Current Issues in Language Planning
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t794297782

Language planning from below: the case of the Xhariep District of the Free State Province

Theodorus du Plessis[a]
[a] Unit for Language Management, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa

Online publication date: 20 September 2010

To cite this Article du Plessis, Theodorus(2010) 'Language planning from below: the case of the Xhariep District of the Free State Province', Current Issues in Language Planning, 11: 2, 130 — 151
To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2010.505069
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2010.505069

Current Issues in Language Planning
Vol. 11, No. 2, May 2010, 130–151

Language planning from below: the case of the Xhariep District of the Free State Province

Theodorus du Plessis*

Unit for Language Management, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa

The Xhariep District is the largest district municipality of the Free State Province of South Africa, covering 26% of the total land surface of this province. It comprises three local municipalities, namely Letsemeng, Kopanong and Mohokare and contains a total of 17 towns. The District is a multilingual area, with Afrikaans (37.1%) and Sotho (37.1%) as the two predominant home languages, followed by Xhosa (19.9%) as the third most prevalent home language. The draft language policy of the Xhariep partly acknowledges this demographic distribution of the languages. In terms of this policy, Afrikaans and Sotho are two of the official languages of the Xhariep District Municipality. English, which is the home language of less than 1% of the Xhariep population, is recognised as the third official language of the Municipality. In the interim, without a formal new language policy, the communities of the area have come up with their own language initiatives. This article presents an analysis of such micro-language planning initiatives at the community level. Language-related problems and the needs of the community are identified, along with the types of intervention that exist at the community level in order to deal with these problems. The investigation is based on an analysis of ethnographic data, collected in a subregion of the Kopanong Municipality during 2008 and 2009, concerning the deployment of a new language policy in the area since 1994.

Keywords: language planning from below; micro-level language planning; localised language planning; bottom-up language planning; interlingual language planning; language policy

Introduction

Language planning (LP) from below can also be described as micro-level LP, which basically entails an approach to LP[1] that can be contrasted with the 'traditional top-down' or macro-approach (Baldauf, 2008, pp. 26–27). Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008b, p. 15) argue that this is a legitimate (new) area of investigation within the discipline of LP. Their recent volume on the topic, *Language planning in local contexts* (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008a), presents a stimulating overview of a variety of micro-level LP cases. One of the striking features of these cases is that they tend to focus on micro-planning for a specific language, i.e. language maintenance and promotion, dialect preservation, intergenerational transmission etc. (cf. Baldauf, 2008, 35ff). In other words, these are cases where micro-level LP is directed at resolving localised language problems and addressing local needs pertaining to a particular language (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008b, p. 9).

*Email: dplesslt@ufs.ac.za

ISSN 1466-4208 print/ISSN 1747-7506 online

DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2010.505069
http://www.informaworld.com

The case study that will be presented in this article also deals with micro-planning in a local context, primarily in response to local needs, and, to some degree, in response to macro-level LP. However, it is not a case study concerning micro-LP for a specific language or languages, but one which is essentially directed at facilitating communication between members of different speech communities. The Xhariep case can be regarded as one in which micro-LP indeed comprises a response to discontinuities found in top-down policy.

The Xhariep

Although the title above refers to LP in the broader Xhariep Municipal District, the focus of the article will specifically fall on micro-LP in three towns of the district's southern local municipality, known as Kopanong Municipality. The towns are Philippolis, Springfontein and Trompsburg. They incidentally form part of a development partnership project between the University of the Free State and their communities, known as *Khula Xhariep*. The partnership supports, coordinates and initiates various bottom-up developmental and developmentally related projects in the three towns. Researchers involved in various disciplines are invited to participate (cf. Khula Xhariep Partnership, 2007). The research that is reported on in this article is a response to this invitation and presents a sociolinguistic perspective on LP from below as an aspect of the language dynamics of the area. As such, the research is of a descriptive nature; the project team itself is not involved in any LP or language policy initiatives in the region.

The Xhariep District is a newly established district municipality in the southern region of the Free State which came into being in 1998 as a result of the restructuring of local government in South Africa. It consists of three local municipalities: Kopanong (population: 55,944), Letsemeng (population: 42,984) and Mohokare (population: 36,321), encompassing 17 towns which are spread over a 34,131 km^2 surface area (Xhariep District Municipality, 2008). The name of the Xhariep District is derived from the Khoikhoi name ('Xhariep' – 'river') for South Africa's largest river, the Orange River (Raper, 2004), which marks the southernmost border of the Free State with the neighbouring Eastern Cape Province.

By far the majority, or 74.6%, of the inhabitants of the area are designated as Black in terms of the current South African racial classification system; 16.2% are designated as coloured and 9.1% as White (cf. Lehohla, 2003). Although this nomenclature, which stems from the apartheid era, is considered inappropriate by many, it is nevertheless deemed necessary for the purposes of affirmative action.

Despite the limitations of language statistics that are obtained from census data (cf. Mesthrie, 2002, pp. 12–13), they nevertheless do provide an overall sociolinguistic profile, in this particular case of the Xhariep District as a multilingual area. Census data on another contentious statistical concept, home language(s)[2], reveal that Afrikaans (37.1%) and Sotho (37.1%) are the two predominant 'first' home languages used here, but that Xhosa (19.9%) and Tswana (4.60%), are two other prominent first home languages also spoken in the area. Notably, English is recorded as the first home language of less than 1% of the Xhariep population (cf. Table 1).

The current multilingual composition of the population can be attributed to a combination of successive migration movements into the area during the early part of the nineteenth century, colonisation by the British, and eventual urbanisation, especially after 1961 (cf. De Bie, 1991). A central part in these developments was played by the town of Philippolis, established in 1823 by the London Missionary Society (LMS) as a mission station for work amongst the San, a nation of hunter-gatherers who were the first prominent

Table 1. Home language spread in the Xhariep District (Lehohla, 2003).

	Letsemeng		Kopanong		Mohokare		Total	
Language	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%
Afrikaans	28256	65.70%	18136	32.40%	3768	10.40%	50160	37.10%
English	289	0.70%	362	0.60%	214	0.60%	865	0.60%
Xhosa	4597	10.70%	12693	22.70%	9567	26.30%	26857	19.90%
Sotho	5427	12.60%	22433	40.10%	22288	61.40%	50148	37.10%
Tswana	4136	9.60%	1890	3.40%	220	0.60%	6246	4.60%
Other	279	0.60%	430	0.80%	264	0.70%	973	0.70%
Total	42984	100.00%	55944	100.00%	36321	100.00%	135249	100.00%

inhabitants of the area (cf. Ross, 1976, p. 22). Philippolis is considered to be the first town north of the Orange River established by Westerners. The mission station quickly became a centre which drew various groups – from 1826 onwards, especially the Griquas, a racially mixed Khoi group (Balson, 2007, p. xi). The Griquas relocated from their erstwhile capital, Griquatown (situated towards the northwest), to make Philippolis their new capital, as part of a land dispute settlement with the colonial powers in Britain (Ross, 1976, p. 21). The San were consequently removed from the area by the LMS (Balson, 2007, p. 150). However, the northward-moving Afrikaner groups also began to flock to the settlement in their quest for grazing for their livestock and were joined by sporadic groups of Basotho from Lesotho in the east.

From the 1850s onward, control of the town of Philippolis changed hands several times as a result of political changes in the larger area that is known today as the Free State. On 23 February 1854, the Boer Republic of the Orange Free State was established, incorporating Philippolis and the other towns in the area. This resulted in the Griquas leaving the area in 1860. In 1896, the British annexed the Free State, and the Anglo-Boer War broke out in 1899. After a peace settlement between the warring factions in 1907, the Union of South Africa was established in 1910 under the British monarchy. The Afrikaners came to power in 1948, and in 1961, South Africa was unilaterally declared an independent republic. Apartheid was instituted as government policy. Resistance to this dispensation ultimately led to the establishment of a democratic South Africa in 1994.

The legacy of these political developments in terms of language-related aspects, specifically in the Xhariep area, is significant.

LP from below

One of the earliest references to the notion 'LP from below' was made by Alexander (1992), who used the term in concurrence with criticism levelled by Bamgbose (1987) and Chumbow (1987) against what they described as 'the canonical model of language planning'. In a paper entitled *Language planning from below*, Alexander (1992, p. 145) argues in favour of LP that is not driven by a 'central government authority at the expense of subsidiary (regional or local) levels of government'. In his view, LP by non-governmental agencies can be regarded as LP initiated from below. Kamwendo (2005, p. 144) describes such LP as a 'grassroots-initiated type of language planning'. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, p. 196ff) described this approach as 'non-governmental planning'. What Alexander is actually advocating is an alternative approach to canonical or 'top-to-bottom planning', an alternative which Bamgbose (1987, p. 114) calls 'bottom-to-top' planning. This refers to

planning 'in which lower levels and even the community can make an input to language planning'. In Bamgbose's (1987, p. 114) view, individuals, organisations and non-governmental institutions play a central role in 'bottom-to-top' LP. In following the earlier work of Kaplan published in 1989, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 196ff) draw a similar distinction between 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' LP. Other authors describe LP from below as 'community-based language planning' (Kozelka 1984 in Bamgbose 1987, 114ff) or 'democratic language planning' (Webb 1991 in Bamgbose 1987, 114ff).

The above approaches all emphasise different aspects of LP from below: 'self-empowering' decision-making (Alexander, Kozelka, Bamgbose); participatory decision-making (Webb, Bamgbose) and non-governmental-based decision-making (Alexander, Kaplan & Baldauf, Bamgbose). A crucial aspect which these different perspectives have in common is the notion of what Baldauf (2008, pp. 25–29) refers to as 'agency in language planning'. In his view, an important feature of LP from below is that agency does not reside at the macro-level. This is one of the fundamental distinctions between macro-LP and the so-called 'micro-level LP' (cf. Chríost, 2006).

The related concepts, 'language planning within the local context' (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008a, 2008b) and 'localised LP', emphasise the local context as the 'key site' for LP (cf. Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008b, p. 9). However, it is necessary to make a distinction between the local context as the site of macro-level LP (*localised LP*) and the local context as a site of micro-level LP implementation (*local LP*). For this reason, Baldauf (2008, pp. 25, 34) defines micro-level LP more precisely as LP in which agency resides with a micro-LP agent, rather than with an implementer. Localised (macro-level) LP can therefore essentially be regarded as a top-down approach to LP, where micro-support is given for the implementation of macro-LP. Agency thus resides at the macro-level (Baldauf, 2008, p. 25). The study by Millar (2006) concerning attempts to involve local government in macro-planning for Scots serves as a good example, illustrating corrective top-down LP at a local level.

One of the interesting aspects of localised LP can be observed in cases where the planning becomes inappropriate. In this regard, Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008b, p. 9) refer to contexts in which language issues are 'localised and for which responses are needed at community level'. Where responses or corrective intervention originate at the macro-level, one could refer to the resultant planning as co-operative localised LP. The inappropriateness of LP may, of course, be related to possible mismatches between macro-level LP and micro-level language practice. In such cases, local input could facilitate corrective macro-level intervention. Inappropriate LP may even result from the inability of local communities to respond to macro-level LP, especially in the case of oppressed and marginalised minorities (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008b, p. 9). In such instances, top-down LP directed at the local level actually becomes coercive LP.

Other examples include cases where local communities 'actively resist national level planning' (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008b, p. 9) or take matters into their own hands, irrespective of or despite macro-level LP efforts. An intention to ultimately influence macro-planning may be present – but not necessarily. Such a situation may merely comprise an instance of local LP driven by a desire to address local language problems and needs – in other words, what we refer to as 'language planning from below'. (In many instances, the LP efforts may nevertheless lead to divergent LP.)

In an earlier publication, Stroud and Heugh (2003, pp. 18, 23), in a related fashion, use the concept of 'actorhood', referring to the choice that citizens (or speakers) make to represent themselves as speakers and members of speech communities in structures that can make a political difference. The authors link the concept to their alternative notion

of 'linguistic citizenship' (as opposed to linguistic human rights), which they define as 'the role of language in power, access and equity in a democratic framework of participatory citizenship'. Essentially, they question the legitimacy of top-down validations (through national official language policy) of language practices and argue that speakers' own representations and concept of language become the building blocks for a new 'politics of language'. The notion of participatory linguistic citizenship can be regarded as a critique of a narrow nation-state (implicitly 'top-down') conception of citizenship and linguistic rights which ignores the linguistic versatility of multilingual portfolios ('multilingualism from below'). Stroud and Heugh (2003, pp. 18, 23) contend that agency with regard to language rights should reside with speakers themselves, in other words at the local level; but that in the process, such agency should claim and define new spaces at the higher level. Cardinal (2007, p. 89) would probably refer to participatory linguistic citizenship as 'horizontal governance', a joint form of governance involving macro- and local-level planning.

The view presented by Stroud and Heugh (2003), and in a sense also by Cardinal (2007), principally challenges the homogenising and legitimising forces of top-down LP. The mentioned authors propose an alternative approach whereby agency from below is given prominence and granted recognition within a participationary framework of (horizontal) governance. Shohamy (2006) presents a rather strongly worded critique and challenge, similar to that of Stroud and Heugh (2003).

At the conclusion of her overview of an expanding view of language policy, in which she effectively presents the case for bottom-up LP (which she convincingly illustrates with reference to areas such as language in the public space), Shohamy concludes that top-down LP essentially violates democratic principles and personal rights and constitutes an imposition. It is an imposition because it violates the principles of participation, representation and inclusion (by not involving teachers, for instance) and organises society in terms of 'language units', using language as the main organising variable, thus perpetuating class differentiation and mechanisms of power (Shohamy, 2006, pp. 138–140). In response to these impositions and violations, she devotes her last chapter to strategies, involving a democracy of inclusion, critical awareness (especially towards language policy mechanisms), the claiming of personal rights and language activism (which seeks to correct wrongs and injustices) (Shohamy, 2006, pp. 149–166). In these terms, Shohamy is pleading for a repositioning of agency in language policy and planning in order to achieve participation, 'for all those participating in societies to continually dialogue and negotiate as well as struggle about language issues' (Shohamy, 2006, p. 165).

Although somewhat related, agency in linguistic citizenship and agency in negotiating language policy differ conceptually from agency in micro-level LP, according to Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008b) and Baldauf (2008). The emphasis in Liddicoat and Baldauf's approach falls more strongly on according recognition to micro-level LP as a worthy field of study (without excluding different forms of interrelation with top-down LP, however). For the other authors, LP from below becomes more than a field of study – it is regarded as a site of struggle where hegemonising powers are contested and alternative approaches are constructed through negotiation and participation.

One of the implications of all the above views – as Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008b, p. 9) point out – is that LP 'is not limited to government bodies with the power to impose their ideas through their own political dominance'. Some of the agents of micro-LP include individuals, language organisations, other organisations (e.g. religious bodies, educational institutions and literacy groups) etc. These agents contribute to what Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008b, p. 9) call 'more distributed relationships of power'. Although some scepticism has

been expressed regarding the notion of micro-level LP (cf. Baldauf, 2008, p. 19), it can be argued that the activities of micro-LP agents typically involve a recognisable language policy and LP – in other words, actions directed at solving language problems at the local level. Micro-level LP agents do, in fact, plan to utilise and develop the local language resources; as already argued, their actions are often not a direct result of some larger macro-policy.

As Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008b, p. 3) observe, 'traditional LP' research focuses on the actions of macro-level institutions, mainly government agencies, and local LP is perceived as secondary and marginalised – a circumstance that the authors ascribe largely to definitional factors. However, this approach stems from a certain perception of power in top-down LP, which results in a limited understanding of decision-making about languages, as though there were always a causal link between top-down planning and micro-level outcomes. More often, the outcomes at micro-level are different from those that were envisaged – a phenomenon which has been called 'unplanned' LP (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, pp. 297–299). Such a view, according to Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008b, pp. 3–4), largely ignores what happens at the micro-level. The authors thus advocate research concerning micro-level LP, both within the context of the micro-level operationalisation of macro-level planning and that of micro-level LP 'in its own right' as envisaged in the approaches put forward by Stroud and Heugh (2003) and Shohamy (2006). One should therefore not misconstrue these positions to be suggesting an either-or-approach to LP research; micro-level LP can be a research focus which deepens our understanding of the complexities of the LP phenomenon. As such, the relation between micro- and macro-LP should not be ignored.

Methodology

Micro-level LP studies included in the publication *Language planning in local contexts* (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008a) represent a shift in research focus. As these and related studies are still largely situated within the broader field of LP studies, no specialised methodologies have been developed as yet. However, owing to the change in the object of study, the researcher will inevitably have to make methodological adaptations. In contrast to the activities of macro-level LP agents, which are relatively well documented, the work of micro-level agents is often not recorded. For this reason, a variety of different methods and approaches to collecting micro-LP information need to be considered.

The well-known Ideal Typology of Language Cultivation and Language Planning developed by Haarmann (1990) can actually serve as a point of departure in methodological considerations. Of relevance to our purposes here are his different types of agency involved in language planning and language cultivation and their efficiency in terms of organisational impact. In the typology, this comparative efficiency is graded on a continuum ranging from minimum to maximum impact. Terms such as 'efficiency' and 'organisational impact' refer to a higher or lower degree of planning authority and are not evaluative concepts which rate an LP activity in terms of its success or failure. The types of agencies that Haarmann (1990) distinguishes range from individuals at one end of the spectrum to governmental agencies at the other. Their activities relate to what can be described here as types of LP, ranging from the macro- to the micro-variety. The concerned typology can be used as a sociolinguistic 'tool' for investigating the settings of LP and the organisational impact thereof. More importantly, it allows us to desribe and analyse the emergence of 'lower-level' LP (Haarmann, 1990, pp. 120–123). For the purposes of the Xhariep investigation, the focus falls on individuals as agents of LP.

In his theory of language problems, Neustupny (1978, pp. 243–257) provides further tools for our analysis. He approaches LP, language policy and language cultivation as different forms of language treatment directed at correcting inadequacies in the broad communication system – all comprising part of what he describes as a 'metalinguistic correction system'. Three central components feature in such a correction system:

- inadequacy identification (including the identification of the language problem);
- an action programme (including the LP goal); and
- implementation.

Our interest lies mainly in the first two components of the correction system, in the context of activities in the research area relating to LP from below – with particular emphasis on the language problems as identified by inhabitants of the area, as well as the steps that have been put in place (if any) to solve these problems. Evidence regarding these two components will provide an indication of bottom-up LP.

The study of micro-level LP in the Xhariep project area is based on ethnographic data collected between 21 July 2008 and 27 August 2008 in the Kopanong Municipality of the Xhariep and recorded in a field-work logbook and fieldnotes (cf. Yperzeele & Kotze, 2008) by two research assistants from the Universities of Antwerp and the Free State, respectively. The logbook and fieldnotes contain data relating to 25 interviews that were conducted with different stakeholders in the area, ranging from ordinary citizens, community workers, local government officials, educators, Khula Xhariep associates and local government leaders to politicians and staff of the home for the elderly based in Trompsburg. (Politicians here refer to members of political parties and locally elected leaders, as well as persons in governance positions, such as councillors and mayors; Government officials are excluded.) Just more than half (13) of these interviews were conducted with individuals. The exact number of participants in group interviews has not been recorded in the field notes. The interviews varied from unstructured, open discussions held with a combined variety of stakeholders to more structured interviews. (The latter mostly involved headmasters of schools and will not be considered in the current discussion.) Many respondents preferred the open group discussions because of the anonymity they afforded. They also felt more at ease if officials and nurses participated in the discussion, so that these persons would not think that the respondents were 'talking behind their backs'. In such instances, no names were recorded in the fieldnotes, and unfortunately, the number of respondents present was also not recorded.

Because of the unstructured nature of most of the interviews, the fieldworkers subsequently organised their notes in terms of 15 broad topics, representing a first level of analysis and interpretation of the data. Only responses relating to three of these topics were considered for this article. These included responses that were categorised as reflecting a language attitude (although no direct questions were asked in this regard), responses pertaining broadly to language use in the particular town and, more specifically, responses revealing information about the internal and external language practices within the local municipalities. The selection was further limited to include only those responses (in the relevant three categories) given by stakeholders in the three Khula Xhariep towns.

In the end, the data that are presented below were gleaned from a total of 25 interviews that were conducted over the period mentioned above – 14 with a variety of individuals and 11 with different groups (cf. Table 2).

The individuals who granted interviews were selected on the basis of referral. Ultimately, those recorded here can be regarded as being fairly representative in respect

Table 2. Interviews per type of respondent and town.

Respondents	Philippolis	Springfontein	Trompsburg	Total
Individuals	4	4	6	14
Groups	3	5	3	11
Total	7	9	9	25

Table 3. Individual respondents and their location.

Respondents	Philippolis	Springfontein	Trompsburg	Total
Citizen	1	1	1	3
Councillor	0	1	0	1
Khula Xhariep associate	1	0	0	1
Major	0	0	1	1
Official (Municipality)	1	2	2	5
Politician	1	0	0	1
Staff, home for the elderly	0	0	2	2
Total	4	4	6	14

of the three towns, as Table 3 indicates. There is also a balance between citizens and officials and decision-makers.

The group interviews reported here were conducted with four different groups of respondents, as indicated in Table 4. In terms of the limited data set presented here, only one interview that exclusively involved citizens was conducted.

The selected filtered responses of the different participants, as recorded in the fieldnotes, were scrutinised by the author in order to determine what the interviewees perceived as a 'language problem'. It should be noted that the respondents were not always directly asked to identify such problems. However, on the basis of their responses to different questions about the language situation in general, it is possible to infer whether they perceived certain language practices as problematic – for instance, in cases where respondents specifically mentioned that official meetings are held mostly in English or that communication with municipal officials is hampered by the fact that they insist on using English (even though, according to some respondents, these officials cannot speak the language effectively) etc. A purely quantitative analysis of these problems is not possible, since the data comprised ethnographic notes, rather than the actual verbatim responses of participants. Also, many responses were obtained during group interviews, which means that individual respondents cannot be identified.

A second categorisation for the purposes of this article was carried out by identifying the source and nature of the perceived language problems. The source of each language

Table 4. Group respondents and their location.

Respondents	Philippolis	Springfontein	Trompsburg	Total
Citizens	0	1	0	1
Citizens and officials	2	1	2	5
Citizens, officials and nurses	1	1	1	3
Officials	0	2	0	2
Total	3	5	3	11

problem was classified in terms of four broad topics: 'No language problems'; 'Continued language problems'; 'Language problems related to the new government' and 'Language problems related to the new officialdom'. These classifications were made from the (projected) point of view of the respondent – in other words, in terms of what she/he supposedly perceived as a language problem.

The nature of each identified language problem was further classified in terms of at least six broad problematic areas: 'Language attitudes and preferences'; 'Language policy and language rights'; 'Language services'; 'Language skills'; 'Modes of interaction' ('Oral communication', 'Internal communication', 'Written communication') and 'Points of interaction'.

The limitations of the particular data set should be noted. As Yperzeele (2009, p. 25) rightly observes, the fieldnotes already comprise representations by the fieldworker, rather than transcriptions of the actual responses of the interviewees and have inevitably been filtered by the cognitive processes and knowledge of the fieldworker. In order to neutralise this effect, a selected number of observations were made at different service-delivery points (clinics, information desks, traffic services), specifically at the municipal clinics and traffic department. As police stations do not fall under the local authorities, they have been excluded from the current data set. Incidentally, the only discrepancies recorded in the relevant field notes were related to interviews involving police officers. One example of a discrepancy occurred during an open interview at Springfontein Police Station with a few police agents and citizens when one of the police officers reported that most clients could speak either Afrikaans, Xhosa or Sotho (with the implication that no language problems were being experienced). However, in this regard, the fieldworker's earlier observations of interaction at this station revealed that Sotho was mostly spoken, and that this actually did present a language problem (Logbook entry 96, 14 August 2008).

Top-down language planning in the Khula Xhariep area

One of the most striking features of the language dispensation in the Xhariep is the fact that official recognition has always pertained to the language of those in political power. The languages of African people living in the area were not officially recognised until 1994, when South Africa adopted 11 official languages, including 9 indigenous African languages.

Before 1994, language policy at both provincial and municipal levels was largely informed by the constitutional directives on statutory bilingualism (English/Afrikaans) – at least in that part of South Africa which was controlled by whites (i.e. other than in the black homelands). The Xhariep District fell within such an area.

Nationally, a new language dispensation, moving towards a new undefined form of bilingualism (as a minimum requirement), is envisaged for post-apartheid South Africa. The pre-1994 dispensation was characterised by a rigid form of statutory (Afrikaans + English) bilingualism which, as Devenish (1990, p. 441) points out, comprised '(t)he legislative mechanism designed to guarantee entrenched bilingualism in South Africa'. South Africa's new constitution no longer contains such a provision. Rather, in terms of Section 6, government is now required only to use at least (any) two official languages (RSA, 1996). Regarding this provision, Cowling (2003, pp. 84, 88) argues '... that bilingualism is [still] the bottom line in any language dispensation in South Africa as a whole or any part of it', but that we are moving '... from colonial bilingualism to representative multilingualism', in other words to a new, unprescribed form of bilingualism or multilingualism.

The provinces have a joint mandate regarding language policy and are responsible for formulating provincial language policy. They must provide the norms and standards for

language policy at the local government level. Currently, top-down LP in the Free State is spearheaded by the provincial government department responsible for language, i.e. the Free State Department of Sports, Art, Culture and Recreation. To date, however, no provincial language policy has been promulgated. Consequently, local municipalities have also been unable to finalise their overt language policies.

In terms of Section 6(3)(b) of the Constitution (RSA, 1996), municipalities in South Africa are required to 'take into account the language usage and preferences' of their residents. Section 18 of the *Local Government Municipal Systems Act* (RSA, 2000) confirms this mandate and adds the requirement that the special needs of people who cannot read or write must be taken into account. The brief for the actual determination of a language policy is found in Section 2.4.3 of the National Language Policy Framework, which contains the following specific instructions:

> Local governments will determine the language use and preferences of their communities within an enabling provincial language policy framework. Upon determination of the language use and preference of communities, local governments must, in broad consultation with their communities, develop, publicise and implement a multilingual policy. (Department of Arts, and Culture, 2002)

The draft language policy of the Xhariep partly acknowledges the demographic distribution of the languages in the area. In terms of this policy, Afrikaans and Sotho are two of the official languages of the Xhariep District Municipality. English – the home language of less than 1% of the Xhariep population – is recognised as the third official language (Xhariep District Municipality, 2003).

This policy regulates the use of the official languages (Section 2) in proceedings and transactions of the municipal council (Section 3), in official documentation and notices (Section 4), identification signs (Section 5) and communication (on an internal basis, as well as with the public and with other institutions) (Sections 6–7). In addition, Section 9 makes provision for 'language facilitation services' – without any definition of what is meant by this term, however. The same section requires proficiency in the three municipal languages, and to this end, provision is made for the presentation of free language courses. However, the policy does not define language proficiency. This provision should thus probably be read together with Section 2, which provides for three 'municipal languages', Sotho, Afrikaans and English. Furthermore, the policy also makes provision for 'affirmative action' with regard to the marginalised languages (i.e. technically the African languages spoken in the area, particularly Sotho, Xhosa and Tswana) and stipulates that knowledge of the municipal languages is a requirement for promotion (Section 10). The policy finally contains possible punitive measures relating to non-compliance with policy provisions (Section 12), and also provides for the establishment of a language committee for monitoring (Section 13), as well as for the objective of implementing the policy within 5 years (Section 14). The proposed punitive measures include the possibility of regarding non-compliance as misconduct which could lead to disciplinary action (Section 12(1)).

Bottom-up language planning in the Khula Xhariep area

The focus of the discussion below will fall on evidence gathered in the Khula Xhariep area pertaining to the two core aspects of language planning that we identified earlier on, namely inadequacy identification and an action programme.

Inadequacy identification

Our findings will be discussed in terms of the categorisation suggested above, starting with the source of language problems in the Khula Xhariep.

No language problems

One of the striking features of the recorded responses is the fact that the respondents generally seemed convinced that no language problems were experienced in the Khula Xhariep area. Several of the respondents indicated that there were no communication problems (Logbook entry: 87; 123), that they had no complaints regarding language (Logbook entry: 134) and that 'potential language problems' were 'resolved in a variety of ways' (Logbook entry: 20; 21; 88; 117).

Yperzeele (2009, pp. 36, 70) concludes, on the basis of the foregoing, that a 'harmonious' linguistic situation exists in Kopanong. She attributes this harmony to relatively effective bottom-up *self-regulation* among the inhabitants of the area regarding language matters.

Continued language problems

Despite the claims asserting that there are no language problems, a close scrutiny of the recorded responses reveals that respondents did, in fact, identify some inadequacies. Some of these problems clearly cannot be directly related to the new dispensation (new government and new officialdom). In fact, our analysis of some responses indicates that there are certain language problems that have been carried over from previous eras. These continued problems include the fact that some nurses can only speak Afrikaans (and/or English) (Logbook entry: 120), the fact that most meetings are held in the black areas – and mostly in Xhosa and Sotho (Logbook entry: 28), that documents are issued in English, but sometimes also in Afrikaans (Logbook entry: 124), that the completion of forms in English and Afrikaans is problematic (Logbook entry: 87), that people (councillors, staff members, community members) who are used as interpreters are not trained as such (Logbook entry: 134) and that people wish to be served in their home language (Logbook entry: 14).

These examples cover a variety of problematic areas, including problems regarding oral and written communication between the Municipality and citizens, problems regarding interpreting services and problems regarding language options at service points. These problems can specifically be ascribed to the dominance of Afrikaans and English in the area, a situation inherited from the pre-1994 language regime, which fostered official bilingualism in these two languages. They can also be attributed to the lack of recognition accorded by the previous dispensation to societal multilingualism and, consequently, to the local languages which are used widely in the Khula Xhariep. These factors have jointly contributed to the limited language services offered in the area and, obviously, also to the lack of trained language practitioners.

Language problems related to the new government

Respondents also alluded to some language problems which can be related to the new government and its policies and structures.

Problems identified on the basis of the recorded responses include written communication with the public, such as letters from government, being provided in English

only (Logbook entry: 11); the issuing of public notices in English only (Logbook entry: 89) and the prominence of English on street signs (Logbook entry: 14). Respondents also mentioned the predominance of English during meetings as a problem (Logbook entry: 11).

The above-mentioned problems largely comprise contraventions of the draft language policy of the Kopanong Municipality. In terms of the draft policy, official communication with the public (both oral and written) may not be conducted in English only. Thus, the examples actually point to covert language policy decisions promoting a central role for English in dealing with the public. In the absence of a final overt language policy, interim arrangements seem to be made from above, essentially reflecting language sentiments that differ from those of the communities. The fact that respondents mentioned the above problems indicates that they do not necessarily perceive an English-only policy as a solution.

Language problems related to the new officialdom

Finally, other problems that were identified can be directly related to the new officials who have been appointed since 1994.

Respondents cited the tendency of officials from the 'higher regions' (i.e. provincial and national government) to favour English as a problem, since some officials do not have a good command of the language, despite being forced to speak it – even in cases where the home language of an official is Afrikaans (Logbook entry: 14). Another problem concerns officials who cannot speak Sotho (Logbook entry: 101). The officials' lack of knowledge of the language policy of Kopanong was also mentioned (Logbook entry: 89).

Although these issues could also be regarded as problems continuing from the previous era, they can definitely be related to the post-1994 system involving officials who are forced to deal with a new language situation for which they are not adequately prepared.

Secondly, the nature of the language problems identified will be considered. Reported language problems in the Khula Xhariep area can be defined in terms of the following six broad categories:

(1) *Language attitudes and preferences*. Respondents reported that language is sometimes used as a means of discrimination or that the use of a language may sometimes be a symptom of some attitude (such as racial prejudice – new black officials will avoid using Afrikaans in the company of people that are considered conservative Afrikaners, but not in any other company) (Logbook entry: 18). This concerns the use of Afrikaans in particular. Regarding language preferences, interviewees reported a perceived insistence on the part of the municipal authorities on the exclusive use of English. Respondents also felt that they should be assisted in their home language (Logbook entry: 14).
(2) *Language policy and language rights*. The lack of knowledge among officials regarding the language policy is perceived as a problem (Logbook entry: 89), along with the lack of clear directives (Logbook entry: 18). Respondents pointed out that people are not aware of their language rights and consequently do not lodge complaints with the appropriate institutions (Logbook entry: 14; 28).
(3) *Language services*. Respondents reported shortcomings relating to the provision of interpreting services and the non-professional quality of the services, as a result of a lack of training (Logbook entry: 11; 28; 134).

(4) *Language skills*. Respondents reported a lack of appropriate language skills among officials, who often do not understand the local languages (Logbook entry: 101). In addition, the new black officials make excessive use of English; and their command of the language is poor (Logbook entry: 14).

(5) *Modes of interaction*.

   a. *Oral communication*. No problems were reported in this regard.
   b. *Internal communication*. Numerous respondents cited the predominant internal use of English within the Municipal offices as a problem. This practice sometimes tends to slow down procedures and meetings. The lack of interpreters at meetings was also mentioned (Logbook entry: 28; 129).
   c. *Written communication*. Respondents pointed out that written communication is often problematic, owing to the high rate of illiteracy in the area (Logbook entry: 123). Problems are also posed by the use of only English, or only English and Afrikaans, in written communication, including documents, forms and even fines (Logbook entry: 18; 87). Problems relating to the new local government include the predominant use of English in letters from government and public notices, and the prominence of English on public signs (where English occupies the top position) (Logbook entry: 11; 89).

(6) *Points of interaction*. Respondents reported ongoing problems, including the use of local languages at meetings held in black areas where not everybody understands these languages, and the lack of interpreting services in municipal reception areas (Logbook entry: 28; 124; 129). Respondents complained that communication at the Municipality is increasingly being conducted in English (Logbook entry: 14).

The above overview points to the centrality of language problems relating to communication between the Municipality and citizens (as well as internal communication within the Municipality). In turn, these problems are related to shortcomings regarding language skills, as well as inadequacies in respect of language services and language regulation, especially in terms of interpreting services and the lack of an appropriate language policy framework. An underlying problem that may have a bearing on all of the above, pertains to attitudinal issues and tensions arising from differences in language preference.

Table 5 contains a comparison between the source and the nature of the language problems.

The ambivalence among the respondents regarding language problems can be discerned quite clearly in this comparison. In many instances, a circumstance that is cited as a language problem is simultaneously also considered *not* to be a problem. This phenomenon suggests that solutions may indeed be available for many of the problematic areas. The comparison in the table also suggests that some language problems may arise from more than one source. The spread of problems, as reflected in the table, possibly indicates the prominence of some language problems, for example, those relating to language preferences, the language competency of officials, internal communication and public meetings.

The findings above suggest that many of the recognised language problems cannot necessarily be attributed to the envisaged new language regime for the area, but that they are actually 'carry-over' problems that were not addressed adequately in the past. If we are correct in assuming that the overwhelming denial of language problems may be an indication that bottom-up LP action has actually addressed these problems, then we are

Table 5. Comparative plotting of source and nature of language problems in the Khula Xhariep area.

Nature of language problem	No language problems	Continued problems	Language problems related to new government	Language problems related to new officialdom
Language attitudes and preferences				
Language attitudes	X	X		
Language preferences	X	X	X	X
Language policy and language rights				
Knowledge of language policy				X
Knowledge of language rights			X	
Language policy			X	
Language services				
Interpreting	X	X		
Language skills				
Language competency: officials	X	X		X
Language competency: public	X	X		
Modes of interaction				
Written communication				
Accounts	X			
Documents	X	X		
Fines		X		
Forms	X	X		
Letters from authorities			X	
Letters to public	X			
Posters		X		
Public notices	X		X	
Street signs			X	
Oral communication				
Communication with public	X			
Driving lessons	X			
Internal communication	X		X	X
Oral notices	X			
Telephonic enquiries	X			
Points of interaction				
Clinics	X			
Municipal offices	X		X	
Public meetings	X	X	X	
Reception	X	X		
Service points	X			
Traffic department	X			

dealing with a case where the top-down LP of the past has been found inadequate to address the local language needs of citizens.

The findings suggest that some problems can indeed be attributed to the new language regime, but that these problems do not actually arise from inadequacies in the draft language policy. Rather, they arise from covert top-down language policy initiatives, which seem to be ignoring the bottom-up language conventions alluded to above. In the next section, it will be shown that the bottom-up solutions to the identified language problems definitely do not include over-simplified policies which promote monolingual solutions involving English.

Action programme

The action programme in the current case refers to solutions to language problems in the Khula Xhariep area that appear to have become conventional. Different respondents agreed about the types of conventions that are operational, and which are aimed at addressing the language needs of citizens in a bottom-up manner.

Our overview of solutions to language problems in the Khula Xhariep area suggests that there is not necessarily a one-to-one correlation between each individual problem and the appropriate solution. Respondents' arguments as to why, in their view, no language problems exist, mostly included suggestions for possible solutions. By implication, these suggestions comprise evidence of successful bottom-up LP in the Khula Xhariep, thereby confirming the 'linguistic harmony' referred to by Yperzeele (2009, pp. 36, 70).

In her study, Yperzeele (2009, 38ff) identifies four prominent categories of solutions to language problems, i.e. a compromise (on the part of the more proficient speaker) in order to accommodate the speaker with lower language proficiency, informal (and not institutionalised) interpreting services, linguistic divergence (albeit very limited) and code-switching (cf. Yperzeele, Cuvelier, Meeuwis, & Vandekerckhove, 2009). Our analysis confirms the application of the first two categories in the Khula Xhariep, but also reveals further categories which need consideration.

From the responses, it can be inferred that over time, citizens in the area have adopted four broad approaches to solving their language problems, i.e. lingual, interlingual, attitudinal and communicative approaches. Over and above these four approaches, there were also responses which can be grouped together as 'Proposed solutions'.

Lingual approach to solving language problems

The lingual approach to solving language problems in the Khula Xhariep region involves conventions such as opting for a lingua franca (Afrikaans and/or English in this case) or a local language (Sotho or Xhosa) or for multilingualism in general. To some extent, this approach would require (and promote) individual bi- or trilingualism. Examples of each convention are as follows:

(1) *Opting for a lingua franca*. Oral communication with local government is facilitated when both officials and citizens can speak Afrikaans (Logbook entry: 18; 21; 25; 101) or English. Where the official cannot speak the language of the client, the lingua franca is used by both as a fall-back option (Logbook entry: 14). Problems regarding written communication (mostly internal) are solved by using mainly English (Logbook entry 5; 8; 14; 89; 129; 134).
(2) *Opting for a local language*. According to this option, oral communication problems are solved by using one of the local languages, Sotho or Xhosa, which are fairly well known (Logbook entry 28; 89; 114). However, this solution does not work for the white population, whose knowledge of the local languages is poor.
(3) *Opting for multilingualism*. Oral and written communication problems are solved through both societal multilingualism[3] (no limitation is placed on using the different languages of the region within the municipal sphere, as there are generally people around who know these languages and who could help out when language barriers do arise) and individual multilingualism (some individual officials and

some citizens apparently claim to be competent in the major languages of the region). The examples relevant to this option comprise solutions adopted by the Municipality as an alternative to the predominant use of English (Logbook entry: 18; 120; 124). Technically, they do not refer to the application of multilingualism by the public.

Interlingual approach to solving language problems

The interlingual approach involves three options, i.e. assistance (to speakers who do not understand a specific language), explanation and language facilitation (informal interpreting or translation). Examples of each are provided below:

(1) *Assistance*. One of the most frequently used solutions to a lack of knowledge of the language used by the Municipality in official communication is asking for assistance. In most cases, such problems relate to the filling in of forms (for instance, at clinics). Where the client cannot understand the form, help is requested from an official or bystander, or – in the context of the home – from a child (Logbook entry: 14; 18; 25; 87; 88; 89; 91; 94; 101; 114; 117; 120; 123). In many instances, the problem pertains to illiteracy among citizens. The solution can also be used for the reading of official letters, especially when they are written in English (Logbook entry: 11), and for dealing with official documents in general (Logbook entry: 124).
(2) *Explanation*. Requesting explanations is linked to the above option. This action is required when public notices and signs are not understood. Here, the problem stems more specifically from illiteracy (Logbook entry: 89; 120; 124).
(3) *Informal interpreting*. Informal or *ad hoc* interpreting is utilised by both local government and citizens as an option for resolving language problems. Where citizens experience problems (at clinics, meetings etc.), they request the help of an interpreter (Logbook entry: 94; 129).
(4) *Translation*. The examples gleaned from the responses refer to translation as a solution initiated by local government authorities (Logbook entry: 5).

Attitudinal approach to solving language problems

Two diametrically opposed attitudinal solutions are sometimes also used to resolve language problems, i.e. activism and language tolerance. Whether or not language activism actually represents a solution is a moot point. The same applies to language tolerance. The following examples can be cited:

(1) *Activism*. Three reported examples of language activism are language insistence, demanding the use of one's language – in this case Afrikaans – and complaining (Logbook entry: 21), and boycotting, in this case refusing to pay traffic fines which are not issued in one's own language (Logbook entry: 18).
(2) *Language tolerance*. Two examples of applying language tolerance as a problem-solving option are: not complaining when there is a problem (Logbook entry: 14; 28) and not being antagonistic towards other languages, in this case (usually) Afrikaans (Logbook entry: 14).

Communicative approach to solving language problems

From the responses, it can be inferred that three conventions are applied with a view to solving language problems from a communicative perspective, i.e. accommodation, mixed solutions and pragmatic solutions. Relevant examples are listed below:

(1) *Accommodation*. Accommodation is a frequently used option which essentially involves one speaker accommodating the language choice of the other. The examples mostly involve cases where the official cannot speak the language of the client, who then switches (Logbook entry: 20; 94; 114; 88; 120). Cases of officials accommodating clients were also mentioned (Logbook entry: 87).
(2) *Mixed solutions*. Mixed solutions refer to a combination of some or all of the options above, e.g. using English as a lingua franca PLUS providing interpreting services (Logbook entry: 8; 17), allowing the use of local languages PLUS using English and Afrikaans as lingua francas (Logbook entry: 89; 134), using the local language PLUS using English as a lingua franca PLUS providing interpreting services (Logbook entry: 5; 124) etc. Another facet of this approach involves varied solutions, e.g. using the local language OR English as a lingua franca (Logbook entry: 5; 123) and using the local language OR the most common language (Logbook entry: 88).
(3) *Pragmatic solutions*. The examples in this regard once again relate mostly to conventions followed by local government and local government officials. They are nevertheless worth mentioning. Most prominent is the convention of establishing consensus on the language(s) to be used at a meeting by using the language of the area or region (Logbook entry: 5; 88; 89; 94), or using the language of the majority of those present (Logbook entry: 134) or using the 'most convenient' language (Logbook entry: 8).

Proposed solutions to language problems

Technically, our examples of proposed solutions do not comprise instances of bottom-up language problem-solving, as they were given by councillors and officials. However, these proposals do reflect openness towards the language needs of the locals. There seems to be a realisation that interpreting services are essential (Logbook entry: 129), that language regulations are important (Logbook entry: 18) and that officials should actually accommodate the language of the client (Logbook entry: 112).

The overall impression obtained from this analysis relates to the varied and non-prescriptive nature of bottom-up solutions to language problems that seem to have become conventional in the Khula Xhariep area. Another notable tendency is the recognition and accommodation of the multilingual character of the area and also of the multilingual competencies of many of the inhabitants. Finally, the growing importance of English in combination with other options is evident. However, it is important to note that the importance of English is not necessarily the result of bottom-up initiatives. Rather, English seems to have become prominent in local government circles, especially internally. This is probably the outcome of covert policy consensus regarding the future role of this language. Nevertheless, there was no evidence of an over-simplified approach favouring an English-only solution.

Lessons for top-down language policy development

The data presented above suggest that over the years, the citizens of the multilingual Khula Xhariep area have developed ways to deal with most of the language problems experienced

in the area. Although some problems persist, the overall local attempts to resolve language problems seem to be relatively successful. These conventional solutions have been developed within the context of different language eras and language regimes in which particular languages have been favoured and elevated from above. Despite these top-down measures followed over the years, local 'home-made' solutions have been developed, partly in response to planning from above, but also in an attempt to adequately address local needs.

In this particular case, inadequacy identification regarding current top-down language policy (or the lack thereof) occurred at the local level, resulting in a corrective action from below. In fact, a continuing process has evolved in the top-down language policy vacuum. The draft language policy for the area might be responding to some of the locally developed conventions that have been identified above, such as a tolerant approach to the different languages of the area, encouraging officials to acquire these languages etc. Section 10 of the *Proposed language by-law for Xhariep* contains incentives for competence in the 'marginalised municipal languages' (Xhariep District Municipality, 2003). The data revealed here, on the other hand, suggest that there may be instances where bottom-up LP in the Khula Xhariep actually aligns with the covert LP implementation which we have alluded to above: by giving prominence, even at local level, to the use of English, as is perceived to be the practice at provincial and national level. The evidence also points to an increased role for English at the local government level. This growing prominence of English, in an area where the language is not commonly spoken as a home language, can be directly linked to the priorities of the new regime, which seems to favour this language. If this is true, then micro-LP is no longer necessarily a response to local language needs. Instead, it tends to become coercive localised LP. In such a case, agency has shifted from below to the top.

On the other hand, some of the inadequacies we have identified point to weaknesses in top-down language policy design for an area such as the Khula Xhariep. Future language policy should thus incorporate provisions concerning the following:

(1) Interlingual communication
   a. Provision for appropriate language services
   b. Provision for professionally trained service providers
   c. Provision for other language facilitation services (assisting with the completion of forms, etc.)

(2) Language code of conduct for officials
   a. How to approach 'the language issue' (dealing with issues of language tolerance, multilingual awareness, prescribing adequate approaches and responses etc.)
   b. How to interact with a multilingual public
   c. How to deal with different modes of written communication
   d. How to deal with internal communication

(3) Recourse and remedies
   a. The right of the public to appropriate treatment
   b. Available remedies and recourse
   c. Procedures to follow in cases of violations and grievances

(4) Evaluation and revision
   a. Directives on communicating language policy (to officials, public)
   b. Clear targets and procedures for evaluating language policy measures
   c. Time-frame(s) regarding revision of policy.

By giving due consideration to conventions followed in LP from below, top-down language planners who are serious about 'horizontal governance' (Cardinal, 2007, p. 89) might find that their efforts have the desired impact in the long run.

Conclusion

In this article, we have considered the actual LP mechanisms at work; how language problems at local level are identified; how solutions are reached; how conventions are developed; whether these plans are succeeding; how they are evaluated etc. Some of the sceptics to whom Baldauf (2008, pp. 18–19) refers may still not be convinced that there is a need to study micro-level LP or that the kinds of activities discussed above can even be referred to as instances of 'language planning'. However, the Khula Xhariep case study clearly suggests that we should not underestimate the role of agency in LP efforts and that LP from below can indeed be systematic in nature, and also that solutions from below can actually become conventionalised. Ultimately, one's stance on LP from below will largely be informed by one's approach to LP in the first place. The approach developed by Neustupny (1978) to LP as a metalinguistic corrective act provides a useful analytical framework, as shown here, which can prevent us from adopting an either–or attitude to LP from below. In fact, this article demonstrates that an analysis of evidence concerning LP from below could even be beneficial for the purposes of top-down language policy-making.

In conclusion, the case presented here brings us back to the sentiment expressed by Alexander (1992, p. 145), who argues in favour of LP that is not driven by a central government authority, and Kamwendo (2005, p. 144), who values grassroots-initiated LP. Although one might not necessarily agree with these sentiments, they do alert scholars to the crucial role of agency in bottom-up LP. The evidence presented above definitely provides new insights into this aspect and also contributes towards providing a new perspective on the problem relating to discrepancies between language policy and language practice. Instead of focusing only on the discrepancies, we can now also consider the evidence regarding a needs-oriented language ideology and its manifestation in corrective LP measures.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Mss Saskia Yperzeele and Chrismi-Rinda Kotze for their assistance in collecting data and to Chrismi-Rinda Kotze for her support in analysing the data and finding additional information. The research was conducted as part of the Multilingual Information Development Programme (MIDP), a partnership project between the Provinces of Antwerp and the Free State and the two universities located in the respective Provinces. The project is funded by the Province of Antwerp (cf. University of the Free State, 2009).

Notes

1. The term 'language planning' is used interchangeably with the related term 'language policy', in keeping with the practice that is usually followed in the literature. As Shohamy (2006, p. 49) points out, the boundaries between the two terms are not always clear – particularly in cases where language policies move beyond mere statements and incorporate details concerning procedures, etc. One way to resolve this dilemma is to see the terms as referring to different points on a *language planning continuum*, where LP is understood as essentially a (language) interventionist phenomenon. The 'language policy' point on the continuum can then be regarded as relatively less interventionist in nature (involving principles, goals etc.) and the 'language management'

(cf. Spolsky, 2004) point as relatively more interventionist (involving more detailed plans, control measures etc.) – a point which represents 'tools for managing language policy' (Shohamy, 2006, p. 55). In this article, the term 'language planning' has been used in the inclusive sense outlined here.

2. Statistics South Africa defines *home language* as '(t)he language most often spoken at home, which is not necessarily the person's mother tongue' (Lehohla, 2003, p. vi). For this reason the recorded responses regarding language are reported in terms of 'first home language' choices. Webb (2002, pp. 66–68) reviews the range of difficulties regarding language demographic nomenclature in South Africa.
3. Multilingualism here includes bilingualism and trilingualism.

Notes on contributor

Theodorus du Plessis is a professor in Language Management and head of the Department of Language Management and Language Practice at the University of the Free State. He is involved in language management activities in South Africa and is editor-in-chief of the Van Schaik Publishers series, *Language policy studies in South Africa*, and associate editor of the Journal, *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*. He is also co-editor of several books and articles on language politics in South Africa and a member of the International Academy of Linguistic Law.

References

Alexander, N. (1992). Language planning from below. In R. Herbert (Ed.), *Language and society in Africa: The theory and practice of sociolinguistics* (pp. 56–68). Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Baldauf, R. (2008). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. In A.J. Liddicoat & R.B. Baldauf (Eds.), *Language planning in local contexts* (pp. 18–41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Balson, S. (2007). *Children of the mist. The lost tribe of South Africa*. Queensland: Interactive Presentations.

Bamgbose, A. (1987). When is language planning not planning? *Journal of West African Languages*, *18,* 6–14.

Cardinal, L. (2007). Language politics and horizontal governance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *185,* 89–107.

Chríost, D. (2006). Micro-level language planning in Ireland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *7*(2/3), 230–250.

Chumbow, B. (1987). Towards a language planning model for Africa. *Journal of West African Languages*, *18,* 15–22.

Cowling, M. (2003). The tower of Babel – language usage and the courts. *EHRR*, *36*(2), 84–111.

De Bie, P. (1991). *Die groei van dorpe in the Oranje-Vrystaat en die implikasies daarvan* (Unpublished master's mini-thesis). *University of Pretoria*.

Department of Arts and Culture. (2002, November 13). *National Language Policy Framework* (Final draft). Pretoria: Author.

Devenish, G. (1990). Statutory bilingualism as an aid to construction in South Africa. *South African Law Journal*, *107*(3), 441–453.

Haarmann, H. (1990). Language planning in the light of a general theory of language: A methodological framework. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *86,* 103–126.

Kamwendo, G. (2005). Language planning from below: An example from northern Malawi. *Language Policy*, *4,* 143–165.

Kaplan, R.B., & Baldauf, R.B., Jr. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Khula Xhariep Partnership. (2007, September 9). *Khula Xhariep Partnership Home Page*. Retrieved July 30, 2009, from http://KhulaXhariep.co.za/

Lehohla, P. (2003). *CENSUS 2001. Census in brief* (Report no. 03-02-03 (2001)). Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

Liddicoat, A.J., & Baldauf, R.B., Jr. (Eds.). (2008a). *Language planning in local contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Liddicoat, A.J., & Baldauf, R.B. (2008b). Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In A.J. Liddicoat & R.B. Baldauf (Eds.), *Language planning in local contexts* (pp. 3–17). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Mesthrie, R. (2002). South Africa: A sociolinguistic overview. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *Language in South Africa* (pp. 11–26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Millar, R. (2006). "Burying alive": Unfocused governmental language policy and Scots. *Language Policy*, *5,* 63–86.
Neustupny, J. (1978). *Post-structural approaches to language. Language theory in a Japanese context*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
Raper, P. (2004). *New dictionary of South African place names*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.
Ross, R. (1976). *Adam Kok's Griquas. A study in the development of stratification in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
RSA. (1996). Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. *Act 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
RSA. (2000). Local Government Municipal Systems Act. *Act 32 of 2000*. Pretoria: Government Gazette.
Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stroud, C., & Heugh, K. (2003). Language rights and linguistic citizenship. In K. Heugh (Ed.), *Language policy and democracy in South Africa. The prospects of equality within rights-based policy and planning* (Doctoral Dissertation, Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University, Study VII, pp. 1–27).
University of the Free State. (2009). *MIDP IV.* Retrieved July 30, 2009, from Unit for Language Management: http://www.ufs.ac.za/faculties/content.php?FCode=01&DCode=153&DivCode=D026&uid=1311
Webb, V. (2002). *Language in South Africa. The role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
Xhariep District Municipality. (2003). *Proposed language by-law for Xhariep*. Trompsburg: Author.
Xhariep District Municipality. (2008). *Xhariep District Municipality*. Retrieved March 18, 2008, from http://www.xhariep.gov.za
Yperzeele, S. (2009). *Are you being served? De rol van taalattitudes bij publieke dienstleveringsinteracties in ruraal Zuid-Afrika* (Masters thesis, submitted for completion of the MA in African Languages and Cultures, University of Ghent, 2008–2009 academic year).
Yperzeele, S., Cuvelier, P., Meeuwis, M., & Vandekerckhove, R. (2009). Multilingualism and language attitudes in the Xhariep District: The case of Kopanong, In P.V. Cuvelier (Ed.), *MIDP Colloquium 2009. Multilingualism from below. Proceedings*. University of Antwerp, 14–16 September, 2009, pp. 108–110.
Yperzeele, S., & Kotze, R. (2008). *Investigation Xhariep. Field notes*. Antwerp & Bloemfontein: University of Antwerp & University of the Free State.

Logbook entries

Taken from Yperzeele and Kotze (2008) (CK = Chrismi Kotze; SY = Saskia Yperzeele, JZ = Jani Zandberg).
Logbook entry: 5, Date: 21 July 2008, Location: Municipality, Springfontein, Participants: Unit Manager 1, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 8, Date: 22 July 2008, Location: Local Municipal Office, Kopanong, Trompsburg, Participants: Kopanong Communication Officer, Kopanong Participation Officer, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 11, Date: 22 July 2008, Location: Home, Trompsburg, Participants: City dweller, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 14, Date: 23 July 2008, Location: Home for the elderly, Trompsburg, Participants: Occupant 1, Head and Executive Member Khula Xhariep Project (white community), Occupant 2, Secretary and Executive Member Khula Xhariep Project (coloured community), Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 17, Date: 23 July 2008, Location: Municipality, Springfontein, Participants: Unit Manager 1, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.

Logbook entry: 18, Date: 23 July 2008, Location: Traffic Department, Springfontein, Participants: Senior Administration Officer Grade 2, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 20, Date: 23 July 2008, Location: Community Hall, Springfontein, Participants: City dwellers, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 21, Date: 24 July 2008, Location: Home, Philippolis, Participants: Ex-politician, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 25, Date: 24 July 2008, Location: Municipality, Philippolis, Participants: Unit Manager 2, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 28, Date: 25 July 2008, Location: Road shop, Springfontein, Participants: Former Teacher Williamsville Primary School and Interim Chairman Khula Xhariep Project, Researchers: CK, JZ and SY.
Logbook entry: 87, Date: 12 August 2008, Location: Post Office, Springfontein, Participants: Officials and City dwellers, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 88, Date: 13 August 2008, Location: Mamello Clinic, Trompsburg, Participants: City dwellers, Nurses and Officials, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 89, Date: 13 August 2008, Location: Municipality, Trompsburg, Participants: Acting Unit Manager, City dwellers and Officials, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 91, Date: 13 August 2008, Location: Municipality, Trompsburg, Participants: City dwellers and Officials, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 94, Date: 14 August 2008, Location: Sehularo Tau Clinic, Springfontein, Participants: City dwellers, Nurses and Officials, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 96, Date: 14 August 2008, Location: Police Station, Springfontein, Participants: Police officers and citizens, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 101, Date: 15 August 2008, Location: Post Office, Trompsburg, Participants: Officials and City dwellers, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 112, Date: 18 August 2008, Location: Traffic Department, Springfontein, Participants: Officials, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 114, Date: 18 August 2008, Location: Municipality, Springfontein, Participants: Official, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 117, Date: 19 August 2008, Location: Post Office, Philippolis, Participants: Official and City dwellers, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 120, Date: 20 August 2008, Location: Philippolis Home Based Care Clinic, Philippolis, Participants: City dwellers, Nurses and Officials, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 123, Date: 20 August 2008, Location: Municipality, Philippolis, Participants: Officials and City dwellers, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 124, Date: 20 August 2008, Location: Home, Philippolis, Participants: Local1, Khula Xhariep associate, Local2, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 129, Date: 21 August 2008, Location: Xhariep District Office, Trompsburg, Participants: Executive Mayor, Xhariep, Councillor, Researchers: CK and SY.
Logbook entry: 134, Date: 22 August 2008, Location: Municipality, Springfontein, Participants: Councillor, Researchers: CK and SY.