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Abstract
This research explores parental perspectives on language education in Maasai Land, Tanzania, and the ways in which school realities at a Swahili-medium government (SMG) school and an English-medium private (EMP) school align with and diverge from parental expectations. While significant research shows benefits of Swahili-medium schooling in Tanzania, many parents are clamouring for English-medium private primary schools, while the 130+ local languages are muted in formal schooling. This study employs interviews with parents at one SMG and one EMP, and school observations at these same schools, to explore and compare valuations, expectations for use, and use of Maa, Swahili and English. This research finds that parents are generally very supportive of multilingual education, with perspectives both reflecting and rejecting dominant political discourses shaped by nationalism and neoliberalism. Schools’ orientations towards languages as problems or resources are shaped by symbolic and economic valuations of languages in Tanzania’s broader political economic context.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction to the Study

Significant research points to the importance of learners’ first/dominant languages in their schooling experiences. In Africa, the majority of children do not have access to schooling in their dominant languages, which hampers their ability to access what is being taught. Tanzania has the distinction of being one of the only African countries using an African language (Swahili) as the medium of instruction for all of primary school. However, while extensive research points to the benefits of using Swahili as the language of instruction at all levels of education in Tanzania, many parents are demanding English-medium from the earliest levels of education. A burgeoning industry of private English-medium schools has developed to meet these demands, as even parents of the humblest of means, with no prior exposure to English, are rushing to find English-medium schools for their children.

While many studies have noted the contradiction between what research is recommending and policy is prescribing, on the one hand, and what parents are demanding, on the other (e.g., Babaci-Wilhite, 2010; Rugemalira, 2006), existing studies have not yet unpacked the beliefs and values behind parents’ English-medium preferences, nor have they investigated the extent schools are able to meet the language expectations of the learners’ parents. This study addresses these gaps by exploring parental attitudes and expectations for language education, and the extent to which school language practices align with parents’ expectations. Through parental interviews and observations at one Swahili-medium government school and one English-medium private school, this study addresses the following questions:

1. What are parents’ attitudes and expectations for their children’s primary school language education in the semi-rural Maasai community of Monduli, Tanzania?
2. To what extent are these attitudes and expectations aligned with school realities at one Swahili-medium government school and one English-medium private school?

Contextual Background

This study was conducted in the small Maasai town of Monduli, Arusha, Tanzania, where previously-limited access to primary and secondary education is rapidly expanding, and where several English-medium private primary schools have been established in the past ten years. As
with the rest of the country, all government primary schools are Swahili-medium, and all
government secondary schools are English-medium. Primary school is seven years: Classes 1-7.
Secondary school is four years: Forms 1-4, and is followed by high school, Forms 5-6. Swahili,
the national language and lingua franca throughout Tanzania and many parts of East Africa, is
spoken as a first or second language by an estimated 99% of Tanzanians. English, one of the
official languages (alongside Swahili), is spoken by an estimated 5% of Tanzanians, and is rarely
heard in semi-rural communities like Monduli. In addition to Swahili and English, there are over
130 Tanzanian languages representing as many different ethnic communities. These languages
are not used at all in formal schooling. In Monduli town, the main languages heard in public
spaces are Maa (the language of the Maasai) and Swahili.

Rationale and Significance
This research speaks to a phenomenon seen in many postcolonial contexts globally, where,
despite extensive research advocating for use of local languages in schools, parents often want
their children to be schooled using a globally-powerful language, such as English. As a result,
English-medium private schools are a pervasive reality in many parts of the world, particularly in
the Global South. In these private school contexts, parents’ perspectives often have a significant
influence on the way schools are run, including on the way languages are used, since these
schools only exist because of parents’ preferences for certain kinds of schooling.

Parents play critical roles in their children’s education, and are key partners to schools in
supporting children’s formal schooling. Parents often have strong opinions about the type of
schooling their children should receive, and these opinions are grounded in experiences and
beliefs that have emerged from their own contexts. However, oftentimes in the literature,
parents’ perspectives are dismissed as ignorant, with recommendations frequently made to
educate parents in order to shift their attitudes. This research is based on the premise that
nuanced understandings of parental perspectives have a significant role to play in helping
schools to better serve the communities in which they work. Additionally, if there is need to
educate parents on beneficial and feasible language education options, an in-depth understanding
of parental perspectives is crucial in order to make the parental education both effective and
respectful. At the same time, there is need to understand the extent to which classroom practices
are aligning with parental expectations, such that parents can know if what they are making sacrifices to pay for, is indeed what they are getting.

In Tanzania, educational realities are changing rapidly, due to a combination of the re-introduction of universal primary education in 2002 and the growing presence of private school options. Many families are sending their children to higher levels of schooling than ever before. For this upsurge of education to be successful, it must be owned by the people, and address their self-defined needs. If parents’ expectations are not being met, they may become disillusioned and withdraw from the system, either taking their children to private schools, or removing them from schooling completely (and both of these responses are pervasive in Monduli). This situation fuels inequality, with those who can pay receiving a better education, and those who cannot pay ending up alienated from any opportunities for formal schooling. The mass exodus from Swahili-medium government schools to English-medium private schools points to a public school system disconnected from the demands of parents, particularly with regards to language education. Understanding parents’ attitudes and expectations can help to lessen the gap between what schools are offering and what parents are demanding.

This research has significant implications for the ways in which parents and schools can interact, and for ways in which schools can be more sensitive to the needs of the parents. This research also has significant implications for ways in which the government and community organizations may work to engage in dialogue with parents about hotly-contested language education issues, and for ways in which policy-makers may be responsive to community perspectives and attitudes. As such, the intended audience for this research includes the local community itself, local schools (both Swahili- and English-medium), policy-makers, curriculum designers, and all other education actors. Due to the similarity of concerns across Africa, this research is important not only throughout Tanzania but also across the African continent and beyond.

In addition to promoting greater sensitivity to community attitudes and perspectives on education, this research can impact the community by sparking increased discussion on the nature of language education, and on visions of what education is intended to accomplish in semi-rural Tanzanian communities.
Researcher’s Stance

My motivation to address this topic of parental perspectives on language education stems from seeing the impact parents’ perspectives can really have on educational realities in East Africa, to the extent of birthing a thriving industry of English-medium schools in Tanzania, and preventing the Kenyan policy of using mother tongue in early primary schooling from being implemented. Throughout my six years of experience in East Africa, I have been concerned by the crisis in Tanzanian education, which has been fueled to a large extent (at the post-primary level) by the insistence on learning through and being assessed in a language in which neither students nor teachers are adequately proficient. I have seen many Tanzanian secondary and university classrooms in which the pedagogical possibilities, and the ability for any meaningful learning to take place, have been severely compromised by the ‘English-medium’ diktat.

I have chosen Monduli town as the site of my study because of my experience and long-term commitments there, and because of my interest in doing research outside of the major urban centres where most of the language education research has been conducted. I have spent significant time in Monduli over the past six years, including founding a Community Library in the community in September, 2015, during the course of this study. Through my adoption into a Maasai family, I have participated in community life as a family member, and consider Monduli to be my long-term home. This research is important to me personally, as it has offered me a chance to deepen my relationships with and understanding of the community in which I live and work, and to interact with some of the schools where many of our Library participants study. This research, both through its process and its findings, can contribute (and have already contributed) to the improvement of the relevance and quality of the Community Library’s vision and practice, and its ability to address the real needs of the community, from the vantage points of both parents and schools.

Through these six years in Monduli, I have seen how language is always a central (often the central) concern regarding education, as the children struggle to make sense of their secondary studies in English. “Kiingereza ndio kila kitu” (“English is everything”) my mother says, as we look at my sister’s Form 1 report card, and identify English as the probable culprit of dangerously low scores in all the subjects. In response to the older children’s perilous struggles
with English-medium secondary school, my parents yearn to send the younger children to English-medium primary schools, but alas the school fees are prohibitive.

At the same time, the pressure to learn the languages of school results in Swahili, rather than Maa, being used with the children at home, and the younger siblings are fairly monolingual Swahili speakers. Our grandmother is deeply upset about not being able to communicate with her grandchildren in their own language, complaining that the children are constantly at school or church (in Swahili), so do not have time to learn their language or listen to traditional Maasai stories. However, other community members have told me that there is no need to learn Maa (or even Swahili) at school, because these languages can be learned at home.

It is in this context that I ask what possibilities parents see for multilingualism in the community, or do they see it as inevitable that one language must be sacrificed for another of higher status? To what extent is multilingualism valued? What different value does each of the languages hold in the imaginations of the parents, and what do they see as the role of the schools with regards to each language? To what extent do parental attitudes and expectations lend support to models of additive multilingualism in schools, or to what extent do parental expectations lean towards subtractive models where local languages are sacrificed to learn the language(s) of greater social mobility?

The answers to these questions have important implications for the future of language education in Tanzania, including future policy directions, the balance of power between public and private education sectors, the survival of local languages, and possibilities for effective multilingual education.

Perspectives on the value and meaning of different languages, as well as current realities of language education, have important historical and political roots. Understanding the historical-political roots of language education in Tanzania can not only help us to make sense of the current situation, but can assist in interpreting the attitudes and expectations of parents. With this in mind, I now turn to a discussion of the historical and political context of language education in Tanzania.
Chapter 2: Historical and Political Context of Language Education in Tanzania

Language is deeply political. Language mediates community identity boundaries, and is often employed to construct an ‘us’ which is different from ‘them.’ Upon the achievement of independence, African states inherited the arbitrary borders created by the departing colonial regimes, encompassing tremendous ethnic and linguistic diversity. Often drawing from European constructs of the nation-state which equate unity with uniformity, some African states set about constructing their hitherto non-existent ‘nations’ through various symbols meant to signify national unity and oneness. Tanzania is celebrated as one of the most successful African countries in developing a sense of national cohesion, and certainly the Swahili language has played a central role in constructing and performing the Tanzanian ‘nation.’ Under the Ujamaa nation-building project, Swahili became a critical symbol and agent in the construction of a Tanzanian nation, representing decolonization and African identity. However, with the ascent of neoliberalism in the 1980’s, market-based logic and the growing influence of international donors came to trump nationalist language education discourses, leading to the gradual erosion of nationalism and the privileging of English over Swahili. Throughout these political-economic metamorphoses, Tanzania’s 130+ local languages have been aggressively marginalized, being understood as divisive forces accentuating difference (in tension with the unity Swahili was meant to cultivate), and as economically impotent languages which have no place in a competitive capitalist climate.

In these ways, throughout Tanzania’s history, language education has been a site of struggle for larger political and ideological battles. Acknowledging that it is difficult to understand current language education discourses, policies, and realities without understanding this broader Tanzanian history, it is to the history of Tanzanian language education which I now turn our attention.

Language and Nation Building in Tanzania

By the time of Tanganyika’s independence in 1961, Swahili was already functioning as the *lingua franca* of much of East Africa, particularly along the coast. Amidst the national liberation movement of the 1940’s and 50’s, Swahili had been a critical medium of national mobilization and political education, with strong nationalist connotations developing in association with the
Swahili language (Blommaert, 1999, p. 88). The Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) placed great emphasis on promoting the Swahili language, and when TANU came to power upon the achievement of independence in 1961, its party policy became state policy, and Swahili became the national language of the new country (Blommaert, 1999, p. 88).

The initial years of national consolidation (1961-66) were characterized by the co-existence of Swahili and English, with Swahili as the language of African nationalism, liberation, and pride, and English maintaining a place of prestige in high political and social life. Despite the privileging of tradition and cultural authenticity in cultural policies (Askew, 2002, p. 178), in the domain of language, the more than 130 local languages giving expression to Tanganyika’s diverse cultures and traditions were sidelined to make way for Swahili and English. The deteriorating relations with Britain following the Tanganyika-Zanzibar union (forming Tanzania in 1964) led to the strengthening of the association between the English language and neocolonialism, and contributed to the consolidation of Swahili as the language of Africanhood and independence (Blommaert, 1999, pp. 90-1).

The Arusha Declaration in 1967, ushering in Ujamaa (Tanzania’s version of African socialism), marked the beginning of a new era in Tanzanian politics, and a paradigm shift in cultural and linguistic policies. At the core of Ujamaa was a cultural revolution. President Julius Nyerere and his administration were well-aware of the power of culture - including language and education as critical sites of enculturation – in constructing identities and deepening allegiances. All cultural activities were to be in the service of socialism. The socialist aesthetic favoured unity, egalitarianism, inclusivity, and popular participation, with cultural authenticity and tradition diminishing in importance (Askew, 2002, p. 278). This thrust towards unity and egalitarianism was accompanied by a flurry of activity promoting and strengthening Swahili as a symbol and agent of national unity, at the expense of local languages, which were marginalized in all public spheres.

In the education realm, the introduction of Ujamaa corresponded with the launching of Education for Self-Reliance (ESR), which was to work towards universal primary education, the eradication of illiteracy amongst all Tanzanians, and the fostering of national consciousness. The curriculum was to be relevant to the rural agrarian communities, who were placed at the centre of
the national imagination as the core of Tanzanian national identity. Under ESR, education was to nurture “cooperative endeavour, not individual advancement” (Nyerere, 1967/2004, pp. 72-3). It introduced geographic and ethnic quotas into the education system, in order to facilitate the mixing of students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and to construct and promote a common sense of ‘Tanzanian-ness’ (Cooksey, Court, & Makau, 1994, p. 216). Education was no longer merely the employee training grounds of the colonial era, but was rather part of a larger socialization process leading to the construction of the egalitarian, classless society projected by Ujamaa.

The project of Education for Self-Reliance also had a strong linguistic emphasis. While Swahili had been the medium of instruction up to Class 4 under the colonial regime and during the first years of independence, in 1967 Swahili-medium was extended to the end of primary school (Class 7), with English remaining the medium of instruction for secondary and tertiary education (Brock-Utne B., 2005, p. 56). English, however, continued to be associated with both elitism and neocolonialism, and plans were made to eliminate it as the medium of instruction at all levels of education. The Second Five Year Plan of Tanzania (1969-74) put forward plans to gradually introduce Swahili as the medium of instruction at secondary and university levels, stating that: “The division between Swahili education at primary level and English education at the secondary level will create and perpetuate a linguistic gulf between different groups and will also tend to lend an alien atmosphere to higher education, making it inevitably remote from the problems of the masses of society” (URT, 1969, as quoted in Brock-Utne, 2005, p. 56). The Ministry of National Education developed a plan for the transition to using Swahili as the medium of instruction in secondary schools beginning in 1969, and curriculum developers, linguists, and educators did extensive work in preparation for the changeover (Blommaert, 1999, pp. 91-2). However, with the exception of the subject Siasa (political education), the transition to Swahili as the medium of instruction at the secondary level was not implemented (Brock-Utne B., 2005, p. 57).

As universal primary education was the priority under ESR, and as secondary and tertiary enrolment was still quite limited, the use of Swahili for all primary education effectively meant that Swahili was the language of education for the masses. Swahili was also the language of adult education campaigns, including both adult literacy classes and political education.
Education was to be populist, not elitist, and Swahili was thought of as a language of the people. Swahili became an ideological tool for egalitarianism, for the construction of a Tanzanian national identity, and for populist participation in Ujamaa.

However, as the Swahili language was being used as part of the “ideological hegemonization” of the Ujamaa nation building project, the idea of ‘language’ was largely abstracted, with little or no attention being paid to internal variation within the Swahili language (Blommaert, 1999, p. 181). The linguistic unification of the nation was built on the notion of the generalized use of Swahili – but Swahili of a particular standard variety. Certain varieties of Swahili were afforded greater status than others, with the ‘pure’ ‘standard’ variety being described as quite exclusive, or even as a “laboratory variety” (Yahya-Othman, 1997, pp. 24-5). Thus, the spreading of Swahili amongst the masses did not automatically imply generalized equality amongst all Swahili speakers. While it was much more accessible to the general Tanzanian population than English or any single ethnic language, it still left space for elitism within the Swahili language. Swahili was no more homogenous than the diverse population it was meant to unify.

Whatever its shortcomings, the Ujamaa period was a time of developing national imagination and forging a national identity, with the Swahili language and education of the masses playing critical roles in this nation building project. Despite the realities of serious resource limitations and concerns about quality, Education for Self-Reliance was successful in achieving near universal primary education by the late 1970’s, remarkably increased rates of adult literacy, and had solidified Swahili as the national language (Chachage, 2010). Additionally, Tanzania had achieved the distinction of being the only ex-British colony in Africa with a language policy which seriously challenged the hegemony of English: Swahili was the medium of instruction at the primary level, the language of Parliament, the language of the media, and a first or second language for at least 95% of the population. The projects of Swahilization and nation building had been largely successful.

Neoliberalism, International Influence, and the Rise of English Language Education

By the beginning of the 1980’s, policy-making priorities were beginning to change. A combination of an economic recession from the oil crisis, internal disagreements, and the adoption of International Monetary Fund-imposed conditionalities, led to Tanzania’s economic
liberalization, resulting in the gradual erosion of state power and of the ideological hegemony of Ujamaa. Gradually, neoliberalism came to replace nationalism as the driving force behind language education and cultural policy, and imagined identities as ostensible participants in the global economy came to trump nationalistic identity discourses.

In 1982, a Presidential Commission on Education echoed the 1969 Second Five Year Plan of Tanzania by recommending the replacement of English with Swahili as the medium of instruction in secondary and tertiary education, with plans to begin this transition in 1985 (Brock-Utne B., 2005, p. 57). However, a variety of forces, both internal and external, contributed to the undermining of this second plan for the Swahilization of the whole education system. In 1983/4 the British government funded an extensive study on the levels of English across the education system in Tanzania (Brock-Utne B., 2005, p. 58). The findings of this research, conducted by British nationals Clive Criper and Bill Dodd, were consistent with the numerous previous studies: the levels of English were too low for effective learning to take place (Brock-Utne B., 2005, p. 58). The study found that Swahili was in most contexts the de facto medium of secondary school instruction, reporting that “…were it not for the fact that much teaching is in practice carried out in Kiswahili…it is hard to see how any genuine education could take place at the lower secondary level” (Criper & Dodd, 1984 as quoted in Roy-Campbell, 2001, p. 102). Whereas previous studies with similar conclusions had recommended changing the secondary and tertiary medium of instruction to Swahili, this study made a remarkably different recommendation: English should be strengthened in order for it to become a viable medium of instruction (Roy-Campbell, 2001, p. 102).

Lwaitama and Rugemalira argue that the 1983/4 British study was an intervention designed to justify the British government’s objective of strengthening the English language in Tanzania, so the recommendations could hardly have come out otherwise (Lwaitama & Rugemalira, 1990). Regardless of the bias of the study, the British government embarked on a massive multi-million dollar project in 1987 entitled the English Language Teaching Support Project (ELTSP), with the objective of reinvigorating English as a practicable secondary school medium of instruction (Roy-Campbell, 2001, p. 103). Significantly, the British government, through their Overseas Development Agency (ODA), funded this project on the condition that English would remain the medium of instruction in secondary schools, a condition the Tanzanian government accepted
The ELTSP was to improve English instruction through, among other things, the provision of English language books, provided by the British government on the condition that they be published in Britain (Brock-Utne B., 2005, pp. 59-60). In addition to this being a devastation for the struggling Tanzanian publishing industry, the books supplied to schools through ELTSP were of questionable cultural relevance, and their content was in many cases in direct contradiction with the principles of Ujamaa and self-reliance (Roy-Campbell, 2001, p. 104). In these ways, the ELTSP represented a challenge to the sovereignty of the Tanzanian government with regards to language education, and the replacement of nationalist discourses with development discourses prescribed by an imperial power.

The context of the British government’s intervention is significant, as it sheds some light on how a program which would have been inconceivable in the midst of the 1970’s efforts to prepare for the use of Swahili as the medium of instruction, was endorsed by the Tanzanian government one decade later. By the early 1980’s, Tanzania was embroiled in a severe economic crisis, leading it to intensive negotiations with international donor agencies, particularly the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (Mazrui, 2004, p. 48). The international lending institutions were claiming that Tanzania was too poor to continue to offer universal primary education and its current level of subsidies for secondary education (Roy-Campbell, 2001, p. 102). Eventually, pressures towards economic liberalization took the form of structural adjustment programs (SAPs) imposed on Tanzania by the IMF and World Bank, which forced Tanzania to reduce social spending and to introduce cost sharing measures in virtually all aspects of state spending. With regards to education, the SAPs reversed many of the gains made during the Ujamaa era towards equal access to all levels of schooling. While ESR had minimized the importance of the children’s social background in determining education access, the introduction of cost-sharing (i.e., school fees, or the raising of school fees where they already existed), private schooling, and community contribution requirements facilitated the dramatic growth of inequality in education access in the 1980’s and 90’s (Cooksey, Court, & Makau, 1994, pp. 225-6). Together, the twin forces of neoliberalism and international intervention led to the reinvigoration of English-medium in post-primary schooling and the exasperation of educational inequality, while also laying the groundwork for the liberalization of primary education which would birth the industry of private English-medium primary schools.
These shifts away from discourses of nation building, Tanzanian self-reliance, and Swahili-driven national development, were notable within the Tanzanian government itself. President Julius Nyerere, the architect of Ujamaa and Education for Self-Reliance, was a strong proponent of the Swahili language because of how it contributed to the values of national self-reliance and decolonisation. However, in the 1980’s, Nyerere’s discourses shifted, to include more of a market-orientation and an accommodation of international interdependence. In justifying the maintenance of English as the medium of instruction at post-primary levels, he asserted, “English is the Swahili of the world and for that reason must be taught and given the weight it deserves in our country” (quoted in Mazrui, 2004, p. 22). This represents a significant shift towards the internationalization of the Tanzanian imagination, the strengthening of Tanzania’s identity as a collaborator with the West, and growing investment in English language education as a partner in these new identities, imaginaries, and economic realities.

**Current Realities of Tanzanian Education**

The state of education in 2016 is a far cry from the Education for Self-Reliance envisioned under the Ujamaa system. Amidst increasing pressure to cut public spending and diminish social services throughout the 1980’s and 90’s, Tanzania liberalized the provision of primary education in 1995. The Education and Training Policy of 1995, passed in order to fulfill structural adjustment conditionalities imposed by the IMF and World Bank, states that “the establishment, ownership and management of primary schools shall be liberalized” (United Republic of Tanzania, 1995, p. 36; Bakahwemama, 2010, p. 207). This has led to the establishment and rapid expansion of a lucrative industry of English-medium private primary schools, as parents clamour to educate their children in the language of prestige and to offer their children an early start in the language of post-primary schooling. As private English-medium schools tend to be better resourced than public primary schools (Vuzo, 2010), they tend to outperform their public Swahili-medium counterparts, heightening the public’s perception of the superiority of English, and contributing to the relegation of Swahili to the status of a second-rate language of instruction.

A simultaneous development which has dramatically transformed Tanzania’s education-scape has been the re-introduction of ‘universal primary education’ (UPE) in 2002. In response to the United Nations Millennium Development Goal of UPE and with the heavy support of international financiers, Tanzania eliminated school fees for Swahili-medium government
primary schools in 2002, increasing primary school enrolment by millions of children in the past
decade. Despite accolades from the United Nations for Tanzania’s rapid progress in UPE, these
developments have corresponded with an acute crisis of quality, as increases of resources have
failed to keep pace with the rapid increases in enrolment. Sifuna (2007) points to large class
sizes, severe teacher shortages, and inadequate facilities which all seriously hamper the quality
oberves soaring drop out rates, high rates of grade repetition, and serious limitations in the
quality of teachers as reasons to suspend celebration of increased enrolment numbers

What is clear is that, despite significant quality shortcomings, high drop-out rates, and high
failure rates of the primary school exit exam, more children are now completing primary school
than ever before. These young graduates, many of whom are the first in their families to
complete primary education, have high hopes for the future. However, as Tanzania’s educational
priority has been firmly focused on primary education, the expansion of secondary school
opportunities, although quickly growing, has not been able to keep up with the numbers of
children who are qualified to proceed to secondary school. The result is deep disappointment,
frustration, and the feeling of betrayal by the system, for pupils but also for parents who have
given the schools their children for seven years, only for their children to return home after
primary school with minimal job prospects and few skills relevant to life in the community.

Certainly, the crisis in quality in government schooling, combined with fierce competition for a
limited number of post-primary educational and employment opportunities, has fuelled the
seemingly insatiable demand for English-medium primary schools. The rise of English-medium
private schools, combined with the dilution of quality of Swahili-medium government schools,
has exasperated inequalities in Tanzanian society, while also reinforcing the prestige of English
and lower status of Swahili.

Throughout Tanzania’s history, tensions between African nationalism and neoliberalism have led
to discourses pitting Swahili and English against each other. During Ujamaa, and particularly
during the heyday of Swahilization 1967-75, Swahili was promoted in antagonistic opposition to
English. Similarly, neoliberal discourses, in emphasizing the value of English for social mobility
and global relevance, have promoted exclusively English-medium instruction to displace Swahili’s role in the education system. This history of projecting political-economic battles onto language education has resulted in understandings of the Swahili and English languages as mutually exclusive, while also muting local languages within language education discourses. This situation has suppressed possibilities for multilingual education in Tanzania.

While this chapter has charted the history of Tanzanian language education discourses as reflected in policy and research, it is likely that language education discourses of the masses in some ways reflect, and in some ways reject, these highly politicized constructions of language education. This research explores language education in the imaginations of the masses.

**Conceptual Framework**

The political-economic context, past and present, has a significant impact on how languages are used and valued, in the social-political sphere which includes public education, in the economic sphere, and in personal and communal lives. Richard Ruíz, in discussing approaches to language planning, posits three distinctive *orientations* to understanding language: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource (Ruíz, 1984). The orientations that parents, teachers, and policy-makers have towards various languages, and indeed towards multilingualism in general, are very much mediated by their political and economic environments.

Ruíz understands an orientation as “a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society” (Ruíz, 1984, p. 16). Ruíz explains how closely orientations are related to language attitudes, in that “they help to delimit the range of acceptable attitudes toward language, and to make certain attitudes legitimate” (Ruíz, 1984, p. 16). Certainly, Tanzania’s political-economic history and current realities have profoundly shaped societal orientations to language, and these orientations have been absorbed (and challenged!) to varying degrees by Tanzanian people.

According to Ruíz (1984), the language-as-problem orientation views linguistic diversity as a problem which must be rectified through treatments such as education in the dominant language. Ruíz observes that this orientation tends to be demonstrative of broader orientations which understand social and cultural diversity as problems. The language-as-problem orientation tends to view multilinguals (i.e., non-English-dominant people in the United States where Ruíz writes
from, and non-Swahili-dominant people in Tanzania) as disadvantaged, being more prone to social and economic problems.

The language-as-right orientation is concerned with the entitlement of linguistic communities to access social services, including education, in their dominant language (Ruíz, 1984). The language-as-resource orientation views various languages, and multilingualism in general, as political, economic and social resources which should be developed, managed and conserved. Opposing what he understands as the false dichotomy between unity and diversity, Ruíz argues that a language-as-resource orientation “can only lead to greater social cohesion and cooperation” (Ruíz, 1984, p. 28).

While the wholesale adoption of Ruíz’s framework to understanding Tanzanian orientations is problematic due to the dramatic differences between American and Tanzanian contexts (including in that the multilingualism Ruiz discusses is largely the result of immigration, in contrast to the indigenous multilingualism of Tanzania), the basic concept of understanding language as a problem, right, or resource can have some important explanatory value in understanding orientations and attitudes towards languages and linguistic diversity in Tanzania.

While Ruíz sheds light on orientations towards languages as problems, rights, or resources, Heller and Duchêne (2012) offer insight on how different kinds of valuations of languages are constructed, with particular attention to the hegemonic forces of the nation-state and of capitalism. They examine the ways in which the nation-state, in the name of constructing and regulating markets, creates feelings of ‘pride’ connected with national symbols, such as languages. These languages become imbued with tremendous symbolic power, serving the legitimization of the nation-state through their construction as a “whole, bounded system inextricably tied to identity and territory” (Heller & Duchêne, 2012, p. 3). However, they argue that tropes about linguistic pride and ideologies framing languages as a resources for culture and identity are giving way to paradigms that conceive of language in primarily economic terms, valuing language as a source of profit and as a technical skill.

While Heller and Duchêne (2012) set their discussion predominantly within the trajectories of industrial capitalism of the Global North, their analysis can also inform the examination of the political-economic dynamics shaping language valuation and language discourses in Tanzania.
In Tanzania, the role of the nation-state in constructing feelings of pride and the symbolic value of Swahili, and the increasingly dominant discourses of ‘language as profit’ and attention to the economic value of language (especially English), demonstrate very similar trends as to what Heller and Duchêne (2012) observe.

Taken together, Ruiz’s (1984) framework of language orientations and Heller and Duchêne’s (2012) paradigms of pride and profit and the symbolic and economic valuations of language, form the conceptual framework for this study and will be employed to assist with the interpretation of the study’s findings. The above analysis of the political-economic history and current realities of language education in Tanzania will also assist in the interpretation of the data, understanding that parental perspectives and school realities cannot exist in isolation of broader political-economic trends and discourses.

Now that the broader context of Tanzanian language education has been established through an exploration of some of the historical, political and economic factors shaping language education, I now turn to an examination of the realities of language education through the lens of recent empirical studies addressing language education issues in Tanzania.
Chapter 3: Literature Review

Introduction

Amidst this tenuous history of Swahili-versus-English language battles, and all of the political-ideological baggage which has accompanied them, there is a long history of language education research, dating back to the 1970’s. In this chapter, I review the literature on language education research in Tanzania, observing trends and identifying gaps, and positioning my own research in relationship to the existing literature. As one review of language of instruction (LOI) research in Tanzania has already been conducted (Qorro, 2008), I will begin by examining the findings of this previous review. Noting that the majority of Tanzanian language education studies have been conducted in secondary school contexts, I will review studies investigating language education questions at the secondary level, to offer a broader picture of the key questions and methodologies of existing Tanzanian language education research. I will then turn to literature addressing primary school experiences of language education, including comparisons between Swahili-medium government and English-medium private schools. Finally, I will come to studies examining parental perspectives on language education. Since language education studies focusing on parents are few, I will also include studies which include parents’ voices in any way, even if not as a central part of the study.

In selecting studies to include in this literature review, I have decided to focus on empirical studies only. As language education is such a politically charged issue, there have been many non-empirical articles and books addressing language of instruction, and these will not be included in this review. Additionally, I have decided to focus on studies from the past decade, from 2005 onwards. To avoid duplication, I will not review any of the studies included in Qorro’s 2008 literature review.

Any discussion of research pertaining to language education in Tanzania would be incomplete if it didn’t pay homage to the central contributions of the LOITASA project. LOITASA (Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa) is a ‘South-South-North’ cooperation project supported by the Norwegian University Fund (NUFU) in order to contribute to LOI research in Tanzania and South Africa. Throughout the two phases of this project (2002-6 and 2007-11), the LOITASA project published 8 books of research, sponsored 6 PhD dissertations, and catalyzed significant scholarly discussion on LOI issues. As such, LOITASA research will figure
prominently in this literature review, as this project has moved the field of African language education research forward in leaps and bounds.

**Qorro’s 2008 Review of the Literature**

In her 2008 review of 21 language of instruction studies conducted in Tanzania from the late 1970’s until early 2008, Qorro finds that “all these studies agree, without exception, that the level of English language proficiency among secondary school students and teachers is extremely low; that it is difficult to see how education could possibly take place without the use of Kiswahili” (Qorro, 2008, p. 49). Of these studies, all but two (the British-funded Criper and Dodd study mentioned in the Chapter 2, and one study recommending code-switching) recommended a switch from English to Swahili as the medium of instruction in Tanzanian secondary schools (Qorro, 2008, p. 27). With this review, Qorro (2008) demonstrates that the use of English as the LOI has been problematic for at least four decades, while also uncovering a fixation on secondary school classrooms as the site of language education research: only two of the Tanzanian language education studies she identified were not examining secondary school contexts (one looked at an undergraduate context and one examined primary schools). Although she does not identify gaps in the literature, it is clear that nearly all of the studies she reviews are classroom-based (they do not examine causes of poor English, language use beyond classrooms, or reasons why policy has remained obstinately English-medium). Throughout this review, there is no single mention made of local languages, nor of multilingual possibilities for education: language education is discussed as a tension between English and Swahili. Qorro (2008) notes that despite four decades of research to the contrary, “policy makers, parents and the majority of people among the general public still hold their earlier beliefs on the continued use of English as the LOI” (Qorro, 2008, p. 28). This claim is neither elaborated nor supported by research, although it is followed up by the recommendation for researchers to “sensitize and update policy makers, parents and the public on research findings” (Qorro, 2008, p. 55). The silences in this review point to the need for research investigating community perspectives on language education, and to increase language education research at the primary school level (most of the primary level studies identified for this review were published after Qorro (2008)).
Language of Instruction Research in Tanzanian Secondary Schools

As evidenced by Qorro’s 2008 review, the vast majority of studies on language of instruction issues in Tanzania have been focused on secondary school contexts. This is presumably due to the abrupt switch from Swahili-medium to English-medium which occurs, without adequate support, at Form 1 (the first year of secondary), making secondary school the site of the most poignant LOI challenges and the focus of most of the advocacy for policy change. The first phase of the LOITASA project (2002-6) was focused on secondary school research in Tanzania, contributing to the strong emphasis on secondary school experiences in the LOI literature.

Since Qorro’s 2008 literature review, there have been six major studies examining LOI questions in secondary schools. Of particular importance in secondary school LOI research have been the questions of the extent to which using English as the LOI results in English language learning, and the extent to which content learning, creativity, and critical thinking may be enhanced or compromised depending on the LOI. Classroom observation is a common methodology for researchers investigating the implications of LOI for pedagogy, participation and learning, as well as for examining what ‘English LOI’ policy looks like in practice. Here, I examine four secondary classroom observation LOI studies, two of which (Vuzo, 2005; Mpemba, 2006) observe English-medium classrooms without any research intervention, and two of which (Mwinsheikhe, 2008; Vuzo, 2008) employ quasi-experimental design to observe three different LOI’s: English, Swahili, and code-switching. All four of these studies focus on oral interaction, although Vuzo (2008) also includes written achievement tests to assess learning.

In her study of “problems and prospects” of using English as the LOI in secondary schools, Vuzo (2005) combines classroom observations with interviews of teachers and education officials, to examine the ability of students to communicate in English, the use of code-switching in classrooms, and views of teachers and officials on LOI. Her findings show that code-switching is frequent, students usually fail to grasp content knowledge when it is presented in English, and that very few students can communicate in English, the result of which is minimal student-teacher interaction. The majority of teachers and all education officials cite English LOI as a cause of low academic achievement, and 60% of teachers claim that low English competence amongst teachers is a barrier to effective instruction in English. Vuzo recommends a policy shift to Swahili as the LOI and a strengthening of the teaching of English as a foreign language,
arguing that the current system practices “subtractive English”, but that her recommendations would support “additive English” (Vuzo, 2005, pp. 77-78).

Through observations of secondary science classrooms and a quasi-experimental design, Mwinsheikhe (2008) examines the strategies Tanzanian secondary teachers and students use to cope with English LOI during science lessons, and how these coping strategies impact the teaching/learning of science. Mwinsheikhe finds that common coping strategies in English LOI science classrooms include: code-switching, English teaching (e.g., defining terms, pronunciation drills, correcting spelling), safe talk, punishment, and cramming (Mwinsheikhe, 2008, p. 133). In the experimental design, different streams of Form I students at two different schools were taught in different LOI: English, Swahili, and code-switching (the control group). Mwinsheikhe finds that the Swahili LOI classrooms demonstrate increased and richer interaction (both between teacher and students and amongst students), more asking and answering of questions by students, a more relaxed atmosphere, and greater eagerness and confidence in student participation (Mwinsheikhe, 2008, pp. 130-31). The English LOI classrooms were the greatest contrast to this, while the code-switching classrooms were somewhere in between, depending on the relative amounts of each language used. Mwinsheikhe recommends a switch to using Swahili as the LOI in secondary schools, with the claim that “English LOI not only condemns the majority of students to failure in learning science but also prevents them from proper acquisition of the English language” (Mwinsheikhe, 2008, p. 139).

Vuzo’s 2008 study is similar to Mwinsheikhe (2008) in that it also employs classroom observation and a quasi-experimental design involving comparing English, Swahili, and code-switching LOI’s in a subject class (in this case Geography). Her results are also similar to those of Mwinsheikhe (2008) in that she finds Swahili to be the most effective LOI (followed by code-switching), based on written achievement tests. However, Vuzo (2008)’s recommendations depart from those of Mwinsheikhe (2008), in that her framework of additive multilingualism supports her to develop a model for multilingual education in Tanzania. Her model employs Swahili as the medium of instruction throughout all of primary and secondary schooling, and includes ethnic languages being taught as a subject for the first two years of primary, followed by the introduction of English as a foreign language beginning in class 3 and continuing throughout primary and secondary school. Her model also includes the teaching of a 2nd foreign
language throughout secondary school, and the introduction of a 3rd foreign language in Form 3. She suggests that in the future ethnic languages may be strengthened for use as LOI’s in the first two years of primary school. These recommendations demonstrate an extension of ideas on “additive versus subtractive English” in Vuzo (2005), while also demonstrating a more nuanced understanding of multilingual education compared with the either/or thinking of Mwinsheikhe (2008).

Mpemba (2006) investigates a very similar core question to one that Mwinsheikhe (2008) also addresses: the question of coping strategies employed by both teachers and students in navigating through challenges of English LOI in secondary schools. Through classroom observations, Mpemba (2006) finds that code switching, code mixing, translation, and safe talk are the four most important strategies employed in coping with English LOI. Additional strategies identified are memorization, cramming, tuition classes, and the use of mnemonics (Mpemba, 2006, p. 153). This study takes as its premise that English LOI is a barrier to effective learning, and that Swahili is a tool of nationalism and a necessary challenge to English hegemony.

In contrast to the four studies discussed above which focus mostly on oral language in classrooms, Qorro (2010) examines Form I (first year secondary) students’ English abilities through written tests, to assess their preparedness to use English as LOI as they transition from Swahili-medium primary. In addition to administering tests to 388 Form 1 students, Qorro (2010) also administers questionnaires to secondary teachers of both English and non-English subjects (although all English-medium), and observes and interviews teachers at the source primary schools of these Form I students, to understand their backgrounds of English instruction. Qorro (2010)’s findings show that Form I students are woefully unprepared to study using English as the LOI, and that secondary teachers admit to significant code-switching in oral interactions with students as they find students’ English proficiency to be unsatisfactory for English LOI. Qorro (2010) recommends the use of Swahili as the LOI for Tanzanian secondary schools, while also recommending the teaching of English independently and effectively as a subject only by teachers qualified to teach English. Qorro (2010) is the only research in this literature review combining both primary and secondary schools into a single study, and thus
offers unique contributions on the unfeasibility of the Swahili-medium to English-medium transition in the current system.

Brock-Utne and Desai (2010), identifying the prevalence of LOI studies investigating oral classroom interaction, decide to focus on written tasks to address what they see as a gap in research in this area. Participants are Form I, IV, and VI students in Tanzania, and Grade 4 and 7 pupils in South Africa, representing the first and fourth years of using English LOI in each context (with the addition of students in their sixth year of English LOI in Tanzania). Asking participants to write a narrative, once in their dominant language (either Swahili or isiXhosa) and once in English, to describe a cartoon story they are presented with, Brock-Utne and Desai (2010) find that most students are unable to comprehensibly describe in English what is happening in the story. They find that student compositions in Swahili/isiXhosa accurately describe the events in the cartoon, demonstrate creativity, rich vocabulary, and grammatical ability, whereas English compositions are shorter, less coherent or incoherent, lacking in detail, and difficult to comprehend. They conclude that English language assessments not only offer a poor representation of students’ academic abilities, but English LOI also slows down the learning process and intellectual development.

These six studies, combined with Qorro’s 2008 review, decisively conclude that using English as the LOI at Tanzanian secondary schools interferes with content learning, stifles classroom interaction and participation, and limits pedagogical options, creating reliance on rote approaches to teaching and learning. It seems that the conditions leading to recommendations in the 1970’s and 80’s to change the secondary school LOI to Swahili still exist. Different studies have shown that, despite acknowledging that English is a barrier to learning, both students (Malekela, 2005) and teachers (Senkoro, 2005) are generally in favour of maintaining English as the LOI in secondary schools, with some secondary teachers recommending a shift to English-medium in primary schools as a way of addressing the language challenge in secondary schools (Senkoro, 2005).

**Language of Instruction Research in Tanzanian Primary Schools**

Themes explored in studies of LOI in Tanzanian primary schools are for the most part quite similar to those of studies conducted in Tanzanian secondary schools. However, the existence of
both Swahili-medium and English-medium primary schools allows for inter-school comparisons of Swahili-medium and English-medium classrooms, without the need for quasi-experimental designs used to create classrooms of different linguistic media in secondary school studies. Certainly, the comparison of public versus private school experiences adds an additional dimension to these primary school studies, a dimension not addressed in LOI literature at the secondary level since all secondary schools are English-medium.

Four studies comparing Swahili-medium public and English-medium private schools fit the criteria for this literature review, and are discussed below. In addition, this review discusses three studies looking exclusively at English-medium primary school contexts, including challenges of using a foreign language as the LOI with primary school children and questions of quality in English-medium schools. One single study (Qorro, 2012) examines prospects and limitations of English language teaching in Swahili-medium schools.

Each of the four studies comparing Swahili-medium public and English-medium private schools employs classroom observations as part of its methodology, and three of them (Vuzo 2012, Bakahwemama 2010, and John 2010) also involve interviews to gain deeper understanding of the schools they are comparing. As questions of public versus private school differences are research-worthy independent from their language dimensions (eg. teaching materials, teacher qualifications, teacher living and working conditions), these questions are addressed in these comparative studies, however this literature review minimizes their significance in order to focus on the language aspects of the comparisons.

In her comparative analysis of classroom teaching and learning strategies in Swahili-medium and English-medium schools, Vuzo (2012) finds that student-centered approaches are used significantly more in Swahili-medium classes, i.e., all classes at the government schools except English class, and Swahili class at the private schools. Like Mwinsheikhe (2008) and Vuzo (2008) find in their comparative studies of English- and Swahili-medium secondary classrooms, Vuzo (2012) finds that the use of a foreign language as LOI significantly impedes pedagogical options and the effective learning of subject content (in this case Mathematics, English, and Swahili). Drawing on a UNESCO resource for the teaching of non-mother tongues in multilingual African contexts (UNESCO, 1997), she recommends foreign language classrooms
focus on the learners, rather than just the subject, by drawing on the learners’ linguistic and cultural experience. Vuzo (2012) makes no mention of multiple languages being used in a single class, with the implication that an English-medium class is exclusively in English, and a Swahili-medium class is exclusively in Swahili.

Whereas Vuzo (2012) focuses on classroom teaching and learning strategies, Vuzo (2010) focuses on teaching and learning resources in Swahili-medium government versus English-medium private schools. Selecting both government and private schools from similar middle class neighbourhoods so as to facilitate a fair comparison, she finds that the resources at the private schools, including the low-cost private schools she studied, are superior to those of their public counterparts. She observes that while English is never used at the Swahili-medium schools outside of the limited English classes, Swahili is used regularly at the English-medium schools, in addition to English. She then attributes the higher performance of English-medium schools to the superiority of resources, rather than the use of English, and argues that English-medium schools serve to perpetuate inequalities in Tanzanian society.

Examining aspects of both teaching/learning processes and resources, Bakahwemama (2010) combines elements of both Vuzo (2012) and Vuzo (2010) in her comparison of Swahili-medium government and English-medium private schools. She uses a combination of classroom observations and teacher interviews to explore why, according to both the Class 4 National Examination results and results of written assessment tests that she administered to Class 4 pupils, the pupils of English-medium schools perform better, with the exception of marginally higher results of Swahili-medium pupils in Mathematics. Like Vuzo (2010), Bakahwemama (2010) observes superior resources, smaller class sizes and more motivated teachers in the English-medium private schools. However, like Vuzo (2012), she observes heightened interaction and participation in Swahili-medium classes, while observing a more teacher-dominated dynamic in English-medium classes. Like Vuzo (2010), Bakahwemama (2010) recommends the provision of increased resources, including means of improving teachers’ living and working conditions, in order to improve the quality of Swahili-medium public schools. Unlike Vuzo (2012), who is silent on the use of multiple languages within a single class, Bakahwemana (2010) reports that Swahili is often used in English-medium Mathematics classes to assist learners’ comprehension.
In investigating the differences in quality of Swahili-medium government and English-medium private schools, Julitha Cecilia John (2010) conducts interviews with teachers, parents, and school administrators, and conducts classroom observations. She finds teacher-student ratios to be almost twice as high in Swahili-medium government schools, and finds much better teacher incentives at English-medium private schools. She points to government school teachers’ low motivation and absenteeism as outcomes of a lack of support and poor salaries. John (2010) finds parental involvement at English-medium private schools to be far superior to that at Swahili-medium government schools, with teachers at government schools complaining of uncooperative parents, while teachers at English-medium private schools spoke of regular communication and unproblematic relationships with parents. Finding the level of English at English-medium schools to be very low, including amongst the English-medium teachers, John (2010) concludes that children at the English-medium private schools in this study miss out on both the ability to speak English, and on a quality education (John, 2010, p. 246).

The three studies included in this literature review addressing LOI issues exclusively at English-medium private schools are quite varied in their foci and methodologies. Komba and John (2015) is the only study in this review to employ purely quantitative methods, which they use to examine the written English abilities of Class 7 pupils in four English-medium private schools. Finding that most of the 240 pupil participants had serious problems in their written English, they caution parents to be careful when selecting English-medium schools for their children, and recommend the recruitment of teachers proficient in English for all English-medium schools (although they do not acknowledge the challenge of finding such teachers in Tanzania, nor do they discuss ways of supporting teachers to improve their proficiency). This purely quantitative study could have benefitted from some qualitative analysis to help understand why written English proficiency is so low, and the contexts of these schools, in order to draw clearer implications from this study.

In his large-scale study of ten English-medium private schools, Rubagumya (2010) explores the nature and quality of pedagogy and language use in English-medium schools, the training and English competence of the teachers, and factors motivating owners to establish English-medium schools. Through classroom observations, Rubagumya (2010) observes strict ‘English only’ policies resulting in “safe talk” (as observed also in Mwinsheikhe, 2008 and Mpemba, 2006) and
inhibiting question asking and free expression amongst both pupils and teachers. He also observes punishments, such as wearing sign saying ‘Shame on me, I have spoken Kiswahili’ and corporal punishment, for children who violate the ‘English only’ policy. However, the impracticability of the language restriction and the difficulty of enforcing it result in code-switching in the classroom, and frequent use of Swahili (for both teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interactions) outside of the classroom (Rubagumya, 2010, pp. 53-55). Rubagumya (2010) echoes John (2010)’s finding that teachers at English-medium schools generally have the same qualifications as those of their Swahili-medium counterparts, and have serious challenges in both oral and written English. Through interviews with the owners of the ten English-medium schools, Rubagumya (2010) reports that pressure from parents, the urge to offer a needed service to the community, and the opportunity to make a handsome profit are the prime motivations for owners to start English-medium primary schools, noting a business-orientation similar to that found in John (2010).

Rugemalira (2006) is unique in that he draws from his personal experiences managing an English-medium private school in his analysis of teacher quality, limitations of using English as the LOI in Tanzania, and reasons for parents to choose English-medium (discussed in next section). Rugemalira (2006) discusses the significant challenge of finding quality teachers in Tanzania, using statistics to show the low educational attainment of most teachers, while also noting that the lack of English proficiency pervasive amongst Tanzanian teachers leads to the temptation for English-medium schools to hire teachers from Kenya or Uganda. Out of all the studies in this literature review, Rugemalira (2006) engages most deeply with literature on immersion and bilingual education internationally, using this knowledge to argue that the conditions for effective immersion or bilingual education are not present in most English-medium schools in Tanzania. Like Vuzo (2012), Vuzo (2010), and Bakahwemama (2010), Rugemalira argues that the superior performance of English-medium schools is in spite of, and not because of, the use of English, positing that for most Tanzanian English-medium schools, forcing children to use an unfamiliar LOI may stifle their intellectual development and creativity.

Qorro’s study (2012) is a response to a policy proposed in 2009 (and never implemented), offering public primary schools the choice of using English as LOI. Through observations of English classes at 3 Swahili-medium public schools, she finds English language teaching at
public primary schools to be “inadequate, especially in terms of textbooks, teaching methods, and classroom size” (Qorro, 2012, p. 60). Based on her findings, Qorro (2012) discusses the scope of investments (clearly untenable) the government would have to make in order to bring English language teaching to the level necessary to implement English-medium in public schools. Qorro (2012) makes a unique contribution to the LOI literature, not only by being the only study addressing English teaching in Swahili-medium schools, but also by offering an extensive list of recommendations for feasible ways of improving English language teaching, as alternative and more effective ways of achieving the proposed policy’s goal of improving English proficiency. Drawing on works by Cummins, Baker, and Hornberger, Qorro (2012)’s recommendations are well-grounded in scholarship on multilingual education, including the use of all the learners’ languages as resources in English teaching, building English literacy on literacy foundations in the L1, and using multi-media (including opportunities to listen to English on radio and cassettes) in English learning.

In these eight studies of Tanzanian primary schools (four comparing Swahili-medium and English-medium schools; three studying only English-medium schools, and one examining English teaching in Swahili-medium schools), the poor quality of English is loudly articulated. Like the secondary school studies, most of theses studies point to ways in which English-medium inhibits pedagogical options. However, while making generalizations about the poor quality of English, none of these studies offers an analysis of how the different languages are used, by whom, and under what circumstances. Are there contexts in which English is used more effectively than others? Are there certain speech acts or certain words/phrases/meanings which seem to exist exclusively in one language or another? In what ways are the two languages used to complement each other? How do language dynamics differ at different levels of primary education? These questions represent gaps in the existing literature.

Additionally, it must be noted that six of these studies (all except Rugemalira, 2006 and Komba and John, 2015) are affiliated with the LOITASA project, and all study different combinations of the same six schools, all in Dar es Salaam and Morogoro (presumably all in urban contexts). All eight of the studies involve schools in Dar es Salaam, the commercial capital of Tanzania. None of these studies make much of an attempt to describe their contexts or demographics (with the exception of Rugemalira (2006), who describes the types of well-educated parents who bring
their children to the school in question), thereby limiting the conclusions or generalizations which can be drawn from these studies. My study will address some of these gaps by studying schools in a more rural context, and by offering rich contextual and demographic description of the schools and the surrounding communities.

**Parents’ Perspectives on Language Education in Tanzania**

While many studies on language of instruction in Tanzania refer to parental perspectives in passing, particularly to mention that the vast majority of parents prefer English-medium, I have only identified five studies which formally investigate parental perspectives on language education. Of these, three (John, 2010; Rubagumya, 2010; and Rugemalira, 2006) embed an interrogation of parental perspectives within larger studies, which I have already discussed in the section on LOI in primary schools. I return to these studies in this section to focus specifically on their findings on parental perspectives. Two studies (Qorro, 2005; Rubagumya, 2010) use questionnaires to gather perspectives from large numbers of parents, while two (John, 2010; Babaci-Wilhite, 2010) use interviews to facilitate depth, rather than breadth, of analysis. The mixture of perspectives of secondary school parents (in Qorro, 2005) and primary school parents (in Rubagumya, 2010; John, 2010; Rugemalira, 2006; Babaci-Wilhite, 2010) contribute to the diversity within these studies. All five of these studies, to varying degrees, approach the topic of parental perspectives acknowledging that research supports the use of familiar languages as the most appropriate LOI’s.

Through questionnaires completed by 212 parents of secondary school students in four regions of Tanzania, Qorro (2005) finds that the majority of parents in her study believe that students understand with great ease when taught in Swahili but understand very little when taught in English, and yet the majority still want students to be taught in English. Common reasons parents give for wanting the continued use of English as LOI include enabling students to communicate with many countries, to get employed by and to communicate with foreign companies, and the inadequacy of Swahili terminology particularly for science and technology (Qorro, 2005, p. 102). Qorro (2005) makes recommendations to sensitize parents, stakeholders and the general public on the ill-effects of using an unfamiliar language as the LOI and on theories of language learning, in order to address “false beliefs and false assumptions”, including that using English as LOI is an effective way to learn a language (Qorro, 2005, pp. 116-9). Seeking to “account for the
disparity between public views and expectations” regarding LOI, and the “actual classroom practices and outcomes of secondary school education” (Qorro, 2005, p. 96), the objectives of this study are quite similar to those of my study. However, by using interviews rather than questionnaires, I will be able to explore the reasons for and nuances of parental views and expectations with much greater depth than what Qorro (2005)’s questionnaires allowed.

Through questionnaires completed by 119 parents from ten English-medium primary schools, Rubagumya (2010) finds that the prime (and sometimes exclusive) motivation for parents to send their children to private schools is for their children to learn English, with minimal attention to other aspects of ‘quality’. He categorizes parents’ reasons for choosing English-medium as those pertaining to “linguistic capital” (ie. beliefs that English is a useful resource in the context of global markets) and those based on internalized “linguistic imperialism” (ie. beliefs that English is the only language in which quality education can be delivered; beliefs in the inferiority of Swahili). Finding that only 18.5% of respondents would send their children to the same school if the LOI was not English, Rubagumya (2010) comments that parents seem to be “uninformed on the difference between learning a language and having the language as a medium of instruction” (Rubagumya, 2010, p. 50). In light of his findings on the poor quality of English at many English-medium schools (see above), Rubagumya (2010) expresses concern that some private schools are taking advantage of parents’ demand for English-medium and are short-changing the parents, leaving their expectations of English proficiency for their children unmet.

While Qorro (2005) and Rubagumya (2010) employ questionnaires to get a broad sample of parental views on language education, Babaci-Wilhite (2010) seeks to understand government officials’ and parents’ views through interviews. Babaci-Wilhite (2010) uncovers what she understands as a series of myths to which parents subscribe: that English is the language of important offices, that education is synonymous with English proficiency, and that English LOI results in better learning and life opportunities. Like Qorro (2005), Babaci-Wilhite (2010) believes that sensitizing parents and the general public on the benefits of Swahili-medium schooling is essential, and a key step in the struggle to change the post-primary LOI to Swahili.

While Qorro (2005) urges researchers to be more pro-active in sharing their LOI research with the general public, Babaci-Wilhite (2010) argues that it is the government’s responsibility to educate parents about the benefits of Swahili-medium schooling. This contrasts with the views of
the government officials Babaci-Wilhite (2010) interviewed, who argued that “the government should respect parental choices since Tanzania is a democracy” (Babaci-Wilhite, 2010, p. 296).

John (2010), interviewing six parents from a combination of Swahili-medium government and English-medium private schools, provides the most coherent, in-depth account of parental perspectives within this literature review. Examining parents’ perceptions of quality schooling in general (no matter what the LOI), she finds that parents often measure ‘quality’ by their children’s English language ability. This leads to some parents “despising” Swahili-medium schools, as the perception is there is no quality without English (John, 2010, p. 245). She reports unfavourable perceptions of Swahili-medium government schools, including negligible English ability, poor infrastructure and unmotivated teachers. She also finds that English is frequently viewed by parents as a commodity which they seek to purchase for their children, although she contends that the commodity parents are actually purchasing is poor quality English (John, 2010, p. 249). She warns that the use of English as LOI in private schools blinds people to other important considerations of quality, leading many parents to spend money which they can ill-afford to give their children a poor-quality education.

Rugemalira (2006) discusses his struggles managing a private primary school amidst parents’ “unrealistic expectations” that children speak English only from the moment they arrive at school, and that children be able to speak English within a few months of beginning at an English-medium school (Rugemalira, 2006, pp. 105, 95). Despite his understanding of the importance of early literacy instruction in a child’s first language, he describes how parents’ demands for English-medium made his initial plans to start a Swahili-medium private school untenable. Although he observes that “most parents want their children to master English, in addition to Kiswahili” (Rugemalira, 2006, p. 98), he claims that parental demands for English generally result in subtractive English-medium programs, in which children’s first languages are regarded as obstacles rather than resources in developing English proficiency. Rugemalira (2006)’s observation that speaking English outside of school is perceived as “inappropriate, disrespectful, or just funny” (p. 107), and his discussion of attempts to use English for correspondence with parents as being “not socially acceptable” (p. 106), point to how far removed English is from this community in Dar es Salaam. Rugemalira’s inability to implement a Swahili-medium or transitional bilingual program due to parents’ demands for English-
medium, points to the power of parental perspectives in shaping the educational realities in Tanzania.

Throughout these five studies which address parental perspectives, common findings include parents equating English with quality education, negative attitudes towards Swahili-medium government schools, and the assumption that ‘English-medium’ results in learning of English. However, none of these studies explore sources of beliefs about language education. None of them interrogate parents’ experiences (whether their own experiences, or experiences of their older children or other relatives/friends), to explore how past experiences have shaped perspectives on language education and have given parents good reason to believe what they believe. Experiential factors are particularly important to explore, as educational realities are changing so rapidly that what was true for one child’s experiences ten years ago may not be true today. It is possible parents’ perspectives are not keeping up to these changes, or alternatively that they are putting too much trust in new educational structures, such that their expectations are unrealistic and disconnected from experience. It is also possible that parents’ experiences speak truths about language education that cannot been accessed by classroom observation studies.

Significantly, none of these studies on parental perspectives – and very few in this entire literature review – makes any mention of languages other than Swahili and English. This omission does not reflect the multilingual reality of Tanzania, and reflects the fixation on the Swahili-English dichotomy constructed in the larger political discourses (as explored in Chapter 2). This omission perhaps also reflects the urban bias in these studies, where Swahili is increasingly becoming the first language of many Tanzanians. Relatedly, none of these studies addresses parental perspectives on language education or language learning outside of formal schooling. Attitudes may vary significantly, for example, between learning local languages or Swahili at school, versus at home, and these differences are important to understand. These attitudes may be rooted in beliefs about who is qualified to teach which languages, in beliefs about multilingual development, and beliefs about appropriate languages for reading and writing. Understanding these nuances in language education attitudes and values could have significant implications for possibilities for multilingual education, including potentially in involving parents in language learning. A deeper understanding of parental perspectives can make more room for respecting parents’ agency as actors in the language education process, both in
Another gap in existing research is a comparison of perspectives of parents with children attending Swahili-medium schools versus English-medium schools. Presumably both Babaci-Wilhite (2010) and John (2010) interviewed parents of both types of schools, but neither of them made any attempt to identify which parents said what. The existing literature would suggest that all parents prefer English-medium, but are there parents who have deliberately chosen Swahili-medium? My study addresses this gap by paying particular attention to parents of children at Swahili-medium schools, and comparing their perspectives to those of English-medium schools.

As with the research on LOI in primary schools, there is insufficient demographic and contextual information about participants in studies on parents’ perspectives on language education. By not describing which parents hold these perspectives on language education, existing studies limit their explanatory power or applicability. My study addresses this shortcoming by offering rich demographic and contextual information about the participants and their communities.
Chapter 4: Methodology

Research Design

This study is a qualitative case study examining two different sites: a Swahili-medium government (SMG) school and an English-medium private (EMP) school, both of which are located in the same Maasai community of Monduli, Tanzania. At each of the two sites, the study has two parts. The first part involves interviews with parent participants, to address the first research question: What are parents’ attitudes and expectations for their children’s primary school language education in the semi-rural Maasai community of Monduli, Tanzania? The second part employs school observations to address the second research question: To what extent are these attitudes and expectations aligned with school realities at one Swahili-medium government school and one English-medium private school?

Immediate Context of the Study

The context for this study is the semi-rural community of Monduli, Arusha, Tanzania. Monduli is a district within Arusha region, and Monduli town, where this study is conducted (together with its surrounding areas), is the administrative centre of the district. Monduli is traditionally the home of the Maasai people, but increasingly is also the home of Tanzanians from other ethnic communities who come to Monduli for work. The Maasai are traditionally pastoralists, but in Monduli town, the population is increasingly agrarian, building permanent structures and diversifying sources of income. In addition to cattle-raising, by far the most common occupation and source of income, Monduli residents grow crops such as maize and beans, and engage in small-scale business. Opportunities for salaried employment are limited, and predominantly include work at the Halmashauri (District Council), at schools (including Monduli Teacher’s College and Monduli Community Development Institute), in healthcare, and at local hoteli (small restaurants).

The dominant languages of Monduli are Maa (used amongst the Maasai) and Swahili, the national language and lingua franca of Tanzania. Despite English and Swahili both being official languages of Tanzania, English is rarely heard in Monduli outside of English-medium schools. Most residents of Monduli town speak Swahili as either a first or second language, although many in the remote rural parts of Monduli district speak only Maa, and do not speak Swahili.
This applies particularly to women, who have far fewer opportunities to attend school. Increasingly, children in Monduli town are being raised with Swahili as their dominant language, due to Swahili’s higher status, the immigration of Tanzanians of other ethnicities into Monduli, and inter-ethnic marriages wherein Swahili is the only common language.

Since the liberalization of the education system in 1995, there have been a growing number of private English-medium primary schools, particularly in urban centres, but increasingly also in semi-rural areas such as Monduli. The (re)introduction of universal primary education in 2002 has led to increasing access to public primary education in Monduli, with some families sending their children to school for the first time, and other families sending their children to higher levels of education than what had previously been possible. However, secondary, post-secondary, and employment opportunities have not been able to keep up with the growing numbers of primary (or even secondary) graduates, so access to post-primary education and/or employment remains very competitive, and is often mediated by English language ability (regardless of the relevance of English for the employment responsibilities). Due to this highly competitive situation, it is increasingly common for students to return home after primary (or secondary) school, frustrated that the bright promises of education have not taken them beyond where they have come from.

It is against this backdrop that this research has been conducted

**Parent Interviews**

As mentioned above, this research was conducted at two primary schools in the vicinity of Monduli town: an SMG school called *Mtij Mmoja Shule ya Msingi* and an EMP school called *Shining Star Academy* (both pseudonyms). These schools were selected due to the numbers of their pupils who attend children’s programs at a Community Library which I founded in the community. The parent participants of this study all have one or more children who attend either Mtij Mmoja Shule ya Msingi or Shining Star Academy. They were recruited through their children’s involvement in the Community Library programs. At the Community Library, which is open to everyone in the community at no cost, children are formally registered by their parents. As the children generally come on their own and not with their parents, the registration process frequently occurs after the children have already started attending the Community
Library, through our encouragement of the children to tell their parents to come to formally register them. It is through this process of registration and interacting with parents at the Community Library that the parent participants of this study were recruited. Any parents whose children have attended the Community Library and attend either Mti Mmoja or Shining Star were welcome to participate in this study. Since few children attending EMP schools attend the library programs (as the children attending EMP schools in Monduli are relatively very few), one of the EMP parent participants (i.e., a parent with a child attending Shining Star) was recruited through another EMP parent participant, who connected me with a fellow parent at Shining Star.

For the purposes of this study, ‘parents’ are understood as mothers, fathers or other guardians – any adult who is a primary caregiver of a child who attends one of the schools included in this study, and who is responsible for making decisions about their children’s education. This study includes seven ‘parents’ in total: five mothers, one father and one grandmother. The high number of women in this study is due to the much more active role women play in raising children in this community compared to men.

I spoke to potential parent participants in person about my study, my interest in interviewing them for this research, and what their potential participation would entail. While there were no parents who explicitly refused to participate in the study, there were some who failed to come for interviews at the agreed upon times. Some interviews were conducted in the Community Library during the times when the library was closed to the public, and others were conducted in the participants’ homes, in accordance with the preference of each participant. Before conducting the interviews, I explained to them about my study, what their participation would entail, and their rights as participants. As this is an oral culture and several of the parent participants do not read or write in any language, I explained all this to them orally, based on the information in Appendix B. After allowing them opportunity to ask questions and to decline to participate, I asked them to consent, based on the information in Appendix C. Again, due to the oral culture and the lack of reading and writing ability on the part of many of the participants, the asking for and giving of consent was done orally, in Swahili.

In total, there were seven parents who participated: four with children who attend Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi and three with children who attend Shining Star Academy. With their
permission, I audio-recorded each of the interviews. At the end of each interview, I gave the participant rice and sugar to thank them for their participation.

The interviews were semi-structured, based on the interview protocol provided in Appendix A. The interviews were conducted in Swahili. Since my Maa proficiency is limited, for participants whose Swahili was not strong (three of the SMG participants who have never been to school), a strong Maa-Swahili bilingual sat in on the interviews in order to help with translation where necessary (which was only occasionally, and only in two of the interviews). The translator was a middle-aged woman of essentially the same demographic as the participants, such that they would feel comfortable in front of her.

Detailed demographic information about the parent participants is provided in Chapters 5 and 6, for SMG and EMP parents, respectively. All parent interviews were conducted between December, 2015 and February, 2016, as documented in Appendix F.

School Observations
For the second part of this study, I conducted school observations at Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi and Shining Star Academy. Before beginning the observations, I first went to each of the schools to introduce myself to the Head Teachers/School Administrators. I explained the nature and objectives of my study, and what their schools’ participation would entail. I also gave them an introductory letter, in Swahili, explaining my study and what I was asking from them in requesting that they participate (see Appendix D). As this is a predominantly oral culture, everything that was important for them to know I stated orally, with the letter being more of a formality to reinforce that which I had stated orally.

After receiving the consent of the Head Teachers/School Administrators at each of the two schools, together with consent from various levels of government (as detailed below), I returned to each of the two schools on different days to introduce myself to the teachers as a group, and to again explain my study and what their participation would entail. I gave each teacher a copy of the teachers’ information letter and consent form, in Swahili (see Appendix E). I emphasized that they were not required to consent, that I would only observe in the classes where teachers had willingly offered their written consent, and that I was more than happy to address any questions or concerns they might have, both within that original teachers’ meeting and individually. Nearly
all of the teachers offered their written consent by returning the signed consent form to me, either at the end of the initial teachers’ meeting or throughout the ensuing days during my observations at the school. I did not observe any classes of teachers who had not given their written consent.

In order to get an overview of language use at each of the schools, throughout my school observations I observed language use within the classes (both oral and written), observed language use outside the classes, and engaged in significant discussion with the teachers. At Mti Mmoja, I observed a sampling of classes from Pre-Primary 1 to Class 7, with a focus on Swahili and English language periods, while also observing a number of subject lessons (which are all Swahili-medium at this school). At Shining Star, which at that time only had Pre-Primary and Classes 1-4 (as it is a relatively new school, adding one additional class each year), I observed in each of their four primary school classes. I did not have permission to observe in the Pre-Primary classes at Shining Star, hence my limitation to the four primary school classes alone. Like at Mti Mmoja, my observations focused on Swahili and English language periods, but also included a number of subject lessons (which are all English-medium at this school). Details of the classes observed at both schools are detailed in Appendix F.

I observed for a total of five full days at Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi and two full days at Shining Star Academy. As Shining Star Academy is a significantly smaller school than Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi, with less than one fifth of the student body and less than half the number of observable classes, less observation time was required to get an adequate sense of language use at the school and of the school in general.

At each of the schools, I observed classroom language use according to three categories: oral language, written language, and printed resources. For all three of these categories, I assessed which language(s) were used in which contexts and by who. I used the observation schemes of Appendix G to help to guide my observations, while also making profuse general notes. The oral language observation scheme in Appendix G is an adaptation of the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) Observation Scheme Part B, from Spada and Fröhlich (1995) (see McKay, 2006, pp. 90-94). It includes spaces to indicate the language used in a given utterance, the speaker (i.e., teacher or pupil), the type of utterance, the length of utterance, and any other notes. The classroom writing observation scheme helped to capture data regarding the
language of writing by the teachers and pupils, e.g., on the blackboard, in pupils’ notebooks. The printed resources observation scheme helped to capture data with regards to printed resources around the classroom, e.g., wallcharts, books, signs. These observation schemes, rather than being rigid, helped to guide observations of which languages were used where, by who, and for which functions.

In addition to the classroom observations, I observed language patterns outside the classroom, including teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interactions, and language use at morning assemblies. Both inside and outside of the classroom, I documented general observations of language patterns, as well as documenting some interactions verbatim in my field notes. All documentation of language use was anonymous, noting only the role of each interlocutor (i.e., teacher, pupil of Class X). Particular emphasis was placed on the language use of the teacher, and on observing the extent to which the language choices of the pupils reflected those of the teacher. I also spent significant time in informal conversation with teachers, both individually and in small groups. I documented these conversations in my field notes immediately after they occurred in order to accurately represent the content on the conversations.

**Equipment**

For this research, the equipment I required was a voice recorder to record the parent interviews, and a notebook and pen (and print-outs of observation schemes) for the school observations. I used my laptop to store the data, including the audio files, my scanned school observation notes, and any soft copy comments I had written about the parent interviews and school observations.

**Data Analysis**

I analyzed the data from the parent interviews by conducting a content analysis in order to identify significant themes. I analyzed how often different themes emerged and in what ways, always being attentive to the unique backgrounds of the participants, to get a sense of the contexts out of which certain attitudes and expectations emerged. I followed Nero (2014) in creating profile charts of the key demographic information of each of the parent participants (Nero, 2014, p. 230), which provide background information essential to understanding participants’ comments based on their particular situations. These profile charts are included at the beginnings of Chapter 5 (for the SMG parents) and Chapter 6 (for the EMP parents). I
analyzed data from parents of each school separately, so as to enable me to compare parents’ attitudes and expectations between the two schools, while also enabling the comparison of parents’ attitudes and expectations with the observations from the respective schools.

In my analysis of the classroom observations, I began by assessing which language was dominant in each of the contexts, which was generally immediately clear. I proceeded with an analysis of which speech acts tended to be in which languages when coming from which interlocutor in which kinds of circumstances. Beyond examining which language(s) the speech acts were in, I also examined the quality of the language used, e.g., scripted/memorized language use, original language use, single word contribution, or language use guided by a previous statement or written text. I also analyzed which types of speech acts did not exist, or existed infrequently, by particular interlocutors. I paid particularly keen attention to utterances which were not in the dominant language of the immediate context, for example usages of Maa at the SMG school, usages of Swahili at the EMP school, and usages of English in the Swahili periods of the EMP school. I also examined the context of each utterance to try to understand the causes of the particular kind of language use. In my analysis, I also put particular emphasis on examining differences between teachers’ and pupils’ language use.

I compared the data from the parent interviews with data from the school observations from the corresponding school, to see the ways in which parents’ attitudes and expectations did or did not align with school realities in their children’s schooling experiences.

I transcribed and analyzed all data from the interviews in an ongoing way during the months when I was conducting the interviews (December, 2015-February, 2016). Likewise, I analyzed the school observation data continuously throughout the months when I was conducting school observations (January-February, 2016). I continued with deeper levels of data analysis from March-July, 2016. All data analysis was done in the original languages of the data. All translations in the presentation of the data are my own.

**Ethical Considerations**

Consent to conduct this research was granted by the following institutions and actors: Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH – a national body); the Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS – Arusha Region); the District Administrative Secretary (DAS –
Monduli District); the District Executive Director (DED – Monduli District); the District Education Officer (DEO – Monduli District); the heads of each of the two schools; all of the teachers whose classes I observed and all of the parent participants.

The consent processes for all of the study’s participants, as described above, involved thorough oral explanation to the participants about the nature and purpose of the study, what was being asked of them, how the data would be used, and their rights as participants, including their rights to withdraw, to withhold any information/decline to answer any questions, and to ask any questions before, during and after their participation. Any effects of the potential power differential between researcher and participants which could have impacted the sincerity of the consent were mitigated in the following ways: emphasizing that participation is optional and that it would not have any impact on their children’s participation in the Community Library; inviting participation and asking interview questions in a way which was gentle rather than aggressive or pushy; and interpreting body language and other signs (like not showing up for an interview) and not only participants’ words in trying to understand doubts or unwillingness to participate. While I did offer dry rice and sugar (fairly expensive and culturally appropriate gifts) to parent participants to thank them for participating and compensate them for their time, I did not tell them in advance that I would be giving them these tokens of appreciation, so as not to coerce their participation through material benefit.

In the presentation of the data of this study, I have used pseudonyms for all participants and schools, and have altered some minor aspects of their personal details to ensure that they remain unidentifiable.

The audio data, the transcriptions, and every other piece of typed documentation will be stored in my laptop requiring a password to open it. The consent forms and hand-written classroom observation notes will all be stored in a locked cabinet in my home in Monduli. No one will have access to any of these documents besides myself.

As a way giving back to the school for its help in completion of this study, I have given a gift of books to the school for their small school library. In addition, I have an ongoing relationship with this school through which I hope to keep giving back to the school into the future.
An additional way of giving back to this community is through my work at the Community Library which I founded through the course of this research, and which is now a permanent fixture in this community. This Community Library has already benefitted the parent participants and their children, and will continue to offer ongoing benefits for the participants’ children and the community at large for years to come. Through my work with the Community Library, I will host community meetings with parents to discuss the findings of this research (in a general way, so as to avoid giving away any participant identities). I hope that this will continue to catalyze discussions about language issues and the possibilities and challenges of multilingualism and multilingual education for Monduli and for Tanzania. I also hope that this will help to catalyze conversations about objectives of education, educational relevance in Monduli, and ways in which the rise in access to primary and even secondary schooling in Monduli has or has not been bringing about changes (positive and negative) in the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>July, 2015</strong></td>
<td>Submit proposal and ethics review. Submit application for research permission from Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August, 2015</strong></td>
<td>Receive ethics approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September, 2015</strong></td>
<td>Establish community library in Monduli, Tanzania. Begin library programming for children. Involve parents through the registration of their children and by hosting parents’ meetings (ongoing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October, 2015</strong></td>
<td>Receive research permission from COSTECH to conduct this research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October - December, 2015</strong></td>
<td>Begin the work of recruiting parent participants and making connections with schools. Obtain permission to conduct this research from:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS – Arusha Region);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- District Administrative Secretary (DAS – Monduli District);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- District Executive Director (DED – Monduli District);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- District Education Officer (DEO – Monduli District).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December, 2015 – February, 2016</strong></td>
<td>Conduct interviews with 4 SMG parents and 3 EMP parents. Transcribe the interviews and begin to analyze the data as it becomes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January – February, 2016</strong></td>
<td>Obtain formal permission from the selected schools to involve them in this research. Conduct school observations. Begin to analyze the school observation data as it becomes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March – August, 2016</strong></td>
<td>Complete the data analysis. Write up the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September, 2016 and beyond</strong></td>
<td>Share research findings at various academic conferences and through the publication of academic articles. Hold community meetings at the community library to discuss language concerns in the community with regards to the (general) findings of the research. Write short, accessible Swahili articles based on the findings, to be made accessible in the community and throughout Tanzania through publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Swahili-medium School Parents and School Realities: Findings and Discussion

The first part of this chapter presents findings of the interviews with parents from the Swahili-medium government (SMG) school, Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi, in order to address the first research question: What are parents’ attitudes and expectations for their children’s primary school language education in the semi-rural Maasai community of Monduli, Tanzania? The second part of this chapter presents findings of the school observations at Mti Mmoja, in order to address the second research question: To what extent are these attitudes and expectations aligned with school realities at one Swahili-medium government school? General discussion of the findings is embedded in these two findings sections, with a larger discussion section at the end of the chapter connecting the parents’ perspectives with the school realities for a more thorough investigation of the second research question.

Note that this chapter deals with the interviews and school observations from the Swahili-medium government school only, and that the following chapter (Chapter 6) deals with the interviews and school observations from the English-medium private school.

Portrait of an SMG Mother

Intelligent and articulate, Mama Naserian is a woman who gets things done. With an aura of leadership and confidence, she is clearly in charge of her household. A capable and assertive business woman, she hires a tractor and labourers to help her farm her rented plot of land, from which she sells her harvest of beans and maize at various local markets. Worldly and resourceful, she interacts with tourists as an entrepreneur, having helped form a women’s collective which attracts tourists, sells them beaded work which she and others so expertly create, and has built a traditional Maasai hut through which to teach the tourists about Maasai life and culture.

Mama Naserian and her family speak Maa at home, and she raised her children exclusively in Maa. Requiring Swahili for her entrepreneurial initiatives, Mama Naserian is a self-taught Swahili speaker, and is quite proficient. Like many Maasai women of her generation, she has never been to school, and neither reads nor writes in any language. Her amazingly multi-faceted endeavours demonstrate that social, cultural, and economic participation and ability to contribute to one’s society are based on so much more than schooling and literacy.
Mama Naserian’s traditional Maasai life – from her traditional Maasai way of dressing, to the traditional mud hut she lives in, to the totality of traditions that her life is steeped in – offers a dramatic contrast to that of her eldest daughter. A teacher in Arusha city, her daughter’s life is predominantly in Swahili and English, she is married to a non-Maasai Tanzanian, and, according to her mother, she has forgotten much of the Maa language. She studied primary school at Mt Mmoja Shule ya Msingi like all of her other siblings, studied secondary school (Form 1-4) in Monduli, then, after getting married in Arusha, her husband helped her through teacher’s college. Now she is a successful teacher with several children, and Mama Naserian is clearly proud of her daughter’s accomplishments.

Mama Naserian is the second (and favoured) wife of her husband. Her husband’s older wife lives in the same compound in a different hut, together with her children. Mama Naserian’s eldest son and his family also live on the same compound (as per tradition), and there are young children (Mama Naserian’s grandchildren) running about carrying sticks for herding cattle, with their traditional clothing, a Maasai sheet tied over one shoulder, blowing open in the wind. Like most Maasai families, this family has many cows and goats, which some of the young men take care of in their nomadic lifestyles, moving around every few months looking for sufficient water. There are several other Maasai huts sprinkling the nearby countryside, where other relatives of her husband live. Beyond these dwellings, there are fields of crops, a testimony to how Maasai ways of life are changing, moving away from strict reliance on pastoralism to more agrarian lifestyles. The many brick houses being built not so far away – some of them quite large - provide a constant reminder that there is a nearby military base which pays its military personnel handsomely, far more than the meagre income that can be generated through livestock, farming, and even catering to the tourists.

**Introduction to SMG Parent Participants**

The above portrait introduces one of the SMG parent participants, in order to give a sense of common features of the demographic. All of the SMG parents interviewed speak Maa at home, live in traditional Maasai *bomas* (houses made of sticks, mud and cow dung, with thatched roofs – see Figure 5.1 below), and work in the informal economy, particularly in activities regarding agriculture, livestock, and beadwork. All of them, both women and men, dress in *rubega* (traditional Maasai dress involving layers of Maasai sheets – see Figure 5.2 below), and all are in
polygamous marriages. None of the women interviewed have ever been to school, while the man interviewed completed primary school and attended a livestock college. Intergenerational differences point to quickly changing realities in this Maasai community, including children with far greater access to schooling opportunities and significantly greater proficiency in Swahili than the parents. In these ways, the parent participants in this study are very much representative of the general demographic of parents whose children attend SMG schools in the area.

Figure 5.1: Traditional Maasai Bomas

Figure 5.2: A Maasai mother and son wearing traditional rubega
For this research, four parents (three mothers and one father) were interviewed, each one having one or more child attending Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi. All of these parents have one or more child who attend the Community Library, and were contacted through their children’s involvement. Their demographic information is summarized in Table 5.1. All names are pseudonyms. Note that, in this community, parents are called by the names of their children, i.e., Mama Naserian is the mother of Naserian; Baba Esther is the father of Esther.

Table 5.1: Demographic information of SMG parent participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s level of schooling</th>
<th>Mama Naserian</th>
<th>Mama Rebekah</th>
<th>Baba Esther</th>
<th>Mama Lomnyak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of schooling of their children*</td>
<td>S: Class 7 D: Form 4, then teachers’ college S: Form 3 S: Secondary** S: Secondary** D: Class 5</td>
<td>S: Form 4 D: Form 4 D: Form 4** S: Form 4** D: Class 6** S: Baby – has not begun school</td>
<td>D: No schooling D: Class 7 D: Class 7 S: Form 3** D: Class 5** S: Pre-primary**</td>
<td>D: Secondary** S: Class 7** D: Class 4** S: Class 1** S: Pre-primary**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Farmer, Bead Craftswoman, Member of group which hosts tourists</td>
<td>Farmer, Bead Craftswoman, Market vendor</td>
<td>Farmer, also does business, has cows, also works as a night watchman</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages known</td>
<td>Maa, Swahili (little)</td>
<td>Maa, Swahili (little)</td>
<td>Maa, Swahili, and English (very little)</td>
<td>Maa, Swahili (some)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language(s) used at home</td>
<td>Maa (dominant), Swahili (little)</td>
<td>Maa</td>
<td>Maa (dominant), Swahili (little)</td>
<td>Maa (dominant), Swahili (little)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*‘S’ indicates a son, and ‘D’ indicates a daughter. The highest level of schooling attained by each child is written beside their respective initial.

** A double star beside the level of schooling of a child indicates that the child is still a student and continuing with their studies.

Findings: SMG Parents’ Attitudes and Expectations

The findings regarding SMG parents’ attitudes and expectations for their children’s primary school language education have been divided into three sections. *Language Preferences for*
Children’s Schooling examines parents’ perspectives on which languages should be used in their children’s primary school education, either as media of instruction or in other ways. Monolingual versus Multilingual Ideologies and the Role of Mother Tongue in Schooling details parents’ perspectives on how familiar languages should or should not be used in the learning of unfamiliar languages or when using an unfamiliar language as the medium of instruction. Why these languages are important: The respective roles of Maa, Swahili and English interrogates parents’ valuations of each of these three languages and where they anticipate their children using them in the future.

Language Preferences for Children’s Schooling

Parents of children attending the SMG school express diverse opinions about what languages they want their children to use and be taught at school, and demonstrate different reasoning in how they form these opinions. In general, the parents favour multilingual approaches to schooling, and all of them articulate a sense of how normal and expected multilingualism is in the society.

The parents all have significantly different responses to the question: if there were three government schools equidistant from your home, one using Maa as the medium of instruction, one using Swahili, and one using English, which one would you choose, with all other considerations being equal? Significantly, almost all of the parents resist the monoglossic orientation of the question by selecting more than one medium for the ideal school for their children. Mama Naserian states a preference for both Swahili and English, while Mama Lomnyak wants her children to study in Maa and English. Baba Esther selects Swahili, with the assumption (based on his experience) that Swahili-medium also entails opportunities to learn English, while Mama Rebekah wants her children to learn in English. Importantly, the languages parents state as desirable to be used and learned at school are not the same (not as many) as the languages they describe as important to be used and learned in their children’s general lives.

Mama Naserian and Mama Lomnyak have similar logic in their respective selections of the languages most appropriate for school use, despite their language selections being different. Both of them select two languages to be used as media of instruction, stating that the other language (Maa in Mama Naserian’s case and Swahili in Mama Lomnyak’s case) would be learned
anyway, outside of school, and the languages which the children do not have much exposure to outside of school should be the languages of instruction. Mama Naserian describes a very active role for herself in her children’s language learning, naming herself as her children’s teacher of Maa:

> When they come home they should speak Maa but there at school they should speak all of these languages. There they will speak English, they will speak Swahili, when they come here [i.e., home] I speak with them in Maa. And I indeed am now their teacher of Maa. When they go there, they should speak English and Swahili, when they arrive here at my place I will teach them Maa.


Mama Naserian grants herself significant responsibility and agency in her children’s language education, with important implications for conceiving of education as broader than that which is learned at school.

In contrast to Mama Naserian’s focus on herself as a source of language learning, Mama Lomnyak emphasizes the role of the community in her children’s language learning. Her logic for using Maa and English as the media of instruction is that children in their context will learn Swahili through general exposure, as it is the language that many people know. Children will learn Swahili through interacting with others, including other children, particularly in Monduli town (in contrast to the area where this family lives, which is more rural and has a clearer dominance of the Maa language). In this way, “[The child] will know Swahili early. But s/he will not know English early (Atajua mapema Kiswahili. Lakini Kiingereza hatajua mapema).” Thus, Mama Lomnyak ascribes a significant role to the community in her children’s language education, making space for the school to focus on that which the community will be less likely or unable to teach the children.

Unlike the other three SMG parent participants, none of whom have ever been to school, Baba Esther’s attitudes and expectations for his children’s primary school language education are clearly mediated by his own experiences of schooling, namely his seven years of primary education. He describes his experience at a SMG school in the 1970’s, where they used Swahili
as the medium for all subjects except the English subject, in which they mostly used English (except maybe a bit of translation, he says). Thus, his assumption is that even if Swahili is the medium of instruction, the children will also learn English: “Even if it is a Swahili school, necessarily there will be a place for English. And if it is an English school, necessarily there will be a place for Swahili. (Hata kama ni shule ya Kiswahili, lazima itatokea tu kuna sehemu ya Kiingereza. Na kama ni shule ya Kiingereza, lazima itatokea tu mahali ya Kiswahili.)”

Interestingly, when asked about his opinion about English-medium schools, he said he doesn’t know anything about them.

So for Baba Esther, the selection of Swahili as the medium of instruction is a selection for both Swahili and English at school, and therefore this choice for him is framed as a choice for Swahili (and English) as opposed to Maa:

Certainly, I would choose a Swahili [school]. This is because I can’t tell [my child] to enter the Maa school. I want her language of Maa, she should get this and add other languages. She knows Maa.


Thus, Baba Esther’s selection of Swahili as the medium of instruction, is based on the assumption that Swahili and English will go hand in hand, and is an expression of wanting the school to teach his children the languages they do not know from home, with a clear assumption that using a language as the medium of instruction is a good way of learning the language.

Mama Rebekah is the only SMG participant who states a preference for English as her favoured medium of instruction. As she does not elaborate more on her reasoning or the role she might imagine for other languages in an English-medium school, it is difficult to extrapolate the experiences and attitudes which may have formed this English-medium preference. However, she does say (in Maa, with translation into Swahili) that the children are raised with Maa, so when they go to school it is important to learn something new. In this way, her comments are aligned with Mama Naserian, Mama Lomnyak and Baba Esther, in their perspectives that school learning should be conducted in languages the children do not yet know, so that they may learn the new languages encountered in school.
Monolingual versus Multilingual Ideologies and the Role of Mother Tongue in Schooling

As the above findings suggest, the SMG parents in general favour multilingual schooling environments, with the multilingualism favoured at school generally leaning towards Swahili and English. Additional data from the SMG parents’ interviews demonstrate parents’ different perspectives on monolingual versus multilingual ideologies in how language should be used at school, including different perspectives on the role of familiar languages in learning additional languages, or the place for Maa at all at school.

As many Tanzanian schools, both primary and secondary, punish children for using any language other than the target language, discussion of the appropriateness of these punishments proves a fertile ground for understanding the parents’ perspectives on the ways in which languages should be separated or allowed to intermingle at school. Mama Naserian, with her belief that Maa should be learned at home and Swahili and English learned at school, is the most adamant that Maa should not be used at all at school, expressing approval towards corporal punishment for the use of Maa (or the use of Swahili in secondary school), “so that s/he will know the language that s/he doesn’t know (ili ajue ile lugha ambaye [sic] hajui).” She expresses a clear opinion that suppressing the familiar language of Maa at school will assist in the learning of Swahili and other languages, claiming that this is how children learn. Mama Rebekah offers a similar perspective against the use of Maa at school when she states, “They should only use Swahili, except the teachers should not beat them (Watumie tu Kiswahili ila walimu hapanu piga [sic]).”

Baba Esther, offering a slightly more nuanced opinion on this topic, states that one must look at the particular subject to determine what language should be used (i.e., Swahili or English). He offers the following explanation: “When the teacher is speaking a language there, and you are speaking another language here, it will not be heard well (Wakati mwalimu anaongea lugha pale, na unaongea lugha nyungine hapa, haitasikika vizuri).” He then proceeds to say, “When they go outside, they can speak Maa (Wakitoka nje wanaweza Kimaasai).” Baba Esther’s comments, including his welcoming of the use of Maa outside the classrooms, further express his expectations that schooling is and should be multilingual. However, his description of multilingualism in schooling is very much a multilingualism of monolingualisms – multiple languages should be used, but each in their own time and place, and not together.
Mama Lomnyak, who expresses the opinion that both Maa and English should be used as media of instruction and Swahili be learned through exposure in the community, is the only strong supporter of using Maa in school, although she does not articulate a clear opinion on how the different languages should be used in what ways. However, she does describe how, from her observations, Maa is used at school: “They are given [books] and they read in Maa. They learn Maa. Children in Class 4. (Wanapewa [vitabu] wanasoma kwa Kimaasai. Wakajifunze jifunze Kimaasai. Watoto wa la nne.)” She says the Class 4 children are given the books for a week at a time, and are allowed to take them home, together with Swahili books. In this way, according to her observations, “They learn by looking [at the books] (Wanajifunza kwa kuangalia).” I was unable to confirm or disprove that the children bring home books in Maa, although I never once saw any materials in Maa at the school (and I asked), and I know that Maa books (beyond the Bible) are exceedingly difficult to obtain. Regardless, her favourable assessment of this practice of reading Maa books further demonstrates her support for using Maa at school, including reading in Maa alongside the other languages.

All four of the SMG parents, in various ways, express that their children should not learn (or use as the medium of instruction) languages at school which they already know. In the case of Mama Naserian, the rationale for suppressing Maa at school is expressed in the following way:

[Teachers] know [the children] are Maasai, now if they teach them their own language how will it be? ... Naserian is Maasai. Then you teach her Maa again, when she already knows. She is supposed to be taught the language which she doesn’t know. Like Swahili, and English, indeed teach these. Because she knows Maa.


In this way of thinking, which is echoed in different ways by Baba Esther and Mama Rebekah, school must teach children that which they do not know from their lives outside of school, and, since using a language as the medium of instruction functions to teach a language, the medium of instruction must not be their most familiar language.
Why these Languages are Important: The Respective Roles of Maa, Swahili and English

The above sections discussed which languages are preferred by SMG parents in their children’s schooling. This section discusses why the various languages are important in the parents’ eyes. The importance given to Maa is particularly significant here, as it shows how highly valued Maa proficiency is, despite it not being a preferred language for use at school.

Why Maa?

Although SMG parents’ perspectives on language use at school vary significantly, all four of them express deep valuation of the Maa language and of their children learning it. Besides their own commentaries on the importance of the Maa language, the fact that all four of them use Maa at home as by far the dominant – if not exclusive – language is evidence of the centrality of Maa to their value systems and to their lives, and indeed to the lives of their children.

Some of the SMG parents’ explanations of the importance of Maa revolve around instrumentalist considerations (as they do also in different ways for the other two languages). Several of the parents talk about contexts which demand the use of Maa due to lack of proficiency in Swahili on the part of the potential interlocutors, including relatives. Mama Naserian, for example, states: “Our grandfathers and our grandmothers who do not know Swahili, if you go to speak with them in Swahili, will they hear? They do not hear, so there truly is a loss [if one does not know Maa]. (Babu zetu na bibi zetu ambao hawajui Kiswahili, ukienda kuwaongelesha Kiswahili, watasikia? Hawasikii, kwa hiyo, kuna hasara kweli.)” Mama Rebekah talks (in Maa) of the importance of the home language to enable people to understand each other. Mama Lomnyak discusses the instrumental value of Maa thus:

Maa is important, because you will go somewhere where there is no one who speaks Swahili, it is only Maa. It is very good if he [her child] goes to a place where a language is spoken and he himself knows it....He will like very much if he hears all that people say.

Ni muhimu Kimaasai, maana utaenda mahali hakuna mtu ambaye anaongea Kiswahili, ni Kimaasai tu. Ni nzuri sana akienda mahali lugha inaongelewa na anajua na yeye... Atapenda sana akisikia yote watu wanasema.

Identity, culture, and sense of ownership are additional reasons for valuing Maa in their children’s education for almost all of the SMG parents. Baba Esther describes the enduring importance of Maa to his life and culture thus:
Truly [Maa] is important, because it is a language of tradition. It is my culture. And culture doesn’t get lost. Even you if you are married by my son, necessarily you (pl.) will speak Maa. Necessarily it will just be there.


While Baba Esther describes Maa as being central to his culture/traditions, Mama Naserian describes it as a critical identity marker: “They should know all languages. They should know Swahili, they should also know Maa. Because [by knowing Maa] it will be known that this is truly a Maasai. (*Wanatakiwa kujua lugha zote. Wajue Kiswahili, wajue Kimaasai pia. Maana itajulikana huyu ni Maasai kweli.*)” This comment, in association with her comment above about Naserian being Maasai so of course she knows Maa, demonstrates how dissociable the Maa language and Maasai identity are. These comments also speak to a naturalisation of knowing Maa for those who claim Maasai identity.

The sense of ownership of the Maa language these parents express also highlights the centrality of Maa to Maasai identity. Mama Lomnyak, immediately after stating her preference for both English and Maa to be used at school, justifies her selection by saying, “Maa is good because it is my language (*Kimaasai ni nzuri maana ni lugha yangu.*)” Mama Naserian elaborates on her relationship with Maa (in discussion of her expertise in the language) when she says,

>Yes [I know Maa completely] because I was taught since I was born, it is only Maa. So it is indeed my language. Now the Swahili language I am just stealing stealing it, meaning Maa is my language.


In these ways, the SMG parents express a deep valuation of the Maa language, based on instrumentalist considerations, as well as for its strong association with identity, culture, and the sense of ownership they have over the Maa language.

**Why Swahili?**

The SMG parents have much less to say about Swahili and its importance than they do about Maa and English. The discussions of the importance of Swahili are mostly related to
instrumentalist considerations, and also, for Baba Esther, to Swahili’s status as the national language.

Mama Lomnyak, by way of explaining the utility of Swahili, provides an illustrative example of its importance: If people are trying to fight with her son, they will be using Swahili, so if he knows Swahili he will be able to hear what they are saying and avoid danger. Similar to her comments about Maa, Mama Lomnyak also comments that, “If a child goes to a place which is only Swahili, s/he will feel good if s/he hears what a person says there. (*Mtoto akienda mahali ni Kiswahili tu, atajisikia vizuri akisikia mtu anavyosema hapo.*)”

Baba Esther’s assessment of the importance of Swahili is that it enables him to *pita* (i.e., to pass, gain access to) different places, and will make things easier. His understanding of the instrumental value of Swahili is entangled with his appreciation of Swahili as the national language and the significance it has for Tanzania as a whole. When asked directly about the importance of his children knowing Swahili, his first response is, “I really like for them to know how the country is progressing/what is happening in the country. (*Napenda kabisa wajue nchi inavyoendelea.*)” He also states in a different context:

> Swahili is very important to learn because it is the national language. It is the national language which every person is supposed to know. Every person began to study in Swahili.


Thus, Swahili has important instrumental value in the minds of these parents, some of which is associated with its position as the national language of Tanzania and as the language which ‘every person is supposed to know.’

**Why English?**

Parents’ perspectives on the value of English revolve entirely around instrumentalist concerns, with an important emphasis on the connection between English and employment.

Mama Rebekah and Mama Naserian both speak of English as being essential for employment, and both also speak of the possibility of meeting someone who only knows English, thus making English proficiency essential for interaction. Mama Naserian states:
Now our youth get around, they can look for work in different places, they can meet people who only know English, they do not know Swahili. Now even if that work isn’t far away, s/he will not get it because s/he does not know the language... Since we send them to school, even if s/he does not pass, s/he can employ her/himself through knowing the language.

Thus, for Mama Naserian, there is a very real possibility of English being the deciding factor in employment prospects. Relatedly, Mama Rebekah speaks of how Maa will not be used at work, it will only be English.

Mama Lomnyak, while not offering specific examples of where and why it will be useful, is categorical about the importance of English. She states, “[English] is very good. It is important, s/he will help herself. If s/he finds her/himself in a place where English is, s/he will hear what is being said. (Sidai naleng’ Ni muhimu, atasaidia mwenyewe. Akijikuta mahali lugha iko, atasikia wanavyoongea.)” She also asserts, “It will help me, it will help someone else (Itanisaidia mimi, itamsaidia mtu mwingine),” articulating the way in which one person’s language ability is capital for the whole community. Mama Rebekah and Mama Naserian also describe how English will help their children kupita (to pass, gain access to) different places, in a very similar way to how Baba Esther described the utility of Swahili (see above).

Certainly, the possibility of meeting someone who only knows English is very real in both Mama Naserian and Mama Rebekah’s minds. Mama Rebekah talks about the possibility of there being a visitor such as a white person (“meni kama mzungu”), and the importance of the child knowing English so s/he can translate. Mama Naserian says something very similar, but expands on the idea of the white visitor by saying that maybe “s/he does not know Swahili but s/he has work (hajui lugha lakini ana kazi).” In accounting for these many people who do not know Swahili, she explains that, “Tourists are many now. (Watalii sasa hivi wengi wapo.)”

Baba Esther has a slightly different take on the possibility of meeting someone who does not know Swahili. When asked about the importance of his children knowing English, he offers the following illustrative example:
Myself as their father, I can be sick and be taken to a hospital [run by] white people. Now I do not know English and [if] s/he does not know, how will it work?...If I have a problem, if I tell her/him let’s go there, s/he can speak well with this [doctor], it will be possible to know what my problem is, and any journey/processes that I will need will be possible.

_Hata mimi baba yao, naweza nikawa naumwa, naapelekwa hospitali kwa wazungu. Sasa mimi sijui Kiingereza na ye sijui kwa namna gani?... Nikipata tatizo, nikimwambia twende hapo, anajua kuongea na huyu vizuri, itafanyikiwa kujua shida niliyo nayo, na itafanyikiwa na safari yoyote nitakachohitaji._

In addition to the importance of English for employment and for interacting with people who do not know Swahili, Mama Naserian (as seen in the initial quote of this section) sees the potential for English proficiency to breed opportunities for self-employment. She offers an extensive example of how, if you do not know English, you must rely on a middle person for selling your bead work. They can take advantage by selling something for a higher price and telling you that the buyer insisted on a reduced price, putting this money in their own pocket when that money is supposed to be yours. She also speaks of English proficiency allowing you to translate between two people who do not have a language in common, seemingly also in association with the possibility of self-employment. As a bead craftswoman and someone who interacts regularly with tourists, it is clear how close to her own life this discussion of the economic value of English is.

In these ways, it is clear that instrumentalist considerations dominate the rationale for learning each of the three languages in question. However, Maa has particularly strong identity and cultural connotations, and is strongly associated with ethnic group membership, putting it into a different sphere of language values than the other two languages. Swahili, in addition to instrumentalist considerations, is valued in accordance to its status as the national language (although only by the one SMG parent, the one who has attended school). The value of English for these parents is oriented around their belief in the economic value of the language, employment prospects, and opportunities to interact with foreign visitors, particularly tourists.
Discussion: SMG Parents’ Attitudes and Expectations

Normalization of Multilingualism

Significantly, almost all of the SMG parents (with the exception of Mama Rebekah) select more than one language as the ideal language of instruction for their children’s schooling. This finding emerges despite the monoglossic orientation of the question they are responding to, asking them to select between three hypothetical schools with three different languages of instruction (i.e., Maa, Swahili, OR English). Also of great significance is that all four of the SMG parent participants choose unfamiliar languages as the ideal language(s) of instruction (including Mama Lomnyak, who selects Maa and English as the languages of instruction based on the logic that the children will learn Swahili anyway through their exposure in the community). This finding suggests that the parents are confident that their children will have no problem in learning additional languages, and that they believe using an unfamiliar language as the language of instruction is an effective way to learn a language (a point that will be returned to shortly). These parents’ confidence that their children will not have a problem using an unfamiliar language as the LOI contrasts with Qorro’s (2005) findings, that parents (of secondary students) believe that their children understand very little when taught in the unfamiliar language of English, but want their children to study in English anyway. Despite the contexts being different, and the unfamiliar LOI in question being different (English in Qorro, 2005 and Swahili for the SMG parents), the question of parental attitudes towards using an unfamiliar language as the LOI is the same, and the SMG parents in this study have more confidence in their children’s ability to learn through an unfamiliar LOI than the parents in Qorro (2005).

These parents’ comments demonstrate an understanding of multilingualism as normal and natural, with the learning of Swahili and English offering no real threat or competition to Maa use and proficiency. It is important to note that all four of these parents are themselves multilingual to varying degrees, with the three women participants having developed their language abilities without any experience of schooling. Their own multilingual abilities and learning processes likely have an impact on their preferences for multilingual options for their children’s schooling.
While most of the parents state preferences for multilingual schooling, their ideas about the relationships between languages are not completely clear. Baba Esther opines that, while both Swahili and English should be used in schooling and Maa be allowed outside the classrooms, any given lesson should be confined to a single language, i.e., Swahili in Swahili class and English in English class. This orientation suggests an understanding of multilingualism as a collection of monolingualisms - that each language should stay separate and not interact with the other languages. This perspective also echoes Rugemalira’s (2006) approach, which he terms the principle of separation, whereby Swahili and English should be kept as separate as possible in order to avoid learners getting confused.

Mama Naserian and Mama Rebekah both clearly express the opinion that Maa should not be used at schools, with the rationale that forcing the children to use only Swahili and English will help them to more effectively learn these less familiar languages. Mama Lomnyak, while being clear about her support for the use of Maa at school, is not clear about how the various languages should interact at school.

Thus, these findings show that SMG parents are very supportive of their children’s development of multilingualism, including through multilingual schooling options. They do not see the learning of additional languages, including through their use as languages of instruction, as a threat to their children’s proficiency in their home language of Maa. However, in general they support differentiated spaces for the respective languages, with no suggestion of how proficiency in one language may be a resource in learning additional languages.

**Division of Labour in Language Teaching**

For all four of these SMG parents, there is a clear distinction between the languages their children should use and be taught at school and the languages they should use and be taught at home. While it is of utmost importance to all of them for their children to be proficient in Maa, only one SMG parent (Mama Lomnyak) wants Maa to be used at school. Mama Naserian’s self-identification of herself as a teacher of Maa, and her desire to separate home and school languages (i.e., to use Maa at home and Swahili and English at school), point to an understanding of a division of labour in language teaching. Similarly, Mama Lomnyak understands the community to be the teacher of Swahili, thereby suggesting it redundant to teach Swahili at
school by using it as the language of instruction. In this way, there seems to be an understanding of education as larger than that which is learned at school, with teachers and valuable learning existing outside of schooling. These parents’ comments point to different domains of learning which belong to different learning spaces, and thus a division of labour between parents/community on the one hand and teachers on the other in providing language education in different languages.

**Equating Language of Instruction with Language Learning**

The SMG parent participants understand using a language as the LOI to be the same thing as learning the language. This finding is very much aligned with Rubagumya’s (2010) finding that parents seem to be “uninformed on the difference between learning a language and having the language as a medium of instruction” (Rubagumya, 2010, p. 50). This belief manifests itself in the selection of less familiar languages as ideal LOI, and in the reasons for why Maa should not be used as LOI. All four of the SMG parents express in different ways that it does not make sense to use a language that the child already knows well as the LOI, because children should be taught new languages, and there is no need to teach them what they already know. Mama Naserian and Baba Esther are particularly adamant that their children already completely know Maa, and it is therefore senseless to teach them Maa (i.e., to use Maa as the LOI). By stating that the child ‘already knows’ a language or is taught a language by parents and the community, the parents demonstrate a lack of understanding of different registers of a language, or that academic language is different from the language used in daily life.

**Identity and the Importance of Maa**

The SMG parents express a definite association between the Maa language and Maasai identity. Mama Naserian states that by knowing Maa, it will be known that her daughter is Maasai. Baba Esther articulates that Maa is the language of his tradition/culture. The parents express a clear sense of ownership of the Maa language (Mama Naserian, Baba Esther and Mama Lomnyak all describe Maa as ‘my language’ and/or as ‘my child’s language’), in contrast to Swahili (‘which I am only stealing,’ in Mama Naserian’s words). Indeed, this association of Maa with identity and sense of ownership seem to lead to a sense of naturalisation, or even automaticity, of knowing Maa. This is seen through comments (from both Mama Naserian and Baba Esther) which express the sentiment that ‘my daughter is Maasai, so of course she knows Maa.’ The SMG parents’
comments emphasize the centrality of the Maa language to who they are and what they do in life, and this contributes to their intense valuation of Maa (oral) proficiency for their children.

These findings about the importance of Maa to the lives, identities and values of these parents break a significant silence in the literature on language education in Tanzania. Many studies (such as Babaci-Wilhite, 2010 and Rugemalira, 2006), by making generalized claims about parents’ English-medium preferences, fail to pay adequate attention to the ways in which many parents value the learning of local languages alongside English and Swahili, although often in different ways and for different reasons. This could partially be due to the urban bias of most language education studies in Tanzania (noting that the valuation of local languages tends to be higher in rural areas), as well as the fixation on the Swahili-versus-English tension, addressed elsewhere in this study.

**Perspectives Mediated by Own Experiences**

In describing the importance of each of the languages to what they imagine for their children’s lives, the SMG parents reference very concrete examples of situations where each of these three languages is essential. For example, Maa is essential for speaking with grandparents or other Maasai who do not know Swahili, Swahili is important as Tanzania’s lingua franca and in participating in the life of the nation, and English is a requirement for working with tourists, interacting with foreigners who do not know Swahili, and even going to certain hospitals - as well as for employment opportunities, which are more distant from these parents’ lives. In these ways, the importance of each of these three languages is not an abstraction to these parents: the necessity of these languages touches very directly on their own experiences.

Significantly, all of the parents’ imagined scenarios of language necessity require only oral usages of language, for all three languages. This is also likely an outgrowth of their own experiences, as three of them (all three women) do not read or write in any language, and literacy is not central to Baba Esther’s life either. The examples parents give illustrating the importance of these three languages suggest that they are particularly keen for their children to develop practical, conversational language skills with strong oral ability.
**Language Education at Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi**

This section begins with an introduction to Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi, before exploring the findings of the school observations conducted over a one month period at this school. In doing so, it explores dominant patterns of language use at Mti Mmoja, from the use of Swahili as the medium of the school and dynamics of Swahili-medium classes, to the teaching of English in the English subject lessons, to instances where Maa is used and under what circumstances. It also examines the teachers’ discourses with regards to language education and their perspectives of working in this Maasai community, and how these discourses are performed in their work. It then discusses these findings in relationship to the parental perspectives discussed in the previous section.

**Introducing Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi**

A fairly typical rural primary school, Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi is comprised of several classroom buildings and an office block, arranged neatly together in the dry plains of Monduli. With nearly 20 teachers and very strong leadership, this school has an air of organization and joyful energy. Although located only several kilometres from Monduli town, this is certainly a rural school, surrounded by sparsely-placed traditional *bomas* (Maasai houses, made of branches, mud and cow dung), grazing cows and goats, and even some fields for growing crops. Almost all of the children at the school are ethnically and culturally Maasai, and speak Maa at home. Many come to school with little prior exposure to Swahili, a fact frequently bemoaned by the teachers, who must teach them Swahili while simultaneously using it as the language of instruction. Despite this school being in traditional Maasai Land and serving the Maasai community, very few of the teachers are themselves Maasai, most teachers being assigned to this community from other ethnic communities and other parts of the country. Teachers talk of many challenges of working in this community, including children coming to school hungry and going for the full day without eating, parents who have not been to school and who do not value schooling, frequent absences of children as they help with work at home, and children dropping out of school early due to early marriage or pregnancy.

While in many ways this is a typical rural school, there are some things about Mti Mmoja which make it stand out. Firstly, the teacher shortages plaguing many rural schools have somehow bypassed this school, with each class at Mti Mmoja from Class 3 upwards being blessed with
two class teachers, while the classes from Class 2 downwards each have one class teacher. Class sizes at Mti Mmoja are more favourable than at most rural schools, being mostly in the range of 35 to 60 pupils in Classes 1-7, and 60-80 in each of the two Pre-Primary classes. They have enough classrooms of adequate size, with enough desks for the pupils - even if the pupils are a little tightly squeezed. The books, however, are few and far between, with in most cases only a few books per subject per class. In the 2015 Class 7 national examinations, which determine if and where children will have a chance to study secondary school, Mti Mmoja scored in the 25th percentile of all of the primary schools in the district, and in the 33rd percentile of all of the schools country-wide.

![Figure 5.3: Typical SMG school, similar to Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi](image)

**Language Use at Mti Mmoja**

Apart from English classes and children’s playground language use, Swahili was observed to be the nearly exclusive language used at Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi. Swahili dominated classroom language use, teacher-pupil interactions, and all written work/documents throughout the school. However, there were also instances of Maa being used, particularly common words or phrases, by teachers in their interactions with pupils. In addition, Maa was frequently the dominant language in pupil-pupil interactions, especially outside of classroom contexts. English was used in both oral and written forms in English classes, although Swahili was still the dominant language of oral use in all English classes. English was rarely heard outside of English class.
Swahili-medium Classes: Language Use and Dynamics

The Swahili-medium periods in the primary classes (Classes 1-7), including both Swahili language classes and other subject classes taught in Swahili, tended to be highly focused on the written word, to feature a significant amount of mechanical or formulaic uses of language and minimal opportunities for original language use, and to frequently pay more attention to understanding the exercise than understanding content. Here, some the typical dynamics of Swahili language learning and use are illustrated in a representative Class 3 Swahili period. This is followed by findings from two pre-primary classes which demonstrate different dynamics of language learning stemming from a focus on oral language development and slightly more opportunity for pupil language use.

In a Class 3 Swahili lesson, I observed a ‘comprehension’ (‘ufahamu’) lesson. The teacher had written UFAHAMU: Kusoma kwa sauti (COMPREHENSION: Reading out loud) on the board. She then proceeded to take out a Swahili textbook and read to them from one of the comprehension passages, a lively story about a leopard who was continuously foiled in his attempts to eat human children. She read to them in a stern voice, with minimal expression, making it visibly difficult for these Class 3 children to concentrate or understand the imaginative goings-on of the story. Frequently (almost every sentence), the teacher would read the same sentence twice in a row, leaving the last word for the children to fill in on the second reading, or asking the children a basic question which generated the same response. For example:

T: Chui akaogopa. Chui akafanyaje? (The leopard was afraid. The leopard was what?)
P’s: [in chorus] Akaogopa! (Was afraid!)

After finishing reading the story in this manner, she asked the pupils several oral comprehension questions, the answers to which she was expecting to be verbatim from the story (despite the children not having the book in front of them). For example, one child answered a question by saying “Alikimbia (He ran away),” which, although perhaps vague, was not incorrect. The teacher’s response was, “Mbona unatuongeza hadithi yetu? Kuna mahali ilisema anakimbia? (Why are you expanding our story for us? Was there a place it said he is running?)” In another instance, a pupil responded to her question about what the leopard was planning to do, with the answer “Kuwaua watoto (To kill the children),” which the teacher corrected to “Kuwinda (To
The pupil was not wrong, but the teacher was looking for the specific word used in the story.

As the teacher was asking these questions, the pupils were raising their hands to volunteer an answer, and, when selected, they would stand up at their desks as they answered the question. Noting that not all of the children were raising their hands, she commented, “Kuna wengine ambao hawajaelewa. Ndiyo maana wachache wananyoosha mkono. Nitawachapa fimbo. (There are some who have not understood. Which is why few are raising their hands. I will beat you with a stick.)”

After some oral questioning, the teacher wrote on the board: Jibu maswali yafuatayo (Answer the following questions). She asked the pupils what she had written on the board, and they read the written instructions in chorus. She copied some comprehension questions from the textbook, and the pupils diligently copied them from the board into their notebooks. Then, for each question, she got one child to read the question, a second child to offer the first part of the answer (which was always the first part of the question, according to the formula), then a third child to complete the answer. The second part of this process proved difficult for these children, and every time a child was unsuccessful (they usually re-read the entire question), she would pull the ears of the unsuccessful pupil, saying, “Tumesoma hadithi hii sana (We have read this story so much).” At one point, in response to the pupils’ struggles with this exercise, she asked in frustration, “Mnajua Kiswahili? (Do you know Swahili?)” Then, speaking Maa to one particular boy, “Miyiolo? Eroo miyiolo? (Do you not know? Boy do you not know?)”

In contrast to the emphasis on written language and grammar in the primary classes, the pre-primary classes were almost entirely oral. (Note that I was observing at the beginning of the year, while they begin introducing written letters and numbers later in the year.) With a clearly stated objective of teaching the children Swahili (expressed by both pre-primary teachers), the pre-primary classes involved a series of oral exercises, based on concrete, everyday realities. In the Pre-Primary 1 class, the children were asked to take turns coming to the front of the class to tell the class what kinds of household items they have at home. When called to the front (in order of the attendance roster), the child, often with ample prompting from the teacher, would say something like, “Nyumbani kwetu kuna vyombo, kuna meza, kuna hotipoti…” (At our home there
are dishes, table, hotpot…”) Although there was quite a bit of overlap in the household items the children selected, many children also deviated from the standard answers to include a more diverse array of items. Despite it being a formulaic exercise, this was perhaps the closest thing to pupils making original contributions I observed in any of the classes at this school.

In addition to their opportunities to use Swahili in a relatively independent way in these mini presentations (virtually their only opportunities to speak in this class, beyond simple one-word chorus responses to the teacher), the pupils in this Pre-Primary 1 class had the opportunity to develop receptive Swahili language skills through exposure to the teacher’s use of Swahili. The teacher’s language use mostly consisted of very basic sentences intended to instruct, ask, reprimand, and correct. For example:

“Nyamaza, nyamaza.” (Be quiet, be quiet.)
“Kaa vizuri.” (Sit nicely.)
“Nyumbani kwenu kuna nini?” (What is there at your home?)
“Sikiliza huyu.” (Listen to this [child].)
“Piga makofì. Moja, mbili, tatu.” (Clap. One, two, three.)
“Hujui tena unaongea nini.” (You do not know anymore what you are talking about.)
“Ongea kwa sauti.” (Speak in a loud voice.)

Similarly, in the Pre-Primary 2 class, Swahili language learning involved opportunities for the children to come to the front to use language on their own, inserting their own information according to a set formula. For example in the context of a song called Jieleze (‘Explain yourself’), children would come one at a time to the front of the class and, in song, introduce the names of their various family members to the rest of the class. These strategies of individual ‘presentations’ in front of the class in both of the pre-primary classes offered significant opportunities for participation and the development of confidence in using oral Swahili independently.

Both of these pre-primary teachers named Swahili as an enormous problem for their pupils, and teaching Swahili to be the main objective for the pre-primary classes. The Pre-Primary 2 teacher
expressed that her work would be so much easier if the pupils came knowing Swahili, and that they would be ready much sooner to start writing letters and syllables if they came knowing the language of instruction. Throughout my observations, this teacher kept turning to me and making comments like, “Shida ni Kiswahili (The problem is Swahili)” and “Hawajui Kiswahili (They do not know Swahili).” Indeed, this attitude came out regularly in her teaching as well, as she would say to the children things like, “Huyu hajui Kiswahili kabisa. Haya rudi huko (This [child] does not know Swahili at all. Okay go back [to your seat])” and “Iyiolo Kiswahili? Sasa kama huju Kiswahili nitaongea Kimaasai? ([In Maa:] Do you know Swahili? [In Swahili:] Now if you do not know Swahili will I speak Maa?)”

Use of Maa

Despite very few of the teachers being Maasai, Maa was heard, mostly in fragments, in a variety of teacher-pupil interactions, both within and outside of the classroom. In the above section, fragments of Maa were heard twice (in both Class 3 and Pre-Primary 2), both times in a somewhat degrading tone and in association with questioning the children’s Swahili proficiency. (“Miyiolo? Eroo miyiolo?/Do you not know? Boy do you not know?” and “Iyiolo Kiswahili?/Do you know Swahili?”)

In a Class 6 Swahili class, when soliciting responses from pupils to a question she asked, the Class 6 Swahili teacher asked a particular child, “Kainyoo doi? Tunaanzaje? ([In Maa:] What is it? [In Swahili:] How do we start?)”

In all three of the above examples, a teacher used Maa to ask a simple question, not directly related to the content of the class. None of these instances included any pupil contributions in Maa, nor were these teachers’ questions welcoming of Maa responses from the pupils, as these particular teachers would have been unlikely to understand the Maa responses anyway. The tone of all three of these Maa utterances was somewhat degrading, and these Maa contributions were unlikely to contribute to either the understanding of the lesson or to the pupils’ sense of inclusion by the use of their own language.

In a Class 6 English class (taught by a Maasai teacher), the class was going through English sentences necessary for an exercise on adjectives, and orally translating them into Swahili to ensure comprehension. When they encountered a sentence about a hyena, the teacher asked the
pupils, “Hyena ni mnyama gani kwa Kiswahili? (Which animal is hyena in Swahili?)” After a long pause as he looked for a pupil who knew the answer, he selected the single pupil with a raised hand, who said, “Fisi (Hyena).” After offering this pupil a word of affirmation, the teacher then said, “Na oln’ojine kwa Kimaasai (And oln’ojine in Maa).” In response to this teacher’s Maa contribution, both the pupils and the teacher had big smiles on their faces, several children giggled, and the atmosphere in the classroom lightened and had a sense of enjoyment about it. After this, the teacher continued to facilitate the oral translation into Swahili of the English sentences on the board.

In the same Class 3 Swahili lesson mentioned above, the teacher came across the word kuchuna (to skin an animal) in the comprehension passage she was reading aloud to the pupils. She asked the pupils what this word meant, and, when she did not get a response, she spoke at great length of how children in Arusha town would know exactly what kuchuna means even though they have not done it, but you children who know the word in practice, do not know what this Swahili word means (a reference to being in a pastoralist community where children grow up participating in all work surrounding livestock). Eventually she explained the meaning of kuchuna. Then, directing her question to a volunteer teacher (ethnically Maasai) who just finished secondary school in a nearby school, asked “Kinyumbani mnasemaje? (In the language of home [i.e., Maa] how do you say this?)” When the volunteer teacher failed to answer, the teacher looked for a pupil to answer. Eventually, one pupil stood up and gave the word in Maa (embaare) with a big smile on his face, to which all the children chuckled. The teacher, smiling, repeated the word and said, “Mnashindwa kujua kwa Kiswahili lakini mnafanya nyumbani (You fail to know in Swahili but you do it at home).”

The above two instances of Maa use, involving the Maa words for ‘hyena’ and ‘to skin [an animal]’, show the teacher using the Maa language as a resource to assist with understanding Swahili and English. The final example alone offered the pupils space to use Maa themselves as a resource for understanding a familiar concept in an unfamiliar language. These two examples offer a significant contrast to the first two examples, which had derogatory connotations, were unlikely to contribute anything to pupils’ learning, and saw the teacher using Maa in direct association with Swahili incompetence.
In addition to these five examples of Maa use in classrooms, I also observed Maa being used in teacher-pupil interactions outside of the classroom, albeit rarely. I heard the Pre-Primary 1 teacher summoning a young child with the Maa word, “Wou (Come),” on more than one occasion. Also, at one point when there was a cluster of pre-primary children gathered around the teachers’ room, the Pre-Primary 2 teacher shooed them off in Maa, with a big playful smile. This was a fairly extensive use of Maa, despite this teacher not being Maasai and claiming she did not know Maa (although she has lived in the community for many years).

Outside of the classrooms, the vast majority of pupil-pupil interactions were in Maa, and almost exclusively so for the younger pupils. In one instance of extensive observation of several groups of Class 1 and 2 pupils on the playground and in the unsupervised process of cleaning their classroom, the only non-Maa words used over a 20-minute period of constant chatter were “Angalia! (Look!)” and “Mchokozi (Trouble-maker).” The older children also for the most part used Maa with each other on the playground, with a few exceptions, such as counting in Swahili while playing a ball game. I never observed any attempt to monitor language use outside of the classroom.

**Use of English outside of English Class**

Throughout all of my observations at Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi, there were only three instances of where English was used, in any way, outside of English class, and all of these instances were by the same teacher in Class 7, and all were in History periods. In a lecture about resistance movements against colonial rule, the teacher said, “Heri nife, kutawaliwa NO (Better I die, to be ruled NO),” with this English ‘no’ brought in presumably for dramatic effect. In this same lesson, the teacher posed the rhetorical question, “Utapigana na mkuki wakati wenzako wana machine gun? (Will you fight with a spear when your opponents have a machine gun?)” In this case, she likely used English to name the machine gun because the Swahili for machine gun is not widely known.

In another period of Class 7 History, the teacher and the pupils were talking about different forms of colonial rule. The teacher was eliciting responses from the pupils about different forms of colonial rule, and when a pupils would give the Swahili name for the form of colonial rule, she would ask also for the English. For example:
Similar exchanges occurred also for *mfumo wa mlango wa nyuma* /indirect rule. This was clearly review for the pupils, as they had no trouble with these English words, and the teacher asked for the English names for these concepts without ever mentioning English (as in the exchange above). The use of English in this context for subject-specific vocabulary was likely an attempt to assist with the pupils’ transition to English-medium secondary schools the following year.

**English Classes**

In general, the English classes at Mti Mmoja were dominated by oral Swahili, with written language being exclusively in English. Common teaching techniques included direct translation, full class repetition of words for learning of pronunciation, and a decisive emphasis on written exercises (largely fill-in-the-blank sentences, copied from the textbook onto the board then from the board into the pupils’ exercise books). In general, Swahili was the main language used for explanations, instructions (although simple instructions, like ‘say the word ___,’ were sometimes in English), and meaning making. Teachers frequently used a form of code-switching in which they would mostly be speaking Swahili but would insert the lesson’s keywords in English. In most of the English classes, there were very few full sentences uttered in English beyond what was read off the board, and a few mechanical instructions. In this way, Swahili remained the functional language of instruction in the English classes, which all focused on teaching different aspects of grammar or usages of particular words (like ‘too’ or ‘although’). A description of parts of a Class 6 English lesson provides representative samples of English teaching at Mti Mmoja, as follows.

In a Class 6 English lesson, the subject matter was adding ‘ier’ to adjectives to make them comparative – although the pupils were told they were making the words into adjectives by adding ‘ier’. In explaining the concept, the teacher told the pupils, “*Kubadilisha happy iwe* adjective you omit the ‘y’, omit *maana ni kuondoa* (To change happy into an *adjective you omit the ‘y’, omit means to remove*).” In giving an example, he stated, “The word noisy *inakuwa* [becomes] noisier.” Then came a pronunciation lesson:

T: Sema [say] ‘angry.’
Ps (in chorus): Angry!
T: ‘Angrier.’
Ps (in chorus): Angrier!
T: Yes.

Instructions and the teacher’s questions for the pupils were most frequently expressed in Swahili, often with the lesson’s keywords in English. For example, the teacher asked the pupils, “Mtu ambaye ni unhappy, anakuwaje? Anakosa nini? (A person who is unhappy, how is she/he? What does she/he lack?).” The teacher also made use of direct translation in instructions and questions, for example: “What is the meaning of quiet in Kiswahili? Maana ya quiet kwa Kiswahili?”

After reviewing a list on the board of adjectives not in the comparative form (e.g., friendly, lazy, etc.), the teacher proceeded to copy a series of fill-in-the-blank exercise questions from the textbook onto the board, which the pupils set about copying into their notebooks. Once finished copying, the teacher said, “Tuangalie haya maelezo (Let’s look at these instructions).” Then, looking at the board, he read, “Use these adjectives to fill in the blanks.” He then orally translated this instruction into Swahili and explained in greater detail what they were supposed to do, all in Swahili. He then read them the list of words they were to choose from when filling in the blanks (e.g., friendlier, angrier, etc.), with no attempt to explain these words. The class went through all of the questions, reading them together and translating them into Swahili, to ensure the pupils understood the meanings of the sentences before they attempted filling in the blanks.

Later, as they were reviewing the answers to the questions, he asked (first in English, then in Swahili) for the correct answer to question number four. When selected, a pupil stood up and began to jerkily read from his notebook, “My mum gets lazier than my –” The teacher interrupted the incorrect answer (which was meant to be angrier), saying “Oh my brother!” before explaining in Swahili the principles of the process of elimination and that they had already used ‘lazier’.

Throughout this lesson, pupils’ participation in English was limited to chorus responses to the teacher’s questions, repetition of single words as pronounced by the teacher, and individual pupils reading aloud the exercise questions. Their opportunities to contribute in Swahili included offering explanations of the vocabulary items and helping to translate the exercise questions.
Teachers’ Discourses
Common refrains I regularly heard from the teachers were that Swahili is a major problem for these pupils, and that the Maasai community is uninterested in education. From blaming Swahili errors on the children’s use of Maa at home, to being quick to draw conclusions about parents based on the pupils’ shortcomings, and to making blanket statements about parents who do not care if their children miss school (and sometimes cause them to), the negative comments towards the Maa language and Maasai community were regular elements of my interactions at Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi.

One extensive conversation about these issues was sparked by a teacher showing me a Class 7 pupil’s notebook, where the pupil had written ‘Gari amekwenda’ instead of ‘Gari limekwenda’, a basic grammatical error putting ‘car’ into the noun class reserved for humans and animals. She then said that Maa is the source of these errors, and when I asked for clarification, I was told that it was not because Maa does not have noun classes or because this is a direct translation from Maa, just that using Maa at home means their Swahili is poor. She then proceeded to offer more examples of Maasai people’s poor Swahili, making generalizations about the bad Swahili of the Maasai community. She said that the Maasai “are made to believe in their language (Wanaaminishwa lugha yao),” and therefore do not want to speak Swahili. She complained that the parents in this community lack drive/motivation (“msukumo” – a word used by many teachers to describe what Maasai lack) for education, so if a child decides not to go to school, the parents are happy to have that child at home to care for the cattle. She also spoke extensively of the issue of child marriage, using vivid examples of what happens to girl pupils when they drop out of primary school to get married. She was very clear about the importance of participation and team work between teachers, children and parents in the education of children, pointing out two children in her class (one of whom is Chagga, a prominent ethnic community in Tanzania) whose parents come to the school to discuss their children’s progress. It is not surprising, she said, that these children do wonders!

Another teacher echoed the above teacher’s comments when he observed, “They do not have drive/motivation from home (Hawana msukumo wa kutoka nyumbani).” He proceeded to comment that when the pupils go home, they are only exposed to Maa. He spoke of how they are
so used to using Maa that even Swahili is a problem, with the implication that their poor Swahili is caused by their familiarity with Maa.

In a different context, a Chagga teacher was making comparisons between her home community in Kilimanjaro and the Maasai community. In her home community, even their grandparents went to school, so the idea of not pushing today’s children to study and not teaching them Swahili from home is outrageous. The European missionaries who started schools arrived early in her home community, but, according to her, “Maasai were not governed/colonized (Wamaasai hawakutawaliwa).” As a result, this community does not understand the importance of education. Thus, “If children close their books now, they will not open them again until tomorrow’s class. They will not touch their books at home. (Watoto wakifunga vitabu vyao sasa, mpaka unafungua nao kesho. Hawatavigusa nyumbani.)” Her summation of the Maasai community, which was affirmed by her co-teacher, was expressed thus:

Here [in Maasai Land] they do not like education. They do not understand the importance of education. They only see that education is a must... They bring their children [to school] because they are forced to.

Huku hawapendi elimu. Hawaelewi umuhimu wa elimu. Wanaona tu elimu ni lazima... Wanaleta watoto wao kwa kulazimishwa.

This is a reference to how the government has made it mandatory for all children to attend primary school, so, according to this teacher, some Maasai send their children to school in order to avoid trouble with the police, rather than because they see the value in schooling.

In reflecting on his extensive experience working with the Maasai community, the Head Teacher spoke of how parents see schools as taking their children from them against their will. He recounted an incident where, in a parents’ meeting, one father got up and advised his fellow parents to select one child to stay at home, to never attend school, so that the others may attend school and the family would still have someone to help to tend the cattle and to help with other work at home. The Head Teacher also spoke of how early marriage [arranged by their families] and pregnancy result in many girls dropping out of primary school. He also described how the teachers encourage parents to follow up with their children’s school progress, to come to class to speak with the teachers, and to phone the teacher directly if there is any issue, including to report an absence. The parents, he claimed, rarely do this.
The comments from these four teachers are representative samples of typical discourses about the Maa language and Maasai community presented by the Mti Mmoja teachers. While some teachers expressed such sentiments more extensively and frequently than others, there were no teachers who presented a counter narrative about the Maasai community, including Maasai teachers themselves. These discourses, taken together, reflect a language-as-problem orientation (Ruiz, 1984) towards the dominant home language of the vast majority of these pupils, and a deficit construction of the Maasai community.

**Discussion: Comparing Parental Perspectives with School Realities**

**Swahili and English Learning**

For all four of the SMG parent participants, learning both Swahili and English were important aspirations they had for their children’s schooling (with the possible exception of Mama Lomnyak, who believed that Swahili would be learned through exposure in the community, decreasing the importance of learning it at school). Their explanations of the importance of their children learning these languages were dominated by examples of very practical, conversational usages of both languages, with a decisive emphasis on oral language. Baba Esther voiced his expectations in the clearest terms that his children learn English at Mti Mmoja when he stated his assumption that Swahili-medium necessarily means that children also learn English (as was the case when he was a pupil at Mti Mmoja, although now his English proficiency is minimal). To what extent were these parents’ expectations for their children to become proficient, including in oral language, in both Swahili and English being met by the realities of Mti Mmoja, according the school observations?

It is clear that the majority of pupils at Mti Mmoja enter pre-primary school with minimal proficiency in Swahili, and that by lower-mid primary, most children seem to have a fairly good grasp of the language – although, admittedly, it is difficult to properly assess the pupils’ Swahili ability since they rarely have opportunities to independently produce the language in either written or oral forms. Regardless, it does appear that throughout their primary school careers the pupils become functional in Swahili.

On the other hand, the pupils at Mti Mmoja have minimal exposure to English throughout their primary school careers (virtually none outside their few hours of English instruction per week),
and, even by Class 7, they demonstrate negligible English proficiency in both oral and written forms. Even within their English periods, they have little exposure to ‘real’ language use, as Swahili was the functional language of instruction in all observed English classes, with Swahili being the near-exclusive language for explanations and meaning making.

The strong practical, oral language skills desired by the parents were in stark contrast to the types of language skills emphasized at Mti Mmoja, where the teaching of both Swahili and English was dominated by mechanical, formulaic, writing-oriented approaches. With a clear focus on grammar and language fragments (e.g., through fill-in-the-blank exercises or changing adjectives into comparative adjectives without understanding their different meanings and uses), this approach to teaching both Swahili and English is much more oriented towards extremely narrow examination-writing skills than towards language proficiency. The significant challenges especially in the teaching of English at Mti Mmoja corroborate what Qorro found in her 2012 study: that English language teaching at SMG schools is “inadequate, especially in terms of textbooks, teaching methods, and classroom size” (Qorro, 2012, p. 60). While class size did not appear to be a key constraint to English learning at Mti Mmoja, certainly the rote teaching methods and the lack of learning resources like textbooks posed significant obstacles to the effective learning of English. At least Swahili, as by far the dominant language of school life at Mti Mmoja, has opportunities for general exposure and usage outside the mechanical Swahili classes, and so pupils have greater opportunity to develop Swahili proficiency, particularly in receptive domains. However, even opportunities for Swahili exposure and use are limited to a fairly narrow range of vocabulary, as evidenced in the two pre-primary classes detailed above. Increased opportunities for independent language use of both Swahili and English would likely enable pupils to more effectively develop the practical language skills expected by the parents.

Division of Labour and Use of an Unfamiliar LOI

The SMG parents articulated an understanding of a division of labour in language teaching, in which they themselves take responsibility (together with the community) for teaching their children Maa, while they expect the teachers and schools to do the full job of teaching their children Swahili and English. They also expressed an expectation that using an unfamiliar language as the language of instruction is an effective way of learning that language. The parents saw no contradiction between children’s early mastery of Maa and the need to learn Swahili for
use as the language of instruction from the beginning of pre-primary school, but rather saw this as an opportunity to learn multiple languages, which was highly valued in their eyes.

Teachers, on the other hand, bemoaned the fact that their pupils came to school with minimal Swahili proficiency, and frequently directly blamed the use of Maa at home for challenges in pupils’ Swahili abilities. Speaking in very negative tones, several teachers explicitly pointed to familiarity with and belief in Maa as the main cause of shortcomings in Swahili. A Chagga teacher cited Chagga parents teaching their children Swahili from home as a mark of the educational developments of her home community in contrast to that of the Maasai. Most teachers expressed in disparaging terms that their job is much more difficult due to the children’s Maa-dominance.

In this way, the teachers articulated a clear language-as-problem orientation (Ruiz, 1984) to Maa, a marginalized language in Tanzanian society. This orientation was clearly articulated in their discourses, with no single counter-narrative to challenge this language-as-problem orientation. It was also performed in their teaching, as they were quick to point out (in both Swahili and Maa!) the pupils’ lack of Swahili ability. The two exceptions to this ‘problem’ orientation, however minor they may seem, were the uses of single Maa words to help explain the concepts of ‘hyena’ in the Class 6 English class and ‘to skin [a goat]’ in the Class 3 Swahili class. In both cases, bringing Maa into the classroom in a supportive way (as opposed to using it to point out Swahili incompetence) significantly lightened the classroom atmosphere and arguably assisted in the pupils’ comprehension.

The use of Maa at school, including both in and out of the classroom and in both teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interactions, uncovers a significant silence in the literature on language education in Tanzania. While languages other than Swahili and English receive negligible attention in Tanzanian language education research, there is no mention in any existing study of any language either than Swahili and English being audible in any schooling context. Similarly, there is almost no mention in any language education study of the challenges that Swahili poses as an unfamiliar LOI to some Tanzanian children when they enter school. This study exposes these silences, with the findings that Maa plays a role in school life at this SMG school, and that the LOI of Swahili is unfamiliar to many pre-primary and primary SMG pupils.
While the SMG parents did not explicitly articulate Maa ability as a resource in their children’s learning of other languages, they were unequivocal about the resource that Maa is in their children’s lives. They saw no problem in the language of home being different from the language(s) of school, and in fact found it desirable for school to teach (i.e., use as LOI’s) languages that were not/could not be taught from home.

Thus, while parents saw a division of labour in language teaching as natural and desirable, teachers would have appreciated assistance from the pupils’ home environments in teaching Swahili. The teachers’ frustration at the pupils coming to school with little prior Swahili knowledge affected classroom dynamics, as pupils were often degraded by teachers for not having strong Swahili. The parents’ views of multilingualism, and Maa proficiency in particular, as a resource contradicted teachers’ strong orientation towards seeing the Maa language as a problem.

**The Role of Familiar Languages in Learning Unfamiliar Languages**

While all four of the SMG parents viewed Maa as a resource in their children’s lives, three of them disapproved of the use of Maa at school, with one parent (Mama Naserian) going so far as to say that corporal punishment should be used with children who use Maa at school, believing this would contribute to the learning of Swahili and English. At Mti Mmoja, the lack of use of Maa as a resource in the teaching and learning of Swahili and English (the ‘hyena’ and ‘to skin [a goat]’ examples aside) points to a similar orientation, a belief that the exclusive use of Swahili provides the ideal conditions for learning Swahili. In this regard, parents’ perspectives and school practices on the (lack of) relevance of a familiar language in the learning of a less familiar language are basically aligned. Both parents’ perspectives and school practices, while demonstrating a valuation of multilingualism in different ways, demonstrate a fairly monolingual approach to language learning, or an approach which isolates languages from each other.

However, the dominance of Swahili in the English classes suggests a different understanding of the role of a familiar language in the teaching of an unfamiliar language. The pedagogy employed in English classes (i.e., the use of English in only mechanical, formulaic ways and predominantly in writing, with Swahili used for explanations and meaning making) demonstrated an appreciation of the role of Swahili in learning English. [Note that, while the English teachers
were far more comfortable in Swahili than English, the strong dominance of Swahili in English classes seemed to be more of a decision than a constraint based on teachers’ limited English.] In the minds and practices of the SMG teachers, it appears that Swahili, as a dominant language with a decisive value in the schooling context, is a resource in the learning of English, in contrast to Maa, which is viewed as a problem rather than a resource in the learning of the less familiar languages.

**Maasai Culture and Community**

The SMG parents spoke extensively about the importance of Maa language to Maasai culture, traditions, and identity. They spoke about a sense of ownership over the Maa language, that it is *theirs*, in contrast to Swahili, which they are only stealing/using. They were very clear about how important Maa and Maasai culture are to themselves, their children, and their membership in the Maasai community, and they claimed the Maa language and Maasai identity as a source of pride.

In contrast, the teachers spoke of the Maasai community in derogatory terms, blaming it for children’s absences, for incomplete homework, and for challenges in Swahili. Indeed, Maasai culture was directly referenced by teachers as they crafted their own explanations of why a pupil had been absent, why they were tired, or why they had not completed their homework. In these circumstances, a teacher would often tell a pupil, accusingly, ‘You have been herding cattle’ (explaining an absence), ‘You went to sing yesterday’ (explaining incomplete homework), or ‘You have drunk too much loshoro [traditional Maasai drink]’ (explaining sleepiness).

In addition, teachers often made sweeping generalizations about the Maasai community as a whole, for example by making comments about Maasai parents lacking *msukumo* (drive/motivation), and by saying that Maasai do not care about education but only send their children to school because they are forced. Teachers also blamed Maasai culture for girl children not finishing school because of forced early marriages, and for pupils’ absences (allegedly) due to cattle herding. The teachers’ characterizations of parents as disengaged and uninterested in their children’s education corresponds to the findings of John (2010), which highlight SMG teachers’ complaints of SMG parents being uncooperative and uninvolved.

The SMG parents interviewed demonstrated a keen interest that their children go to school, although, through the division of labour assumption, did not see a significant role for themselves
in supporting their children’s learning of school languages (Swahili and English) and school knowledges. In contrast, the teachers seemed to desire greater parental involvement in their children’s schooling. For example, one teacher described schooling as a partnership between teachers, children and parents, and the Head Teacher detailed how the teachers encouraged parents to be more involved, with minimal uptake from the parents.

The teachers’ descriptions of parents’ disinterest in their children’s schooling do not align with these four parents’ eagerness for their children to attend school and have their lives improved because of schooling. However, it is possible that the participants of this study, because of their recruitment through their children’s involvement with the community library, are more interested in schooling than many other Mti Mmoja parents. It is also possible that these parent participants are not aware of how much their increased involvement in their children’s schooling would be welcomed by the teachers, regardless of parents’ own educational level. Regardless, it is clear that there is a contradiction between the centrality of Maasai language, culture and identity to these parents’ lives, and the negative connotations the Maasai culture and community have in the eyes of the teachers.
Chapter 6: English-medium School Parents and School Realities: Findings and Discussion

This chapter follows a parallel structure to that of Chapter 5, reporting and discussing findings for the second case study, that of the English-medium private (EMP) school. Like Chapter 5, the first part of this chapter examines the findings of the parent interviews, this time with parents who have at least one child attending the EMP school, Shining Star Academy. The presentation and discussion of these findings address the first research question: What are parents’ attitudes and expectations for their children’s primary school language education in the semi-rural Maasai community of Monduli, Tanzania? The second part of this chapter presents findings of the school observations at Shining Star Academy, in order to address the second research question: To what extent are these attitudes and expectations aligned with school realities at one English-medium private school?

Portrait of an EMP Mother

Raising eight children while working at the family shop and tending to the family’s various other small-scale enterprises, Mama Daudi is constantly on the move. A queen of multi-tasking, her life revolves around the home, where the work always seems to be in excess of the number of people available to accomplish it. Skilled in so many different domains, she laughs when she says, ‘You know, we didn’t grow up Uzunguni (in white people’s culture), so we had to do everything for ourselves. So of course I know how to do everything.’

That ‘everything’ for her includes farming, raising ducks and chickens, sewing, doing beadwork, cooking, and making traditional Maasai medicine, among many other things. Incredibly resourceful, she is full of ideas of how to accomplish a handy task, creative uses for any neglected item, and business ideas for how to make a few extra shillings here and there.

Mama Daudi lives with her husband and children in a brick house in Monduli town, which they describe as Swahilini (place of Swahili people) in contrast to other nearby areas in more rural contexts, which they refer to as Maasaini (place of Maasai). She interacts with her children predominantly in Swahili, and even when she occasionally speaks to them in Maa (especially the older children), they respond in Swahili. Mama Daudi and her husband, on the other hand, speak a mixture of Maa and Swahili with each other, giving the children some exposure to the Maasai language.
Mama Daudi is a primary school graduate, having finished all seven years of primary schooling before getting married and having her first child at the age of 17. She is a fervent believer in the power of education to change their lives, and, as such, is deeply committed to sending all of her children to the highest level of education possible. Most of her children have attended local government primary schools, and a combination of government and private secondary schools. With her unwavering belief in education, including the learning of English, she would have dearly loved to send her children to English-medium primary schools, but the school fees are just too high. One child attended an EMP school for a few years with the assistance of a foreign sponsor, and now they are squeezing their money to send one of their youngest children to an EMP for pre-primary education. She herself would have loved to study beyond primary school, but her father was uninterested in furthering his daughter’s education, the responsibilities at home were too demanding, and opportunities for secondary education too few. To this day, she speaks of how she would like to learn English.

Introduction to EMP Parent Participants
The above portrait introduces one of the EMP participants in order to give a general sense of the demographic of EMP parents, and the significant differences between the lives of the SMG and EMP parents. All of the EMP parents have Maa as their first language, are very proficient in Swahili, and use Swahili as the dominant (or, in Mama Priscilla’s case, exclusive) language of interaction with their children. All of them dress in ‘modern’ clothing, i.e., skirts and dresses, as opposed to the traditional rubega which they only wear for special occasions. All of them live in brick houses (which is a recent development for most of them) with electricity, and all are in monogamous marriages. All of them are involved in the informal economy through small-scale business ventures. In many of these ways, including using Swahili at home and living in brick houses, these EMP parents are representative of the broader EMP demographic in Monduli. However, unlike the participants of this study, Monduli’s broader EMP demographic also includes families of ethnicities other than Maasai and some who are employed in the formal economy, as teachers, military personnel, and a host of other professions.

This study includes three EMP participants, all of whom are women, two of whom are mothers and one a grandmother of children who attend Shining Star Academy. The grandmother is included in this study because of her role as the primary caregiver of her grandchild who attends
Shining Star Academy, and as such is responsible for significant decisions relating to her grandchild’s upbringing. It is very common in this community for grandmothers to be raising their grandchildren, hence the importance of including a grandmother in this study. Also, the different generational perspectives offer richer variety to the study’s findings.

Of the three EMP participants, two of them have one or more child(ren) who attend the library program, and were contacted through their children’s involvement. The other EMP parent was connected to the researcher by one of the other EMP participants. Their demographic information is summarized in Table 6.1. As with all other participants, all names are pseudonyms. Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla are the mothers of Daudi and Priscilla (respectively), and Bibi Joyce is the grandmother of Joyce.

Table 6.1: Demographic information of EMP parent participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mama Daudi</th>
<th>Bibi Joyce</th>
<th>Mama Priscilla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant’s level of schooling</td>
<td>Class 7</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>Class 7; Certificate in theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of schooling of their children*</td>
<td>D: Form 4</td>
<td>Various levels of primary school. None of her children attended secondary school.</td>
<td>D: Form 4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: Form 4 + Certificate in Tourism</td>
<td>D: Form 4**</td>
<td>D: Class 2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: Form 6**</td>
<td>D: Form 4**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: Form 4**</td>
<td>D: Form 3**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Form 1**</td>
<td>S: Pre-primary**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: Baby – has not begun school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Farmer, Raises ducks, Works at the family store</td>
<td>Farmer (especially coffee), Dairy farmer (one cow)</td>
<td>Evangelist/Preacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages known</td>
<td>Maa, Swahili</td>
<td>Maa, Swahili</td>
<td>Maa, Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language(s) used at home</td>
<td>Swahili, Maa (little, used mostly with other adults)</td>
<td>Swahili, Maa (little, used mostly with other adults)</td>
<td>Swahili, Maa (minimal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*‘S’ indicates a son, and ‘D’ indicates a daughter. The highest level of schooling attained by each child is written beside their respective initial.
**A double star beside the level of schooling of a child indicates that the child is still a student and continuing with their studies.**

**Findings: EMP Parents’ Attitudes and Expectations**

The presentation of findings of EMP parents’ perspectives begins with an exploration of the factors parents consider in choosing a school for their children. Whereas the previous chapter started by exploring SMG parents’ language preferences for their children’s primary school education, this chapter instead begins with a section on School Choice, since these EMP parents all prefer English-medium schooling, but have different reasons for their English-medium preferences and diverse factors which led them to choose Shining Star Academy over either SMG schools or other EMP options.

**School Choice**

The most prominent factor these parent participants emphasize in choosing to send their children to this particular English-medium private school, Shining Star Academy, is their belief that their children will learn English well at this school. This comes up repeatedly for all three EMP parents, and they express the centrality of English to their choice of school in different ways. For example, Mama Daudi expresses this sentiment bluntly and concisely when she states, “This school is good because they teach English (Shule ni nzuri kwa sababu wanafundisha Kiingereza).” Bibi Joyce speaks of their decision to send Joyce to Shining Star thus: “When we saw how they are taught more English, we said let her just go there so that she gets a good education (Tulivyonna wanafundishwa Kiing zaidi, tulisema acha aende hapo ili apate elimu nzuri).”

Significantly, two of these parents emphasize the importance of learning and using both Swahili and English at this school. Mama Priscilla, for example, in responding to the question of why she chooses to send her daughter Priscilla to Shining Star, describes Priscilla’s abilities in reading and writing in both languages which she has developed at this school (while admitting that her spoken English is still in its infant stages). Bibi Joyce describes how they initially sent Joyce to Shining Star because they were told the school was aiding needy children and that there would not be school fees. When they were later asked to start paying school fees, Joyce had already gotten used to the school, so they decided to struggle to pay the fees with this justification:
We saw [it best that] she continue because they teach Swahili and English. Her mother said since she is taught English and Swahili unlike at primary schools [i.e., government schools], these ones are taught more, let her just go there.

_Tukaona ataendelea kwa sababu wanafundisha Kiswahili na Kiingereza. Mamake akasema kwa vile anafundishwa Kiingereza na Kiswahili sio kama shule ya msingi, hawa wanafundishwa zaidi, acha aende hapo._

Common reasons for these EMP parents to prefer English-medium schools over Swahili-medium schools include the importance of English for their children’s secondary school success and for their children’s future employment prospects, points which will be returned to later in the _Why English?_ section below.

When asked about the differences between EMP and SMG schools, the use of English as the language of instruction was the most prominent but certainly not the only difference of importance to the EMP parents. Mama Daudi speaks of the differences between EMP and SMG schools thus:

_Government [schools] do not teach well. Then if that is not enough, subjects like English, which a child is taught most of the time when she/he enters secondary school, government primary schools do not teach._

_Za serikali hazifundishi vizuri. Halafu isitoshe, masomo kama Kiingereza ambayo mara nyingi mtoto akiingia shule ya sekondari anafundishwa, shule msingi za serikali hazifundishi._

Bibi Joyce compares EMP and SMG schools by comparing the relative abilities of their pupils:

_They all know Swahili the same. But this one [i.e., Joyce] knows more English. The other ones do not know more English. Now if you take a child of around Class 6, s/he cannot speak with [Joyce] in English, s/he does not know. [Joyce] knows._


These two quotations offer a sample of the many comments made by EMP parents regarding the significant differences in English exposure and abilities between EMP and SMG pupils. This is clearly of critical importance for them.
In addition to English proficiency, the work ethic of the teachers (associated with financial incentive) is an important difference between EMP and SMG schools, as noted by the EMP parents. As Mama Daudi states:

[The teaching] is different because at government schools they do not teach, they are not busy, because they know their salaries are there whether or not they teach... The teachers at [Shining Star] themselves know that they must do something to attract the children to go to that school because it is a school which pays a lot of money, not like government schools.

[Ufundishaji] ni tofauti kwa sababu kama shule ya serikali hawafundishi, hawako bizi kwa sababu wanajua mishahara yao iko palepale wafundishe wasifundishe... Wale wa [Shining Star] wenyewe wanajua lazima wafanye kitu kwa kuvutia watoto waweze kwenda ile shule kwa sababu ni shule ambayo inalipa hela nyingi, sio kama shule za serikali.

Similarly, Mama Priscilla states that the government school teachers “do not have incentive (hawana motisha).” She elaborates by saying:

At government schools, you find the teachers are not careful with the children. But you find that someone who knows s/he is being paid well by her/his employer at this private school, s/he is hard-working and makes an effort with this child, s/he desires her/him to understand.

[Katika] shule hizi za serikali, walimu unawakuta hawako makini na watoto. Lakini unakuta yule ambaye anajua analipwa hela nzuri na mwajiri wake wa hii shule ya binafsi, yuko bidii anakazana na huyu mtoto anatamani afahamu.

Thus, both Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla find a significant difference in the quality of teaching between EMP and SMG schools, and they both associate this with the relative salaries and incentives that these teachers receive. For both of them, this difference in teaching quality and work ethic of teachers is an important factor in pushing them to choose an EMP school for their child(ren).

In addition to superior English ability and teaching quality, Mama Priscilla describes a host of other differences between EMP and SMG schools. Among them are how they treat the children (“malezi yao”), issues of spirituality (“mambo ya kiroho”), cleanliness (“usafi”), and how strict the teachers are in demanding punctuality (“hawapokei watoto wakichelewa”). Mama Priscilla also appreciates how there are open lines of communication between parents and teachers, and how at the end of the year parents are given thorough reports on their children’s development.
including suggestions on how to improve. She also says that at SMG schools, “A child can reach Class 4 without knowing how to read or write (Mtoto anaweza kufika daras la 4 hajui kusoma wala kuandika)” because “they do not care about the children’s studies (hawajali watoto kwenye masomo).” All of these issues contribute to the dramatic contrast she paints between EMP and SMG schools generally.

In addition to comparisons between EMP and SMG schools generally, there were some factors which pushed these EMP parents to choose Shining Star Academy over other EMP schools. Indeed, for Mama Priscilla, and to a lesser extent Mama Daudi, there was never serious consideration of sending her child to a SMG school. Both Mama Priscilla and Mama Daudi cite the relatively low school fees of Shining Star as the central reason for selecting this school over other EMP schools. Mama Priscilla, herself an evangelist/preacher, also appreciates that at Shining Star, “They teach religious ethics (Wanafundisha maadili ya kidini).” As she says, “Sometimes the children are given Bible passages...to memorize (Wakati mwingine watoto wanapewa mistari ya Biblia...kukariri),” as well as the chance to recite these passages in front of the other pupils, which is different from other Tanzanian schools which only study religion on Fridays, according to Mama Priscilla. In addition to lower school fees and religious ethics, both Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla mention the superior resources of this school as well as the school’s environment (“mandhari yake ni nzuri” – Mama Daudi), as factors which drew them to Shining Star. As Mama Daudi states, “They have good books, and children are given books and notebooks, so I see this school is good (Wana vitabu vizuri, na watoto wanapewa vitabu, madaftari, kwa hiyo naona hii shule ni nzuri).” Similarly, Mama Priscilla is impressed with “how children are given books for each subject (Watoto wanavyopewa vitabu, kila somo).”

In summary, while the promise of developing English proficiency is the most significant draw to Shining Star for these EMP parents, there are numerous other factors which contribute to their choice of Shining Star for their children. Importantly, using and developing proficiency in Swahili as well as English is a value for these parents. Also, these parents are drawn to EMP schools because of their understandings of the distinctly unfavourable comparisons between SMG and EMP schools, through which they describe SMG schools as having poor English and unmotivated teachers, versus the EMP school which has better English, hard-working teachers, better treatment of children, attention to spiritual concerns, better cleanliness, and punctuality. In
addition, these parents are attracted specifically to Shining Star because of its relatively low school fees, its religious ethics and teachings, and its superior learning resources and school environment.

**Monolingual versus Multilingual Ideologies and the Role of Mother Tongue in Schooling**

As noted in the above section, while the EMP parents have specifically chosen an English-medium schooling environment for their children, they are also clear about the importance of Swahili in their children’s schooling experience. They are not choosing English *instead of* Swahili, but rather *in addition* to Swahili. Indeed, some of the EMP parents are clear about the ways in which they support the use of Swahili to assist the children to understand English. For example, Mama Daudi describes her ideas about how Swahili should be used in English-medium schooling:

>If a child enters there [i.e., the EMP school] s/he maybe does not know, s/he knows Swahili, s/he does not know English. Which is why you change between the languages, meaning you meet someone and explain to him/her in Swahili first. You tell him/her ‘this is a chair’ in English, you come again to tell him/her this is I don’t know tebo I don’t know chair… And when they continue this way, maybe for one year, like how [Daudi] and his classmates are taught, afterwards you find that another year he already understands that this is this and that is that in English.


In this way, Mama Daudi expresses her expectation that Swahili be used as a resource to help children understand in their earliest years of English-medium, until they are able to understand English without the support of the familiar Swahili.

Mama Priscilla describes a similar approach to the use of Swahili to support the learning of English in EMP schools:

>If the teacher sees completely that here the child, even if I speak - the parents do not know English - s/he does not understand me. Definitely there are words s/he will include in Swahili so that the child understands. So there the teacher should use his/her teaching
techniques, so the child can understand him/her. So to totally remove Swahili so that only English is used in class? No.


Like both Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla, Bibi Joyce is also unambiguous about her support for the use of both Swahili and English in the classroom. When Joyce, who is sitting in on the interview, explains how the teachers use a combination of Swahili and English in their teaching, Bibi Joyce expresses her strong approval for a bilingual approach:

> You must know that in Swahili it is this and in English it is this. So these pupils are taught well. I see they are taught well if s/he tells them this in Swahili and s/he tells them in English, it will be good because they will understand all sides. If she is taught this way she will understand everything. More than to teach children English, because they will get lost. They will get lost with regards to language. S/he will not know Swahili, and s/he will not know their language.


These comments from all three EMP participants demonstrate the importance of using Swahili as a resource in the learning of English (particularly for Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla), and the importance of learning and using Swahili alongside English so as to ensure pupils develop their Swahili also (particularly for Bibi Joyce). Significantly, all three participants are categorical that the EMP school should not be a monolingual space, and that Swahili should have an important role in their children’s learning.

However, while the EMP parents are supportive of using Swahili in the English-medium school, they are decisive in their opinions that Maa should have no place at school; that Maa must remain in the domain of the home. Bibi Joyce gives the following explanation:

> If you teach a child Maa at school…it will be a problem because there are Chaggas and they want their language. And Merus and they want their language. And others, other
tribes, they want their language. So it is not appropriate. It is best we just teach her/him at home.

_Ukimfundisha mtoto Kimaasai shuleni... itakuwa shida kwa sababu si kuna Wachagga, si wanataka lugha yao. Na Wameru, si wanataka lugha yao. Na wengine, kabila nyingine [sic], si wanataka lugha yao. Kwa hiyo haifai. Inabidi tu kumfundisha nyumbani._

Bibi Joyce’s statement of it being inappropriate to use Maa at school because of the children coming from a mixture of different ethnic communities reflects opinions stated by the other EMP participants as well. It is important to note that Shining Star Academy is indeed very ethnically diverse, in contrast to Mti Mmoja in which the vast majority of pupils are ethnically Maasai and are strongly Maa-dominant. In addition to the reason of ethnic diversity, other reasons EMP parents give to exclude Maa from schooling include the importance of the national language of Swahili having enough space at school (Bibi Joyce), and doubts that the teachers would be capable of teaching Maa (Bibi Joyce). Mama Daudi does not speak much about the possibility of using Maa at school, although does suggest that in very rural areas where children do not know much Swahili, Maa can be used as a resource in helping pupils understand, similar to her suggestion of how Swahili can be used as a support in the EMP schools. For Mama Priscilla, using Maa at school is so much out of the question that she says very little in terms of explaining why Maa should not be used.

These EMP parents’ comments, including their commitment to excluding Maa from formal schooling, demonstrate a stark divide between language expectations for home and school environments. Bibi Joyce states it thus:

_It is best that when s/he is at home, if it is possible, speak to him/her in the language of home. When s/he is at school s/he is going to speak Swahili and English. If it is possible._

_Inabidi akiwa nyumbani kama inawezekana, mwongeleshe kinyumbani. Akiwa shuleni anaenda kuongea Kiswahili na Kiingereza. Ikiwezekana._

Bibi Joyce goes on to say, “But because nowadays children meet with their friends and only speak Swahili all the time, this is why when they come home you speak to her in your language and she doesn’t know (Lakini sasa kwa ajili watoto wa sasa wanakutana na wenzake kule ni Kiswahili tu wanaongea kila saa, ndiyo maana wakija nyumbani unamwaongelesha kikwako hajui).” Bibi Joyce’s comments point to an expectation of a clear division in the linguistic worlds
of home and school. However, due to realities about the dominance of Swahili, she finds Swahili taking over linguistic space in the home also.

Similarly, Mama Priscilla also offers comments that illustrate how languages are seen to belong to isolated home/school domains, exemplifying the division through the comments of a child:

You find that a person knows that English is for the classroom, Swahili is for the home and maybe Maa or whatever Chagga. There was a day I said something to my child in English, she said ‘Mama, why are you speaking the school language?’ So you find a child knows that English is for school, Swahili is for home, together with Maa.

Unakuta mtu anajua Kiingereza ni cha darasani, Kiswahili ni cha nyumbani na labda Kimaasai au whatever Kichagga. Kulikuwa na siku nilimsemesha moto wangu Kiingereza, alisema ‘Mama mbona unaoingia lugha ya kishule?’ Kwa hiyo unakuta moto anajua Kiingereza ni cha shuleni, Kiswahili ni cha nyumbani, pamoja na Kimaasai.

These comments show how, in the minds of these EMP parents, there is an assumption of a linguistic divide between the realms of home and school. Maa is re relegated to the home while English only belongs at school. Swahili alone is able to transverse the division, with the expectation that Swahili can exist both in the home and at school.

In summary, while the EMP parents see learning English as paramount in their children’s education, they all expect Swahili to play a role in their children’s schooling. While Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla see Swahili as playing an important role in the learning of English, particularly in the early years when English is still unfamiliar, Bibi Joyce takes this further to state her support for what sounds like fully bilingual education, where both languages are learned and used simultaneously.

However, while all three EMP parents are supportive of multilingual approaches to schooling, and the use of a familiar language in the learning of an unfamiliar language, there still seems to be an invisible wall excluding certain languages from the domain of school. All of the EMP parents are adamant that Maa should not have a place at school, that it should be learned at home. These attitudes demonstrate the assumed distance between home and school, and the normalization of school learning being divorced from everyday life. In the midst of this, Swahili offers a potential go-between between the realms of home and school, as parents see it as an appropriate language to use in both realms.
Why these languages are important: The respective roles of Maa, Swahili and English

The EMP parents give reasons for each of the three languages - Maa, Swahili and English – being important to their children’s lives. However, they place particular weight and emphasis on the importance of English, making strong statements about the centrality of English to employment prospects. While all EMP parents state a desire for their children to know Maa, they point to inter-ethnic mixing and cultural change as reasons for Maa’s decreasing relevance in their children’s lives. EMP parents associate Swahili’s importance with its status as the national language and its role in inter-ethnic interaction.

Why Maa?

All three of the EMP parents believe that Maa is important for their children to know. However, they point to cultural change and the mixing with people of different ethnicities as reducing the relevance of Maa in their children’s lives. Significantly, while all EMP participants state the importance of Maa, the reality that none of their children (or the grandchildren they are raising, in Bibi Joyce’s case) are really proficient in Maa points to the poignancy of this cultural change in the lives of these families.

When asked about the importance of Maa, all three of the EMP parents offer essentially the same example to illustrate Maa’s utility: if you have a visitor who does not know Maa, you can give your children instructions about what to prepare for them in Maa without the visitors hearing. That is to say, all three of the EMP parents see Maa as a useful secret language to use in front of non-Maasai visitors for pragmatic purposes. Not one of the EMP parents referenced instances where their children would be required to use Maa due to the lack of any other common language.

In addition to being able to tell secrets in front of visitors, Mama Daudi expresses the importance of Maa in terms which echo the sense of ownership of the language articulated by the SMG parents. In expressing the importance of Maa in her children’s lives, she states, “It is the language of your parents. The language of your parents is very important. (Ni lugha ambaye [sic] ni ya wazazi. Ni muhimu sana lugha ya wazazi.)” She goes on to describe the importance of speaking Maa, even when outside of Maasai Land and interacting with fellow Maasai who know Swahili:
When they meet and speak their language, I see it is better, since they are in a country of different people so they speak their own language. It is really good to know their language... I feel really good when I speak my language compared with Swahili, truly.

Wakikutana na kuongea lugha yao naona ni nzuri zaidi, kwa vile wako kwenye nchi ya watu kwa hiyo wanaongea lugha ya kwao. Ni nzuri kweli kujua lugha yao... Najisikia vizuri kweli nikiongea lugha yangu kuliko Kiswahili kwa kweli.

Thus, Mama Daudi expresses sentimental reasons for knowing Maa, based on how it makes her feel, as well as how it can bring Maasai people together when they are outside of their homeland. These reasons could be associated with a sense of ownership of Maa, which she refers to as “my language (lugha yangu).”

Bibi Joyce, while speaking in similar sentimental terms about the importance of Maa and her sense of ownership of it, also speaks of generational change in language use. She states:

Sometimes it is important to know the language of your birthplace. Yes, it is important. All of us in our family, we all know Maa... All of my relatives know, and my children know. But not well, they don’t know as much as I do.

Saa nyingine ni muhimu kujua kilugha ya kwenu ulipozaliwa. Ee ni muhimu. Sisi wote tunajua Kimaasai kwetu...Ndugu zangu wote wanajua, watoto wangu wanajua nao. Lakini siyo vizuri, hawajui sana kama mimi.

Bibi Joyce also states:

[Maa] is important because it is our language and we were born with it. But our grandchildren mostly use Swahili and a foreign language [i.e., English]. Them, if you teach them this Maa, it’s like, I don’t know, they don’t like it very much. If you want to teach her, [she says] ‘Ah Grandmother what is this that you are teaching us? I don’t know Maa.’


Thus, while Bibi Joyce considers Maa to be very important, she has a sense of ownership over it, and it is part of her identity and group membership, she also acknowledges that it is peripheral to her grandchildren’s lives, and that even her own children do not know it to the extent that she does.
Mama Priscilla has a different perspective on generational change with regards to both language and culture. As a Maasai woman married to a Chagga man, the societal expectation is that the children should learn Chagga, and, in Mama Priscilla’s words, Maa “would only be an extra language (ingekuwa tu lugha ya ziada).” In Tanzania, children are understood to be of their father’s ethnicity, and therefore Mama Priscilla’s children are Chagga, not Maasai. In Mama Priscilla’s case, her children know neither Chagga nor Maa, but grew up speaking Swahili, which frequently happens in inter-ethnic families.

In Mama Priscilla’s analysis, the mixing of cultures at the community level has a profound impact on culture. She describes the cultural change thus:

Here we are mixed up [ethnically] and those grandmothers of the olden days are not here… It is difficult to know a person and her/his culture… The mixture causes change to the extent that a Maasai as a Maasai, it is not evident that s/he is Maasai. Why? A Maasai as a Maasai has traditional clothing. But you find that s/he does not wear them. S/he has ordinary [i.e., mainstream] cultural practices.

Huku tumech changanyikana na wale wabibi wa zamani hawapo... Ni vigumu kujua mtu na utamaduni wake... Mchanganyiko unaosababisha mabadiliko mpaka Maasai kama Maasai isionekane ni Maasai. Kwa nini? Maasai kama Maasai ana mavazi ya kiasili. Lakini unakuta havai. Ana tamaduni zile za kawaida.

When asked whether there are any negative effects culturally of children not knowing their ethnic language, she says,

There are no negative effects…They will study it in history. Like in a book on Maasai culture. Now she is an educated person, she is studying, she meets it in books.

Hamna hasara... Watasoma kwenye historia. Yaani kama kitabu cha utamaduni wa Wamaasai. Sasa si ni msomi yeye anasoma, anakutana nao kwenye vitabu.

These comments show how book learning has come to dominate ways of transmitting culture in the mind of Mama Priscilla. This helps to explain the lack of urgency in her mind for her children to learn Maa: very few books exist in Maa, which makes Maa irrelevant for book learning. These perspectives are clearly an outgrowth of the rise of the prominence of schooling in this community. The pivotal role schooling has in distancing her children from Maa is further illustrated by the following comment:
The amount of time a child is at home is little for learning her/his ethnic language...If you try to look, a child who does not go to school, s/he knows the home language. Because most of the time s/he is there with a parent, so s/he will know it.

*Halafu muda mwenyewe mtoto alioko nyumbani ni mdogo kwa kujifunza ile lugha yake ya asili...Na hata ukijaribu kuangalia, mtoto ambaye haendi shuleni, lugha ya nyumbani anaijua. Maana mara nyingi si yuko pale na mzazi, kwa hiyo ataijua.*

Mama Priscilla’s older daughter went to boarding school throughout both primary and secondary, so when she speaks of the child not spending much time at home because of school, she really means a parent having very little time with a child. Through these comments, Mama Priscilla shows how schooling has played a significant role in pushing out Maa – and presumably also Chagga – from her children’s lives.

Thus it is seen that while these EMP parents say that Maa is important for their children to know, the realities of a changing world, including ethnic mixing and the dominance of schooling, have resulted in their children having very little proficiency in Maa. While both Mama Daudi and Bibi Joyce express a sense of ownership over the Maa language – a sense that Maa is *their* language and the language of their people – they acknowledge (Bibi Joyce in particular) that the younger generation has little interest in Maa. While all three of these EMP parents say that it would be nice for their children to know Maa, including to enable them to have secret conversations in front of non-Maa-speaking visitors, there is little sense of urgency expressed by these parents for their children to learn Maa.

**Why Swahili?**

The EMP parents have notably less to say about Swahili than they do about Maa and English. Observing the centrality of Swahili to both their own lives and the lives of their children, it is likely that the importance of Swahili is too self-evident to these parents to warrant much comment.

The strongest statements from EMP parents about the importance of Swahili have to do with its status as the national language. As Mama Daudi states, “Swahili is our national language *(Kiswahili ni lugha yetu ya taifa).*” Mama Daudi proceeds to discuss the importance of Swahili thus: “I see [Swahili] is good because it is our language and Swahili is a big part of our culture *(Naona [Kiswahili] ni nzuri kwa sababu pia ni lugha yetu na utamaduni wetu kuna Kiswahili).*"
It is striking that Mama Daudi frames Swahili as “our” language, particularly when this statement is juxtaposed with her previously-cited comment about Maa: “I feel really good when I speak my language compared with Swahili, truly (Najisikia vizuri nikiongea lugha yangu kuliko Kiswahili kwa kweli).” Thus, while she refers to Swahili as ‘ours’, it seems it is not as ‘ours’ as Maa is. It is notable that, while several parents claim Maa as their own, Mama Daudi is the only participant to take ownership of Swahili in this way.

Bibi Joyce also associates Swahili’s value with its status as the national language. One of the reasons she gives for excluding Maa from schools is her concern for the national language to have sufficient emphasis. In justifying her point, she states, “Mostly people use the national language, more than their ethnicity, more than their language. Which is why the national language is very big. (Sana sana watu wamebebea lugha ya taifa, kuliko kabila yake kuliko lugha yake. Ndiyo maana lugha ya taifa ndiyo kubwa sana.)”

Mama Priscilla points to the importance of Swahili in inter-ethnic encounters when she discusses their family’s linguistic situation. Responding to a question about what language she uses with her children, she says, “Only Swahili. They do not know Maa because they are Chagga. They only know Swahili, and maybe one two three in English. (Kiswahili tu. Hawajui Kimaasai maana ni Wachagga. Wanajua Kiswahili tu, na labda Kiingereza moja mbili tatu.)” In this way, Mama Priscilla articulates the importance of Swahili in inter-ethnic communication and in inter-ethnic families.

**Why English?**

All three of the EMP parents speak extensively about the connection between English and employment, and indeed the theme of employment comes up incessantly as these parents discuss the importance of English. Bibi Joyce has this to say about the importance of English:

> Without English, for how these times are going, you can’t get any work…if you do not know English well. For example, like now a tour guide, the tour guide who drives tourists. If you find this kind of work, without knowing English you won’t get it.

*Bila Kiingereza, kwa nyakati hizi zinazoendelea, huwezi kupata kibarua yoyote...kama hujui Kiingereza vizuri. Kwa mfano kama hii sasa tour guide, tour guide ile ya kuendesha watalii. Pengine ukipata kazi ya aina hiyo, bila kuja Kiingereza hupati.*
Bibi Joyce is categorical about English being essential for employment opportunities, and cites an example from the tourism sector, due to the exposure to tourism which many Monduli residents have. Mama Priscilla is also extremely convinced of the importance of English for employment, but states it in broader terms, as for her the biggest thing is for her children “to reach their goals (kufika malengo yao)”:

[English] will help them because of where they are heading in their lives in the future. And also for their work…A person has his/her ideas, his/her opinions of what s/he wants to be. And you find that most studies are in what? English. So it will help him/her for his/her current and future life. If s/he studies English. To get a job. Meaning, you see all people who have a job, many have studied what? S/he knows English.

Mama Priscilla’s comments show that she wants to keep all options – including international possibilities - open for her children, and that she sees that English is essential for work opportunities at home and abroad. Significantly, since this comment is made as an expression of
disapproval for making Swahili the LOI at all levels of schooling, it is clear that she believes that not just knowing English, but using it as the LOI, is essential for accessing job opportunities.

Mama Daudi adds another layer to the many comments made about the importance of English for employment when she mentions the importance of English, not just for a job, but specifically for the job interview:

There is importance [of knowing English] because you can go to do an interview maybe to look for employment, maybe it is English, and you only know Swahili.

*Kuna umuhimu pia kwa sababu unaweza kwenda kufanya interview labda kutafuta ajira, labda ni Kiingereza, na uko unajua Kiswahili.*

The distinction between needing English for a job and needing English for a job interview is significant because in Tanzania, job application processes and interviews are frequently in English even for jobs which do not require English for the actual job itself.

In addition to the wide array of assertions of the importance of English and English-medium schooling to employment prospects, EMP parents also talk about the importance of English proficiency to their children’s secondary school success. With reference to her older children’s secondary school experiences, Mama Daudi says this:

The challenge they encounter [in secondary school] is language. Language because my children have studied in these government [primary] schools. Now when they go to secondary school they meet English, which they see as foreign, meaning it is difficult. Someone can...have ability in the subject, but in English, now if in that language s/he does not know two plus two is four, s/he will have to fail. Because if it was in Swahili like it was there [in primary], it would be easy to answer that question.

*Changamoto wanayokutana nayo ni lugha. Lugha kwa sababu watoto watangi wamesoma hizi shule za serikali. Sasa wanavyoenda shule ya sekondari wanakutana na lugha ya Kiingereza, wanaona ni kitu geni, yaani ni gumu. Yaani mtu anaweza... ile somo, lakini kwa Kiingereza, sasa kama kwa ile lugha hajui mbili jumlisha mbili ni nne, itabidi afeli. Kwa sababu ingekuwa Kiswahili kama likiwa kule, ingekuwa rahisi kujibu lilo swali.*

Thus, through her experience with her older children’s challenges with English in secondary school, Mama Daudi positions English as central to post-primary academic success, expressing her understanding of how failure in school can be caused by unfamiliarity with the LOI rather than unfamiliarity with subject matter.
EMP parents also point out the importance of English for computer literacy and in accessing a broad array of printed texts. Mama Daudi articulates the importance of English for using computers when she states, “On the computer you will know what has been written in English (Kwenye kompyuta utajua kimeandikwa nini kwa Kiingereza).” Mama Priscilla states the importance of English to accessing printed texts in this comment: “If I had studied a particular subject in English, if I would find a book maybe in English, it would be easy to read it and to get more material (Ningesoma somo fulani kwa Kiingereza, kitabu labda kwa Kiingereza ningekikuta, ingekuwa rahisi kukisoma na kupata material zaidi).”

Thus, it is seen that EMP parents offer an array of reasons for why English is critically important for their children to learn, most of which revolve around employment prospects. The employment-oriented reasons include enabling the children to reach their goals in any profession they choose, to access international work opportunities, and to succeed in job interviews. Additional reasons given for the importance of English include enabling success in post-primary education, computer literacy, and the ability to access texts that are only available in English.

Discussion: EMP Parents’ Attitudes and Expectations

Normalization of Multilingualism

All of the EMP parents express interest in their children knowing Maa, Swahili and English, and in their children learning and using both Swahili and English at the English-medium school. They see the learning of multiple languages as natural and do not seem to see learning of additional languages as a threat to the more familiar languages. They clearly articulate their expectations for how Swahili should be used as a resource in the learning of English (especially Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla), and state their desires for their children’s English AND Swahili abilities to be developed (especially Bibi Joyce).

This finding confirms Rugemalira’s observations that “most parents want their children to master English, in addition to Kiswahili” (Rugemalira, 2006, p. 98). Rugemalira, however, goes on to say that the nature of parents’ desire for English generally results in subtractive English-medium programs, in which children’s familiar languages are more likely to be seen as obstacles rather than resources in the learning of English. While the question of the nature of the English-medium program will be taken up in the section on the EMP school, it is notable that both Mama Priscilla
and Mama Daudi suggest that Swahili be used as a resource in the first years of schooling until the children are comfortable in English. It is likely that these parents’ expectations of language education lean more towards a subtractive model. However, Bibi Joyce, with her emphasis on learning Swahili and using both Swahili and English simultaneously in the classroom, seems to be describing a model of bilingual education which more closely resembles an additive model.

These parents express confidence that their children will have no difficulty using English as the LOI, as they will learn the language from using it as the LOI. However, their suggestions that Swahili be used to assist the children to understand in the first years of schooling contrast with Rugemalira’s (2006) comments that parents have “unrealistic expectations” for English-medium schooling, expecting their children to speak English within a few months of study at an EMP school (Rugemalira, 2006, pp. 105, 95). It is likely that these parents’ own multilingualism impacts their sense of multilingualism as being normal and natural, while also impacting their understanding of language learning as a process which takes time.

Division of Labour
While all EMP parents want their children to know Maa, they are all adamant that Maa should have no place at school: it must be taught at home. Despite each of the parents stating that the home should be the site of Maa-learning, in practice this is not happening, as Swahili is the near-exclusive language they use with their children. Interestingly, these parents downplay their agency as Maa language teachers for their children by saying that the children do not want to learn Maa (Bibi Joyce and Mama Daudi) and that the children spend so much time at school that they do not have a chance to teach them Maa (Mama Priscilla and Bibi Joyce). Thus, while the parents describe in principle a division of labour in language teaching, in practice their part of the labour – the teaching of Maa – is not happening.

As Maa is a language of home and should not penetrate into the school domain, similarly English is a language of school and should not be brought into the home. This is seen in Mama Priscilla’s story of her child asking her why she was speaking “school language (lugha ya kishule)” when she said something in English at home. This finding aligns with Rugemalira’s observation that speaking English outside of school is perceived as “inappropriate, disrespectful, or just funny,” and for it being socially unacceptable to use English outside the classroom, including in
correspondence with parents (Rugemalira, 2006, pp. 106-7). These findings, showing expectations that Maa be confined to the domain of home and English be confined to the domain of school, point to how separate the linguistic worlds of home and school are, and how this separation is endorsed by the parents.

Amidst this separation of linguistic worlds, it is important to note that Swahili alone is able to transverse these disparate domains, being viewed by the parents as an appropriate language to use both at home and at school.

**English is Important – so we Need English-Medium**

As is to be expected, the EMP parents place extremely high value on the importance of English. Similar to Qorro’s (2005) findings, these EMP parents want English-medium for their children in order to enable them to access employment opportunities, including internationally. Similar to Babaci-Wilhite’s (2010) findings, these EMP parents believe that using English as the LOI results in better learning and life opportunities. Importantly, while these parents express the importance of their children learning English, they speak specifically about the importance of English-**medium**, rather than only English ability, as helping their children to access these opportunities.

While the learning of English is central to these parents’ decision to send their children to Shining Star Academy, there are numerous other factors which influence their choice of school. In particular, Mama Priscilla and Mama Daudi speak of the quality of teaching, religious ethics, individual attention, and superior learning resources and environment as factors which draw them to Shining Star Academy, in addition to the use of English. This finding differs from Rubagumya’s 2010 study, in which he finds that the opportunity for their children to learn English is the dominant – if not exclusive – motivation for parents to send their children to EMP schools, with negligible attention to other aspects of quality.

The EMP parents, in discussing their choice of an EMP school, also make unfavourable comparisons between EMP and SMG schools, similar to those made by the parent participants in John’s 2010 study. Like in John (2010), the EMP parents characterize SMG schools as having unmotivated teachers and poor English. The findings of this study also extend those of John (2010), by showing that parents also believe EMP schools offer better treatment of children,
improved cleanliness, more strictness on issues of punctuality, and better communication with parents.

**Maa, Identity, and Cultural Change**

For the EMP parents, particularly Bibi Joyce and Mama Daudi, Maa has an important place in their personal identities and sense of group membership. In addition, they have a strong sense of ownership over the language, saying things like it is “my language (lugha yangu),” “we were born with it (tulizaliwa nayo),” and it is “the language of our tribe (lugha ya kwetu).” There is a sense of group affiliation when speaking Maa with Maasai outside of Maasai Land, and these parents claim they just feel better when speaking Maa versus Swahili.

However, as central as Maa is to these parents’ identities and sense of group membership, they acknowledge that Maa is peripheral to their grand/children’s lives. They admit that their grand/children do not like Maa very much and are generally uninterested in learning it. These generational differences speak to significant cultural and linguistic change resulting from the mixing of different ethnic communities, to the extent that it is now difficult to recognize what culture a person is from, since people are now moving towards more of a mainstream culture (according to Mama Priscilla). Indeed, the institution of schooling has played an important role in distancing these families from the Maasai language and culture, through eroding opportunities for children to spend time at home with their (grand)parents, and placing higher value on that which can be learned through books.

**Language Education at Shining Star Academy**

This section presents findings from the school observations at Shining Star Academy, an English-medium private school in Monduli. This section begins with an introduction to the school itself, before presenting findings of language use at the school. Language use and classroom dynamics of English-medium classes are explored, including the role of Swahili in English-medium classes, before the contrasting patterns of language use and classroom dynamics of Swahili classes are examined. This section then examines language patterns in written texts
throughout the school, before discussing teachers’ discourses about language learning and the pupils’ parents.

**Introducing Shining Star Academy**

Spacious and well-endowed with resources, Shining Star Academy has an air of orderliness and discipline. The school itself is comprised of six brick classrooms and an office block which outline the central courtyard where the school parades (morning assemblies) take place. Just outside of this square of classrooms is a playground, featuring grass and play equipment, which fills with joyful shouts and laughter as children play at break times.

Inside each of the spacious classrooms, one finds neatly arranged rows of desks, a table and chair for the teacher, and a beautiful cabinet for storing books and other materials. The walls are decorated with imported wallcharts and pictures displaying images of white children and babies, depicting cultures far removed from these children’s own experiences. When the children are in class, they comfortably sit no more than two per desk, with ample space remaining beyond and between the desks where movement activities could easily be conducted. Each pupil has their own textbook and notebook for each subject, which they carry in knapsacks which they hang on the backs of their chairs. Class sizes are small, with only 20-30 pupils per class. The pupils are notably younger for their grade level than at Mti Mmoja, with some of the pre-primary pupils toddling in at barely three years of age. All pupils look smart in their beautiful uniforms, with barely any rip or sign of wear and tear anywhere to be seen.

Shining Star Academy is still relatively small, with some 100 pupils and eight teachers. The teachers, with the exception of the headmistress, all appear to be in their 20’s, and have all studied in private colleges which specifically prepare English-medium teachers. This school is relatively young and still growing, adding one class per year (they have reached Class 4) and building more classrooms with the assistance of foreign sponsors. Pupils come from a variety of ethnic backgrounds, and teachers tell me that virtually all of them speak Swahili, and not their ethnic languages, at home. Many of their parents are relatively well-educated and work in a variety of professions around Monduli. Most children are transported to and from school in cars and motorcycles, hired by the parents to help their children transverse the long distances many of them have to travel to school each day.
Language Use at Shining Star Academy

Throughout my observations at Shining Star Academy, both English and Swahili played important roles in the life of the school, although in different ways. Apart from Swahili class, English was the dominant language of formal classroom interactions, including teaching, teacher-pupil interactions, and all reading and writing. Swahili was occasionally used in the English-medium classroom, in instances of code-switching, in explanations, and in minor questions and phrases. Pupil-pupil interactions within the classroom were a combination of English and Swahili. Outside of the classroom, however, the dominant language was Swahili, including most pupil-pupil interactions (and all extended pupil-pupil interactions), many teacher-pupil interactions, and most teacher-teacher interactions. Swahili classes were dominated by Swahili use, although habituated English words and phrases (e.g., ‘Yes,’ ‘Another one,’ ‘May I please go to the toilet?’) were commonly used by both pupils and teachers. Apart from class work from Swahili periods, virtually all written work throughout the school was in English. There was no instance of any language other than English and Swahili being heard or seen anywhere at this school at any time during my observations.

English-medium Classes: Language Use and Dynamics

The English-medium periods at Shining Star Academy, including both English language periods and subject lessons taught in English, featured a very strong emphasis on the written word, and a
mechanical, almost scripted use of oral language, particularly through the repetitive use of memorized words and phrases. However, there were also some important instances of original full-sentence language use in English, including by the pupils. The lessons at Shining Star were dominated by the textbook, with a similar structure to each lesson stemming from this textbook dependency. The structure featured three parts (although the first part was often omitted): the teacher teaching a short lesson, often directly from the textbook; full class textbook reading and/or orally doing exercises from the textbook; and individually doing textbook exercises with the teacher going around the classroom to mark.

Pupil participation was frequent throughout the English-medium periods, and mostly consisted of giving answers to teachers’ prescriptive questions. In general, the teachers demonstrated fairly high proficiency with the English language, although their speech varied from more standard forms of English in a number of respects and also included literal translations of Swahili phrases/sentences. Pupils demonstrated enough English proficiency to occasionally produce original English sentences, although the privileging of the written word meant that opportunities for oral work were limited, making it difficult to accurately assess pupils’ oral English abilities. The following description of a Class 2 English period illustrates common features of English-medium periods at Shining Star Academy.

As the teacher walks into the classroom, the pupils stand up and chant in chorus, “Good morning Teacher.” The teacher, unconvinced that they said their greeting properly, makes them repeat it. As they sit down, a pupil quips, “Samweli is bothering!” The teacher responds to the minor conflict by saying, “Samweli stop that. You Samweli what are you doing? Look forward.”

The teacher then dives into the lesson. “Open your books to page 18. What does it say?” The pupils, all of whom have an individual copy of the Class 2 English textbook, read the title of the chapter in chorus, “Naming and identifying.” The teacher then asks them, “Okay, what is naming and identifying things in Swahili?” After some effort, a pupil gives the answer the teacher is seeking: “Kutaja na kutofautisha vitu (To name and distinguish things).”

The teacher looks for a pupil to read from page 18. “Okay, one to read. Edward.” Edward then proceeds to confidently read, “What is this?” The teacher repeats what the pupil has successfully read, before asking individual pupils to name one of the objects they see in the picture. After
each pupil’s response, she asks for another pupil to volunteer to name a different object by saying, “What again?” (“What again?” is a direct translation of the Swahili question ‘Nini tena?’ meaning ‘What else?’) After the pupils read in chorus a list of common objects, the teacher asks, “By mentioning things, you are doing what?,” to which a pupil responds, “Naming.”

The next page requires the pupils to name and distinguish between fruits. “Is the mango resemble to orange [sic]?” the teacher asks. “They are all fruits, but are they all the same?” The pupils clearly do not understand, and some mutter “Yes” and others mutter “No.” The teacher repeats the question and offers some explanation, all in English, after which a few pupils respond with the correct answer, “No.” It is unclear whether more than a few pupils have understood.

After more naming and identifying of the textbook’s pictures, including chorus reading, the teacher says, “Open to page 20. Who can name from number one?” A pupil reads, filling in the name of the object in the picture: “What is this? This is a table.” The teacher’s only response to this correct answer is, “Okay, number two. Who can name number two?” The lesson continues with reiterations of this same process until all of the textbook’s examples are finished. The teacher asks, “Who did not understood [sic]?” Not getting any response from the class, she asks the same question in Swahili: “Nani hajaelewa? Mm?” Still getting no response, she asks, “Mmeelwa wote? (Have you all understood?),” to which the class responds with an enthusiastic “Yes!!” Satisfied, the teacher says, “Okay take your exercise book. We do exercise B.”

The rest of the period is consumed by pupils working quietly on the textbook exercise, with the teacher occasionally making comments to the whole class, such as, “Hey, I don’t want to see capital letter in the middle of the line. Middle of the sentence. Sawa? (Okay?)” One by one, the pupils begin calling out, “I am finish,” “Teacher finish,” or “Teacher, am finish.” The teacher responds to each of these pupils with comments like, “You are finish [sic]. Are you sure?” “Okay am coming to mark,” and “Am coming. You just raise up your hand.” The pupils often whisper amongst themselves, seemingly in Swahili, and the teacher often interrupts these interactions with, “Keep quiet!”, or “I don’t want to hear noise,” or “I don’t want to see movement.” At one point, a pupil at the door asks loudly, “Please teacher may I come in?” This ritualized expression, repeated by pupils in all classes any time they want to enter the class in the middle of a period, is the only question asked by a pupil throughout this full period. The teacher, whose speech acts are
dominated by questions (alongside instructions), has gone through the full period without asking a single question that is not in reference to the textbook. The lesson ends uneventfully, as the bell rings and the teacher exits without comment.

This Class 2 English period demonstrates some common characteristics of English-medium periods at Shining Star Academy, including the full period being driven by the textbook, an orientation towards the written word, minimal opportunities for original contributions, and the use of scripted phrases (such as ‘___ is bothering,’ ‘Keep quiet,’ ‘Please teacher may I come in?’, and ‘I am finish’). It is important to note that in a lesson with as practical applications as naming everyday objects, no attempt was made to relate the lesson to real objects nor to ask each other the key questions (e.g., ‘What is this?’) beyond the scope of the textbook.

This strict dependency on the textbook was characteristic of every single English-medium period observed (three English language periods and five subject periods in English). Indeed, the textbooks seemed to be more responsible for steering the lessons and directing learning than the teachers themselves. In two instances, after reading from the textbook as a full class, the teacher accidentally assigned the class to do textbook exercises which they had already completed. When this happened in a Class 4 English period, a pupil intervened by saying, “We read [present tense] yesterday, it is this.” When this happened in a Class 3 Science period, a pupil unhesitatingly contributed, “We already did.” These incidents demonstrate how the use of the textbook has in some cases become so mechanical that it has replaced teacher initiative in directing the pupils’ learning. On another level, these pupil interventions and how they were made with confidence in full English sentences, demonstrate pupils’ agency to intervene to the extent of correcting the teacher through the medium of English.

In addition to these two pupils’ English interventions to correct their teachers, there were other instances of pupils making full-sentence English interventions which were not prompted by the teacher. These interventions included tattling on other pupils, offering explanations, asking questions about content, and asking questions about an exercise. Some examples are given here:

In a Class 4 English period on occupations, where, in reference to their textbooks, the pupils were naming as many occupations as they could, a pupil asked, “Teacher, a porter is a work?” The pupil had seen the word ‘porter’ in the textbook and wanted to know if it is also an
occupation. While the teacher did not initially seem familiar with this word, when the pupil showed her where he found it in the textbook, she agreed that porter is an occupation, and they discussed its meaning (not quite correctly) in Swahili.

Other examples of pupil interventions are as follows:

P: “Teacher, I don’t understand.” (Class 4 English)

P: “Teacher, this one is beating me with a pen.” (Class 4 English)

P: “Teacher, some people have to do that.” (In defence of pupils’ dependency on multiplication tables which the teacher had just criticized.) (Class 4 Mathematics)

P: “Teacher, that is how we write the answer?” (Class 4 Mathematics)

P: “Did somebody take my pen?” (This was followed by a discussion amongst a group of pupils, entirely in English, about where the pen might be.) (Class 4 English)

P: “Teacher, they are sharing answers.” (Class 4 English)

All of these interventions, including their frequency, are notable for the confidence with which they were made, for being entirely in English, and for being initiated entirely by the pupils themselves. These sentences are not scripted or habituated uses of English, but rather represent pupils’ independent formulation of original English sentences. Indeed, such pupil interventions demonstrate a certain agency and assertiveness of these Shining Star pupils, including when they are speaking English.

Use of Swahili in English-medium Classes

While there was no English-medium period that was completely free of Swahili, in most of the periods observed the Swahili use was quite minimal. For instance, in the Class 2 English period described above, the only seemingly functional use of Swahili, other than whispered pupil-pupil interactions, was the translation of the main topic of the day (‘naming and identifying’) into Swahili. Other than this, Swahili was only used in the two questions asking if the pupils understood, and the word sawa meaning ‘okay.’ Swahili did not seem to have an important role in assisting with understanding in these latter two instances, as it is unlikely that the pupils would not have easily understood the English versions of these phrases.
Beyond this Class 2 English period, Swahili was used in instances of code-switching and in offering explanations of English content. One Class 4 Mathematics period provided more instances of code-switching than most other periods, and this code-switching was almost exclusively done by the teacher (note that the teacher did more speaking than all of the pupils combined, so his opportunities for code-switching were also greater). For example, in explaining about vertical multiplication, the teacher said, “You take ngapi ngapi mara ngapi ngapi (You take however many times however many).” In this instance of code-switching, while it is unlikely the pupils would not have understood a fully English version of this statement, the use of Swahili seemed to make the content more accessible to the pupils and also seemed more natural for the teacher to say. In this same Class 4 Mathematics period, the teacher stated the answer to a word problem on the cost of milk in this way: “So twenty-three litres itakuwa four thousand, nine hundred forty-five. Ndio cost yake. (So 23 litres will be 4,945. This is its cost.)” Like in the previous example, while this instance of code-switching does not use Swahili to express anything that would have likely been beyond the grasp of these pupils’ English ability, this code-switching seemed to make the content more accessible and felt like a natural way of expressing the content for this teacher. Notably, this period, which featured the most code-switching, also had the poorest use of English on the part of the teacher, with basic errors being made frequently. It is possible that for this particular teacher, code-switching was at least as much for his own comfort as for the benefit of the pupils’ understanding.

In a Class 4 Geography period, Swahili was used extensively in the teacher’s explanations of concepts. After a review of key concepts from previous periods (involving the teacher looking for memorized definitions of ‘forest’ and ‘cultivated forest’ – the pupils’ attempts to explain based on their understanding were dismissed as incorrect), most of the period involved the teacher reading aloud a text about woodlands, as the pupils followed along in their textbooks. The teacher would pause every sentence or two to offer explanations in Swahili, including the use of code-switching in which key words for the topic would be English, but the sentence structure and majority of the words would be in Swahili. Examples of the teacher’s use of code-switching are as follows:

T: “Kuna wanyama kama baboons and other animals. (There are animals like baboons and other animals.)”
T: “Ni sehemu ambaye ime-covered by bushes. (It is a place which is covered by bushes.)”

T: “Tumesema Central ni sehemu kama Dodoma. (We have said that Central includes places like Dodoma.)”

A typical teaching strategy used in this Class 4 Geography period and throughout Shining Star was where the teacher would read a sentence to the pupils then would repeat the sentence, leaving the last word out for the pupils to say together in chorus. Interestingly, this strategy was also employed using code-switching in this Class 4 Geography period, whereby the second time through the sentence (which had first been read in English), the teacher would translate the first part into Swahili with the last part (including the pupils’ one-word contribution) remaining in English. For example:

T: “Ni sehemu ambazo zina-receive little rainfall during the… (They are places which receive little rainfall during the…”

P’s: Year!

While the Swahili explanations likely helped the children to understand the concepts more readily than the exclusive use of English would have, the Swahili explanations hardly deviated from or expanded on the English text provided in the textbook. There were no pupil contributions (beyond the single-word completions of the teacher’s sentences), no making of connections to knowledge or experiences that the pupils might already have, and no making of connections to any other material already covered in this class. Even when the teacher read to the pupils about Maasai grasslands in Northern Tanzania (the context in which the school is located and where the pupils live), no reference was made to the local environment and no effort was made to connect the textbook learning to the pupils’ already extensive knowledge of this kind of environment. Thus, while the use of Swahili likely contributed to the pupils’ understanding of the textbook learning, the use of Swahili did not change the pedagogy, nor did it contribute to the pupils’ level of participation or depth of engagement with the subject matter. The pedagogy remained textbook-driven, mechanical, and divorced from the pupils’ lives or experiential understanding.

While oral language use in English-medium classes involved some code-switching and occasional Swahili phrases and explanations, written texts were strictly English only. This
applied to the teacher’s writing, the pupils’ writing, printed texts, and texts taped to the walls. There was, however, one exception to this strict separation of languages in written form. In two pupils’ Class 4 English notebooks, I observed that the pupils had written (in a period before I began my observations) a list of seven English parts of speech, and had written the Swahili equivalents beside them. This suggests that a deliberate attempt had been made, most likely by the teacher, to use the more familiar language as a resource in helping to understand the less familiar language.

**Swahili Classes: Language Use and Dynamics**

Swahili classes at Shining Star Academy, while involving extensive textbook use, were often less textbook-driven than the English-medium classes (although some Swahili periods were also very textbook-driven). Swahili classes tended to be more participatory than the English-medium classes, including more original (versus prescribed) contributions offered by the pupils. All Swahili classes involved some amount of English use by both teachers and pupils, particularly ritualized words and phrases (such as ‘Yes,’ ‘Another one,’ and ‘Please may I go to the toilet?’). Occasionally some full sentence, non-scripted English contributions were also made by both teachers and pupils. Throughout the five Swahili periods observed, there was only one teacher (in both Class 4 Swahili periods observed) who made any attempt at patrolling the use of language (i.e., that only Swahili was to be used), and this teacher herself frequently used English in the Swahili periods. The following description of a Class 4 Swahili period demonstrates common characteristics of Swahili periods at Shining Star Academy.

As the teacher walks into the classroom, the pupils stand up and the pupils and teacher exchange their ritualized greetings (pupils in chorus) before the teacher tells the pupils to sit down (‘*Kaeni.*’). The teacher asks the pupils, ‘*Tulisoma nini kipindi kilichopita?*’ (What did we study in the previous period?),” and a highly participatory account of the previous period ensues. This review is teacher-centred in the sense that the teacher asks specific questions to which the pupils respond, but the pupils’ responses often involve full sentence answers, which they comfortably and confidently give.

When the teacher is satisfied that they have remembered the previous lesson, she begins to introduce the new topic by turning to the blackboard and writing KISWAHILI and the date,
followed by the title of the lesson which she copies from the textbook. Based on an instruction she reads from the textbook, she instructs the pupils (in Swahili) to discuss with their friends what HIV/AIDS is. The pupils briefly discuss with each other, then raise their hands ready to offer answers, as the teacher copies three questions from the textbook onto the blackboard. As the teacher leads a discussion of what HIV/AIDS is, and of the activities which can and cannot transmit HIV, the pupils are all very keen to participate and generally offer correct and well-stated responses in Swahili. “Teacher!” they shout with a hand in the air when they want to answer. One pupil mixes English into his Swahili answer when he says, “Ku-share mswaki (To share a toothbrush),” to which the teacher responds, “Ku-share ni kufanyaje? (To share is to do what?).” The full class offers a suitable Swahili substitute for ‘share.’

Later in the lesson, the teacher, based on the textbook, asks the pupils to compose sentences using particular phrases, saying “Dash dash” wherever there is a blank that she wants the pupils to fill in. In offering an original sentence using one of the given phrases, a pupil says, “Juzi alienda kwa doctor akapima joto (Two days ago she went to the doctor and her temperature was taken).” Throughout this exercise, the pupils create interesting and well-formed Swahili sentences, and are visibly engaged in this oral exercise.

The teacher asks the pupils to take out their textbooks, and proceeds to read a passage to the pupils as they follow along in their personal copies of their textbooks. She then asks them to read the same passage aloud together. She asks them questions about the passage and about what we should not do so as to avoid getting HIV, and the pupils participate in a lively manner. They seem to be comfortable, and are eager to offer all sorts of contributions beyond the scope of the textbook. Throughout, the teacher regularly asks the pupils, “Tumeelewana? (Have we understood each other?)” and “Mmeelewa? (Have you understood?),” to which the pupils always respond, “Yes!” In making an explanation, the teacher says, “It means kwamba…(It means that…).”

The teacher asks the pupils to take out their notebooks, and they dutifully work on the questions from the textbook until the end of the period. At one point, a pupil who wants to re-enter the classroom after momentarily going out, asks, “Please teacher may I come in?,,” to which the teacher responds, “Ndio” (Yes).” After the pupil enters, the teacher says, “Unasema, ‘Please
teacher may I come in.’ *Siyo Kiswahili.* (You say, ‘Please teacher may I come in.’ It is not Swahili.)” The pupil corrects himself by repeating his question in Swahili.

Throughout this period, both the teacher and the pupils occasionally mix English into their Swahili. On two occasions in this period, the teacher makes an effort to ‘correct’ the English use, firstly by asking the full class how to say ‘share’ in Swahili, then by requesting a pupil to repeat his habituated English request in Swahili. This period demonstrates more engaged pupil participation than the English-medium periods, including more pupil-generated ideas which are not directly derived from the text nor prescribed by the teacher’s questions. While this period is for the most part textbook-driven, the pupils do not take out their own textbooks until towards the end of the period, granting them greater freedom to generate their own contributions based on their previous knowledge.

The only two periods I observed at Shining Star Academy which involved any amount of time not directed by the textbook were both Swahili periods. The first was a Class 3 Swahili lesson on Swahili proverbs. The teacher had the pupils play a game in which the pupils were divided into three teams. One team gave the beginning of a proverb, for which another team was required to provide the ending. This was a fun and engaging way of reviewing proverbs, and it gave the pupils an opportunity to bring in proverbs which they knew from outside of their classroom learning. While this game offered a rare departure from the textbook-based learning at Shining Star, it must also be noted that this period began with the teacher saying, “*Fungua ukurasa 37* (Open to page 37)” and some textbook-driven discussion of proverbs, and ended with the pupils doing textbook exercises individually at their desks.

The other period not dominated by textbook learning was a Class 1 Swahili lesson on self-introductions. In this period, the pupils took turns going to the front of the class to introduce themselves. The teacher had written Swahili prompts on the board, such as ‘My name is…’ ‘I am ___ years old’ ‘I study at ___ school’ and ‘My father is called….’ While the pupils for the most part completely ignored what was written on the board, these self-introductions were fairly successful, with the teacher helping the pupils out by asking them directed questions when they got stuck. The pupils demonstrated that they were not simply following a memorized script by saying things in a variety of ways, and by inserting different details about themselves which were
not called for in the given questions. This period offered the pupils a rare opportunity to generate original contributions and to express something about themselves, even if only on a very factual level. Judging from the English language use I heard from these Class 1 pupils, it is highly unlikely that such an exercise in English would have produced such coherent self-introductions, and certainly not of the variety that was possible in the familiar language of Swahili.

Like in the English-medium classes, unprompted pupil interventions in the Swahili classes at Shining Star Academy were relatively common. Pupil interventions observed in the Swahili classes include correcting the teacher, tattling, and asking a question. Significantly, three out of five of the pupil interventions observed over the course of five Swahili periods were actually made in English. Each of the two Swahili interventions were correcting the teacher. In a Class 4 Swahili period, the teacher had made a simple spelling error on a vocabulary item she wrote on the blackboard. After a long oral discussion of the vocabulary item, a pupil pointed out the teacher’s mistake by saying, “Teacher, umeandika vibaya wasia (Teacher, you have written wasia badly).” In the Class 3 Swahili period involving the proverb game, a pupil, speaking Swahili (besides the word ‘Teacher’), corrected the teacher’s allocation of points to the different teams. All three of the English language pupil interventions in Swahili periods occurred in the Class 3 proverb lesson. One pupil responded to the pupil questioning the teacher’s allocation of points by saying, “No, you gave them two [points].” Later in the period, a pupil tattled on a classmate by saying, “Teacher, this one gives the answer [pronounced ‘answa’].” The final pupil intervention was a question about what the pupils were expected to do: “Teacher, we write?”

These interventions, like the interventions made during English-medium periods, demonstrate a certain amount of agency and initiative on the part of the pupils. However, it is remarkable that in a Swahili class where the expectation is for Swahili, the more familiar language, to be used, pupils would use English, the less familiar language, in interventions requiring original language use.

Beyond these pupil interventions, the use of English in habituated words and phrases was common in all Swahili periods. The words ‘yes,’ ‘no,’ and ‘teacher’ were constantly used in all Swahili periods observed. The Swahili equivalents of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ were never used by the pupils and rarely used by the Swahili teachers. The Swahili equivalent of ‘teacher’ was only
heard once, and that was a self-correction by a pupil (who had initially said ‘teacher’) in a Class 4 Swahili period where the teacher had already reprimanded one student for using English. Other common English words/phrases used by teachers include, “Another one” and “Good!” In a Class 1 Swahili class, when the teacher asked the pupils to clap for a classmate (“Mpigieni makofi”), they recited in chorus, “Well done, well done, try again another day, a very good girl!” Apart from the Class 4 Swahili teacher’s encouragement of pupils to use Swahili in Swahili class, there was no attempt by any of the other teachers to monitor language use in their Swahili classes.

**Written Texts**

All written texts visible around the school were in English. These included wallcharts, class timetables, class mottos, Bible verses and calendars. The wallcharts (as well as some pictures on the walls of some of the classrooms) were clearly imported and were notable for their distinctive cultural irrelevance. For example, in Class 1, there was an ‘action words’ wallchart with words such as bathing, skating and combing, all of which were accompanied by white children performing these actions in a very different context from the realities in which these Tanzanian children live. There was a fruit chart with pictures and names of all kinds of fruit, only a few of which are familiar in Tanzania. Two alphabet charts were on the walls, with a picture accompanying each letter, many of which were of foreign items which would be unfamiliar to these children in any language. In Class 2, there were complicated charts of Diphthongs, Long Vowel Diagrams, Beginning Diagrams, Ending Diagrams, Beginning Blends, Sight Words, and a chart of The Human Body labelling a white child’s body in incredibly advanced detail. I never once saw any of these wallcharts used (the one exception being a simple homemade times tables chart which had no text besides the numbers), and indeed the very nature of these wallcharts made them seem more for show than for learning.

During my observations, I spent some time studying the Swahili and English notebooks of Class 4 and Class 1 pupils. I observed the Class 4 Swahili notebooks to have many spelling errors, errors which seem to stem from writing familiar words according to how they are pronounced based on English phonics. The Swahili errors seem to be those of Swahili speakers who have not been adequately exposed to the conventions of writing the language which they proficiently speak. Grammar errors were not common. The pupils seem to have been given slightly more opportunity for composing original sentences, including a short composition, in their Swahili
notebooks than their English ones, although dry grammar exercises were also common in the Swahili notebooks.

The Class 4 English notebooks were even fuller of mistakes, both grammatical and spelling. Many of the mistakes were very significant. Some had been corrected by the teacher, but the majority had not been, including many which had been given a check mark despite significant errors. Occasionally, a teacher had ‘corrected’ a correct answer by crossing out the pupil’s work and replacing it with an incorrect answer (for example, changing “fifty past three” to “three past fifty” in naming the time 3:50). In contrast to the Swahili errors, most of the English errors were not logical, seeming to stem from an unfamiliarity with the language. With a few exceptions, such as answering comprehension questions and composing five original sentences using the phrase ‘same as,’ almost all of the work in the English notebooks consisted of mechanical grammar exercises.

**Teachers’ Discourses**

The teachers at Shining Star Academy were much less vocal about language issues and about their pupils’ parents than their counterparts at Mti Mmoja. When they did speak about the pupils’ language learning and about their parents, their comments were generally positive and encouraging.

With regards to using the unfamiliar language of English as the language of instruction, teachers were generally patient with the pupils’ gradual progress in learning English. They acknowledged that English is difficult for the pupils because they speak Swahili at home, and spoke of how Swahili can be used to help the children to understand while they are still learning English. “Bado hawajui (They do not yet know [English]),” several teachers said, especially of the younger children, as an explanation for why they should use some Swahili to support the children’s learning. They were generally patient with the children’s imperfect English, not expecting them to master English immediately and not seeing a problem in using a language of instruction which is different from the home language.

In supporting the transition to English-medium from home environments which are predominantly Swahili, the headmistress explained to me how in the earlier classes, particularly pre-primary and Class 1, they use mostly Swahili, increasing the use of English in Classes 2-4.
Indeed, on my first day at Shining Star, she was categorical that they use two languages at this school: Swahili and English. However, during later visits both the headmistress and another teacher told me that the pupils try hard to speak English everywhere in the school compound because they do not want to be forced to wear a gunny sack. The headmistress explained that whichever pupil is wearing the gunny sack must catch another pupil speaking Swahili in order to pass the gunny sack on and be relinquished of the embarrassment of this punishment. She explicitly stated that this gunny sack punishment is to make the child feel shame for speaking Swahili, in order for them to learn English.

Thus, it seems that the school’s policy is somewhat ambivalent about the use of Swahili. The fact that all of these teachers, including the headmistress, frequently used Swahili with the pupils, particularly outside of lesson time, demonstrates that if indeed there is an English-only language policy on the school compound, it is not strictly enforced. The way the teachers spoke about language learning and how Swahili can help the pupils understand, and the way they used Swahili in many of their out-of-class interactions with the pupils, demonstrate their support for the use of Swahili as a resource in the children’s learning.

With regards to the pupils’ parents, teachers generally spoke of them as supportive, cooperative, and engaged with their children’s education. One teacher described how when something is requested of the parents, they willingly respond. This teacher gave the example of buying textbooks for their children. When they closed the school at the end of the year, they asked parents to come to the school to purchase the textbooks for their children for the upcoming year. The parents complied without a problem. “Wazazi si usumbufu (Parents are not bothersome),” this teacher told me.

The headmistress characterized the parents as very demanding. For example, the parents wanted the school day to be extended to include ‘tuition’ classes after the regular classes are finished, which the headmistress did not approve of, believing it would be too much for the children. The parents also wanted a school bus, she said, which was beyond what the school was equipped to provide. Some parents were even requesting an option of boarding at the school, which the headmistress was completely against because of her belief that young children need to be with their parents until the age of 15.
These examples of teachers’ discourses demonstrate how Shining Star Academy teachers generally characterize parents as supportive, cooperative and demanding. They were patient with their pupils’ English language learning trajectories, and saw the pupils’ and their parents’ unfamiliarity with the LOI as natural and unproblematic, as an expected challenge in the process of learning.

**Discussion: Comparing Parental Perspectives with School Realities**

**English and Swahili Learning**

The EMP parents were clear that the learning of English was a top priority for their children’s schooling. At the same time, they expressed an expectation that Swahili have some place in schooling, as an aid in the learning of English in the initial years, and even to be used simultaneously with English throughout schooling to ensure that both languages are developed (so that “they will understand all sides (wataelewa pande zote)” - Bibi Joyce). The observations at Shining Star Academy showed that Swahili does indeed have a place in the children’s schooling, but more as a resource in the learning of English and English-medium content (especially in the earlier years) than as a language to be used and developed alongside English throughout schooling.

The dynamics and language use in English-medium classes at Shining Star Academy bore strong resemblance to dynamics of English-medium classes observed in several other English-medium classes in Tanzanian primary and secondary schools (Rubagumya, 2010; Mwinsheikhe, 2008; Mpemba, 2006; Vuzo, 2008; Vuzo, 2005). Most notably, safe talk featured prominently in all of the English-medium classes at Shining Star Academy, whereby both teachers and pupils would use scripted phrases, prescriptive questions and responses, and language relying significantly on the textbooks in most of their classroom English use. Similarly, Rubagumya (2010), Mpemba (2006) and Mwinsheikhe (2008) all find safe talk to be a common coping strategy when pupils and teachers are forced to use English as the LOI when they are not adequately familiar with the language. However, at Shining Star Academy, there were some notable exceptions to the use of safe talk as a coping strategy, as seen through the pupil interventions described above, featuring original language use unprompted by the teacher.
Like Rubagumya (2010) observed in his study of ten EMP schools, Shining Star had an English-only policy which included punishments intended to shame pupils who spoke Swahili at school. However, at Shining Star there was an ambivalence surrounding this policy, and, like in Rubagumya (2010), the impracticability of limiting communication to English was demonstrated in the use of code-switching in classrooms and the frequent use of Swahili (for both teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interactions) outside of the classrooms. That said, it does appear that the general English proficiency of pupils at Shining Star was higher than that in the EMP schools studied in both Rubagumya (2010) and John (2010), as most English-medium classes did not rely heavily on Swahili for the flow of the class.

Code-switching, used more in the English-medium subject lessons at Shining Star than in the English lessons themselves, was a consistent feature in the English-medium lessons in Vuzo (2005), Mwinsheikhe (2008), Mpemba (2006), and Rubagumya (2010). In this way, the findings from Shining Star are consistent with previous studies of Tanzanian English-medium classes – although at Shining Star the reliance on code-switching was less than in the aforementioned studies, including the three studies of secondary school classrooms (Vuzo, 2005; Mwinsheikhe, 2008; and Mpemba, 2006).

Translation was another coping strategy which Mpemba (2006) found to be commonly used in English-medium classrooms which was also used, although not extensively, in Shining Star’s English-medium lessons. The use of cramming and memorization of definitions, additional coping strategies observed in both Mpemba (2006) and Mwinsheikhe (2008), factored into Shining Star’s English-medium lessons, as observed in the reliance on memorized definitions and pupils’ unsuccessful attempts to explain concepts when departing from these memorized scripts (as evidenced in Class 4 English and Class 4 Geography examples described above).

The use of mnemonics (Mpemba, 2006), English teaching in English-medium subject lessons (e.g., defining terms, pronunciation drills, correcting spelling) (Mwinsheikhe, 2008), and punishment (Mwinsheikhe, 2008) were coping strategies observed in other studies which were not observed at Shining Star Academy.

Whatever the coping strategies employed by both teachers and pupils in order to make the best of using an unfamiliar LOI, and whatever pedagogical constraints are caused by the unfamiliar LOI,
it does seem that the pupils are generally learning English. Their oral and written English abilities are evidenced by their interventions featuring original English use (particularly in Class 4, the highest class at this school), and their general ability to respond to the teachers’ prescriptive questions and to complete the textbook tasks. In this way, the school realities do seem to generally align with the parents’ clearly articulated expectations that their children learn English.

The Swahili lessons at Shining Star, when compared with their English-medium counterparts, tended to feature more lively, engaged pupil participation, more original contributions beyond the scope of the textbook, and increased comfort and confidence on the part of the pupils. These findings align with the findings of Mwinsheikhe (2008), in which Swahili-medium periods (when compared with English-medium with the same students) featured greater eagerness and confidence in student participation, a more relaxed atmosphere, and increased and richer interaction. While Vuzo (2012) finds that student-centered approaches are used significantly more in Swahili-medium periods than in English-medium periods at EMP schools, findings from Shining Star show that student-centered approaches (such as games, opportunities for more pupil-driven language use) were used only marginally more in Swahili-medium periods. While the pedagogical differences between Swahili-medium and English-medium periods at Shining Star were present but undramatic, the biggest difference found in the Swahili periods was that pupils offered more original contributions which were not prescribed by the teacher and which deviated from or expanded upon the textbook.

**Division of Labour and Use of an Unfamiliar LOI**

The EMP parents expressed an expectation of a division of labour in the language education of their children: the parents/families are to teach the children Maa, and the teachers are to teach the children English. The EMP parents were adamant that Maa should have no place at school, and, while they stated that Maa should be taught at home, the reality is that they use Swahili almost exclusively with their children. Swahili thus becomes a language which can be used and taught in both the home and school domains. The parental expectation that Maa is taught at home and English taught at school was aligned with the teachers’ expectation that teaching English is the sole responsibility of the teachers, as they did not expect the parents to have any knowledge of English. The teachers, however, did expect the children to come to school with proficiency in
Swahili, and expressed no interest in whether the children were familiar with their ethnic language(s) - and even expressed the assumption that they exclusively speak Swahili at home. The parents expressed the belief that using a language as the LOI is an effective means of learning the language, and saw no problematic contradiction in using different languages at home and at school. Similarly, the EMP teachers seemed to see it as natural and unproblematic that schooling should be in an unfamiliar LOI, and expressed no frustration that the children come to school without any prior knowledge of English. Thus, with regards to the onus of responsibility for the teaching of respective languages, the expectations of the parents and the teachers are well-aligned.

**The Role of Familiar Languages in Learning Unfamiliar Languages**

The EMP parents clearly articulated the expectation that Swahili be used in their children’s English-medium education, in order to help the children learn English (Mama Priscilla and Mama Daudi) and in order to further develop their Swahili proficiency (Bibi Joyce). Correspondingly, the EMP teachers seemed to articulate and perform a language-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984) to the pupils’ familiar language of Swahili, using Swahili to help the pupils understand English and English-medium content, particularly in the lower classes. Similar to Rubagumya’s (2010) observations, there is officially an English-only policy including shaming punishments, but the policy’s enforcement seems to be minimal. In this way, parents’ expectations for the use of Swahili at the EMP school align with school practice.

**Maasai Language and Culture?**

While the EMP parents to varying degrees expressed the importance of knowing Maa, they unambiguously stated that the role of Maasai language and culture in their lives is changing, with Swahili and English rising in importance. At the EMP school, there was virtually no mention of or practical reference to local languages or cultures, whether Maasai or any other. Indeed, at the EMP school the only visible culture (imported wallcharts aside) was that which Mama Priscilla described as “mainstream culture (tamaduni za kawaida),” the general Tanzanian culture involving the Swahili language, ‘modern’ clothing, and the generally urban lifestyles alluded to through the textbooks and other learning materials. If observing the school alone, one may be inclined to think that the pupils and teachers are all Waswahili, those whose primary linguistic and cultural affiliations are to the Swahili people, without other ethnic and linguistic identities.
The EMP parents’ comments about the children spending so much time at school that they do not have time to teach them Maa, how the parents described the dominance of the written word in their expectations for learning, and the realities of the EMP school, suggest that the institution of school may be playing a substantial role in the erosion of local languages and cultures.
Chapter 7: Cross-Case Comparison and Discussion

This chapter offers a cross-case analysis of the case studies of the Swahili-medium government school and the English-medium private school. Firstly, I present a comparison of the SMG and EMP parents’ perspectives, followed by a comparison of the school realities at each of the two schools. After this, I present some broader discussion of the larger themes that emerge from an examination of all four data sets together. I discuss the findings in relationship to Ruiz’s three orientations to language (Ruiz, 1984) and to Heller and Duchêne’s work on pride and profit, or symbolic and economic values of language (Heller & Duchêne, 2012). I conclude with a discussion of how the findings of this study relate to the political discourses of language as discussed in Chapter 2.

Comparing SMG and EMP Parents’ Perspectives

This section examines the similarities and differences between perspectives of SMG and EMP parents in order to address the first research question: What are parents’ attitudes and expectations for their children’s primary school language education in the semi-rural Maasai community of Monduli, Tanzania?

While there are some notable similarities between the attitudes and expectations of SMG and EMP parents, particularly with regards to their support for multilingualism and multilingual education and their valuations of English as an economically important language, there are also dramatic differences in their perspectives. As many of these differences are related to differences in their backgrounds, I offer a brief comparative overview of their demographic information here.

All parent participants in this study are Maasai, and all have lived in Monduli their entire lives. All speak Maa as their dominant language (although at least one of the EMP parents is about equally dominant in Maa and Swahili), and all speak Swahili to widely varying degrees of proficiency, with the EMP parents generally far stronger in Swahili than their SMG counterparts. Three of four of the SMG parents (all of the mothers) have never been to school, while the EMP parents and the SMG father all have between two and seven years of primary schooling, with one EMP mother and the SMG father also having some post-primary school training. All parents, both SMG and EMP, are involved in the informal economy. All EMP parents and the SMG
father can read and write in Swahili, while the SMG mothers do not read or write in any language. All SMG parents are in polygamous marriages, while all EMP parents are in monogamous marriages. The SMG parents live in traditional Maasai bomas, wear traditional rubega, and live a distance (a few kilometres) from Monduli town, while the EMP parents all live in brick houses, wear ‘modern’ clothes, and (with the exception of Bibi Joyce) live closer to Monduli town.

The following table offers a comparative summary of SMG and EMP parents’ attitudes and expectations towards language education and their perspectives on the three main languages in question.

Table 7.1: Comparing SMG and EMP Parents’ Attitudes and Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>SMG Parents</th>
<th>EMP Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes and expectations towards language education</strong></td>
<td>Most select multiple languages as the ideal LOI’s (i.e., Swahili &amp; English; Maa &amp; English)</td>
<td>Want English as the LOI, in addition to Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maa should not be used at school (although exceptions, including one parent suggesting Maa be an LOI). Maa is not a resource in schooling.</td>
<td>Adamant that Maa should not be used at school. Maa is not a resource in schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Languages should be taught separately (one parent only).</td>
<td>Swahili has a role in English-medium classrooms, especially in the early years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingualism is natural and normal. Schools should be multilingual also.</td>
<td>Multilingualism is natural and normal. Schools should use both Swahili and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using an unfamiliar language as the LOI is an effective way of learning the language.</td>
<td>Using an unfamiliar language as the LOI is an effective way of learning the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A central purpose of schooling is language learning (Swahili and English). Therefore, an unfamiliar language should be used at school.</td>
<td>Learning English is a central purpose of schooling, although other objectives are also articulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focused on importance of developing strong practical, oral language skills.</td>
<td>The relative importance of oral and written language to these parents is unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>SMG Parents</td>
<td>EMP Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes and expectations towards language education</strong></td>
<td>Division of labour: parents teach Maa at home, teachers teach Swahili and English at school.</td>
<td>Division of labour: parents teach Maa at home, teachers teach English at school. Swahili exists in both worlds. But parents admit their use of Maa with their children is negligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Maa</strong></td>
<td>Maa is important for identity, group membership, and sense of ownership. Much pride and symbolic value associated with Maa.</td>
<td>Maa is important for identity, group membership, and sense of ownership – but strong sense that this is changing. Maa has symbolic value for these parents, but they have little expectation it will have much value for their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maa is needed for speaking with people who do not know Swahili.</td>
<td>Maa is beneficial to know to enable secret communication in front of non-Maasai visitors. No mention of any situation where Maa may be the only common language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Swahili</strong></td>
<td>Swahili is important as the national language. Helps us know what is going on in the country.</td>
<td>Swahili is important as the national language. It is our language and a big part of our culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swahili is needed for speaking with people who do not know Maa.</td>
<td>Swahili is essential for inter-ethnic encounters and inter-ethnic families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swahili is important for some job opportunities.</td>
<td>Swahili is important for some job opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of English</strong></td>
<td>English is essential for employment, including in tourism sector and opportunities for self-employment.</td>
<td>English is essential for employment, including in tourism sector and international opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multilingualism, Multilingual Schooling and Appropriate Sites of Language Learning**

The most striking similarity between SMG and EMP parents is their common view of multilingualism as being natural and normal, and their support for various forms of multilingual education. The SMG parents’ selection of multiple languages as ideal media of instruction and the EMP parents’ unambiguous support for using Swahili alongside English in English-medium
schooling demonstrate their interest and expectations that their children’s schooling be multilingual. Both SMG and EMP parents, all of whom are themselves multilingual, view multilingualism as a resource, all of them contest the notion that knowing multiple languages can cause mental confusion, and many of them express interest in their children learning additional languages beyond Maa, Swahili and English, should the opportunity arise.

However, amidst this unequivocal support for multilingualism and multilingual education, all but one of the parents express that they believe that Maa should not play a role in their children’s schooling. Their reasoning varies, however, with SMG parents explaining that their children already know Maa so there is no need for them to learn it in school, and EMP describing how schools are multi-ethnic, and it is therefore impossible to please everyone by including everyone’s home languages.

All parents believe that using an unfamiliar language as the LOI is an effective way of learning that language, as evidenced by all parents choosing unfamiliar (or relatively unfamiliar) languages as the ideal media of instruction. All of them see language learning as a central purpose of education (Swahili and English for SMG parents and English for EMP parents). All parents expect schooling to teach their children that which the children cannot learn from home, resulting in an expectation of a division of labour in language teaching. For the SMG parents, this expectation of a division of labour is that they the parents will teach Maa at home while the schools will take the full responsibility for teaching Swahili and English. For the EMP parents, the expectation is that it is the job of the home to teach children Maa, and the job of the school to teach English, with Swahili existing in both worlds. Significantly, while the EMP parents claim that Maa should be taught at home, the reality is that none of them use much Maa with their children, and that their children’s Maa proficiency is negligible.

**Maa and Linguistic/Cultural Change**

The most striking difference between SMG and EMP parents’ perspectives lies in their attitudes towards Maa. Most parents (and SMG parents most fervently) describe how central Maa is to their identities and membership in the Maasai community, and talk of their sense of ownership over the Maa language. However, the EMP parents speak extensively about how their linguistic and cultural worlds are rapidly changing, and how, while it would be nice for their children to
know Maa, its relevance in their children’s worlds is minimal. This narrative of rapid linguistic and cultural change offers a dramatic contrast to SMG parents’ narratives of the automaticity of Maasai people knowing Maa, and the inevitability of Maa continuing to be in their lives in future generations. While SMG parents describe the imperative of their children knowing Maa because of the many situations in which Maa is the only possible communicative option, EMP parents imagine no such situations, instead illustrating Maa’s importance with examples of how it can be a convenient secret language in front of visitors (who they assume do not know Maa). Their starkly contrasting attitudes towards Maa, its value and relevance, and their imaginations about its usefulness to their children’s lives, suggest that the SMG and EMP parents inhabit dramatically different socio-cultural spheres. This may partially be a result of EMP parents’ greater experience with schooling, their proximity to Monduli town (although not all of them), and their increased experience with inter-ethnic encounters.

Comparing SMG and EMP School Realities
This section examines the similarities and differences between SMG and EMP schools, in order to enable the second research question to be addressed: To what extent are these parental attitudes and expectations aligned with school realities at one Swahili-medium government school and one English-medium private school? As many of the contrasts between the SMG and EMP schools are related to demographic differences in the populations they serve, I begin this section by comparing the demographics of the respective schools.

Certainly, the school fees associated with attending EMP schools such as Shining Star Academy result in the segregation of school-goers based on their economic situations. Therefore, it is not surprising that most parents who send their children to Shining Star Academy are financially better off and more highly educated than the parents whose children attend Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi. Importantly, Shining Star has a much more ethnically diverse student body than Mti Mmoja, which for the most part teaches pupils who are ethnically Maasai. Relatedly, the dominant home language for most of the Shining Star pupils is Swahili, in contrast to the dominant home language of the majority of Mti Mmoja pupils, which is Maa.
The following table offers a comparative summary of school realities at Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi (SMG) and Shining Star Academy (EMP), with regards to language use, pedagogy, teachers and resources.

Table 7.2: Comparing SMG and EMP School Realities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>SMG School</th>
<th>EMP School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Use</strong></td>
<td>Swahili is the dominant language used throughout the school (except for frequent Maa pupil-pupil interactions outside of class).</td>
<td>A combination of English and Swahili is used throughout the school. Formal classroom language use is strongly dominated by English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent use of Swahili as resource in English class. Swahili used in translation, explanation, instructions, and meaning making.</td>
<td>Occasional use of Swahili (as resource, also as functionless habit) in English-medium classes. Swahili used in translation, code-switching, and explanations. Used by teachers, not pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English almost never used outside of English class.</td>
<td>English frequently heard in Swahili class, especially habituated words and phrases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional use of Maa, often in derogatory way by teachers. Rarely used as resource.</td>
<td>Never any languages used beyond Swahili and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly narrow range of language use, particularly in lower classes.</td>
<td>Scripted use of language; often derived from textbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe talk used, particularly in lower classes and in all English classes.</td>
<td>Safe talk used in all English classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little effort to regulate language use. Swahili used extensively in English periods without objection. No observed efforts to regulate language use outside the classroom.</td>
<td>Little effort to regulate language use in either Swahili or English-medium periods. No observed efforts to regulate language use outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School practice demonstrates a belief that the exclusive use of Swahili (i.e., as opposed to using any Maa) provides the ideal conditions for learning Swahili.</td>
<td>School practice demonstrates a belief that the familiar language of Swahili plays a role in the learning of English. However, ambivalence is evidenced by the school’s official English-only language policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-centered.</td>
<td>Textbook-centered (as mediated by the teacher).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Few pupil questions or interventions.</td>
<td>Some pupil questions and interventions, in both languages (including using English in Swahili class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imagination-less, mechanical, reproductive approach to teaching.</td>
<td>Imagination-less, mechanical, reproductive approach to teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>SMG School</td>
<td>EMP School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td>Very limited opportunities for original contributions, creativity, or critical thinking.</td>
<td>Very limited opportunities for original contributions, creativity, or critical thinking – although pupils occasionally claim space for original contributions by making ‘interventions.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers ask prescriptive questions, pupils answer.</td>
<td>Teachers ask prescriptive questions, pupils answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very few instances of pupils asking questions.</td>
<td>Very few instances of pupils asking questions (and when they ask, it is often in reference to textbook).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>Teachers completely comfortable in the LOI.</td>
<td>Teachers’ use of LOI includes frequent basic errors and unidiomatic uses of the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are very frustrated that children do not come to school knowing the LOI.</td>
<td>Teachers do not see a problem in using a LOI that is different from the home language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are impatient with the children’s progress in learning the LOI.</td>
<td>Teachers are patient with the children’s learning of the LOI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers speak negatively about the pupils’ parents and the Maasai community.</td>
<td>Teachers speak positively about their pupils’ parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Few textbooks, with as many as ten pupils sharing a single textbook or not using textbooks at all.</td>
<td>Every pupil has their own textbook for each subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crowded desks.</td>
<td>Spacious desks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large class sizes and minimal individual attention.</td>
<td>Small class sizes with opportunity for individual attention and heightened opportunities for pupil participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multilingualism in Approaches to Language Teaching**

There are great contrasts in language dynamics, including in the way languages are combined or kept separate, between the SMG and EMP schools. At Mti Mmoja, the LOI (Swahili) is by far the dominant language used throughout the school, although the pupils’ dominant home language of Maa is also occasionally used, particularly in pupil-pupil interactions outside of the classroom. In contrast, at Shining Star, both the LOI (English) and the dominant home language of Swahili are used around the school, with English being the dominant language in the
classroom, and with Swahili (and also English, to a degree) being used frequently outside of the classroom, in teacher-pupil, teacher-teacher, and pupil-pupil interactions.

While both the SMG and EMP schools use a language unfamiliar to the majority of the pupils as the LOI, at Shining Star the home language (Swahili) is used and regarded as a resource, while at Mti Mmoja the home language (Maa) is regarded as a problem to overcome. This is likely because of the value differentials between Swahili and Maa in Tanzania. Swahili has high currency as the language of mainstream Tanzania, the national language, a subject examined in schools, and a language needed for most economic activities in the country. In contrast, Maa has high symbolic value in the Maasai community, but little currency as a language of economic activity. I return to this discussion below.

In the learning of English at both schools, Swahili is used as a resource. At Mti Mmoja, Swahili is used in English periods for explanations, instructions, translations and meaning making, being relied on so heavily that Swahili is for the most part the LOI during the teaching of English. At Shining Star, Swahili is used in the teaching of English and especially in the teaching of content in English-medium subject lessons, although much less frequently than in the English periods at Mti Mmoja. This is presumably because the level of English ability at Shining Star is significantly higher than at Mti Mmoja, even if comparing the lower primary pupils at Shining Star with the most advanced pupils at Mti Mmoja. In English periods and English-medium subject lessons at Shining Star, Swahili is used, although not extensively, in translations, explanations, and instances of code-switching.

At Shining Star, English (the less familiar language) plays a role in Swahili periods (the more familiar language). The English used in Swahili periods is mostly in scripted and/or habituated words and phrases (e.g., “Teacher!,” “May I please go to the toilet?” and “Another one”). However, Shining Star pupils sometimes use English in interventions involving original language use in Swahili periods. This finding of the frequency of English use in Swahili class when the pupils (and teachers) are much more familiar with Swahili is surprising, and perhaps speaks to the intensity of valuation of English at this EMP school. This is in stark contrast with language use at Mti Mmoja, where there is virtually no role for English in any context beyond English language periods.
Maa is used frequently at Mti Mmoja as the most natural language for informal pupil-pupil interactions, and occasionally even for teacher-pupil interactions both in and out of the classrooms. In addition, Maasai culture is frequently referenced by teachers at Mti Mmoja, although often in a negative way, for instance in ascribing reasons for pupils not having their homework complete, being drowsy, or being absent from school. In contrast, at Shining Star no language other than Swahili and English was used in any context throughout all my observations, and no reference to Maasai culture, or any other aspect of the local context, was made by either teachers or pupils. Indeed, at Shining Star the only cultural referents to any other culture/context besides mainstream Swahili-speaking Tanzania were the wallcharts seemingly imported from Europe and India.

**Pedagogy (as pertaining to language use)**

Pedagogy is generally quite similar at both the SMG and EMP schools. At both schools, all classes are dominated by a mechanical, imagination-less, prescriptive approach to teaching. Being strongly teacher-centered, the classes provide minimal opportunity for original contributions, creativity or critical thinking. Very few classes demonstrate much engagement with meaning-making or with implications/applications of knowledge, and there is often more emphasis on understanding the exercise than understanding content. Many classes feature a narrow or scripted use of language, and safe talk (found to be commonly used in English-medium classes by Mwinsheikhe, 2010; Mpemba, 2006; and Rubagumya, 2010) is common, particularly in English classes at both schools, and in the lower classes of the SMG school.

The most substantial differences in pedagogy between the SMG and EMP schools are related to the availability of textbooks and smaller class sizes at the EMP school. For example, while pedagogy at both schools is dominated by mechanical exercises (e.g., filling in the blanks), EMP pupils do these directly from their textbooks, while SMG pupils do these by copying exercises from the board. The smaller class sizes at the EMP allow for slightly increased pupil participation (particularly participation relating to the textbook) and individual attention. The Swahili periods at Shining Star feature slightly more opportunities for original contributions and less reliance on textbook learning (e.g., through curriculum-related games), than the English periods at the same school.
In the literature on language education in Tanzania, there is a strong suggestion that the use of the unfamiliar language of English as the LOI, at both primary (EMP) and secondary levels, limits pedagogical options and inhibits learning. For example, Rubagumya (2010) finds that the use of English at EMP schools inhibits question asking and freedom of expression for both pupils and teachers. Rugemalira (2006) finds that English-medium interferes with intellectual development and creativity. In comparing pedagogies in Swahili and English periods at both SMG and EMP schools, Vuzo (2012) and Bakahwemama (2010) find heightened interaction and participation and more student-centered approaches in Swahili classes versus English classes, regardless of the school. The six secondary school studies reviewed in Chapter 3, several of which compare pedagogy and classroom dynamics of Swahili-medium and English-medium classes, conclude that using English as the LOI interferes with learning, reduces participation, and creates reliance on rote learning and teaching (Vuzo, 2005; Mwinsheikhe, 2008; Vuzo, 2008; Mpemba, 2006; Qorro, 2010; Brock-Utne & Desai, 2010).

In contrast to these studies’ findings, this study finds little pedagogical difference between SMG and EMP schools, and actually finds slightly improved pupil participation, question asking, and pupil interventions at the EMP school. That said, the improved pupil participation etc. at the EMP school is likely related to the smaller class sizes and superior resources (as found also in Vuzo, 2010 and Bakahwemama, 2010), and likely has very little to do with the language itself. The slight increase in original contributions and creativity in the Swahili periods versus English periods at the EMP school, however, seems to support (albeit weakly) the findings of the above studies which suggest Swahili is more conducive to pupil participation and diverse pedagogical options than English. However, this study’s findings of similarities in pedagogy, language use, and classroom dynamics at both SMG and EMP schools and in both Swahili and English periods at each school (once differences in resources and class sizes are accounted for) suggest that pedagogical practice is shaped by ideas and norms about pedagogy, and is not constrained by language alone. This is evidenced by the way in which pedagogy remains fairly consistent, regardless of familiarity with the language of instruction, within and between schools.

Comparing Parental Voices with School Realities

As stated above, both SMG and EMP parents are highly supportive of their children’s multilingual development, and generally desire(expect both Swahili and English to be used at
school. At Mti Mmoja, both Swahili and English are taught, but Swahili is extremely dominant, including in English periods. It is unlikely that parents’ interest in/expectations for their children’s learning of English are being met at Mti Mmoja. On the other hand, SMG parents state that Maa should not be used at school, and for the most part this expectation is aligned with the observed reality.

The language use and teaching at Shining Star seem to be quite aligned with EMP parents’ expectations. This is particularly true for Mama Daudi and Mama Priscilla, who describe how Swahili should be used in the early years to assist their children to learn English, a description which aligns with the school realities observed in this study. The expectations of these two mothers and the school realities at Shining Star resemble a subtractive model of language education, whereby the familiar language is used until adequate proficiency is developed in the ‘new’ language, at which point the initial language is gradually left by the wayside. This contrasts with Bibi Joyce’s opinion that both Swahili and English should be used throughout schooling, to ensure that learners get to know all content in both languages (resembling an additive model). Bibi Joyce’s perspectives on ideal language education are certainly not aligned with school practice at Shining Star, where the use of Swahili decreases as pupils’ proficiency increases. Even when Swahili is used as a resource in explaining English-medium content, the keywords related to the subject learning are generally only stated in English, preventing the acquisition of subject-specific vocabulary in Swahili.

The SMG parents’ expectation of a division of labour, whereby the parents teach the children Maa and the teachers take full responsibility for the teaching of Swahili and English, stands in stark contrast to teachers’ expectations that children’s learning of Swahili is supported from home. On the EMP side, the fact that EMP parents are using Swahili with their children aligns with EMP teachers’ expectations that children learn Swahili from home. Neither EMP parents nor teachers expect children to have any English exposure outside of school, so in this way the EMP parents’ and teachers’ expectations are aligned.

Parents, particularly SMG parents, are especially interested in their children developing strong oral, practical language skills. With an extremely strong emphasis on written language and mechanical exercises in the language pedagogies at both schools, there is little evidence that
pupils are developing oral, practical language skills. In this way, there is a disparity between parental expectations and school realities of language education.

While almost no parents state a desire for Maasai language or culture to play a role in their children’s schooling, SMG parents articulate their strong valuation of both their language and culture. This valuation is in discordance with how Maasai language and culture are treated at the SMG school, in disparaging ways which suggest that Maasai language and culture are problems which interfere with Maasai children’ schooling. In contrast, Maasai language and culture are not referenced in any way, positively or negatively, at the EMP school – it is as though they do not exist. As EMP parents are not particularly concerned with their children’s learning of Maasai language and culture, this creates no dissonance between parental attitudes and school realities. The fact that neither the families nor the schools of the EMP children are teaching them Maasai language or culture means that these children are being deprived of learning opportunities which are afforded to their SMG counterparts.

**Language Orientations: Problem or Resource?**

Throughout this study, parents and teachers (through both their explicit statements and through their language practices) demonstrate differing attitudes towards each of the three languages, and towards multilingualism and multilingual practice in general. Their statements about language, their language use, and their language practices with their children/pupils demonstrate different language orientations, as understood by Ruíz (1984) as “a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society” (Ruíz, 1984, p. 16). While Ruíz (1984) identifies three prevalent language orientations (or, more accurately, two prevalent orientations and one desirable one), there are two dominant orientations which emerge in this study: language-as-problem and language-as-resource. Ruíz’s (1984) additional orientation, that of language-as-right, does not emerge in this study, as no participants express any sentiment of entitlement to using their dominant languages in accessing social services, including education.

All parent participants in this study, both SMG and EMP, view language learning and multilingualism as resources. SMG parents in particular see Maa as a crucial life resource, for instrumental purposes as well as because of its close association with identity, group membership, and community belonging. EMP parents also appear to claim Maa as a resource,
for example to be used as a secret language in front of non-Maasai visitors. However, the descriptions EMP parents offer for Maa being a resource are quite weak when compared to those of the SMG parents, and it seems the EMP parents’ strong valuation of Swahili and the momentum of linguistic and socio-cultural change mean that Swahili is privileged at the direct expense of Maa. EMP parents evidently do not view Maa as enough of a resource to transmit it to their children.

While SMG parents view Maa as a strong life resource, they do not see it as a resource in the learning of Swahili, English, and school knowledge, as evidenced by their desire to exclude Maa from the schooling of their children, to the extent of one parent recommending children be beaten for speaking Maa at school. Similarly, EMP are adamant that Maa should play no role in the schooling of their children.

At the SMG school, there is an unambiguous orientation to Maa as a problem. Teachers explicitly blame challenges in Swahili on children’s Maa proficiency, offering explanations such as “They are made to believe in their language [Maa]” for pupils’ Swahili errors. The orientation to Maa as a problem is further seen in its occasional derogatory use by teachers in association with questioning pupils’ Swahili proficiency, for example in asking (in Maa), “Boy do you not know [Swahili]?” and “Do you know Swahili?” in response to pupils’ hesitations or failure to answer teachers’ questions. However, the occasional uses of Maa as a resource at the SMG school (once through the teacher’s giving the Maa for the word ‘hyena’ in English class, and once through the teacher soliciting the Maa word for ‘to skin [a goat] when pupils failed to understand the Swahili), and the result of lightening the classroom atmosphere, engaging the pupils and contributing to their understanding, give a glimpse into the possibilities of using Maa as a resource in schooling, regardless of teachers’ proficiency.

All participants, both parents and teachers, seem to view Swahili as a critical resource in children’s lives and schooling. EMP parents are categorical in their belief that Swahili should be used at the English-medium school in order to assist with their learning and understanding. At the SMG school, Swahili is used as a vital resource in the learning of English, and, to a lesser extent, at the EMP school Swahili is used as a resource in the teaching and learning of both English and English-medium content.
Attitudes towards these various languages, and orientations to them as problems or resources, are related to the political economic context in which they exist. As discussed in Chapter 2, language education discourses have been highly politicized throughout Tanzania’s history, with Swahili holding intense symbolic value as the language of nationalism and decolonization, and with English wielding intense economic power and representing globalization, economic development and international opportunities. The language orientations and language values demonstrated by this study’s participants both reflect and reject, but are certainly entangled with, these larger political discourses.

Swahili’s importance, as articulated by the parents who have been to school, is framed by its status as the national language. This is seen in comments such as, “It is the national language which every person is supposed to know.” The way one EMP parent has internalized and identified with Swahili’s symbolic value as the national language is demonstrated by her comment, “It is our language and Swahili is a big part of our culture” – despite her assertions about feeling so good when speaking Maa (“our language”) in contrast to Swahili. In this way, Swahili has come to play a critical symbolic role in constructing the nation, “our” culture, and in creating expectations for “every person” [i.e., every Tanzanian]. At the same time, Swahili is imagined to play an important role in being connected to the goings-on of the nation, as seen in the association of Swahili with “know[ing] what is happening in the country.” It seems that Swahili plays an important symbolic role in these parents’ membership in the “imagined community” (Anderson, 2006) of the nation of Tanzania. However, the perspectives of the SMG parents who have never been to school stand in stark contrast to these nationalistic discourses about Swahili. “The Swahili language I am just stealing stealing it,” says one SMG mother. Indeed, for the SMG parents who have not been to school, and to an extent for some of the educated parents as well, Swahili represents much more of an economic resource than symbolic attachment to any nation.

SMG teachers’ frustration that their pupils come to school with little previous exposure to Swahili is most likely an outgrowth of these highly politicized narratives of Swahili as “the national language which every person is supposed to know.” The naturalization of the association between Swahili and Tanzanian-ness allows teachers to see lack of Swahili
knowledge as a deficit, to see knowledge of Swahili as a basic expectation they should be able to have of their pupils. It is likely that the EMP parents’ desire/expectation that their children’s home language of Swahili be used in the process of learning the unfamiliar LOI, in contrast to SMG parents’ general lack of support for their home language of Maa being used in the process of learning the unfamiliar LOI, is based on this currency which Swahili has as the highly politicized national language.

In contrast to Swahili, which has high symbolic value alongside a degree of economic value, English is esteemed by all parent participants as having powerful economic value. All parents, both SMG and EMP, speak extensively and passionately about the crucial value of English for employment prospects. They assert that English is essential for all forms of employment, with special mention of the tourism sector which is particularly visible in Monduli. SMG parents also mention the importance of English to potential self-employment opportunities, such as selling cultural items to tourists, while EMP parents also value English for its power to enable international employment opportunities. Other reasons parents state for valuing English include its importance in job interviews, in enabling computer literacy and access to a broad array of printed resources, in communicating with people who do not know Swahili (e.g., wazungu/white people), and going to wazungu hospitals for treatment.

Significantly, the entire thrust of these parents’ valuation of English is associated with its economic value (including in the assumption that meeting people who do not know Swahili might lead to a job). It is associated with employment, with life prospects outside of Monduli. English represents the gaining of access to an external system, and is not associated with local community development, beyond bringing externally-generated income home (to “build me a better house,” as one parent said). This fixation on economic benefit, and the emphasis on individual economic advancement (which the family is to benefit from) as opposed to local relevance, reflect the values of neoliberalism, which bolster the pro-English discourses of language education. In these ways, parents’ discourses about English reflect dominant discourses about economic competitiveness, globalization, neoliberalism, and the need for international (and not local) relevance.
The way English is taught at both SMG and EMP schools, with absolutely no opportunity for identity engagement, expressive/creative use of language, or association with anything cultural, reflects the trend which Heller and Duchêne (2012) observe, whereby the “idea of language as “profit” moves away altogether from ideologies of language, culture and identity, to treat language instead as a technical skill” (Heller & Duchêne, 2012, p. 8).

Maa is discussed by both EMP and (especially) SMG parents with great pride and in association with significant symbolic value. Both SMG and EMP parents speak of Maa as being an integral part of their identities, and as connecting them to the Maasai community and to their birthplace. They have a sense of ownership over the language, a sense of it being “ours.” They also speak of how good it feels to speak their own language, and how it contributes to their sense of belonging, including when they speak Maa outside of traditional Maasai Land. For the SMG parents, Maa also has strong instrumental value in enabling them and their children to communicate with people who do not know Swahili.

One SMG parent asserts significant agency with the statement, “I am their teacher of Maa.” This assertion constructs Maa as a valid and important form of knowledge, while affirming that valuable education/teaching takes place outside of schooling. The clarity with which several SMG parents articulate their expectation that Swahili and English be taught and spoken at school and that Maa be taught and spoken at home, points to a division of labour in which the school is charged with teaching languages associated with economic value, and the family is charged with the responsibility of teaching the languages with rich symbolic value. This distinction speaks to both SMG and EMP parents’ expectations of schooling as a tool for economic advancement.

The SMG and EMP parents’ strong valuation of Maa rejects the dominant either/or discourses of language education which severely marginalize all local languages in Tanzania. By claiming a central place for Maa in their children’s lives, which they are to learn alongside the economically powerful languages of Swahili and English, they are demonstrating the falsity of the notion that languages are in opposition to each other, and asserting that local languages and identities do not have to be in contradiction with the symbols and values of nationalism, but rather that they can co-exist and be complementary. The SMG school, in contrast to the parents’ perspectives, appears to be more closely aligned with the dominant either/or discourses, through its
presentation of non-Swahili language ability as a problem which interferes with the development of Swahili as a symbolic resource of the nation-state.

In general, both SMG and EMP parents’ perspectives on multilingualism as being natural and normal reject the either/or political discourses which pit languages in antagonistic opposition to each other. None of these parents see languages as in competition with each other, but rather see that these languages play differing and complementary roles in their children’s lives and societies, and that they are all important and valuable, albeit for different reasons.

**Education for Self-Reliance or Local Irrelevance?**

The parent participants of this study express expectations that schooling serve the interests of economic advancement, and, beyond the comments placing value on Swahili as the national language, they express little concern that schooling contribute anything to symbolic or cultural domains. Importantly, parents’ fixation on employment prospects outside of the local community as well as the content of schooling at both SMG and EMP schools reflect a ‘learning to leave’ orientation, whereby schooling is intended to prepare learners for a life outside of their current context. This orientation to the purpose of schooling contradicts the principles of Education for Self-Reliance (ESR) (Nyerere, 1967/2004), in which education was to meet the needs of local communities, and not merely be an employee training grounds. Indeed, the willful divorcing of home languages and cultures from those encountered at school demonstrates a disinterest in schooling contributing skills and knowledge which are directly applicable to life in the local communities.

The warning of the Second Five Year Plan of Tanzania (1969-74) still rings true: that the use of unfamiliar LOI’s, and different LOI’s at different levels of schooling, will “create and perpetuate a linguistic gulf between different groups and will also tend to lend an alien atmosphere to higher education, making it inevitably remote from the problems of the masses of society” (URT, 1969, as quoted in Brock-Utne, 2005, p. 56). Indeed, the linguistic gulfs between different groups (those who have been through different levels of schooling and those who have attended EMP versus SMG schools) and the remoteness of schooling from the problems of the masses have become increasingly entrenched. This study shows an enormous linguistic gulf between the worlds of the SMG and EMP schools, as well as between the SMG parents and the SMG school,
and between the EMP parents and the EMP school. Whereas education under ESR was to contribute to the development of an egalitarian, classless society, the current system of segregating different demographics into different schooling systems based on economic ability fuels inequality and individualism (Bakahwemama, 2010), exacerbating the already divisive economic differences in Tanzanian society.

While Education for Self-Reliance, which was developed to meet the needs of Tanzania in the immediate post-independence period, may not hold the key to the development of an effective education system in 2016, the orientation of education to the preparation for employment results in foiled expectations and a sense of betrayal by the system, as the job market cannot nearly keep pace with the rapidly growing numbers of primary, secondary, and tertiary graduates in Tanzania. Graduates of all levels of schooling are being barred access to the relatively small job market, as illustrated by the following cartoon (Fede, 2016):

![Political Cartoon by Fede](https://www.artofede.blogspot.com)

Figure 7.1: Political Cartoon by Fede

Source: Fede, 2016, June 1, *Raia Mwema*. Copyright 2016 by Fede. Reprinted with permission.
In this cartoon, the fist of the socio-political-economic system ("mfumo") is holding back education ("elimu") and graduates from being relevant to/gaining access to the employment market ("soko la ajira"). This cartoon addresses the detachment between education and employment, and graduates’ feeling of helplessness about accessing employment in the face of a system which is unconducive to graduates entering the job market.

Indeed, there is an imperative to work towards an education system - and societal expectations for an education system - which help to cultivate well-rounded, broadly relevant graduates, who can communicate with, understand and be relevant to local communities while also developing communicative capacity with, understanding of and relevance to the broader Tanzanian, African and global communities.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

This chapter summarizes the findings and main ideas of this study, and examines the study’s implications for language education, community involvement in schooling and education in general. The chapter then presents some of the limitations of the study, before offering some suggestions for future research directions.

Languages, Cultures, Values and Dissonances

This study finds that parents regard multilingualism as natural and normal, and are supportive of using multiple languages in schooling. While they see all three languages of Maa, Swahili and English as important to know, they see these languages as belonging to different domains, with only the economically powerful languages as appropriate to be used in schooling. The SMG parents regard Maa as an important resource in their children’s lives, with significant symbolic value with regards to identity, culture and group membership. In contrast, the SMG school and its teachers treat the Maasai language and culture as problems which interfere with academic success, and that it would be preferable for the children to learn Swahili rather than Maa from home. However, no parents or teachers of either SMG or EMP schools (with one exception) regard Maa as appropriate for use in any way in schooling. That said, the importance especially SMG parents place on Maa and their self-identification as teachers of Maa points to their understanding that important education takes place beyond the institution of schooling.

Together with the high value parents place on learning additional languages, they express the belief that using a language as the LOI is an effective way of learning the language. The extent to which a familiar language is regarded as a resource to be used in the learning of additional languages seems to be connected to its political-economic value in the broader societal context. While Maa, the dominant language of the vast majority of SMG pupils, is regarded by neither parents nor teachers as a resource in the learning of additional languages, Swahili, the dominant language of the vast majority of EMP pupils, is regarded and actively used as a resource in the learning of English (and English-medium content) at both schools. This is connected to Swahili’s currency as having high symbolic value as the national language as well as economic value as a language used in business and employment, which contrasts with Maa, which is seen as a language of local culture (contradicting the national values embodied in Swahili) and as lacking
in economic value. English is intensely valued for its role in improving employment prospects, which are central to how parents articulate the purpose of schooling. As much as parents value English, they express the desire that English be learned alongside Swahili (and Maa, for the SMG parents), and not in opposition to these languages.

This study also finds a significant linguistic and cultural gulf between the worlds of home and school, for both SMG and EMP pupils. This stark divide prevents the knowledge and skills of the disparate worlds from informing and supporting each other. Particularly at the SMG school, where the children’s home language and culture are referenced with very negative connotations, this home/school divide can result in the suppression of the abilities and knowledge that children bring from home, while also potentially teaching children to look with distaste upon the world from which they come. The school observations show that neither the SMG nor the EMP schools attempt to be directly relevant to the local communities, but are rather preparing their pupils for an external world through a ‘learning to leave’ orientation. While equipping pupils with the skills and knowledge needed for social mobility through employment opportunities is a key expectation of schooling, the reality of a tiny job market means that the majority of these children will live their lives in their home communities. It is imperative that these schools prepare their pupils to be contributing, intelligent and agential members of their home communities while simultaneously preparing them for higher education and the elusive job market.

The SMG school, as a state institution, communicates the dominant construction of a Tanzanian as a Swahili-speaker (and not a Maa-speaker), and prepares its pupils for membership in the imagined community of Swahili-speaking Tanzanians. The EMP school, on the other hand, seems to prepare its pupils for membership in an economic, rather than symbolic, community. It appears that these different schools are preparing their pupils for membership in different linguistic, cultural and economic worlds. In contrast to the values of Education for Self-Reliance, this two-tier system is exacerbating the linguistic and economic gulfs between different groups, fuelling inequality and cementing language hierarchies which put English at the top.
Implications

This study’s findings with regards to parents’ positive perspectives on multilingualism point to possibilities for developing and implementing models of multilingual schooling, particularly involving Swahili and English. In contrast to common refrains claiming that parents all want English-medium, this study’s findings show that parent perspectives are more nuanced than that, and that parents generally value the learning of multiple languages, as well as the use of more familiar languages as resources in learning. While it seems that to a degree these schools are already multilingual (seen particularly in the use of Swahili at the EMP, the heavy use of Swahili in the SMG English periods, and the occasional use of Maa at the SMG), formalizing the use of multiple languages in the classroom could enhance the multilingual instruction, in order to improve the learning of all languages in question, deepen understanding of content, and enable learners to be conversant with subject knowledge in more than one language. While only one parent expressed interest in the use of Maa at school, the high valuation (especially SMG) parents place on the Maa language, together with the inclination of both parents and teachers to see and use familiar languages as resources in the learning of unfamiliar languages, points to the possibility of bringing Maa (and other home languages) into the classroom as resources in learning. Certainly, the symbolic power of Swahili as the national language enables its easier use as a resource in the classroom when compared with Maa. However, the fact that Maa is already occasionally being used in the classroom with positive results suggests possibilities of Maa being used as a resource in order to empower rather than further marginalize speakers of non-dominant languages and to work towards greater relevance and equality in the education system.

This study also points to a need for improved understanding between parents and teachers, particularly at the SMG school. Their expectations differ as to the site of Swahili learning, with SMG parents expecting the teachers/school to take full responsibility for teaching Swahili, while teachers expect support in the teaching of the national language. Additionally, teachers are frustrated that parents do not offer more support in the schooling process in general, for example in encouraging the children to study in the evenings, ensuring children come to school every day, communicating with the teachers and following up with their children’s school progress. Measures should be taken, particularly by the schools but also potentially by local governments, to assist parents and teachers to be on the same page, including to help parents to understand the important role they can play in their children’s schooling regardless of their own experience in
school, and to facilitate the communication of parents’ expectations and educational values to the teachers.

As there is general conflation amongst parents of language learning and using the language as the LOI, there is need to raise awareness amongst the general population about the differences between learning a language and learning *through* a language. Awareness must also be raised about how (except in specialised programs designed to teach the target language and content simultaneously) using a language as the LOI is usually *not* the most effective means of learning a language (Brock-Utne, 2005; Qorro, 2005).

**Limitations**

One of the main limitations of this study is the small sample size it involved, of both the numbers of parents and the numbers of schools. Additionally, the nature of this study involving two cases means that this study provides rich information about a limited number of people and schools, and that the findings are not generalizable. It must also be acknowledged that, due to my recruitment of parent participants through their children’s participation in the Community Library, these parents may not offer a representative sample of the full population of parents at the SMG and EMP schools. It is likely that this study’s parent participants are more interested in their children’s education than the average parents for each of the given schools.

Another limitation of this study is that it was conducted in one specific community, which has had less exposure to formal schooling and less exposure to Swahili than much of the rest of the country. This further prevents its findings from being generalizable to the rest of Tanzania. However, as this is a case study seeking to offer in-depth understanding of one particular context, this in no way compromises the validity of the findings for this particular context.

My limited ability in the Maa language is a further limitation of this study, as it required me to use a translator to help with parts of two of the interviews. In addition, for the parent participants who are strongly Maa-dominant, conducting the interviews in Swahili rather than Maa (or rather than giving participants the option of using whichever language(s) they are most comfortable with) could have limited or changed the content of participants’ comments during the interviews.
Future Research Directions

There is need for similar studies to be conducted comparing parental perspectives with school realities in a variety of Tanzanian communities to give a better sense of perspectives and realities of language education throughout the country, and not only in this one somewhat unique community. Parental perspectives are critically important to understand, including as language of instruction debates are hotly contested surrounding the new Education Policy of 2014, which has yet to be implemented. In addition, it is important to further understand the ways in which Tanzanian schools are or are not aligning with the interests and expectations of the communities they serve, in light of Tanzania being a democracy which is to be responsive to the voices of its citizens, and in light of the mass exodus of Tanzanians from the government schooling system to private English-medium schools. The apparent dissatisfaction of a rapidly growing number of Tanzanians with the government system needs to be thoroughly understood, in order to better enable the government system to meet the needs of its citizens throughout the country.

In addition, there is need for studies examining possibilities for multilingual education, in response to parents’ clear interest in multilingualism in their children’s schooling. As it can be difficult for people to imagine and comment on models of multilingual education which they have never seen or experienced, it would be advisable to initiate a form of multilingual schooling at a pilot site, and to study community perspectives regarding the implemented model of multilingual education, together with the strengths and challenges in the implementation of the model.
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Appendices

Appendix A (English)

Interview Protocol

Note: These are semi-structured interviews, and as such, the exact content and order of questions are subject to change, depending on the responses of the participant.

Opening comments: Thank you for coming to speak with me today. As I mentioned, I am doing research on parents’ views on language education, for my master’s degree. Politicians and professors speak a lot about language of instruction, but I think it is important to listen to the voices of parents themselves: what do parents want for their children’s schooling?

So I would like to hear a little bit about your views on the use of languages in schools, the experiences of you and your children regarding the use of different languages at school, and how you see different languages should be used in what ways in primary schools. Anything you would like to say about language education, I would like to hear.

If there is anything I ask that you are uncomfortable answering for any reason, no problem, we will move on to something else. Anything you say to me is confidential. I will not tell anybody anything that you say to me today, and I will not mention your name in anything I write. Do you have any questions before we begin? Is it okay if I audio-record our conversation?

Background questions:

- Which of the two schools included in this study (Saba Saba and Shining Star Academy) do you have a child attending, and in which class?
- Do you have other children? If so, what schools do they, or have they, attended?
- What school(s) have you attended? Up to what level?
- What is your line of work?
- What language(s) do you speak?

Your children’s schooling experiences:

*Note: For any of the below questions which do not ask explicitly about language, it is assumed that since language is such a central (perhaps the central) issue in education, participants will discuss language considerations unsolicited. However, if language issues are not discussed unsolicited, I will ask a leading question about language factors with regards to the given question.*

- Why do you choose to send your child [at either Saba Saba or Shining Star Academy] to the school they attend?
- What do you like most about this school? What would you like to see improved?
• In what ways is this school the same or different from the school(s) your other children have attended/are attending?
• If you have older children, what has been their experience in secondary school [which are all English medium]?

Language Values:
• Why is it important to you for your child to speak Swahili? Where do you expect your child to use Swahili, in the present and future? Is this response different for reading and writing, versus oral Swahili?
• Why is it important to you for your child to speak English? Where do you expect your child to use English, in the present and future? Is this response different for reading and writing, versus oral English?
• How important is it to you for your children to understand and speak mother tongue?
• Do you think there could be a place for mother tongue in schools?
• What language(s) do you use with your children? And why?
• What do you see as the benefits of knowing more than one language? What drawbacks do you see?

Your own schooling experiences:
• When you were in primary school, what language did you study in? How was your experience of this? What worked well about this? What do you hope can be different for your children?
• If you went to secondary school, what was your experience of studying English? Do you feel like you learned much English, and to what extent have you used it since then?

Use of languages in schools:
• If your child is attending English-medium: What do you see as the role, if any, of Swahili in learning English at school? Should Swahili be used at all at your child’s school, outside of Swahili class?
• If your child is attending Swahili-medium: What do you see as the role, if any, of Swahili in learning English at school? Should any Swahili be used in your child’s English class? Should any English be used in your child’s Swahili-medium classes?

Attitudes towards Language Learning:
• What do you think is a good age for your children to start learning English? Swahili? Mother tongue? And what about for reading and writing in each language?
• Does mother tongue have any role in helping your children to learn Swahili? Do mother tongue and Swahili have any role in helping your children to learn English?
Appendix A (Swahili)

Interview Protocol

Ninashukuru kwa kuja leo kuongea na mimi.

Asante kwa kuja leo kuongea nami. Kama nilibivyosha katika mwili, ninafanya utafiti kuhusu maoni ya wazazi juu ya elimu ya lugha, kwa ajili ya shahada yangu ya pili. Wanasiasa na maprofesa wanaongea sana kuhusu lugha ya kufundishia, lakini ninadhani ni muhimu kusikiliza sauti za wazazi wenyewe: wazazi wanataka nini katika elimu ya watoto wao?

Kwa hiyo, ningepeka kusikia kidogo kuhusu maoni yako juu ya matumizi ya lugha shuleni, uzoefu wako na uzoefu wa watoto wako kuhusu matumizi ya lugha mbalimbali shuleni, na unavyoona inastahili kutumia lugha mbalimbali katika shule za msingi, na kwa njia gani/kwa namna gani/na kwa vipi. Nitapenda pia kisikia kitu chochote utakachotaka kusema kuhusu elimu ya lugha, nitapenda kusikia.

Hakutakuwa na shida kama kuna kitu ninakuuliza ambacho hutaka kujibu kwa sababu yoyote, tutaendelea na suala lingine. Mazungumzo haya na jina lako vitabaki kuwa siri. Una maswali yoyote kabla hatujaanza?

Maswali ya msingi:

- Mtoto wako anayehudhuria mradi wa maktaba anasoma shule gani, na yuko darasa la ngapi?
- Na wewe, umehudhuria shule gani? Mpaka kiwango gani?
- Unafanya kazi gani?
- Unaweza kuongea lugha zipi? Kuna lugha gani ambazo unaweza kuongea?

Uzoefu wa watoto wako shuleni:

- Kwa nini umeamua kuchagua kumpeleka mtoto wako kwenye shule anayosoma?
- Unapenda nini zaidi katika shule hii? Nini ungependa kiboreshwe?
- Unaona nini katika shule hii ni sawa na nini tofauti ukilinganisha na shule nyingine ambazo watoto wako wamehudhuria?
- Ukiwa na watoto ambao wameshasoma shule ya sekondari, wameona masomo ya sekondari? Wamekuwa na changamoto gani, au wameona nini rahisi kwenye masomo yao ya sekondari?
Thamani za kilugha:

- Kuna umuhimu gani kwa watoto wako kujua kuongea Kiswahili? Unategemeea watoto wako kutumia Kiswahili wapi, kwa sasa na kwa baadaye? Jibu lako litakuwa tofauti nikiuliza kuhusu kwa kuandika na kusoma, badala ya kuongea, Kiswahili?
- Kwa maoni yako, kunu umuhimu gani kwa watoto wako kujua kuongea Kiingereza? Unategemeea watoto wako kutumia Kiingereza wapi, kwa sasa na kwa baadaye? Jibu lako litakuwa tofauti nikiuliza kuhusu kwa kuandika, badala ya kuongea, Kiingereza?
- Kwa maoni yako, ni muhimu kwa watoto wako kuweza kusikia na kuongea lughamama yao? Kwa nini?
- Kwa maoni yako, unafikiri ingefaa kuwa na nafasi ya lugha za kikabila shuleni? Nafasi ya aina gani? Kwa nini?
- Unatumia lugha gani na watoto wako? Kwa nini?
- Unaona kuna faida gani kwa kuongea lugha zaidi ya moja? Unaona vikwazo gani?

Ujuzi wako wa kishule:

- Ulipokuwa shule ya msingi, lugha gani ilitumika kama lugha ya kufundishia? Ulionaje kwa kutumia lugha hiyo? Ilisaidia nini, na kulikuwa na changamoto gani kwa kutumia lugha hiyo? Kuna kitu ambacho unatumia lugha tofauti kwa watoto wako?
- Kama ulisoma shule ya sekondari, ulionaje matumizi ya Kiingereza kama lugha za kufundishia? Unafikiri kwamba unahez Slowi na kuongea Kiingereza sana, na kwa kiasi gani umetumia Kiingereza baada ya kumaliza masomo?

Matumizi ya lugha shuleni:

- Kama mtoto wako anasoma shule ya English-medium: Unaona kwa jinsi gani Kiswahili kinaweza kuwasaidia watoto wako kuongea Kiingereza? Kwa maoni yako, Kiswahili kinastahili kuwa na nafasi ya matumizi yoyote nje ya darasa la Kiswahili?
- Kama mtoto wako anasoma shule ya serikali: Unaona kwa jinsi gani Kiswahili kinaweza kuwasaidia watoto wako kuongea Kiingereza shuleni? Kwa maoni yako, Kiswahili kinastahili kutumika kwenye somo la Kiingereza? Inastahili kutumia Kiingereza kwenye masomo ambayo yanatumia Kiswahili kama lugha ya kufundishia?

Maoni kuhusu Kujifunza Lugha

- Kwa maoni yako, umri gani unafaa kwa watoto wako kuanza kujifunza Kiingereza? Kiswahili? Lugha mama? Na umri gani unafaa kuanza kujifunza kusoma na kuandika kwa kila lugha?
- Kwa maoni yako, lugha mama inaweza kuwasaidia watoto wako kuongea Kiswahili? Lugha mama na Kiswahili inaweza kuwasaidia watoto wako kuongea Kiingereza?
Appendix B

Information Letter for Parent Participants

(To be shared with parent participants verbally in Swahili by the researcher before parents give consent to participate in an interview.)

Dear Parents,

I, Monica Shank, would like to invite you to participate in a study I am doing as part of my master’s degree at OISE at the University of Toronto. I am looking for parents who have a child participating in the community library program and attending either *Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi* or *Shining Star Academy*.

My research is about parents’ perspectives on language education. The study seeks to understand what you as parents think about using different languages in schools. If you are interested in participating, I will ask you to come for an interview. In the interview, I will ask you about some of your experiences using different languages in schools, what you think about Swahili, English, and mother tongues in schools, and your expectations for your children’s language learning at the school which they attend.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary: only those who wish to participate will participate. By agreeing to participate in the study, you will be agreeing to allow me to use your comments in the write-up and possible publication of my study. However I will not use anyone’s names and I will not include any information that will make you identifiable.

In this study, I am just interested in hearing what you think. Everyone’s thoughts are valid, and there are no right or wrong answers. If you are uncomfortable or change your mind about participating, you may withdraw at any time, and if you do not want me to, I will not use your comments in my study.

If you are interested in participating, we will set up an interview time which is convenient for you. Each interview should take less than one hour to complete, and I will have tea and *maandazi* (bread) for you.

Do you have any questions or concerns about this?

If you have any further questions or concerns, feel free to talk to me privately after this meeting or any other time, either by phone at +255 [redacted] or here at the community library. If you are interested in participating in the study, you can sign up with me either after this meeting, or in the upcoming weeks at the community library.

Sincerely,

Monica Shank
Appendix C

Consent to Participate in Study as a Parent Interviewee

(To be shared with parent participants orally in Swahili, and consented to orally, in acknowledgement that many parent participants do not read or write.)

Monica Shank has explained to me the study she is conducting, entitled Parental Voices in Primary Swahili and English Education in Maasai Land, Tanzania, and I understand the following about my participation:

- I will participate in one interview.
- My participation is voluntary, and I may choose to stop participating at any time in the study, without penalty. Also, I may decline to answer any question in the interviews for any reason. I may choose to withdraw my data from inclusion in the study up until the time the study has been reported or published.
- Any information shared during interviews will be kept strictly confidential and all participants’ identities will be kept anonymous during the collection, analysis, and reporting of the research data; no identifying information will be used in the reporting of the data either in presentations or in written research reports.
- I understand that what I share in the interviews may be used in academic publications or presentations. However, no identifiable information related to my comments will be included.
- While findings from the study will be shared, neither I, nor my children, nor anyone I mention, will be identified in any way in the sharing of the findings.
- Nobody will have access to the interview data besides the researcher, Monica Shank.
- The researcher will audio record the interviews, only if I consent to being audio recorded. Otherwise, she will document my comments throughout the interview in writing only.

I agree to participate in the research (circle): YES NO

I agree to have the interviews audio recorded (circle): YES NO

Name:______________________________________

Signature:___________________________________

Date: _______________________________________
Appendix D (English)

Information Letter and Consent Form for School Administrators

Dear Administrator,

My name is Monica Shank and I am a Master of Arts student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. I would like to invite you to participate in a study exploring parental perspectives on language education, and how these perspectives relate to language use in schools. The details of the study are as follows:

Title of Research Project: Parental Voice in Primary Swahili and English Education in Maasai Land, Tanzania

Principle Investigator: Monica Shank, MA Candidate, OISE, University of Toronto

Purpose of the Study: This study seeks to understand parental perspectives on language education, and to explore how these perspectives relate to language use in schools. I will be interviewing 6-8 parents of pupils at a Swahili-medium government school and an English-medium private school. I will then observe language use at a Swahili-medium government school and an English-medium private school, and look at the observed language patterns in relationship to the attitudes and expectations of parents.

Your school’s potential involvement: If you and your school agree to participate, I would ask to observe at your school two days per week during the months of January and February, 2016. I would be most interested in observing in classrooms, spanning the full range of levels at your school. I would also be interested in observing outside the classrooms: on the playgrounds and during parades.

Benefits: By participating in this study, you will be assisting in the creation of knowledge about language education, and, once the study is complete, you will receive a summary of the findings of the full study. This study may help in your school’s understanding of the community’s perspectives on language education, and may be useful as you relate with parents. As a token of appreciation for your contributions to the study, I will donate some Swahili and English books to your school for use by the pupils and teachers at the school.

Risks: There are no potential risks in your decision to participate in this study.

Participants’ Rights:

- To Confidentiality: All participants’ identities will be kept strictly anonymous and confidential through the use of pseudonyms in both the analysis of the data and the oral and written reporting of the findings. All data collected will be kept on a password protected external hard drive in my home that will be locked in a cabinet and all data will be destroyed no later than five years from now.
To Ask Questions about the Research: If you would like to ask questions about this research project, you may do so at any time. Please contact me (Monica Shank) at +255 or monica.shank@mail.utoronto.ca, or you may speak to me in person. You may also contact my supervisor, Dr. Antoinette Gagné, regarding questions at antoinette.gagne@utoronto.ca. The University of Toronto also has an office regarding ethics if you want more information about your rights as a research participant, or to verify the authenticity of this research. You may contact the Office of Research Ethics at 416-946-3273 or ethics.review@utoronto.ca

To Withdraw at Any Time: You may withdraw from the study at any time by contacting me. Participating teachers may decide to end their participation in this study at any time for any reason and any information collected on them will be destroyed. However, once my research findings are reported or published, you CANNOT withdraw.

Please read and sign the attached consent form if you are willing to participate in this study. If you agree to having your school participate, I would request to have a meeting with the teachers of your school, at which point I would explain the study to them. I would provide consent forms for all teachers who wish to participate in the study. I would only observe the classes of teachers who consent to participating.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Monica Shank

OISE, University of Toronto

PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF THIS LETTER FOR YOUR RECORDS

******************************************************************************
CONSENT FORM

I have read Monica Shank’s letter describing the research project and I understand that my participation will involve the following:

- The researcher, Monica Shank, will observe language use at our school during the months of January and February, 2016.
- The researcher will require the consent of any teachers whose classes she seeks to observe.
- Any information gathered will be kept strictly confidential and all participants’ identities will be kept anonymous during the collection, analysis, and reporting of the research data; no identifying information will be used in the reporting of the data either in presentations or in written research reports.
- I understand that data collected may be used in academic publications or presentations. However, no identifiable information related to the schools will be included whatsoever.
- I will receive a copy of the research report summarizing the findings of the study.
- I may withdraw before the study is reported or published at any time with no penalty. However, once the study is reported or published, I may NOT withdraw.

I agree to have my school participate in this research (circle):  YES  NO

Name:______________________________________

Phone Number:________________________________

Signature:_____________________________________

Date: _________________________________________
Appendix D (Swahili)
Information Letter and Consent Form for School Administrators

Monica Shank
S.L.P. xx
monica.shank@mail.utoronto.ca
+255 716 620 438
22/11/2015

Shule ya Msingi ya xxxxxxx
S.L.P. xxxx
Monduli, Arusha

Ndugu Mkuu wa Shule,

Mimi ninaitwa Monica Shank na ni mwanafunzi wa shahada ya umahiri katika Chuo Kikuu cha Toronto. Ningependa kukualika kushiriki katika utafiti unaochunguza maoni ya wazazi juu ya elimu ya lugha na jinsi maoni haya yanavyoendana na matumizi ya lugha katika shule za msingi nchini Tanzania. Yafuatayo ni maelezo zaidi kuhusu utafiti huu:

Mada ya Utafiti: Maoni ya Wazazi Kuhusu Lugha ya Elimu Umaasaini Nchini Tanzania

Mtafiti Mkuu: Monica Shank, Mwanafunzi wa Shahada ya Umahiri, Chuo Kikuu cha Toronto

Malengo ya Utafiti: Utafiti huu unalenga kuelewa maoni ya wazazi juu ya elimu ya lugha, na kuchunguza jinsi maoni haya yanavyoendana na matumizi ya lugha katika shule za msingi za serikali na za binafsi. Mtafiti ataafanya mahojiano na wazazi wa wanafunzi wa shule moja ya serikali na shule moja ya binafsi. Atashuhudia matumizi ya lugha katika shule moja ya serikali inayotumia Kiswahili kufundishia na shule moja ya binafsi inayotumia Kiingereza kufundishia. Atachunguza ushahidi ili kuangalia kama hali halisi ya matumizi ya lugha shuleni inaendana na mategemeo ya wazazi, na kwa kiasi gani.

Ushiriki wa Shule Yako: Ningependa shule yako ishiriki katika utafiti huu kwa kuniruhusu kushuhudia matumizi ya lugha hapa shuleni. Ikiwa unakubali ombe langu, ninapenda kuomba nafasi ya kushuhudia shuleni kwako katika mwezi wa kwanza na wa pili, 2016. Hasta hasa ninapenda kushuhudia darasani, lakini pia kwa kiasi fulani nitashuhudia nje ya madarasa, hususani uwanjani wakati watoto wanapocheza na kwenye magwaride. Aidha, ukikubali kushirikisha shule yako, nitaomba nafasi ya kukutana na walimu wa shule yako ili niwaelzee utafiti huu, kwani nitashuhudia tu madarasa ya walimu wanaokubali kushiriki.

Manufaa ya Kushiriki: Kwa kushiriki katika utafiti huu, utakuwa ukichangia katika kupanua ulewa wa elimu ya lugha na utafiti ukishakamilika utapatiwa muhtasari wa matokeo ya utafiti. Utafiti huu unaweza kusaidia shule yako kuelewa zaidi mitazamo ya wazazi inayohusu elimu ya
lugha na unaweza kuwa wa manufaa katika kuboresha mahusiano na wazazi. Katika kuonyesha shukrani kwa michango yenu katika utafiti huu, mtafari ataichangia shule yako vitabu kadhaa kwa matumizi ya wanafunzi na walimu hapo shuleni.

Haki za Washiriki:

- **Kuhifadhiwa kwa Majina:** Majina ya washiriki na shule zote zinazoshiriki katika utafiti huu yatahifadhiwa. Majina ya bandia yatatumika katika uchunguzi na ripoti ya utafiti huu. Aidha, taarifa nyingine zozote zinazoweza kuwatambulisha washiriki kwa namna moja ama nyingine zitahifadhiwa pia.

- **Kuuliza Maswali kuhusu Utafiti:** Mshiriki anaruhusiwa kuuliza swali lolote huhusu utafiti huu wakati wowote. Anaweza kuniuliza mimi (Monica Shank) maswali ana kwa ana kuwasiliana nami kwa simu (+255 [redacted]) au kwa bara pepe (monica.shank@[redacted] au monica_shank@[redacted]). Vilivile, anaweza kuwasiliana na msimamizi wangu, Profesa Antoinette Gagné, kwa bara pepe (antoinette.gagne@[redacted]). Sambamba na hayo Chuo Kikuu cha Toronto kina ofisi inayohusiana na maadili ya utafiti kwa kuwasiliana nao akitaka taarifa zaidi kuhusu haki zake kama mshiriki au kuthibitisha ukweli wa utafiti huu. Anaweza kuwasiliana na Ofisi ya Maadili ya Utafiti kwa bara pepe (ethics.review@utoronto.ca).

- **Kuondoa ushiriki wa mshiriki:** Anaruhusiwa kuondoa ushiriki wake katika utafiti huu wakati wowote kwa kuwasiliana na mtafari. Pia walimu wanaoshiriki katika utafiti huu wanaweza kuondoa ushiriki wao wakati wowote na taarifa inayowahusu itaondolewa na kuteketezwa. Hata hivyo, ripoti ya utafiti huu ikishakamilika, hakuna nafasi ya kuondoa ushiriki wake tena.

Ikiwa utakubali kushiriki katika utafiti huu, tafadhali ninaomba usome na kujaza fomu iliyoambatanishwa na bara hii. Pia nitawapatia walimu wote watakaokubali kushiriki katika utafiti huu fomu za kukubali ushiriki.

Ninatanguliza shukrani zangu za dhati kwa kulifikiria ombi langu.

Wako mtiifu,

Monica Shank

Mwanafunzi wa Umahiri

Chuo Kikuu cha Toronto
FOMU YA KUKUBALI KUSHIRIKI

Kuhusu ombi la Monica Shank kufanya utafiti katika shule ya __________________________:

Mimi, ________________________, nimesoma barua ya Monica Shank inayoelezea utafiti wake na nimeelewa mambo yafuatayo kuhusu ushiriki wa shule yetu:

- Mtahitaji wa utafiti huu, Monica Shank, atashuhudia matumizi ya lugha shuleni kwangu mnamo mwezi wa kwanza na wa pili mwaka wa 2016.
- Mtahitaji ataomba ruhusa kwa mwalimu kabla ya kushuhudia darasa lake.
- Majina ya washiriki wote yatahifadhiwa na hayatatumika katika ripoti ya utafiti.
- Matokeo ya utafiti yanaweza kutumika katika machapisho na mawasilisho ya kitaaluma. Hata hivyo, majina ya shule na washiriki yatahifadhia.
- Nitapokea nakala ya ripoti ya utafiti huu ukishakamilika.
- Ninaweza kuondua ushiriki wa shule yetu wa shule yetu kabla ripoti ya utafiti haijatolewa. Ripoti ikishakamilika au kuchapishwa, sitaweza kuondua ushiriki wangu tena.

Ninakubali kuishirikisha shule yangu katika utafiti huu.

Jina:____________________________________

Namba ya Simu:___________________________

Saini:___________________________________

Tarehe: __________________________________

Asante kwa kukubali kushiriki!
Appendix E (English)

Information Letter and Consent Form for Teachers

Dear Teachers,

My name is Monica Shank and I am a Master of Arts student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. I would like to invite you to participate in a study exploring parental perspectives on language education, and how these perspectives relate to language use in schools. The details of the study are as follows:

Title of Research Project: Parental Voice in Primary Swahili and English Education in Maasai Land, Tanzania

Principle Investigator: Monica Shank, MA Candidate, OISE, University of Toronto

Purpose of the Study: This study seeks to understand parental perspectives on language education, and to explore how these perspectives relate to language use in schools. I will be interviewing 6-8 parents of pupils at a Swahili-medium government school and an English-medium private school. I will then observe language use at a Swahili-medium government school and an English-medium private school, and look at the observed language patterns in relationship to the attitudes and expectations of parents.

Your role: I will be observing at your school two days per week during the months of January and February, 2016. I would like to observe language use in your classrooms, which would involve me sitting quietly at the back of the classroom as your lessons proceed as normal. I will also be observing outside the classrooms: on the playgrounds and during parades. I will be observing which languages are used in which ways, under which circumstances, and between which speakers. This will include both oral and written language use.

Benefits: By participating in this study, you will be assisting in the creation of knowledge about language education, and, once the study is complete, you will receive a summary of the findings of the full study. This study may help in your school’s understanding of the community’s perspectives on language education, and may be useful as you relate with parents. As a token of appreciation for your contributions to the study, I will donate some books to your school for use by the pupils and teachers at the school.

Risks: There are no potential risks in your decision to participate in this study.

Participants’ Rights:

- To Confidentiality: All participants’ identities will be kept strictly anonymous and confidential through the use of pseudonyms in both the analysis of the data and the oral and written reporting of the findings. All data collected will be kept on a password-protected database.
protected external hard drive in my home that will be locked in a cabinet and all data will be destroyed no later than five years from now.

- **To Ask Questions about the Research:** If you would like to ask questions about this research project, you may do so at any time. Please contact me (Monica Shank) at +255 or monica.shank@ or you may speak to me in person. You may also contact my supervisor, Dr. Antoinette Gagné, regarding questions at antoinette.gagne@. The University of Toronto also has an office regarding ethics if you want more information about your rights as a research participant, or to verify the authenticity of this research. You may contact the Office of Research Ethics at ethics.review@utoronto.ca

- **To Withdraw at Any Time:** You may withdraw from the study at any time by contacting me. Participating teachers may decide to end their participation in this study at any time for any reason and any information already collected will be destroyed. However, once my research findings are reported or published, you CANNOT withdraw.

Please read and sign the attached consent form if you are willing to participate in this study. Thank you for considering to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Monica Shank

OISE, University of Toronto

PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF THIS LETTER FOR YOUR RECORDS
CONSENT FORM

I have read Monica Shank’s letter describing the research project and I understand that my participation will involve the following:

- The researcher, Monica Shank, will observe language use in my class during the two days per week she will spend at our school during the months of January and February, 2016.

- Any information gathered will be kept strictly confidential and all participants’ identities will be kept anonymous during the collection, analysis, and reporting of the research data; no identifying information will be used in the reporting of the data either in presentations or in written research reports.

- I understand that data collected may be used in academic publications or presentations. However, no identifiable information relating to myself or the school will be included.

- I will receive a copy of the research report summarizing the findings of the study.

- I may withdraw before the study is reported or published at any time with no penalty. However, once the study is reported or published, I may no longer withdraw.

I agree to participate in this research (circle):  YES    NO

Name:______________________________________

Phone Number:__________________________

Signature:______________________________

Date: _________________________________
Ndugu Mwalimu,

Mimi ninaitwa Monica Shank na ni mwanafunzi wa shahada ya umahiri katika Chuo Kikuu cha Toronto. Ningependa kualikia kushiriki katika utafiti unaochunguza maoni ya wazazi juu ya elimu ya lugha na matumizi ya lugha katika shule za msingi nchini Tanzania. Ninaomba nafasi kushuhudia kwenye darasa lako, nikiangalia matumizi ya lugha. Ukikubali kushiriki, mambo yafuatayo yatazingatiwa:

- Majina ya shule na washiriki wote yatahifadhiwa na hayatatumika katika ripoti ya utafiti.
- Matokeo ya utafiti yanaweza kutumika katika machapisho na mawasilisho ya kitaaluma.
- Unaweza kuondoa ushiriki wako kabla ripoti ya utafiti haijatolewa. Ripoti ikishakamilika au kuchapishwa, hutaweza kuondoa ushiriki wako tena.

Ukikubali kushiriki, ninaomba ujaze hapo chini.

Ninatanguliza shukrani zangu za dhati kwa kulifikiria ombi langu.

Wako mtiifu,

[Signature]

Monica Shank
Mwanafunzi wa Umahiri
Chuo Kikuu cha Toronto

****************************************************************************

Ninakubali kuishirikisha shule yangu katika utafiti huu.

Jina: ____________________________________________

Namba ya Simu: _________________________________

Saini: _________________________________________

Tarehe: __________________________

Asante kwa kukubali kushiriki!
Appendix F

Summary of All Data Collection Activities

PARENT INTERVIEWS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Parent Participant (Pseudonyms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 30, 2016</td>
<td>Mama Daudi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 2016</td>
<td>Mama Naserian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 6, 2016</td>
<td>Mama Rebekah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2016</td>
<td>Baba Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2016</td>
<td>Mama Lomnyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2016</td>
<td>Bibi Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2016</td>
<td>Mama Priscilla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHOOL OBSERVATIONS:

Mti Mmoja Shule ya Msingi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Classes Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| January 26, 2016 | • Class 4 Swahili  
|             | • Class 7 Swahili  
|             | • Class 7 Mathematics  
|             | • Class 1 Writing (Swahili)  
|             | • Class 6 English  |
| February 1, 2016 | • Class 6 Swahili  
|             | • Class 6 Mathematics  
|             | • Class 4 English  
|             | • Class 2 Swahili  
|             | • Class 7 English  |
| February 5, 2016 | • Pre-Primary 2 Mathematics  
|             | • Pre-Primary 2 Swahili  |
| February 8, 2016 | • Class 3 Mathematics  
|             | • Class 3 English  
|             | • Class 2 Reading (Swahili)  
|             | • Class 3 Swahili  
|             | • Class 7 Work Studies  |
| February 23, 2016 | • Class 6 English  
|             | • Pre-Primary 1 Swahili  
|             | • Class 1 Reading (Swahili)  
|             | • Class 7 Science  
|             | • Class 7 History  |

Shining Star Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Classes Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| January 27, 2016 | • Class 2 Swahili  
|             | • Class 2 English  
|             | • Class 4 Geography  
|             | • Class 4 English  
|             | • Class 4 Swahili  
|             | • Class 3 Science  
|             | • Class 3 Swahili  
|             | • Class 4 Swahili  |
| February 2, 2016 | • Class 1 Mathematics  
|             | • Class 1 Swahili  
|             | • Class 4 Mathematics  
|             | • Class 4 English  
|             | • Class 4 Geography  |
Appendix G

Classroom Observation Schemes

Classroom Observation Scheme #1: Oral Language

School: .................................  Class: .................................  Date: .................................

Teacher: .................................  Subject: .................................  Time: .................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Type of Utterance</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing Emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classroom Observation Scheme #2: Classroom Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Writing</th>
<th>Teacher/Student</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Original vs Copied</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classroom Observation Scheme #3: Printed Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Location in Room/Visibility</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>