Mapunda 2013; Uwezo Tanzania 2013), as well as shortcomings observed in the system such as dull and monotonous lessons and low levels of participation and interaction in the classroom. Similarly, poor performance in national examinations, and the high level of grade repetition amongst large proportions of students have also been attributed in part to issues relating to the MoI and the limited competence learners have in Swahili, in the first instance, and English at subsequent levels of education.

8.2.3 Comparison of language in education policies in Zambia and Tanzania

From this brief overview it can be seen that while both countries have had numerous changes over the years, and currently have different models for language-in-education policies, there are some key similarities. In both contexts, policies privilege a small number of dominant languages, which can also be formally learnt. While Zambia's policy has space for more languages, this still only includes dominant regional languages. Importantly, the majority of languages in each country are not included in language-in-education policies.

In both contexts, there may be learners for whom the policies do not present substantial difficulties. This is particularly the case for Swahili-speaking children in Tanzania, who are able to learn through a language they know for the whole of primary school. This is also the case for children who speak one of the seven regional languages permitted in the first four years of education in Zambia. Indeed, in contexts where students have knowledge of the prescribed MoI, our research has shown a higher level of interaction amongst students and between students and teachers, and that overall lessons appear to be livelier. However, in both country contexts, children who are not familiar with the MoI face difficulties in engaging with their learning. These challenges are particularly acute for children within the early stages of their education.

While Tanzania retains Swahili for the whole of primary education, in both countries we see a move towards English in the higher stages of education. These policies prescribe sequential multilingualism (Reilly et al. 2022), which allows for multilingualism overall but only monolingualism at any one point in the educational system. Again, the focus is on only a few languages overall. The reality however is that students, in Zambia and Tanzania, informally learn and practice a number of community languages and that their "lived multilingual realities" (Reilly et al. 2022) are apparent both inside and outside the classroom.

8.3 Methodology: Linguistic ethnography in multilingual communities

For this study, we adopted a linguistic ethnographic approach to our data collection, which was guided by three main principles – researching collaboratively, researching multilingually, and researching responsively (see Costley and Reilly 2021; Reilly et al. 2023 for a more detailed discussion of these principles). Linguistic ethnographies allow us to collect data which highlight the complexities of indi-

viduals' multilingual realities (Unamuno 2014), to highlight how individuals and communities use language, how they view language, and it provides a detailed understanding of how individuals conceptualize and rationalize their own language and how this relates to wider social, cultural and historical factors (Copland and Creese 2015). Our research design was developed collaboratively by our entire team, with individual country leads overseeing the research within each country. Gastor Mapunda (University of Dar es Salaam) coordinated the data collection and processing in Tanzania, with Joseph Mwansa (University of Zambia) leading on the work in Zambia. Between 2020 and 2022 two rounds of data collection took place in each country. This chapter draws substantially from the first round of data collection which was conducted in early 2020. The ethnographic work in each country consisted of a combination of participant observation, classroom observation and recording,[3] interviews, and focus groups with students, staff, parents, and other community members.

In Zambia, data was collected in two sites. The first was Kasama in the Northern Province. This is a predominantly Bemba-speaking area, with a number of multilingual urban centers. The second site was Nakonde in the Muchinga Province. This is a predominately Namwanga-speaking area. Due to the regional location of both sites, Bemba is the regional language for both areas and therefore the language which is stipulated by policy to be used as the MoI in the first four years of education. The data collection in Zambia centered around nine schools and included 52 interviews and 11 focus groups with teachers, students and community members. These interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. During interviews, participants were free to draw from their linguistic repertoires to communicate as they wished.

Tanzanian data collection took place in Songea District of Ruvuma, where the main language of the community is Ngoni and in Nzega Rural District, Tabora Region, where the community primarily speaks Sukuma. In both areas, Swahili is the language of wider communication between groups. Ten schools were involved in the data collection. We conducted 37 interviews and 18 focus group discussion sessions with teachers and community members.

The audio recordings were transcribed in the original language(s) used and then translated into English to aid analysis and comparison across contexts and by all project members. A transcription protocol was created at the beginning of the project, to be used by teams in each country. After transcription of the original

3 Due to COVID-19 restrictions in place at the time of data collection, less participant observation/classroom observation took place than initially planned. We draw predominately on interview and focus group data in this chapter.

audio, translation was undertaken by individual country leads (Mapunda and Mwansa) in collaboration with research assistants. A thematic coding analysis was then conducted collaboratively which was an iterative process involving individual team members coding transcripts and sharing these for comment and additional coding. We also conducted online collaborative analysis sessions in which the whole team coded transcripts together and developed emerging themes. During research assistant training, guidance was given on coding. Initial rounds of coding were undertaken by each team's research assistants, in collaboration with Reilly. This followed an inductive process, producing codes from the data, which were collated together in one master coding sheet. This then facilitated the collaborative coding of data across each country context amongst the wider team, and the identification of key thematic areas. Ethical approval for this research was granted by the University of Essex, University of Dar es Salaam and University of Zambia.

8.4 Findings from the data: Multilingual competence in multilingual communities

The current section moves on to discuss the main themes that emerged from the data.[4] Crucially, we highlight the ways in which the data reflect both how multilingual repertoires are acquired in informal spaces and also some of the attitudes and feelings of communities of speakers from languages that are not officially taught and learnt in school. We discuss what language competence is required, and valued, in the informal spaces outside of the classroom. We then go on to discuss how boundaries are set up between the school and the home and how learning occurs in the two contrasting contexts, with the choice of language use almost mapping directly onto these physical spaces. We also highlight what we term "hostile language learning" which relates to the ways in which children learn which languages to use in which contexts, and most crucially, which languages not to use. There is also a discussion of some recurring themes such as language barriers, language hierarchies and the link to identity, language ideology and cultures. Throughout, we share contextualized quotes and excerpts from the interviews and conversations along with information on the (primary) language these are in and the areas they are from. Following Creese and Blackledge

4 All data discussed was collected as part of the *Bringing the outside in* research project (BTOI 2020–2022).

(2010), in our transcriptions we make no distinction between separate named languages in the data.

8.4.1 Multilingual communities and multilingual competence

During interviews and focus groups, individuals were asked to report on their language practices in a range of situations. What emerged clearly from the responses is that multilingual competence is a central aspect of navigating one's daily life in and across these contexts. That is, multilingualism is a natural part of everyday communication. We first present data from Zambia, then explore insights from Tanzania.

One parent in Nakonde, Zambia illustrates this reality as they describe the languages they use when shopping:

Extract 1, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS4-IntPaRe040320MM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Nga nazana umwinamwanga nkawomvya icinamwanga, nga muwemba nanti umu Swahili akuwomvya iciwemba niciSwahili. . .Tukawomvya naconyekailindiwazana umwina mwanga umuvwanzya mu ci Namwanga nye.
Parent (English translation)	'If the shopkeeper speaks Namwanga, I use Namwanga, if they speak Bemba or Swahili, I use Bemba or Swahili. . .We use Namwanga too. When you find the one selling speaking Namwanga you speak to them in Namwanga.'

What this quote shows is that there is a flexibility inherent to these multilingual practices as individuals will adapt to the linguistic repertoires of those with whom they are communicating. This is echoed by other parents who highlighted that depending on the location of the market, their language practices might change:

Extract 2, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS2-IntPaRe040320MM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Nga twaya mukukalanga tulimonye tukulanda iciNamwanga nga twaya kuNakonde mmm vikuwaviwili. . .ici Swahili ni cinamwanga ni ciwemba.

Parent (English translation)	'When we go to buy within the area we use Namwanga. When we go to Nakonde. . .mmm we use two languages. . . We use Swahili, Namwanga and Chibemba.'

Fluid multilingual practices are also found within other community activities such as in Parent Teacher Association meetings and at church with one parent in the Nakonde area noting that there is a 'mixing' (our translation) of languages in the area due to the fact that different ethnic groups and different languages exist within the space.

In community life then we see that multilingualism is commonplace and a natural way to negotiate communication and meaning making. Individuals use their multilingual competencies to effectively communicate with different people across a range of contexts. These practices are also evident in other areas of the community where, for example, the radio station in Nakonde is multilingual with programmes in English, Bemba and Namwanga, or a mixture. What this shows is that multilingual competencies are valuable meaning-making resources for individuals within the community.

The extent of these multilingual practices and the ways in which they manifest is also often linked to specific locations. For example, in some contexts individuals reported using and hearing "more Namwanga" than other languages, such as in meetings within the church (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS2IntPaRe040320MM). However, it is important to note here that while Namwanga may be the dominant language which is actively used and obviously valued, other languages, such as Bemba and Swahili, are still present within these contexts.

The use of multiple languages in daily life is also reflected in the data from Tanzania. Here too, it is evident that multilingual competence is necessary to communicate effectively with people from different places and different ethnic groups. Here we hear from a community member:

Extract 3, [community member focus group], Nzega Rural District, Tanzania (BTOI 2020–2022 TNZIDFGCMRE280920EJ)

Community Member (Swahili)	Unapokuwa sokoni maanake katika biashara siyo kwamba utakutanana kabila moja tu; watu wengi wanaofanyabiashara ndani ya soko mle. Ina maana wewe ukitaka kutoka huko unajua kabisa sasa mimi lugha yangu ni hii ya baba na mama tu. Hii niliyokuwa nayo sasa naenda sokoni, sasa hivi nika jaribu angalau ukubashiribashiri niongee niongee hata kalugha kamoja, maana natakana mchicha "eeh sasa wale waliomo mle sokoni watajua tuna wewe

kwamba tayari hapa sasa hivi nataka mchicha mzuri sehemu fulani, lakini Wewe kumbe umetoka nyumbani unajua lugha moja tu ya baba na mama kamani "mwadela" ndiyo hivyo sasa ukifika sokoni. Ina maana utalazimikana wewe utumie Kiswahili iliujulikane mapema na sokoni.

Community Member (English translation) 'If you're at the market place, which means in a business setting, it does not mean that you will meet people from only one ethnic group. You will meet people from various ethnic groups in the market. This means that when you get there, you'll have to know that it's not your mother tongue that will be used there. You should be able to predict a few words from Swahili, like now I need *mchicha* [a kind of leafy vegetable]. It should not be the case that you understand only your mother tongue *Mwadela* [Sukuma greeting equivalent to 'Are you fine?']. This means that you will be forced to use Swahili so that people can understand.'

Here we see clearly that a natural mode of communication is one in which multilingual competence is required. It is not sufficient to only have knowledge of your "mother tongue" as, when interacting with people with different backgrounds in the marketplace, resources from many languages are required to ensure efficient communication.

In both countries, reports on how language is used in daily life within the community suggest a pattern of language use in which monolingualism is not the norm. Individuals expect to use multiple languages for different purposes in their daily lives and multilingual competence is therefore an asset. The learning of these multilingual competences comes from the need to navigate and facilitate communication in the different (informal) contexts. The community is such that you will always meet speakers of different languages where social norms also play a role in the efforts interlocutors make to ensure they are accommodating and facilitating good communication. In these contexts, speakers make efforts to communicate leading to the gradual development of multilingual competencies which are nuanced to the needs of different contexts.

8.4.2 Boundaries between home and school

A key theme that emerges from the data is the idea of boundaries between the home and the school. The separation between school and home can be seen in the below extract, where a parent is responding to a question about what language is used for their child's education:

Extract 4, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS14-IntPaRe0320MM)

Parent (Bemba)	But kusukulu kwena nshaishiba bwino bwino nga balasankanya icibemba ne ciNamwanga.
Parent (English translation)	'But as for in school, I don't really know whether they also mix Bemba and Namwanga.'

In this reflection in which the parent says they do not know what happens in schools, we see that there is a lack of knowledge as to what the language practices of the school are. This is a sentiment that was echoed by many family members across our data who said they were not sure what happened in the schools and what languages the teachers were using. This is important not only as it highlights that the policy and practices of the schools are not being successfully communicated to parents, but also that there is a lack of knowledge about the extent to which home and family language practices are valued in schools. The linguistic boundaries created between the home/community and the school are also evident within the example below from Tanzania. The separation between the home environment and the school environment can be clearly seen in the following extract. When asked what languages are used in the classroom, one Tanzanian parent stated:

Extract 5, [parent interview], Nzega Rural District, Tanzania (BTOI 2020–2022, TTBM-WFGCMRe250920EJ)

Parent (Swahili)	Sisi kujua sana hatuwezi tukaelewa, sana sana ni waalimu.
Parent (English Translation)	'For us, we can't know much, mostly teachers do.'

As was also seen above with a parent in Zambia, there is a lack of knowledge or involvement regarding the language situation which children are exposed to in education. This could in part be influenced by ideas around whose responsibility it is to ensure children acquire competence in particular languages. While pa-

rents may have influence over the languages of the home, the languages of education are the responsibility of teachers:

Extract 6, [community member focus group], Nzega Rural District, Tanzania (BTOI 2020–2022, TTBMWFGCMRe250920EJ)

Parent (Swahili)	Haya mambo ya Kiswahili tunawapelekea waalimu wakatufundishe.
Parent (English Translation)	'We take these issues about Swahili to the teachers for them to teach us'

These attitudes also play an important role in how learners informally learn how to navigate these different contexts with different languages based on what they are faced with. Their parents expect them to use the home language at home and in the community, where mixing is allowed, but at school even the parents know that different rules hold.

The boundaries between home and school are reinforced by the language policies within each context, and the separation of the home space and the education space is mirrored in the separation of the home language and the educational language. Within the Zambian contexts this is predominately due to the language-in-education policy not allowing space for Namwanga – the language most commonly spoken in the home in the Nakonde region. And in the Tanzanian context, it is the dominance of Swahili which reinforces these boundaries.

When asked whether their child has any difficulties engaging with education due to language, one parent in Zambia stated:

Extract 7, [Parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS2-IntPaRe040320MM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Eeh tukutituti muwufupi tukupusana, ndiwafuma walemba iciwemba kokoni cizungu, kootukulandavye icinamwanga ampela so ukuzananga wati tandi alembe sukaa ukulanda icinamwanga.
Parent (English translation)	'Yes we can say that, in short, we differ, when they do their work in Chibemba and English at school, here at home we just speak Namwanga that's all, so you find that they do not write (Bemba) with understanding they instead speak Namwanga.'

This parent draws attention to the fact that the home and the school "differ" and that there is an expectation that the languages used in these distinct spaces will also "differ". For the parent here, as well as many others in our data, the fact that

the children are asked to do their work in Chibemba is an indication that their children's competence in Namwanga is not viewed as an appropriate resource within the education system and, as a result, this has implications for how they learn and progress and what they can do in their different languages. From the observations of children in classrooms, and from the accounts provided by family and teachers, the children appear to be aware of these boundaries and the rules regarding what languages to use at school, and this awareness is what feeds their language practices and how their language competence develops. The competence therefore importantly involves learning how to navigate different spaces with different languages and being aware of the boundaries that regulate their multilingual practices. This navigation is supported by a Zambian teacher's observation in an interview where they report students' language practices in the classroom:

Extract 8, [teacher interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZN0201-INTTE030320CM)

Teacher (Bemba)	. . .but lingi line nga baisa mu classs, nalicitafye notice ilingi tabalanda icinamwanga aimlessly filya ilingi balandafye mu cibemba nomba nga bafuma panse elyo walaumfwa nomba.
Teacher (English translation)	'But I have noticed that when they come in class, they don't use Namwanga aimlessly, they normally use Chibemba, when they go outside, that's when you hear them.'

Children know not to use "Namwanga aimlessly" (BTOI 2020–2022, ZN0201INTTE030320CM) in class as it is not officially allowed. The classroom spaces subsequently become more monolingual spaces in which Chibemba is the dominant language. In contrast, at school children will draw on their multilingual competences when outside of the class, for example when playing with their friends:

Extract 9, [teacher interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZN0201-INTTE030320CM)

Teacher (Bemba)	Nga baleshunguluka abengii cibemba necinamwanga
Teacher (English translation)	'When they are playing, many use Chibemba and Namwanga.'

8.4.3 Hostile language learning and language policing

Another key theme that emerged from our data is what we refer to as "hostile language learning". In hostile language learning, children are being encouraged to acquire competence in an unfamiliar language through negative policing of their (more familiar) language practices. In some instances, learners are punished for using more familiar language practices. In Tanzania for example, there is evidence of students being forced to wear "blocks" around their necks to signify that they have broken the "language rules" within the school (Gibson et al. 2022).

Through this process, children acquire the linguistic awareness of when and where it is appropriate to use the different resources within their repertoire, and the dominance of one language over another is reinforced. This does not form part of any formal language learning. Rather, the informal acquisition of this awareness, we suggest, is a result of the restrictive monolingual language policies and their enforcement within the classroom. In the Zambian context discussed here, the negative response which children receive when they use Namwanga in school provides input to their awareness of the boundaries placed on languages – and the spaces in which those languages should be used. This in turn affects children's engagement within the classroom and their languages practices both at school and within the home.

One of the methods that children must use in such contexts is learning to supress some languages while in the classroom. This is clearly expressed by the Zambian teacher below, who says learners come with Namwanga but they then "get used" to Bemba, meaning that they start to learn how, in the classroom context, they need to supress one of their languages. This extract also demonstrates another case of hostile language learning discussed above where it appears that the teachers, despite the fact that the students do not understand Bemba, persist in speaking to them exclusively in Bemba.

Extract 10, [teacher interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZN02Te-INT050320(2)JM)

Teacher (Bemba)	Kuli language yabafye ifyo fine. Baleesa ne cinamwanga cekaceka mu first week. Nomba by the time twiletulesambila icibemba belebaleba used nabena. But ilya first nasecond week kulabafye limbi cilya ulelanda tabacishibe pantu baliba used ne cinamwanga.

Teacher (English translation)	'Language is like that. They come with only Namwanga in the first week. But as they go on learning Bemba, they get used to it. But in the first and second week sometimes they don't understand what you are saying because they are used to Namwanga.'

Hostile language learning also is encouraged as some teachers will not deviate from the official language policy to assist students' understanding, regardless of whether they know the child's home language. For example, teachers who use Namwanga in Zambia, are perceived to be "friendly" while those that do not, are not.

Extract 11, [teacher interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZNINTTeRe020320JM)

Deputy Head	Asanga nomba teacher monster palaba distance sana ninshi. . .Ninshi palaba distance sana kano asangako uuliko friendly.
Teacher (Bemba)	
Deputy Head teacher (English translation)	'If he finds a monster of a teacher, that creates a big distance. . .There is some distance unless he finds a friendly [teacher].'

A "monster" teacher here refers to a teacher who is not willing to accommodate learners' linguistic repertoires, but instead sticks rigidly to the formal language policy. This description illustrates that language choice can be used to overcome the distance between the learner and the teacher – between the school and the home. But if teachers choose not to embrace learners' language repertoires, then this distance will be increased. Even when teachers are encouraged to use Namwanga to help students to engage with learning, this is often only encouraged in the earlier stages of school, and is gradually phased out. And of course, a teacher's own individual style and personality – whether they are a "monster" or not – also plays a central role in an educator's own personal practices.

8.4.4 Language barriers, language crashes

Issues regarding student engagement and understanding are explicitly linked to language competence and the disconnect between the language of the home and the language of the school. This is powerfully described by one teacher in Nakonde District in Zambia as a "language crash", meaning that students are prevented from being able to engage with subject content and classroom activities (BTOI 2020–2022, ZN02TeINT050320(2)JM). Instead, they are simply unable to un-

derstand what they are being taught or what the teacher is saying. The only option for teachers is to then deviate from the official MoI policy and to utilize the language resources which students have – in this case competence in Namwanga – in the classroom. This is illustrated by one Zambian teacher:

Extract 12, [teacher focus group], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZNTeFGTeRe300320JM)

Teacher A (Namwanga)	Nangu wamona ukuti ici taleumfwa pantu bambi tababomfyako nangu Bemba pa ng'anda. . .
Teacher B (Namwanga)	Nga bantu bapalamina uku [pointing in direction of the border] ne ciswaili.
Teacher A (Namwanga)	. . .cinamwanga so nga wamona ukuti taleecita understand wabomfyako icinamwanga.
Teacher A (English translation)	'Or when you notice that she does not understand this because some don't use any Bemba at home.'
Teacher B (English translation)	'Like people living near this area [pointing in the direction of the Tanzanian border] and Swahili.'
Teacher A (English translation)	'It is only Namwanga, so when you notice she doesn't understand you use Namwanga.'

However, this practice is itself often constrained by the specific teacher and the teacher's own language competence. "Language barriers" can persist if teachers do not also have competence in Namwanga:

Extract 13, [teacher interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZNINTeRe020320JM)

Deputy Head Teacher (Bemba)	Aa. But that one also depends na teacher aleebafunda nao ngateshibe ukulanda iciNamwanga palaba ka language barrier.
Deputy Head Teacher (English translation)	'Aa. But that one also depends on the teacher teaching if he doesn't speak Namwanga then there is a language barrier.'

In terms of learners understanding the contexts for using their multiple linguistic repertoires and also learning where and when these can be freely used, the classroom and school setting presents a confusing context. For one, there are contrast-

ing language practices between teachers, and two, the school can sometimes be a space where multilingual practice is allowed but then is phased out over time. Learners must therefore navigate these changing circumstances to understand the spaces where their linguistic repertoires are allowed and where they are not allowed.

8.4.5 Language, identity and place

When parents in the Namwanga speaking area of Zambia were asked what languages they would like their children to learn through and be able to use in schools, responses differed. For some, Namwanga was the clear preference. This is due to the fact that this is the language most closely linked to the area, the communities in the area, and their identities. The following excerpt clearly outlines this link between speaking Namwanga, being Namwanga, and living in this specific place. It also illustrates that identity is one of the factors that feed the use of particular languages and therefore shapes multilingual repertoires, since in the presence of other languages, speakers continue to use the languages that are significant for their identity.

Extract 14, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS-10IntPaRe110320MM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Ndingakunda ukuti wasambilila iciNamwanga?
Researcher (Namwanga)	Acanicino mungalondela ukuti wawomvya iciNamwanga?
Parent (Namwanga)	Amuno awinamwanga elo walimunsiya winamwanga?
Parent (English translation)	'I would like them to learn in Namwanga.'
Researcher (English translation)	'Why would you want him/ her to learn in this language?'
Parent (English translation)	'Because most of the children are Namwangas and they live in a Namwanga speaking area.'

For this parent, children should be allowed to use Namwanga in school and to learn through Namwanga because they are Namwangas. This would help to bridge the gap between the home and the school as learners' identities and linguistic resources would be valued within the educational space. The importance of the connection between place and language was emphasized numerous times in the interviews in both Zambia and Tanzania. This is clearly evident in the following excerpt in which the parent repeats that Nawmanga should be used in schools as they live in a Namwanga speaking area in Zambia.

Extract 15, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS-1IntTeRe030320MM)

Researcher (Bemba)	Ngamwalikwete amaka citundunshi mwingakabila abana balabomfya muma sukulu?
Parent (Bemba)	Nganalikwete amaka since njikala ku bwinamwanga kuti natemwa balabomfya ici Namwanga cine.
Researcher (Bemba)	Ninshi mwingafwaila ukuti balasambilila mu cinamwanga?
Parent (Bemba)	Pantu area yabeenamwanga
Researcher (English translation)	If you had a choice which language(s) would you want your child to learn in at school?
Parent (English translation)	If I had a choice since I live in a Namwanga speaking area I would prefer children use Namwanga.
Researcher (English translation)	Why would you want him/her to learn in Namwanga?
Parent (English translation)	Because it is a Namwanga speaking area

This association of Nakonde with Namwanga is a clear theme emerging from our data. There is an emphasis placed on the need to have the communicative competence required to navigate life in the area, as one parent notes that Namwanga is essential "to communicate effectively here in Nakonde District" [our translation] (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS2IntPaRe040320MM). The importance here is placed on the language competence that children will need to "communicate effectively" in the area in which they live (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS2IntPaRe040320MM). This parent views this competence as one which should be included and nurtured in

the education system. This is also due to the fact that Namwanga is considered to be the language of the home:

Extract 16, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS-13IntPaReMM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Ningasola icinamwanga. . .Amunocenicawa in detail mucinamwanga umwana atangaapone amuno achinoakalanga kung'anda.
Parent (English translation):	'I would choose Namwanga. . .because Namwanga here is detailed and children cannot fail because it is the language they use at home.'

By "detailed" the parent above means that children are very competent in Namwanga and that they cannot fail in examinations if this was to be used as the language of instruction. Incorporating the language competence that children already have will connect the school to the local community and will enable greater understanding:

Extract 17, [parent interview] Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZNPaInt-121021JM)

Parent (Bemba)	Ee ngafwilisheko panoono, so ifwe tatwakwata amabuuku yamu cinamwanga. Ecalenga abaana balesambilila mu [mucibemba] mucibemba. Nomba tumona kwati fwebafyashi tumonakwati ni challenge pantu abafyashi abengi balefwaya abaana balesambilila muli local language kukwamba ee [ee]elyo kuntashi eko bayayamba ifingi ifingapekanya kuli Leesa [emukwai].
Parent (English translation)	'Yes, let me add a little to finish, so we don't have books in Namwanga. This is why our children are learning through Ichibemba. But we parents see this as a challenge because many parents want their children to learn in the local language from the beginning and then later, they start learning other things which may be prepared for them by God.'

The very explicit association of language and place points to an interesting way in which individuals conceptualize language competence and practice. The description of Nakonde as a Namwanga speaking area potentially suggests a monolingual space which stands in contrast to the multilingual repertoires and practices reported in the previous section. While the area may be viewed as "Namwanga-speaking" this is not the only language used in this area, nor the only language in which individuals have competence. From the perspective of shaping the contexts

in which multilingual repertoires can be used, learners learn from these parent attitudes that the home is a space where mainly Namwanga is expected and in responding to these expectations, learners begin to cement the boundaries that end up defining their language practices.

In the predominately Chibemba speaking area in Kasama in Northern Zambia where data collection was also conducted, similar themes emerge when parents choose their preferred language for use in education. For these individuals there is a sense of identity and ownership towards the Bemba language. One parent states that they would choose Bemba for use in school as "it is our language" (BTOI 2020–2022, ZKINTPa130320JM).

This contrasts with attitudes towards English, which is not viewed as a language which is intrinsically connected with individuals' identity:

Extract 18, [parent interview], Kasama District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZKINTPa-130320JM)

Parent (Bemba)	Icikalamba saana ico ningasalilila iciBemba pantu ecilimi tubomfya kuno mwesu. Emukwai. Icisungu kwena twaliifyenga saana pantu ici twayampululafye kubanensu.
Parent (English translation)	'The most important reason I would choose Bemba is that it is the language we use here at our place. Yes. English, we have burdened ourselves, we have borrowed it from our friends.'

However, Namwanga and Chibemba are not the only languages which individuals state they would want used in education. Some parents state that they would want their children to learn in English. The reasons for this are similar however, and relate to Namwanga and/or Chibemba being associated as the languages of particular areas, while English is a language which provides opportunities in other spaces whilst also being a "burden". The perceived importance of English is stated emphatically by one parent as "without it there is nothing we can do" [our translation] (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS12IntPaRe110320MM).

Another response highlights the perceived opportunities which English would provide, mainly focused on moving out of the location in which the children are currently living. Again, this shows the regionality of language use, as well as echoing back to the notions of borders which was also discussed earlier on.

Extract 19, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS-11IntPaRe110320MM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Amuno ndiwayaku Lusaka ninsizi njiwakawomvya icizungu nivintu vikawaavipepuke ndamanyile icizungu.

Parent (English translation)	'Because when they go to Lusaka and other countries, they use English. Things become easier when they know how to speak English.'

While Namwanga and Bemba are viewed as useful languages to know in specific places, English is viewed as a useful language to know as it "can be used anywhere" [our translation] (ZMPNS12IntPaRe110320MM).

Similar themes emerge from the Tanzanian data. The Sukuma language is associated with the culture of the area and the community (in the Sukuma area), and Swahili is associated predominately with the school. Participants regularly point to a disconnect between the language of the community and the language of education. This can result in challenges for students' education due to their lack of familiarity with the language of instruction:

Extract 20, [community member focus group], Nzega Rural District, Tanzania (BTOI 2020–2022, TNZIDFGCMRE280920EJ)

Community member (Swahili)	Hawawezi kuongea vizuri Kiswahili kwa sababu milaya humu ni ya Kisukuma. Lugha ya Kiswahili, wanaipata wakiingia shuleni, ndiyow anapata Kiswahili wakitoka ni Kisukuma tu. Hasa ndiyo maana hawaelewi mara kwa mara.
Community member (English translation)	'They can't speak Swahili well because the culture here is Sukuma. They only get Swahili when they enter school, and when they are outside the school they use Sukuma only. That is why they often do not understand (Swahili).'

We see from this excerpt too that explicit connections are made here between language and culture. Cultural identity is seen as inextricably linked with language and culture which in turn influences the languages which are, and are not, used in different contexts. Attitudes towards language are also therefore intimately tied to individuals' sense of identity. Another parent reflects on the importance of their children speaking Sukuma:

Extract 21, [parent interview], Nzega Rural District, Tanzania (BTOI 2020–2022, TNZIDFGCMRE280920EJ)

Parent (Swahili)	Mimi mwanangu anapoongea hii lugha ya Kisukuma, pia napo ni kama anaongea utamaduni wa pale nyumbani kwangu, na Kiswahili pia mimi napenda akifahamu tu vilevile. Nayo si ni lugha ya kwetu tu pia. Lakini mila nayo pia asiipoteze pale nyumbani. Na mpaka sasa hivi tunaona tu unakuta mtu msomi professor lakini

akianza kuongea Kiswahili chake utajua tu huyu ni Msukuma au huyu ni Mngoni. Maana yake lazima ile elimu itakuwa haiwezi ikabadilika hata siku moja, kwa sababu ya ile lugha ya nyumbani.

Parent (English translation)

'When my child uses Sukuma at my home it's like he/she speaks our customs, and I'd like him/her to know Swahili as well because it is also our language, but should not lose our home culture. Even now we can see that no matter how educated a person is, he/she can be identified as a Sukuma or Ngoni by the accent of the Swahili he/she speaks, because education cannot change traces of the ethnic language.'

The parent emphasizes here that speaking the Sukuma language is part of what makes someone Sukuma. It enables children to "[speak] our customs" and to ensure that the cultural identity of the Sukuma people is not lost. This parent does also indicate the multifaceted nature of cultural identity within Tanzania and how this relates to language. They note that Swahili is "also our language" which once again highlights the importance of multilingual competence for individuals in contemporary Tanzania.

The cultural identity of a particular group – Sukuma people – is linked to language and to language practices. There is a perception that Sukuma do not tend to use Swahili regularly. We also see, from one student focus group, the connections between particular spaces and particular languages, as they note that it is particularly uncommon for individuals "who are at home" [Student #2 Nzega Rural District, Tanzania, Focus Group, BTOI 2020–2022 TNZSHFGSTRe250920EJ] to be using Swahili. Students note that they will not use Swahili with their parents at home as they "have not been to school" and so "don't know Swahili" [Student #1, Nzega Rural District, Tanzania, Focus Group, BTOI 2020–2022 TNZSHFGSTRe250920EJ]. This provides an example of how individuals acquire communicative competence within this multilingual setting and learn when and where to use particular aspects of their linguistic repertoire. They are learning how to draw on their repertoire based on the language use of their parents. The close connection between Swahili and education reinforces a binary in which Swahili is the language of the school while Sukuma is the language of the home.

There is a common perception of boundaries between the school and the home and between the languages used within each space. However, while acknowledging the difficulties which arise due to the conflict between the language of the home and the language of the school, for some the two spaces – and the languages associated with them – should be kept separate:

Extract 22, [community member focus group], Nzega Rural District, Tanzania (BTOI 2020–2022, TTBMWFGCMRe250920EJ)

Community member (Swahili)	Sababu hawa watoto wametoka nyumbani, wanakuja shuleni, waje tu moja kwa moja wakikute Kiswahili. . . ata waona mwalimu kwamba hawa ni wafanyaje? Ninahangaika au? Kuwafundisha ata waona mwalimu lakini kwangu waje tu moja kwa moja wanalo la Kiswahili hapa. Lugha za asili waziache tu huko huko nyumbani.
Community member (English translation)	'Because these children come straight from home to school, and they come across Swahili . . . . it is the teacher who will decide what to do with the children. [The teacher will say] "What should I do with them? Am I just wasting my time or? But when they come to me, they should directly start with Swahili here. They should leave ethnic languages at home."'

This participant highlights that the boundaries constructed between the languages of the home and the school are very fixed and rigid. To such an extent that they state that the "ethnic" languages should be left at home when the children move from the home space to the school space. This is a very concrete example of the ways in which the multilingual competence of children is not considered to be of value for education – they are expected to leave part of their linguistic repertoire, and a part of themselves, at home when they go to school. This reinforces the belief that children's identities, culture and language are not welcomed within the educational space, and they must become a new version of themselves when engaging with education. When children are aware of these attitudes, this constitutes hostile language learning (see also Section 8.4.3), where they learn quite harshly that they need to navigate different spaces with different languages.

Finally, we share below two powerful excerpts reflecting the link between language ideologies, identity and erasure. In a discussion with parents from the Namwanga speaking area in Zambia, we observed an often expressed feeling of being marginalized and forgotten. At the end of the interviews, when asked if they had any additional thoughts or questions they wished to add, they concluded by stating:

Extract 23, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPN-S2-IntPaRe-040320MM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Nkulonda ukusalifya po mwatalika ukwizuka nukutukonchela nasalifya.

Parent (English translation)	'I want to thank you for remembering to come, thank you.'

Extract 24, [parent interview], Nakonde District, Zambia (BTOI 2020–2022, ZMPNS-11IntPaRe110320MM)

Parent (Namwanga)	Kweni amazwi yeni tutakweti twasalifya vyenaswe pakuti mwizakootutatela tuchilole. So pano twamilola twivwainsansa nukumanya ukuti awana wandi wasambilila itchete. Watandiwawe vino swemo twalinjia munoweni uwuteko wuwasakamazile.
Parent (English translation)	'I do not have anything to add. I just want to thank you for your coming because no one has ever been here to find out from us how children learn'.

These statements reflect both the strength of feeling the parents have for the issues involved, and their ongoing experiences of not having a say in the decisions that influence their experiences and the experiences of their children. In this case the topic of conversation had been on formal education, but it is possible to imagine that this sense of marginalization might stretch beyond the specific issue of the medium of instruction.

8.5 Discussion and concluding remarks

This chapter has sought to examine views towards language practices in Zambia and Tanzania. Discussing interview and focus group data collected in each country we have illustrated the ways in which multilingual competence is viewed both inside and outside of schools. Through doing so we have sought to answer the following questions:

1) What language practices are found, expected, and valued outside of schools?
2) What language practices are found, expected, and valued inside schools?
3) How are the language practices found outside schools acquired or developed?

From interview and focus group responses in each country we see that multilingual language practices and competencies are commonplace in the daily lives and interactions of individuals. Individuals have to draw on a broad range of linguistic resources for a range of purposes as they interact with others with different linguistic backgrounds and repertoires. A key theme emerging from discussions of language use outside of school is that individuals actively embrace using their

multilingual repertoires to make their communication as effective as possible. However, this fluidity of language use and viewing multilingual competence as a resource for successful and effective communication does not always extend to language use in education. These multiple languages are acquired in spaces outside of the classroom, at home and in community spaces where multilingualism is the norm and children are exposed to multiple languages from an early age and in different contexts. It is therefore not the acquired multilingualism that is remarkable, but the artificially imposed monolingualism – at least in policy terms – within school which stands in stark contrast to community realities.

We see that the language competencies which children acquire outside of school, informally – the language practices they learn and use for effective communication in the home and community – are not viewed as resources for education. Often, they are viewed as barriers holding children back, and as something which must be overcome and, if used, quickly discarded to ensure children acquire competence in other dominant national or regional languages and English instead. While we see language ideologies and reported language practices which suggest awareness of the value of multilingualism in daily life, when it comes to education, monolingual ideologies are more commonplace. Individuals display very fixed and rigid perceptions about what are appropriate languages of the home and what are languages of the school, with little acknowledgement or desire to see significant overlap between the two. We see these ideologies across both countries from parents, teachers, and children. There is a clear separation between the school and the home, and this is reinforced through the separation of languages.

While there are not necessarily overly negative views towards local languages spoken within the community, there is a strong sense of language separation. For example, in our Zambian data Namwanga is viewed as the language of the local community, of local identity and culture, and competence in the language is viewed as important for interacting within the local area. Similarly in Tanzania, Sukuma is strongly associated with community identity and culture. Namwanga and Sukuma are perceived as valuable languages only within a small area and when communicating with a limited number of people. The strong association between geographical space and one language – e.g., "Sukuma-speaking area" and "Namwanga-speaking area" – highlights some of the monolingual ideologies present in each space. These ideologies may well be important factors in ensuring the maintenance of marginalized languages and language communities, but they also hide the realities of the multilingual competencies of individuals and communities. As a result of these monolingual ideologies, involving boundaries between languages, and boundaries between the school and the home,

there is little acknowledgement of the multilingual competencies and repertoires of children, and of how these can be used as valuable resources for engaging with education.

These ideologies – found in school policy, and in attitudes in the home – provide a response to the third question on how language practices are learnt and developed. These language ideologies are passed on to children who then learn to create boundaries within their repertoires and learn when and where particular languages are, or are not, welcome. The hostile language learning environment which students are exposed to has consequences for their identity formation and could negatively affect their sense of cultural identity (Chumbow 2013; Kirkpatrick 2013). They learn that their "home-selves" and home linguistic practices are not welcome in all contexts. The ways in which children acquire linguistic competence in the school environment is one of sequential multilingualism (Reilly et al. 2022), in which students learn to separate languages, and in which a monolingual one-language-at-a-time approach is encouraged. This monoglossic approach to language which is institutionalized within school (Erling, Adinolfi and Hultgren 2017; Erling et al. 2021) may subsequently spread into other aspects of students' lives outside of the educational space.

Informal acquisition of communicative competence within this multilingual setting is strongly influenced by prevailing language ideologies, monolingual language policies, and language rules enforced by teachings in classroom settings. Students are faced with a hostile language learning environment within education spaces in which they are discouraged and stigmatized for using their "home" language. A result of this is that students must learn what languages are deemed to be appropriate in different contexts.

To improve experiences of education, policy-makers and teachers must start from a position which views the language competencies students bring to the classroom as valuable resources. This is particularly important when children just start school, because at that critical moment they need to transition smoothly to the school culture in its entirety and this transition should not come at the cost of their wider linguistic repertoires, experiences and identities.

References

Banda, Felix & Hambaba Jimaima. 2017. Linguistic landscapes and the sociolinguistics of language vitality in multilingual contexts of Zambia. *Multilingua* 36(5). 595–625.

Brock-Utne, Birgit. 2010. Policy on the language of instruction issue in Africa – a spotlight on South Africa and Tanzania. In Zubeida Desai, Martha Qorro & Birgit Brock-Utne (eds.), *Educational Challenges in Multilingual Societies*, 74–101. Cape Town: African Minds.

BTOI. 2020–2022 (collection date). Bringing the Outside in: Merging Local Language and Literacy Practices to Enhance Classroom Learning and Achievement. Unpublished audio recordings, transcription files, field notes, visual images.

Cameron, John & William Dodd. 1970. *Society, Schools and Progress in Tanzania*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Limited.

Central Statistics Office (CSO). 2012. *Census of Population and Housing*. Lusaka.

Chumbow, Beban Sammy. 2013. Mother tongue-based multilingual education: Empirical foundations, implementation strategies and recommendations for new nations. In Hamish McIlwraith (ed.), *Multilingual Education in Africa: Lessons from the Juba Language-in-Education Conference*, 37–56. London: British Council.

Copland, Fiona & Angela Creese. 2015. *Linguistic Ethnography. Collecting, Analysing and Presenting Data*. London: Sage.

Costley, Tracey & Colin Reilly. 2021. Methodological principles for researching multilingually: Reflections on linguistic ethnography. *TESOL Quarterly* 55(3). 1035–1047.

Creese, Angela & Adrian Blackledge. 2010. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *The Modern Language Journal* 94(1). 103–115.

Curriculum Development Centre (CDC). 2013. *National Literacy Framework*. Lusaka: Curriculum Development Centre.

Erling, Elizabeth J., Lina Adinolfi & Anna K. Hultgren. 2017. *Multilingual Classrooms: Opportunities and Challenges for English Medium Instruction in Low and Middle Income Contexts*. Reading: Education Development Trust.

Erling, Elizabeth J., John Clegg, Casmir Rubagumya & Colin Reilly (eds.). 2021. *Multilingual Learning and Language Supportive Pedagogies in Sub-Saharan Africa*. London: Routledge.

Gibson, Hannah & Colin Reilly (eds.) 2022. Rethinking multilingualism: Education, policy and practice in Africa. *Journal of the British Academy* 10(s4). 1–20.

Gibson, Hannah, Gastor Mapunda, Colin Reilly, Tracey Costley & Nancy C. Kula. 2022. Rethinking Language: The Need for Language Supportive Pedagogies Within Teacher Training in Tanzania. Unpublished manuscript. University of Essex and University of Zambia.

Jamhuri ya Muungano ya Tanzania. 2014. *Sera ya Elimu na Mafunzo*. Dar es Salaam: Wizara ya Elimu, Sayansi na Teknolojia.

Kelly, Michael J. 2000. *Reading Comes First: Primary Reading Programme Baseline Reading Study*. Lusaka: Ministry of Education.

Kirkpatrick, Andy. 2013. The lingua franca approach to the teaching of English: A possible pathway to genuine multilingualism in local languages and English. In Hamish McIlwraith (ed.), *Multilingual Education in Africa: Lessons from the Juba Language-in-Education Conference*, 11–16. London: British Council.

Kula, Nancy C. & Joseph Mwansa. 2022. Learning literacy in a familiar language: Comparing reading and comprehension competence in Chibemba in two contrasting settings in Northern Zambia. *Journal of the British Academy* 10(s4). 97–124.

Lindsjö, Karin. 2018. Contextualizing the quality of primary education in urban and rural settings: The case of Iringa Region, Tanzania. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian Journal of Geography* 72 (4). 234–247.

Languages of Tanzania Project (LOT). 2009. *Atlasi ya Lugha za Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.

Makoni, Sinfree & Pedzisai Mashiri. 2006. Critical historiography: Does language planning in Africa need a construct of language as part of its theoretical apparatus? In Sinfree Makoni & Alistair Pennycook (eds.), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*, 62–89. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

McKinney, Carolyn. 2020. Decoloniality and language in education: Transgressing language boundaries in South Africa. In Joel Austin Windle, Dánie de Jesus & Lesley Bartlett (eds.), *The Dynamics of Language and Inequality in Education*, 115–132. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Mapunda, Gastor. 2013. Teacher questions in linguistically constrained situations: Lessons from two primary schools in rural Tanzania. *Utafiti* 10(1). 59–71.

Mapunda,Gastor. 2015. The changing roles of English in Tanzania: Past and present. In Martha Michieka & Yousif Elhindi (eds.), *The Changing Roles of English in Eastern Africa*, 34–57. Champaign: Common Ground Publishing LLC.

Mapunda, Gastor. 2022. Revisiting the English-Swahili debate on Tanzania's medium of instruction policy at secondary and post-secondary levels of education. *Journal of African Languages and Literatures* 3. 1–22.

Mapunda, Gastor & Hannah Gibson. 2022. On the suitability of Swahili for early schooling in remote rural Tanzania: do policies and practice align? *Journal of the British Academy* 10(s4). 141–168.

Ohannessian Sirarpi & Mubanga E. Kashoki (eds.). 1978. *Language in Zambia*. London: International African Institute.

Tibategeza, Eustard Rutalemwa & Theodorus Plessis. 2018. The prospects of Kiswahili as a medium of instruction in the Tanzanian Education and Training Policy. *Journal of Language and Education* 4(3). 88–98.

Reilly, Colin. 2021. Malawian universities as translanguaging spaces. In Beth Anne Paulsrud, Zhongfeng Tian & Jeanette Toth (eds.). *English-Medium Instruction and Translanguaging*, 29–42. Multilingual Matters.

Reilly, Colin, Tracey Costley, Hannah Gibson, Nancy Kula, Mompoloki Bagwasi, Dikosha, Dikosha, Phetso Mmolao, Joseph Mwansa, Martha Mwandia, Gastor Mapunda & Edna James. 2023 Emerging principles for researching multilingually in linguistic ethnography: Reflections from Botswana, Tanzania, the UK, and Zambia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 44(8). 689–701.

Reilly, Colin, Mompoloki M. Bagwasi, Tracey Costley, Hannah Gibson, Nancy C. Kula, Gastor Mapunda & Joseph Mwansa. 2022. 'Languages don't have bones, so you can just break them': rethinking multilingualism in education policy and practice in Africa. *Journal of the British Academy* 10(s4). 1–20.

Rubagumya, Casmir M. 1990. Language in Tanzania. In Casmir M. Rubagumya (ed.), *Language in Education in Africa*, 5–14. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Unamuno, Virginia. 2014. Language dispute and social change in new multilingual institutions in Chaco, Argentina. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 11(4). 409–429.

Uwezo Tanzania. 2013. Are our children learning? Annual learning assessment report 2012. https://uwezotanzania.or.tz/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Uwezo-Tanzania-Annual-Learning-Assessment-Report-2012.pdf (accessed 2 May 2024)

Wedin, Asa. 2010. Classroom interaction: Potential or problem? The case of Karagwe. *International Journal of Educational Development* 30(2). 145–150.

White, John. 1980. The historical background to the national education in Tanzania. In Edgar C. Polome & Charles Peter Hill (eds.), *Language in Tanzania*, 261–282. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whiteley, Wilfred H. 1956.The changing position of Swahili in East Africa. *Africa* 26(4). 343–353.