



Language Planning Mechanisms towards Kiswahili as a Trade Language of the East African Community in Rwanda

Jean Wycliffe Mawike Masezerano¹ , Paul Zang Zang²

¹International Relations, Kigali Independent University, Kigali, Rwanda

²Faculty of Language, Humanities, and Social Sciences, University of Yaoundé I, Yaoundé, Cameroon

Email: masezeranow@gmail.com, zangzangpaul@yahoo.fr

How to cite this paper: Masezerano, J.W.M. and Zang, P.Z. (2023) Language Planning Mechanisms towards Kiswahili as a Trade Language of the East African Community in Rwanda. *Open Access Library Journal*, 10: e9948.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1109948>

Received: February 28, 2023

Accepted: March 28, 2023

Published: March 31, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Open Access Library Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

Language can be said to be one of the factors of regional integration. The integration of an individual into a community can be measured among other things through language. However, this factor is neglected when it comes to scholarships concerning regional integration. Language planning mechanisms of Rwanda do not favour the effective learning and acquiring Kiswahili as a trade language of the East African Community. To address this, the study used secondary data and primary data collected from participants found in the Rwandan bordering and urban communities. The data collected about language planning mechanisms that people see around them were statistically processed and analysed by use of hierarchical linear regression. Results showed the significant effectiveness of language planning mechanisms at the p -value below 0.05. It was found that language planning mechanisms are not enough to have a significant influence in promoting Kiswahili. Therefore, the study suggested that government of Rwanda and its partners put in place some language mechanisms that promote Kiswahili as a language of trade and integration in the EAC.

Subject Areas

Linguistics

Keywords

Kiswahili, Language Planning Mechanisms, Trade Language, East African Community, Rwanda

1. Introduction

Language can be said to be one of the factors of regional integration. The inte-

gration of an individual into a community can be measured among other things through language. However, this factor is neglected when it comes to scholarships concerning regional integration. According to Tochon (2009) [1], it is clear that for an individual to master a language that is not his or her mother tongue, there must be a policy that regulates the way of learning and acquiring that language. Spolsky (2004) [2] noted that language policy making is one of the most productive areas within which to examine interactions among global, national, and local forces.

Despite a growing acknowledgement of language policies that address conflicting visions for education, state-building, globalisation, and economic growth, as Edge (2006) [3] and Reagan (2005) [4] stated, the existing research on the designing and implementation of language policies practices across countries is still not enough. As a response to this problem, Patten (2001) [5] proposed three dimensions, namely official multilingualism, linguistic rationalisation and language maintenance. Once these three models are considered, language policy will cease to be problematic to some countries with linguistic diversity. It will also help regional integration blocs around the world that want to plan for language use.

Talking of language policy of regional integration blocs around the world, the European Union (EU) language policy is viewed as “unity in diversity”, which can be taken as a slogan of the community. The EU is considered as the only integration organisation to preserve the cultural differences that exist among the member states (Károly, 2008) [6]. Different scientific articles published after 2008 in Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN] consider English to be an official and working language of ASEAN community (Cheng, 2012 [7] and Deerajviset, 2015 [8]). This has been impacted by the fact that English is the official and semi-official medium of instruction and a school subject in Asian nations (Cheng, 2012) [7]. For Mercado Común del Sur (MERCOSUR), the official working languages are Spanish and Portuguese. However, Morris (2016) [9] asserts that the integration politics of MERCOSUR does not consider the issue of languages because the practices and politics of languages of member countries differ from one another. He, therefore, concluded that the lack of politics on the language of integration in the bloc affects the accelerated movements of people and goods in the region.

In Africa, some countries have failed to elaborate effective language policy that promotes their linguistic diversity. Contrarily, they have decided to adopt languages of colonial masters as their unitary languages (Léglise and Migge, 2008) [10]. Although some cases of African countries recognise some official status for an African language, they still adopt colonial languages alongside African language(s). It can be said that it harms the effective communication of citizens to some extent because it results in weak mastery of any language among the adopted ones.

This has also been the case for regional integration commitments on the continent. Looking at language policies of regional integration in Africa, it can be

realised that most of the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) do not have specific language policies. It is only the East African Community that went further to recognise Kiswahili as its official language and lingua franca with English as an official language (EAC, 1999) [11]. In this regard, the promotion of Kiswahili shall be supported by language policies in member countries.

Rwanda is involved in the promotion of Kiswahili since it is a member country of the EAC. The chronological use of language in Rwanda shows that before the independence in 1962, Kinyarwanda enjoyed the medium of instruction at all levels of education and in all sectors of lives (Samuelson and Freed man, 2010) [12]. Rwanda, as a country that plans to become a gateway for the Great Lakes and the East African region, has the vision to produce a multilingual workforce (The Republic of Rwanda, 2012 [13]: 12). However, the current education system of Rwanda allows three languages namely Kinyarwanda, French, and English to be offered in school as subjects where Kinyarwanda enjoys the privileges of being a language of instruction in the lower primary while either English or French takes over from upper primary until university level (The Ministry of Education [MINEDUC], 2003: 23) [14]. This means that a Rwandan student can develop multilingualism in Kinyarwanda, French and English.

According to National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (2012) [15], statistics show that Kinyarwanda, English, and French have 48.8%, 0.1%, and 0.1% of speakers, respectively. Even though the recent census did not explicitly show statistics on the number of speakers of languages spoken in Rwanda, the two precedent censuses reported that French, Kiswahili, English, and other languages counted for 5.1%, 2.3%, 0.8%, and 1.1% respectively (The Republic of Rwanda, 1991: 129) [16]. The census generally reported that Kinyarwanda as a national language was spoken by almost every Rwandan.

The number of speakers of Kiswahili in Rwanda reported reveals that speakers are still few. This fact causes slow integration of Rwandans into all domains of the East African Community. One might argue that the influence of language policy of the country towards the promotion of trade language is either ignored or unrealised. This raises debate on how the language planning mechanisms in Rwanda can promote Kiswahili to enable citizens to effectively communicate with their EAC counterparts. Hypothetically, the study believes that effective language planning mechanisms have a significant influence on Kiswahili as a trade and integration language in Rwanda.

2. Literature Review

The study considers language policy as a set of policies with which language planning mechanisms are also important. Language planning mechanisms are crucial in promoting a certain language that seems to be used by speech communities and decided by officials. Sometimes, officials consult what has been done in other contexts in terms of planning and implementation. The study therefore reviews language planning mechanisms from general to specific in or-

der to understand the existing problem.

Mwaniki (2010) [17] explored the strategic role of language within the EAC and concluded that the theoretical and practical management of language requires a detailed understanding of multilingualism and social structure, and of multidimensional social and demographic space as Spolsky (2009) [18] declared. In reality, Mwaniki wanted the EAC to address the application of language management in all sectors of the community affairs for the development and the promotion of regional integration. Similarly, Isingoma (2017) [19] explored and analysed policies, practices, and perspectives of languages in the East Africa and advised the community to grapple with the question of language choice for some time.

Deforche (2015) [20] criticised the Rwandan policy of language of serving political and economic interest for elites only. He argued that the little attention given to national language stops the literacy for people. Acquiring Kiswahili as a second language for Rwandese students would sharpen their intellectual skills and increase their benefits from Kiswahiliphone countries (Ntawiyanga, 2009) [21]. He reiterated the need to strengthen Kiswahili in the educational system of Rwanda in order to create the ability to communicate and provide access to the world marketplaces.

Mlaga (2017) [22] recommended the Rwandan decision-makers to decide on how Kiswahili can be taught in all secondary school. He also recommended the quality training of teaching and the preparation of a good curriculum for it. By this, Rwanda will be promoting integration in the EAC through promoting Kiswahili. Considering the existing literature about the importance of language planning mechanisms of Rwanda towards Kiswahili, most authors did not analyse the effectiveness of language planning mechanisms towards Kiswahili. The study analyses the effectiveness of those mechanisms that are available and evaluate the existence of language planning mechanisms towards Kiswahili as a language of trade and integration in the EAC.

3. Methodology

The study used Rwanda as an area of study where bordering and urban communities were selected purposively. Due to the fact that Rwanda is surrounded by countries that use Kiswahili, this geographic position can be considered as a pathway for the development of Kiswahili in Rwanda as Niyomugabo (2019, p. 8) [23] noted. Thus, communities of Cyanika and Gatuna between Rwanda and Uganda, Rusumo between Rwanda and Tanzania, and Nemba between Rwanda and Burundi as bordering communities, and then Kigali and Huye as urban communities were selected.

The target population was those people working in different domains of language use, as indicated by Fishman (1972) [24]. Such categories are administration, business, education, religion, and media. Seventy-eight (78) participants for each domain were picked except the religion domain whose participants were

seventy-two (72). Due to this, the study used probability and non-probability sampling while designing and selecting the sample and sample elements. The study used probability while calculating the sample size where the study used Kothari (2004) [25] formula. Hence the population of the study is not known, the researcher chose to calculate the sample size by using the confidence level of 95% which is preferred and the margin error of 5% and the standard deviation of 0.5. Kothari formula is as follow:

$$n = \frac{z^2 pq}{e^2}$$

where n is the sample size, z is the level of confidence which equals to 95% = 1.96, p is the population proportion which equals to 0.5, and e is the margin error which is equal to 5% = 0.05. q is found by taking $(1 - p)$.

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \frac{z^2 p(1-p)}{e^2} \\ n &= \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.5(1-0.5)}{0.05^2} \\ n &= \frac{3.8416 \times 0.25}{0.0025} \\ n &= \frac{0.9604}{0.0025} \\ n &= 384.16 \cong 384 \end{aligned}$$

To this, the study used 384 people as the sample. Non probability sampling was used in distributing and selecting sample elements according to their domains of language use and location. The study adopted questionnaire as a technique of data collection where questions were designed in Likert scale form and participants could react from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Nemoto and Beglar, 2014) [26]. After collecting data, the study used statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) for data processing where the information given was coded and quantified. The study ran a hierarchical linear regression in order to analyse the data.

Researchers tested both validity and reliability of the questionnaire by relying on different values set by prominent scholars in research methods. Firstly, the Cronbach's alpha of 0.7 for the validity of Likert scale questionnaire as Cronbach (1990) [27] and Reid (1990) [28] consider it as acceptable. This value was found after conducting a pilot study to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. Secondly, researchers used Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to test the validity and the structure of the questionnaire for its restructuring (Jolliffe, 2002: 9) [29]. The rotated correlation matrix showed the value of 0.3 which permitted researchers to reconstruct the questionnaire. Additionally, Kalser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's testes found the adequacy of the sample at the acceptable value of 0.6.

4. Presentation and Discussion of Results

4.1. Participants' Bio Data

Age, domains of language use, and location are considered as bio information of participants. This information was used because researchers consider them as important data to scientifically influence participants' responses. **Table 1** presents statistics on demographic characteristics of participants. It should be noted that the characteristics were coded as follow. Age: 12 - 18 is coded as 1; 19 - 25 is coded as 2; 26 - 45 is coded as 3; and 46 and above is coded as 4. For domains of language use, administration was coded as 1, education was coded as 2, journalism was coded as 3, business was coded as 4, and religion was coded as 5. For location, urban community was coded as 1 and bordering community was coded as 2.

Table 1 shows that age as participants' characteristic has a mean of 2.87 which tends to a mean of 3 and this means that many participants were between the age of 26 and 45. Participants from this category present 52.6% of participants (**Table 2**). In relation to domains of language use, the mean is 2.97 which mean that many participants were from journalism domain. Participants from journalism domain of language use present 20.6% of all participants (**Table 3**). Then on location, the mean is 1.53 which means that many participants were from bordering communities than those from urban communities. Participants from bordering communities present 52.9% of all participants (**Table 4**). Then 2 was the mode for location characteristic which means that participants from bordering communities appeared many times.

Table 1. Statistics on general information of the participants.

		Age	Domain of Language use	Location
N	Valid	384	384	384
	Missing	0	0	0
	Mean	2.87	2.97	1.53
	Median	3.00	3.00	2.00
	Mode	3	3	2

Source: Field data, 2020.

Table 2. Age of participants.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
12 - 18	17	4.4	4.4
19 - 25	91	23.7	28.1
26 - 45	202	52.6	80.7
46 and above	74	19.3	100.0

Source: Field data, 2020.

Table 3. Domains of language use of participants.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Administration	78	20.3	20.3
Education	77	20.1	40.4
Journalism	79	20.6	60.9
Business	78	20.3	81.3
Religion	72	18.8	100.0

Source: Field data, 2020.

Table 4. Location of participants.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Urban	181	47.1	47.1
Bordering Community	203	52.9	100.0

Source: Field data, 2020.

Cook (2000) [30] states that the acquisition of language is not the same among learners. He also believes that there are three main factors which influence the second language acquisition. Those factors are age, personality and motivation. **Table 2** shows that many participants were made of age between 26 and 45 years old while few participants were of age between 12 and 18 years old.

Table 3 shows that participants of the study from different domains of language use were almost equal in figures. By looking at the valid percentage of participants of each domain of language use, it is clear that the first four domains which are have almost the same percentage. The only domain that has percentage below 20 is that of religion which has only 72 participants which is equivalent to 18.8% of all participants. However, the percentage of religion domain is approximately equal to the percentages of other domains. This gives a balance in the distribution of participants which in turns gives an impression that responses from all domains of language use studied are reliable. According to (**Table 4**) many participants were picked from bordering communities while the small number of participants was picked from urban communities. Participants from bordering communities counted for 203 out of 384 participants of the study which equals to 52.9% of all participants whereas urban communities counted for 181 participants which equals to 47.1%.

4.2. Descriptive Statistics for Language Planning Mechanisms Variable

Frequencies in **Table 5** show that statistics are significant for all seven items at the fourth level of agreement which is agree. However, results also tend to show that people almost thought to be neutral for all statements. But it is clear that, if the addition to those agreed and those who strongly agreed with items, numbers

Table 5. Descriptive statistics on language planning mechanisms on trade language (Kiswahili).

Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
The government creates and encourages the creation of Kiswahili teaching centres	25	57	81	164	57	384
The government supports private centres of teaching and learning languages including Kiswahili	25	40	124	144	51	384
Procedures are encouraged to label their products in regional languages including Kiswahili	25	50	109	128	72	384
The government accompanies writers to produce language learning materials for Kiswahili	15	10	85	194	80	384
Government tries to avail Kiswahili interpreters	22	41	93	163	65	384
Children are thoroughly encouraged to learn Kiswahili as a regional language	17	41	36	192	98	384
Local leaders are encouraged to learn Kiswahili for motivational reasons	18	30	133	146	57	384

Source: Field data, 2020.

of those who agreed with statements under language planning sub variable will significantly increase compared to other levels of agreement for all items. In brief, the majority of participants agreed with statements.

In order to attain the objective of the study, researchers constructed seven statements (see **Table 5** and **Table 6**) seeking participants' agreements on whether language planning is implemented. **Table 6** shows that the statement that relates to government creating and encouraging Kiswahili teaching centres has the mean of 3.45 which does not have a tendency to the agreement levels. It only falls in neutral agreement. This means that participants are not sure whether the government does create or encourage those centres of teaching Kiswahili or not. But it can also be that participants are not aware of those centres which might be the reason why the mean falls in the neutrality level of agreement.

The second statement which was to test whether the government supports private centres of teaching and learning trade language has the mean of 3.41. This means that participants believe that the government does not support those centres. But on the other side participants were not sure about the existence of those centres. Although the participants' responses were neutral, it does not mean that they did not know the importance of language centres. The importance of language centres is recognised by (Nelleke & Young, 2017) [31] in developing people professionally and even competitively. This was also one of the recommendations of the European Commission (EC, 2011: 61) [32] to the European Union. To include the language infrastructure data and contact list in European information centres. The absence of language learning and teaching centres at the community level shows that the government does not put emphasis on how citizens will learn the language of integration in the EAC.

Table 6. Statistics on language planning mechanisms towards trade language (Kiswahili) in Rwanda.

	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic
The government creates and encourages the creation of Kiswahili teaching centres.	3.45	0.057	1.111	1.235
The government supports private centres of teaching and learning languages including Kiswahili.	3.41	0.054	1.053	1.109
Producers are encouraged to label their products in regional languages including Kiswahili.	3.45	0.058	1.130	1.277
The government accompanies writers to produce language learning materials for Kiswahili.	3.82	0.047	0.924	0.854
Government tries to avail Kiswahili interpreters.	3.54	0.055	1.071	1.147
Children are thoroughly encouraged to learn Kiswahili as a regional language.	3.82	0.055	1.069	1.143
Local leaders are encouraged to learn Kiswahili for motivational reasons.	3.51	0.051	0.993	0.987

Source: Field data, 2020.

The third statement was related to the labelling of products in regional languages including Kiswahili. The mean to this statement is 3.45 which means that participants do not see products labelled in regional languages including Kiswahili. This result reminds manufacturers the importance of labelling products in languages that are considered to be common or regional. It also reminds the role of policymakers (government) in urging manufacturers to label products in languages used in the community particularly the language of integration of the EAC.

The European Commission (2006) [33] asserts that labelling is an important market tool which should be viewed as an integral part of communication between societal players. This was also found by Ayodele and Awele (2016) [34] when they were looking at the effects of labelling products in local languages on purchasing decision. They found that labelling pharmaceutical products for instance has a positive effect on consumer purchase decision. Since labelling products can be used as a strategy for advertisement, sociolinguists mobilise manufacturers to emphasis on it because it contributed to maintaining and acquiring language. This was supported by the study done by (Callanan *et al.*, 2014) [35] on whether labelling can be a good method for young people to learn a language than directive method. They found that labelling has a positive signi-

ficance in learning a language compared to directive method.

The statement related to whether government accompanies writers to produce materials in Kiswahili, and participants tended to agree with that. However, the mean for that statement is 3.82, which means that participants were mostly neutral on whether the government supports writers in producing materials written in Kiswahili as a language of integration in the EAC. This result shows that participants do not explicitly recognise the role of government in supporting writers to write in the trade language. However, Williams (2012) [36] states that writing can have a facilitative role in the development of a language.

The availability of interpreters seemed to be insufficient according to the participants' views. The statement related to this has a mean of 3.54 which means that if the government had made them available to the community, participants would have not been neutral to the statement. This result can be used to remind the role of interpretation and interpreters in learning the second language as Akhyar (2011: 1) [37] revealed in his study. He said that translation and interpretation as language practices may contribute to the learning of second language more particularly for adult learners like those in universities. Regarding the sixth statement which means sixth possible language planning mechanism, participants' agreement shows that such planning has a mean of 3.82. This means that participants had a tendency to agree that the government encourages children to learn regional languages including Kiswahili.

The last statement related to language planning that encourages local leaders to use regional languages including Kiswahili. The mean to this statement is 3.51, which means that participants believe that the government does not encourage local leaders to use regional languages including Kiswahili in order to motivate other people to learn them. It is importantly known that in the absence of motivation, language acquisition will not be achieved. In this regard, Ellis (1994: 715) [38] suggests that motivation is "the effort which learners put into learning a L2 as a result of their need or desire to learn it". Also, Lightbrown and Spada (2001: 33) [39] identify motivation in SLA as an intricate incident which can be identified along with two factors which are "learners' communicative needs and their attitudes towards the second language community" (Ibid.).

4.3. The Effectiveness of Language Planning Mechanisms on Trade Language (Kiswahili) in Rwanda

Language planning or language management mechanisms are very important for effective implementation of language policy. To measure this, the researcher formulated seven latent factors or statements (see **Table 5** and **Table 6**).

The hierarchical linear regression model was used to assess the effectiveness of language planning mechanisms towards the promotion of trade language (Kiswahili) as a language of regional integration in Rwanda. The model permitted the study to enter other controlled variables in the model in order to check which change can be brought by those variables in the outcome. The objective to

use hierarchical linear regression is to analyse the effect of a predictor variable after controlling others (Mitzi, 2007: 10) [40]. To this end, the study entered language planning first as a predictor variable in the model then other controlled variables were entered later so as to check their value change in R square.

The study did a statistical test in order to assess the statistical effectiveness of language planning mechanisms towards trade language advancement. **Table 7** shows that the first variable that was entered in the model was language planning and has a coefficient of ($\beta = 0.394$) which corresponds to std. err. = 0.070, $t = 8.376$, and $p < 0.05$. The other controlled variables like age, domain of language use, and location have statistics as follow. Age has a coefficient of $B = -0.124$ which corresponds to std. err. = 0.499, $t = -2.651$, and $p < 0.05$. Domain of language use has a coefficient of $B = 0.024$ which corresponds to std. err. = 0.274, $t = 0.518$, and $p > 0.05$. The last variable entered in the last step was location which has a coefficient of $B = -0.061$ which corresponds to std. err. = 0.774, $t = -1.299$, and $p > 0.05$. Looking at the above statistics, it can be said that it is only language planning which can be used to predict the outcome in trade language as a dependent variable. Among the controlled variable, it is only Age which has a significant p-value despite its negative t value. The study confirms this because its p-value is significant at the $p < 0.05$.

Table 7. Statistical significance of language planning mechanisms on trade language (Kiswahili) in Rwanda.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	42.384	1.798		23.574	0.000
	Language Planning	0.589	0.070	0.394	8.376	0.000*
2	(Constant)	46.314	2.320		19.965	0.000
	Language Planning	0.583	0.070	0.390	8.359	0.000
	Age	-1.323	0.499	-0.124	-2.651	0.008*
3	(Constant)	45.965	2.418		19.009	0.000
	Language Planning	0.581	0.070	0.388	8.291	0.000
	Age	-1.325	0.500	-0.124	-2.652	0.008
	Domain of Language use	0.142	0.274	0.024	0.518	0.605**
4	(Constant)	47.493	2.687		17.675	0.000
	Language Planning	0.573	0.070	0.383	8.161	0.000
	Age	-1.256	0.502	-0.117	-2.501	0.013
	Domain of Language use	0.142	0.274	0.024	0.519	0.604
	Location	-1.006	0.774	-0.061	-1.299	0.195**

Note: for models * $p < 0.05$, ** $p > 0.05$. Source: Field Data, 2020.

The objective of the study was to assess the effectiveness of language planning mechanisms towards trade language (Kiswahili) promotion in Rwanda. The researchers, based on such an objective, formulated a hypothesis to test. It states that language planning mechanisms are effective in the promotion of trade language in Rwanda as a language of regional integration.

According to statistical results in **Table 7**, the $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.000$). These results give the study the ability to assert that available language planning mechanisms in Rwanda are not effective towards the promotion Kiswahili which is the language of trade and integration in the EAC. However, **Table 5** shows that participants had a tendency to argue that language planning mechanisms put in place by the government are effective but the extent to which those mechanisms are effective can be questioned. This is because the mean for all latent factors for language planning mechanisms fall in the neutral level of agreement.

In order to have effective language policy, Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008) [41] propose the language planning which considers more local issues. In their study, the authors suggested certain local issues that could be considered while planning for language policy and planning. They concluded that local contexts reveal clearly that micro-level language planning was not only a legitimate area of investigation for language planning scholars but that it was also a fundamental part of the language planning process with which language planning as a discipline must engage.

Looking at Rwandan language planning, it is stated that the official languages of Rwanda are Kinyarwanda, English, and French as the national constitution of 2003 amended in 2015 highlights (The Republic of Rwanda, 2003) [42]. The constitution states from the first up to the fourth paragraph of article 2 of chapter 2 that: “the national language is Kinyarwanda. The official languages are Kinyarwanda, English and French. An organic law may add or remove an official language. Official documents may be either in one, two or all of the official languages.” It is within the line of the last paragraph of this article that members of the lower house passed the organic law establishing Kiswahili as an official language as Bishumba (February 2017) [43] reported in the New Times.

Critically, the status planning for language use in Rwanda is there but not in an explicit way. This is because there is no detailed policy on how official languages should be used. By looking at the status planning for Kiswahili language in Rwanda, it can be said that Kiswahili has by law gained the status to be an official language in Rwanda even though it is not yet stated in the national constitution. The existing education sector policy, as it was edited in 2003 and updated in 2010, stipulates: “Rwanda has chosen the path of multilingualism. This has economic, social and political justification. Apart from the mother tongue of Kinyarwanda, French and English have been introduced in all schools as curriculum subjects and as the language of instruction from primary grade 4. All three languages are found throughout the education system from primary to tertiary levels.”

According to this existing policy, Kiswahili language had no significant place in Rwandan education system even though it is being taught to those students taking languages option from senior four of secondary. But in general, this existing education sector policy of the Ministry Of Education (MINEDUC, 2010) [44] referred itself to the national constitution which provides only three languages to be official in Rwanda excluding Kiswahili which of course was decided to be an official language later in February 2017 after two years of constitutional amendments. Although, the existing education sector policy only stipulates three languages in education, Mlaga (2017) [22] argues that Kiswahili started being taught in Rwandan schools from senior four up to senior six since 2008 with some reforms in education. As it was introduced in secondary schools, the Kigali Institute of Education started also to train Kiswahili teachers. He continues by saying that in the new current curriculum, Kiswahili language is being taught as from senior one up to senior three as subject.

All the above steps taken show that Rwanda has at least taken strategies to promote Kiswahili and those strategies can be classified at the level of acquisition planning for language as it was suggested by Chumbow (1987) [45] in his language planning model. This reflects the findings of the study where participants agreed not to know the effectiveness of language planning strategies for trade language and recall the importance of the effectiveness of language planning mechanisms stipulated by Spolsky (2007) [46] in his language policy theory's components. Other scholars who talked of the importance of language policy mechanisms which are at the local level are Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008) [41] and their assertion has a direct connection with the findings.

5. Conclusion

Finally, it revealed that language policy could be effective when there was also effective language planning mechanisms. This supported the findings of the study, which confirmed that the existing language planning mechanisms by the time the study was carried out towards the promotion of Kiswahili were not effective. Participants of the study could confirm that strategies for promoting Kiswahili were not effective hence they would propose improvement. The study examined the effectiveness of language planning mechanisms put in place by the government of Rwanda for promoting Kiswahili as a language of regional integration in Rwanda as well as in the EAC. Results from statistical analysis showed that participants did not know whether there were mechanisms put in place by the government to promote Kiswahili as a language of integration. The study also found, by using secondary data from documents, that specific strategies to promote Kiswahili as a language of integration were not effective and not enough. The study asserted that the existing strategies were not effective because there was no specific or written policy governing the language use of all official languages including Kiswahili in the daily life of Rwandans.

To this end, the study found some of the ways that could be used to promote

Kiswahili at the micro-level. Such ways were like the encouragement of the government to create public or private language centres that taught foreign languages including Kiswahili. Secondly, manufacturers could be encouraged to label their products both in community languages and other languages of integration including Kiswahili. The government could also make its language planning strategies effective by supporting writers and by availing translators and interpreters to the community. Encouraging local leaders to try to use Kiswahili could also make a policy effective. According to the participants' opinions, the study concluded that the then-existing language planning mechanisms were not effective as the respondents showed. This was to mean that the study used the opinions of participants that were gathered by using a structured questionnaire. Therefore, the effectiveness of language planning mechanisms could also be assessed by using other techniques like observation. It should be reminded that language planning could have a significant influence in promoting Kiswahili when government partners were also involved. These partners were like media, researchers, NGOs, and regional organizations.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Tochon, F.V. (2009) The Key Global Understanding: World Languages Education—Why Schools Need to Adapt. *Review of Education Research*, **79**, 650-681. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325898>
- [2] Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language Policy*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- [3] Edge, J. (2006) *Locating TESOL in an Age of Empire*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230502239>
- [4] Reagan, T. (2005) *Critical Theory, Globalisation and International Language Education*. The University Lecture Series, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- [5] Patten, A. (2001) Political Theory and Language Policy. *Political Theory*, **29**, 691-715. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591701029005005>
- [6] Karoly, A. (2008) Language Policy in the European Union. *Eger Journal of English Studies*, **8**, 125-141. <http://anglisztika.ektf.hu/new/content/tudomany/ejes/ejesdokumentumok/2008/Karoly2008.pdf>
- [7] Cheng, L. (2012) The Power of English and the Power of Asia: English as Lingua Franca and in Bilingual and Multilingual Education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, **33**, 370-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661432>
- [8] Deerajviset, P. (2014) The ASEAN Community 2015 and English Language Teaching in Thailand. *Journal of Humanities and Special Sciences*, **10**, 39-75. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/eJHUSO/article/view/85666>
- [9] Morris, M.A. (2016) *Language Politics of Regional Integration: Cases from the Americas*. Palgrave MacMillan, London.
- [10] Léglise, I. and Migge, B. (2008) *Language and Colonialism: Applied Linguistic in the*

- Context of Creole Communities. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 297-338.
- [11] The East African Community (1999) The Treaty for the Establishment of the East African Community. East African Community, Arusha.
- [12] Samuelson, B.L. and Freedman, S.W. (2010) Language Policy, Multilingual Education, and Power in Rwanda. *Language Policy*, **9**, 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-010-9170-7>
- [13] The Republic of Rwanda (2012) Rwanda Vision 2020. https://www.nirda.gov.rw/uploads/tx_dce/05_-_Vision_2020_06.pdf
- [14] The Ministry of Education (2003) Educational Sector Policy [Policy Brief]. http://mineduc.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/EDUCATION_POLICY.pdf
- [15] National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (2012) Fourth Population and Housing Census: Main Indicators Report. <https://microdata.statistics.gov.rw/index.php/catalog/65/download/509>
- [16] The Republic of Rwanda (1991) Recensement Général de la Population et de l'habitat. <https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/550/datafile/F1/V4>
- [17] Mwaniki, M. (2010) Language Management and the East African Community: Language Matters. *Studies in Languages of Africa*, **41**, 260-277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2010.515240>
- [18] Spolsky, B. (2009) Language Management. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [19] Isingoma, B. (2017) Languages in East Africa: Policies, Practices and Perspectives. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, **10**, 25-37. <https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v10i3.27401>
- [20] Deforche, R. (2015) Language Policy in Rwanda: Is Adopting English as an Official Language the Best Policy in Terms of Education for Rwanda? Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kent, Kent. https://www.academia.edu/4412081/Language_Policy_in_Rwanda
- [21] Ntawiyanga, P. (2009) The Role of Kiswahili in the Process of National Development in Rwanda. *Kiswahili*, **18**, 1-18.
- [22] Mlaga, W.K. (2017) Historia ya Kiswahili nchini Rwanda: Kielelezo cha nafasi ya utashi wa kisiasa katika ustawi wa lugha ya Kiswahili. *Kioo cha Lugha*, **15**, 1-17. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/kcl/article/view/162891>
- [23] Niyomugabo, C. (2019) Kiswahili Nchini Rwanda: Ufunguo wa Maendeleo Endelevu. Unpublished Conference Paper at East Africa Kiswahili Commission, 15-16 p. <https://docplayer.net/101882719-Draft-programme-working-document.html>
- [24] Fishman, J.A. (1972) Language in Sociocultural Change. Stanford University Press, Redwood City.
- [25] Kothari, C.R. (2004) Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. 2nd Edition, New Age International Publishers, New Delhi.
- [26] Nemoto, T. and Beglar, D. (2014) Developing Likert-Scale Questionnaires. In: Sonda, N. and Krause, A., Eds., *JALT2013 Conference Proceedings*, JALT, Tokyo.
- [27] Cronbach, L.J. (1990) Essentials of Psychological Testing. 5th Edition, UCL Press, London.
- [28] Reid, J. (1990) The Dirty Laundry of ESL Survey Research, TESOL. *Quarterly*, **24**, 323-338. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586913>
- [29] Jolliffe, I.T. (2002) Principal Component Analysis. Springer, New York.
- [30] Cook, V. (2000) Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press and Macmillan Publishers Ltd., Beijing.
- [31] Nalleke, V.D. and Young, S. (2017) The Role of Language Centres in the Profes-

- sional Development of Non-Tenure Track Language Faculty. In: Kronenberg, F.A., Ed., *From Language Lab to Language Centres and Beyond: The Past, Present, and Future of Language Centres*, International Association for Language Learning Technology, Auburn, 46-59.
https://www.academia.edu/32835536/From_Language_Lab_to_Language_Center_and_Beyond_The_Past_Present_and_Future_of_Language_Center_Design_A_publication_of_the_International_Association_for_Language_Learning_Technology
- [32] European Commission (2011) Report on Language Management Strategies and Best Practice in European SMEs: The PIMLICO Project. Semantica Ltd., Brussels.
https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/pimlico-full-report_en.pdf
- [33] European Commission (2006) Labelling: Competitiveness, Consumer Information and Better Regulation for the EU.
https://ec.europa.eu/food/sites/food/files/safety/docs/labelling-nutrition_better-reg-competitiveness-consumer-info_en.pdf
- [34] Ayodele, C. and Awele, E. (2016) Labelling in Local Languages and Its Effects on Consumer Purchase Decision of Pharmaceutical Products in Lagos Metropolis. *Nigerian Journal of Management Studies*, **17**, 157-166.
- [35] Callanan, M.A., Akhtar, N. and Sussman, L. (2014) Learning Words from Labelling and Directive Speech. *First Language*, **34**, 450-461.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723714553517>
- [36] Williams, J. (2012) The Potential Role(s) of Writing in Second Language Development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, **21**, 321-331.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.007>
- [37] Akhyar, R. (2011, November 3-5) Language Learning through Interpreting and Translation: Highlighting Students' Experiences. *Proceeding the 58th TEFLIN International Conference, "Language Learning through Interpreting and Translation: Highlighting Students' Experiences"*, Semarang, November 2011, 54-59.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284578704>
- [38] Ellis, R. (1994) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [39] Lightbrown, P.M. and Spada, N. (2001) Factors Affecting Second Language Learning. In: Candlin, C.N. and Mercer, N., Eds., *English Language Teaching in Its Social Context*, Routledge, London.
- [40] Mitzi, L. (2007, February) Stepwise versus Hierarchical Regression. *Southwest Educational Research Association 2007 Annual Meeting*, San Antonio, 7th February 2007, 1-30.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235464734_Stepwise_versus_hierarchical_regression_Pros_and_cons
- [41] Liddicoat, J.A. and Baldauf, B.R. (2008) Language Planning in Local Contexts: Agents, Contexts and Interactions. In: Liddicoat, A.J. and Baldauf Jr., R.B., Eds., *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690647-002>
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329068322_Language_Planning_in_Local_Contexts_Agents_Contexts_and_Interactions/citation/download
- [42] The Republic of Rwanda (2003) Educational Sector Policy [Policy Brief].
http://mineduc.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/EDUCATION_POLICY.pdf
- [43] Bishumba, N. (2017, February 9) MPs Approve Law Making Swahili Official Lan-

- guage. <https://www.newtimes.co.rw/section/read/207840>
- [44] The Ministry of Education (2010) Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010-2015. Ministry of Education, Kigali.
https://reb.rw/fileadmin/Policies/education_sector_strategic_plan.pdf
- [45] Chumbow, B. (1987) Towards a Language Planning Model for Africa. *Journal of West African Language*, **17**, 15-22.
- [46] Spolsky, B. (2007) Towards a Theory of Language Policy. *Working Paper in Educational Linguistics*, **22**, 1-14.