Managing Linguistic Diversity within and outside the Classroom in an International Multilingual High School in Namibia

Henry Amo Mensah
National University of Lesotho, Roma, Lesotho

Abstract: The paper examines multilingual practice and its management at Windhoek International School (WIS) which is a multilingual and multicultural educational international school in Namibia. The paper finds out how linguistic diversity is managed both within and outside of the classroom. The study which was qualitative used a mixed method approach for data collection. The research instruments used in this study were questionnaires, interviews and observation. Two unequal linguistic spaces at WIS emerge: the classroom space and the non-classroom environment. While the classroom space is affluent, prestigious and structural where monolingual norms are largely observed creating a situation of 'monolingual habitus' (Gogolin, 1994), the non-classroom space is constitutive and agentive with the habitus being multilingual. The findings reveal that the school community is linguistically diverse because of the large number of different languages represented in the various repertoires. English, however, dominates in the classroom and the participant's consumption of media while Languages other than English(LotEs) are used outside of the classroom and at home. The findings also reveal that two kinds of bilingualism also exist at WIS. These are 'subtractive' and 'additive bilingualism'. Based on these findings, the paper suggests that WIS should vigorously encourage 'dynamic' multilingual practices. In addition, it recommends that due recognition should be given to indigenous Namibian languages to meet a fundamental requirement in the International Baccalaureate (IB) language policy guidelines which support the active learning and use of the host country languages where IB schools are located.

Keywords: Globalization, discourses, multilingualism, superdiversity, linguistic habitus, International Baccalaureate

1. Introduction

Increased cultural contact and linguistic diversity emerging out of globalisation (Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck, 2005, p. 201) have occasioned the need for a reconsideration of multilingual practices and their management in multicultural and pluralinguistic educational spaces. Linguistic spaces are not empty spaces. They are filled with all kinds of attributes and features both materially and symbolically (ibid). In linguistic spaces of multilingual communities where a community of languages is used, different languages are assigned different statuses. For example, Bourdieu (1991) conceptualises the linguistic space as a market. He argues that the 'linguistic market' is hierarchical and assigns different values to different languages and people's competences in them. In addition, the values that different languages enjoy in the

market are dependent on the background and social status, among other things, of the individual who uses the language.

Hornberger and Vaish (2008) have noted that one of the consequences of globalisation is the spread of English as a medium of instruction in national school systems (p. 1). They postulate that disadvantaged communities are increasingly demanding access to English so that their children can join a workforce that mandates knowledge of this language (ibid). The demand for access to English is inextricably linked to the instrumental value of English. As a linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1991), English is easily convertible to cultural capital in terms of educational qualification and economic capital (Pan & Block, 2011, p. 393). At the same time, Hornberger (2009) argues that multilingual education offers the best possibilities for preparing coming generations to participate in constructing more just and democratic societies in the globalised and intercultural world. Clearly, the Hornberger and Vaish (2008) study and Hornberger (2009) show up the conflict between a drive for English on the one hand and spreading the values of multilingualism on the other.

2. Aim of the Paper

The paper reports on a research finding on multilingual practices and management in an international school in Namibia. According to Gynne and Bagga-Gupta (2013), school arenas offer children and young people a range of opportunities for usage of communicative resources related to languaging and learning (p. 479). They also hypothesize that multilingual educational settings allow researchers to study dimensions of language use in everyday life in schools and to examine languaging including literacy usage (p. 479). Following the postulation of Gynne and Bagga-Gupta, this paper takes a two-fold theoretical approach to multilingualism. These are an individual and societal perspective and an institutional standpoint on multilingualism. First, the paper considers relevant aspects of individual and societal multilingualism that have an effect on language choices within Windhoek International School (WIS), as well as on the achievement of educational success of the multilingual learners enrolled there. Second, from an institutional angle, it investigates language practices and their management at WIS. The views of individual and societal multilingualism that inform this paper are the broad and functional definitions of multilingualism.

3. Site for the Study: Windhoek International School

WIS was selected as the site of the study for a number of reasons. First, the school is one of a small number of private and independent schools in Namibia. It was established to serve the educational needs of the international and local community of the capital city, Windhoek. The student body represents a diverse range of nationalities with different cultures which include a tapestry of languages. It is also a site in constant flux - a meeting point for learners and teachers from many different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and, therefore, a constantly changing site where learners of different nationalities and cultures meet.

WIS is fully accredited by the American-based New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) and the Council of International Schools (CIS), an organisation to

which more than 330 schools worldwide are affiliated. It offers the Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) programme and is also authorised by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) to offer the IB Primary Years Programme (IBPYP), IB Middle Years Programme (IBMYP) and the IB Diploma Programmes (IBDP), all intended to offer coherent and internationally-recognised curricula. Thus, in terms of what is taught, the school subscribes to an educational programme which intends to prepare students for advanced tertiary education in an international market. A school with such an international positioning is of particular interest when it comes to the recognition of indigenous language varieties while also giving access to a global language.

4. Discourses of English Monolingual Habitus

Bourdieu's (1991) theory of habitus is a set of predispositions which incline agents to act and react in certain ways. 'Linguistic habitus' is theorised as the set of unquestioned dispositions related to thinking about, valuing and using languages. It is a broad concept that encompasses style, rhetorical abilities, grammatical knowledge, vocabularies and knowledge of various linguistic codes as well as particular paralinguistic features such as accents (Pavlou, 2010, p. 30). A person's linguistic habitus may be determined by structural factors such as a language's prestige. Williams (1992, p.137) defines prestige as the relative value of one language over another in social advancement. In other words, prestige refers to the positive image a language has on its intended users (Pavlou, 2010, p.57). Gogolin (1994) refers to 'monolingual habitus' as the deep-seated habit of assuming monolingualism as the norm in a linguistic community. In other words, 'monolingual habitus' refers to the dominant linguistic notion that accepts the homogeneity of languages and cultures in a nation state. Pan and Block's (2011) explanation of De Swan's (2001) World Linguistic Analysis suggests the reality of a global monolingual habitus with a hypercentral English at the core of a single coherent global language system (p. 393). The monolingual habitus is given impetus by the fact that English is regarded as a linguistic capital that provides users greater communication advantage. In the educational context, the concept of 'monolingual habitus' takes the position that only certain official languages are appropriate as the Medium of Instruction(MoI). Transferred to the classroom context, 'monolingual habitus' refers to the situation where it is wrongly assumed that all learners are a homogenous group and can be taught using a single MoI (Gogolin, 1994). The practical manifestation of the global monolingual English habitus in education is that the acquisition of and proficiency in the prestigious 'central' English by non-native speakers is the key to internationalisation and a link to getting connected to the world.

5. Discourses of Multilingualism

UNESCO (2009) advocates language policies that support multilingualism, language learning and endangered languages (p. 83). It suggests that such policies are central to the long term sustainability of cultural diversity (ibid). Different discourses of the multilingualism assign different meanings to the term. Dominant ideologies emphasise complete facility in different languages before one can be regarded as multilingual (Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck

2005, p. 199). Ludi (2000) states that traditionally a person may be called multilingual if he/she uses his/her languages on a regular basis and is able to switch from one to another wherever it is necessary (p. 25). Generally, however, the term may refer to (i) the ability of an individual to use two or more languages often at varying levels of proficiency and (ii) the phenomenon of a community of speakers who know and use multiple languages. Broadly, a multilingual individual is defined as one who knows and can communicate in more than one language, be it productively (through speaking, writing or signing) or receptively (through listening, reading or perceiving) (Baker & Jones, 1998). A functional definition of 'multilingualism' refers to how a multilingual person is able to adjust his/her language choice to a particular context and to shift from one language to the other, if necessary, independently of the balance between his competencies (Ludi, 2000, p. 15).

Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck (2005) posit that 'multilingualism' should not be full competence in different languages. They argue for the phenomenon of 'truncated multilingualism' which refers to multilingualism which is organised topically on the basis of domains or specific activities (p. 199). In other words, crossing and truncated multilingualism refers to the situation of translinguistic encounter where there is a sharp difference in knowledge of language across interactants. It indicates what counts as competence in real environments and how writers' and speakers' communication goals are understood in particular situations. It includes the processes of negotiation and repair that attend all communicative practices. Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck (2005) again conceptualise multilingualism as "not what individuals have and don't have, but what the environment as structured determinations and interactional emergence, enables and disables" (p. 197). Societal multilingualism, on the other hand, primarily concentrates on the interplay between languages in a community that accommodates speakers of various languages. A multilingual society is one in which more than one language is used as L1, where many speakers are themselves bi-or multilingual but some may be monolingual speakers of a single one of the community of languages.

6. Multilingual Education Discourses

An understanding of multilingual education begins with an understanding of 'bilingual education'. Baker (2001) defines bilingual education as education in more than one language that may also include more than two languages. Garcia (2009), on the other hand, perceives bilingual education as an instance in which learners' and teachers' communicative practices involve the use of multiple multilingual practices that ensure that the learners get the best from these practices (p. 9). Earlier, Lambert (1974), referred to by Garcia et al. (2011), explains that bilingualism could either be subtractive or additive (p. 2). In education, subtractive bilingualism refers to a system in which the L1 as MoI is taken away and replaced by the L2. This results in a monolingual system where an L2 becomes the sole language – of – learning for a number of learners. In additive bilingualism, an L2 is added to an L1 as medium of instruction (MoI) without any loss of the L1. Subtractive and additive bilingualism are linked to the concepts of 'language minorities' and 'language majorities' respectively. According to Garcia et al. (2011), language minorities usually experience subtractive bilingualism as they study in a language which is different from their L1 (p. 2). In other words, the L1 of language minorities is taken

away as they learn the school language. Conversely, learners from a language majority within a multilingual context usually experience additive bilingualism as they are likely to learn the school language in addition to their home language. The argument for additive bilingualism is that it is socially and cognitively beneficial, whereas subtractive bilingualism results in the replacement of learners' home language as the MoI so that effectively the L1 is reduced in terms of its value in knowledge development.

Garcia et al. (2011), considering the transformation that bilingualism has undergone in the 21st century, propose the concepts of 'recursive' and 'dynamic' bilingualism (p.1). The theoretical basis of these two new models of bilingualism is that language practices of bilinguals are complex and interrelated and not simply linear (Garcia et al., 2011) as additive and subtractive bilingualism seem to suggest (p. 3). According to Garcia et al. (2011), recursive bilingualism refers to cases where bilingualism is developed after the language practices of a community have been suppressed (p. 3). In this situation, language minority communities who have experienced language loss and then attend bilingual schools in the hopes of revitalising their languages undergo a process of recursive bilingualism. Since they already have an L1, they do not start as simple monolinguals. Rather, they recover bits and pieces of their existing language practices. They develop bilingualism that continuously reaches back to move forward (Garcia et. al., 2011, p. 3). On the other hand, dynamic bilingualism refers to language practices that are multiple and try to adjust to the multilingual learning environment. Dynamic bilingualism refers then to the different uses of multiple language practices that enable multilingual individuals to communicate in multilingual environments.

The International Baccalaureate (IB) (2013 – 2014) defines multilingual education in terms of the number of languages that an internationally minded learner possesses. It also suggests the use of L1 and other languages to differentiate tasks and activities so that learners' prior knowledge can be activated in the classroom (p. 22). Thus multilingual and bilingual educations are similar to the extent that both instances involve the use of more than one language in education (Baker, 2001; Garcia, 2009).

Hornberger (2009) states that multilingual education begins from the knowledge that learners bring to the classroom and moves toward their participation as full and crucial actors in society – locally, nationally and globally (p. 2). Through the use of different languages in the curriculum, children develop multiple language practices. This is effective when a wide range of languages is accepted and tolerated in the classroom. To Hornberger (2009), multilingual classrooms are hybridized classrooms which offer the possibility for teachers and learners to access academic content through the linguistic resources learners bring to the classroom while simultaneously acquiring new ones (p.10). She advances the point that classroom practices can foster transfer of language and literacy across languages and modalities. Such a transfer involves languaging.

Gynne and Bagga-Gupta (2013) postulate that languaging includes the use of oral, written and other semiotic resources related to work done in school settings (p. 480). As the dynamic and social use of different linguistic features, languaging also fosters the creation and negotiation of meaning (ibid). Garcia et al. (2011) have introduced the term multiple translanguaging practices (p. 2). Garcia (2009) defines translanguaging as the multiple discursive educational practices that individuals use that use bilingualism as a resource in the classroom. Translanguaging takes

the position that bilinguals have one linguistic repertoire from which they strategically select features to communicate effectively. Again Garcia (2009) states that translanguaging has the potential of allowing bilinguals to use their entire linguistic repertoire to develop language practices that allow them to learn demanding content.

The IB advocates that multilingual classrooms should be the norm, which means that a diversity of languages should be used in the classroom. It believes that the ability to communicate in a variety of modes in more than one language is essential to the concept of international education that promotes intercultural perspectives (Sing & Qi, 2013, p. 19). The IB also holds that "bilingualism, if not multilingualism, is the hallmark of a truly internationally minded person" (Sing & Qi, 2013, p. 17). It is important to note, however, that the IB does not adopt "the reciprocal position that, a monolingual person has a limited capacity to be internationally minded" (ibid). In addition, the IB adds that recognising the multilingual and multicultural composition of learners can help affirm learners' identities and autonomies (International Baccalaureate 2013 – 2014, p. 22). The IB language policy guidelines also support the active learning and use of the host country languages where IB schools are located.

7. Methodology

The study was qualitative in that it sought to provide an in-depth analysis of multilingual practices at WIS in addition to finding out how linguistic diversity was managed with the aim of resolving possible conflicts regarding language use. The participants, 20 learners and 20 teachers, were purposively selected on the basis of their multilingual repertoires for the interview. In addition, 5 learners and 5 teachers were also purposively selected for the interview based on their multilingual repertoire and their willingness to take part in it. In keeping with Miles and Huberman (1994), who argue that sampling strategies for qualitative research should be driven by a conceptual question, not by concern for 'representativeness' (p. 20), the study was motivated by the conceptual question: how does a multilingual educational institution manage linguistic diversity both within and outside of the classroom?

The case study method was used. According to Berg (2004), the case study method may be defined as a process of gathering adequate information in a systematic manner about a particular person, social setting, social group or an event (p. 283). The purpose of this method is to allow the researcher to find out in fine detail and with sufficient depth how the person or social group operates or functions in real circumstances. The research instruments used in this study were questionnaires, interviews and observation.

7.1. Data from Questionnaire

The questionnaire focused on the linguistic profiles, domains of language use, language biographies of the participants and their attitudes towards the language they knew. (see Appendixes 1 & 2) In the first part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to fill in all the languages they knew in a table even if they were not proficient in them. The rationale behind this was to find out the linguistic profiles and individual multilingualism of the learners and teachers in line with the definitions of Baker and Jones (1998), who define a multilingual

person as one who can speak and communicate in more than one language, be it actively (through speaking, writing, or signing) or passively (through listening, reading, or perceiving) or in Ludi's (2000) terms, a person who uses her or his languages on a regular basis and is able to switch from one to another wherever it is necessary. The second part concentrated on the domains in which they used the languages. The third part focused on the language biography of learners and teachers. This section asked the learners and teachers to state briefly where they learnt the language(s) they indicated that they knew and where they came across them for the first time. Another question sought to find out whether they would like to improve their proficiency in the languages they knew. Table 1 shows the responses from learners and teachers.

Table 1. Linguistic Profile, Domains of Use, Language Biography and Language Attitude

Languages	**Number of Learners**	**Number of Teachers**	**Domains of Language Use**	**Where Language They Learnt for the First Time**	**Attitude towards the Language(s)**
English	20	20	Home; school; everywhere	Home while they were growing up; strengthened their knowledge in pre-school.	English was important to them because it was a world language. Although they were competent in it, they still wanted to improve their knowledge of it.
Afrikaans	10	10	Home; village; school	Home	They wanted to improve their knowledge of it. A learner wanted to learn Afrikaans better so she would not lose her knowledge of it.
French	9	8	French lessons	Home; school	They wanted to improve their knowledge of it. A learner mentioned that she wanted to improve her knowledge of French because it was a "beautiful language".
German	7	6	Home; German lessons; swimming lessons; home	Home; school	They wanted to improve their knowledge of it. A learner who indicated that he was proficient in German still wanted to improve his knowledge so he could communicate effectively in it while in Germany.
Portuguese	7	4	Home; school; Portuguese lessons; other subjects	Home; school	-

Spanish	5	3	Home	Home	They wanted to improve their knowledge of it. A learner wanted to improve her knowledge of Spanish in order to be able to communicate with her stepmother at home.
Dutch	-	3	Home in Holland	Home; school; college and from watching TV	A teacher whose L1 was Dutch mentioned that she attached great importance to it.
Russian	-	1	Home; school	Home; family in Russia	Russian was her culture.
Herero	2	-	Home; village	Home	-
Otjiherero	1	-	Home; village	Home	-
Damara	1	-	Home	Home	He wanted to improve his knowledge of it because it was his L1
Nama	-	1		South of Namibia.	Knowledge of Nama helped her to understand the culture of the people of Southern Namibia.
Oshikwayama	-	1	Home	North of Namibia	-
Rukuwangali	-	1	Home in Kanango in Namibia		She wished she was more fluent in Rukuwangali because needed it for professional purposes. A better understanding of Rukuwangali will help her understand the Oshiwambo dialects.
Swahili	1	2	Home	Home; school	A teacher said Swahili made her feel more Kenyan
Zulu	-	1		Home	-
Xhosa	-	1	University	University of Cape Town	-
Tamil	-	1	Home	Friends during social interactions	-
Hindi	-	1	Home	School	-
Kannada	-	1	Home	School	-
Malayalam	-	1	Home	Home; friends during social interactions	-

Xista	-	1	Home	Home with parents and friends in Mozambique	-
Changana	-	1	Home	Home with parents and friends in Mozambique	-
Kikuyu	-	1	Home; school	Home with family	-
Dholou	-	1	Home; school	-	-
Yoruba	-	1	Home with Nigerian community in Namibia	Home	It was a mark of his cultural identity

In all, four learners stated that they knew five languages, 12 learners mentioned four languages as the languages that they knew and four learners pointed out that they knew three languages.

7.2. Data from Interviews

Five learners and 5 teachers were purposively selected on the basis of their linguistic profile and their willingness to participate in the semi- structured interview. The learners comprised four females and one male. The reason for the gender imbalance is that the male learners were reluctant to be recorded. The teachers were made up of one male and four females. On the other hand, the teachers were selected solely based on their linguistic profiles.

The interview was divided into four parts. First, each participant was asked to give some comment on their personal background. Second, they were asked to comment on their language use inside and outside of the classroom. These questions also aimed at finding out whether there were occasions that languages other than English were used in the classroom, who used them and what the circumstances of such use were. In addition, the questions sought to find out if the teachers and learners in particular were confident in using English in the classroom. The third part of the questions focused on which languages learners and teachers used in communication with their friends and colleagues outside of the classroom, which languages teachers used in communication with the learners outside of the classroom and which languages learners used in communication with teachers outside of the classroom. These questions aimed at finding out why they used them in social domains such as in cell phone texting and writing emails. Another area of interest was their choice of language in entertainment, such as watching television or listening to the radio, where receptive rather than productive preferences are involved. Finally, the interview intended to find out which language(s) learners and teachers used at home, specifically with whom the learners and teachers used specific language(s) with and for which

purpose. Tables 2 and 3 show learners' and teachers' responses on the different domains that they used their repertoire.

Table 2. Domains of Language Use

Name of Learner	Number of Languages Known	Languages	Language Used inside the Classroom	Language Used outside the Classroom	Language Used at Home	Language of Entertainment and Communication	Additional Comments by Learners
Louisa	4	English, Otjiherero (L1), Afrikaans, French	Mostly used English, Occasionally used Otjiherero and Afrikaans	English, Otjiherero, Afrikaans	Otjiherero and a little bit of English	TV: English Radio: English Text messages: English	She was confident in using English. Although Otjiherero was her L1, she hardly wrote it because its grammar was daunting.
Sandra	4	English (L1), German, Afrikaans, Spanish	English in all subjects, German and English in German class	English, German, Afrikaans	English and German; and Spanish occasionally	TV: English Text message: English	She was confident in using English. She used both English and German in German class because she was not proficient in German. English acted as a way of bridging her knowledge in German.

Maria	3	English, Afrikaans (L1), French	English but Afrikaans in French class	English, Afrikaans	Afrikaans	TV: English Films: French; Afrikaans occasionally Radio: Afrikaans; English Text: English; Afrikaans Email: English	She spoke English very well. She used both Afrikaans and French in the French class as a way of bridging her knowledge in French. Her parents insisted she spoke Afrikaans at home because according to her parents, "it was a way of keeping in touch with her roots"
Ursula	2	English (L1), German	English, German during German class	English	English, German occasio-nally	TV: English Text: English Email: German and English	She was proficient in English and it influenced her choice of TV programmes
Pedro	2	English, Portuguese (L1)	English, Portuguese occasio-nally	Portuguese	Portuguese	TV: English Radio: English; Portuguese occasionally Email: Portuguese; English	He was not proficient in English because he had been learning it for two years. He codes-witched between English and Portuguese. He needed to improve his knowledge to actively participate in class.

Table 3. Domain of Language Use: Teachers

Name of Teacher	Number of Languages Known	Languages	Language Used inside the Classroom	Language Used outside the Classroom	Language Used at Home	Language of Entertainment and Communication
Teacher A (Portuguese teacher)	6	Portuguese (L1); English; Afrikaans; German; Spanish; French	Portuguese	English; Portuguese; Afrikaans; occasionally used French and German with colleague teachers.	Portuguese English; Afrikaans	TV/Radio: Portuguese; English Email: Portuguese; English
Teacher B (Portuguese teacher)	6	Xistwa (L1); Portuguese; English; Kiswahili; Changana; Spanish	Portuguese	Portuguese with learners; occasionally used English with learners; Portuguese, English with teachers	Xistwa; Portuguese; English	TV/Radio: Portuguese; English Email: Portuguese
Teacher C (Learning support teacher)	5	Dutch (L1); English; German; French; Afrikaans	English	English	Dutch; English; Afrikaans	TV: Dutch; English Radio: Dutch; English; Afrikaans Email: Dutch; occasionally in French
Teacher D (French teacher)	3	French (L1); English; Spanish	French; occasionally used English	English	French	Radio/TV: French/ English Email: French; English
Teacher E (EAL teacher)	3	English (L1); French; Rukukwa-ngali	English but code-switched between English and learners' L1	English	English	TV: English Radio: English; French Email: English; French

7.3. Data from Classroom Observation: English and Geography

The information gained from the questionnaire and interviews was supported by the researcher's observations of real-time language use in the classroom. Two lessons, namely Geography and English were observed. The total number of hours of observation was two hours and forty

minutes. Observation was used because according to Silverman (2000), observing what happens in the classroom allows the researcher to observe what participants in a research study actually do and not what the participants think they do (p. 34). Specifically, in this study, the purpose was to find out at firsthand how linguistic and cultural diversity was managed in a multilingual classroom. In addition, by observing these two lessons, the researcher sought to find out how the teaching and learning practices in the classroom reflected the multilingualism of the community.

The accompanying guiding questions for the observation were intended to find out the number of learners in each classroom at the time, confirm the languages represented as learners' L1s, the L1 of the teacher, which Languages other than English(LotEs) were used, how often the LotEs were used, the circumstances in which LotEs were used, the occasions when students communicated in LotEs, how the teacher reacted to students who communicated their LotEs and whether or not the teacher used LotE in the classroom. In addition, it sought information on the circumstances of introducing LotE into the classroom (if any) interactions and whether LotEs ever functioned as 'bridging' in the development of knowledge; whether LotEs were used for 'scaffolding'.

According to Labov (1972), 'the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation' (p. 209). Systematic observation may be affected by the 'Observer's Paradox' which is that the presence of the observer may change the condition of the observed. In order to minimise the observer's paradox, Leedy and Omrod (2010) suggest that during observation, there are two options open to the researcher. The researcher can observe as a relative outsider or he/she can assume the role of an observer – participant. In this study, the researcher combined both roles.

As a participant – observer, the researcher moved around and asked students questions on why sometimes they code – switched. With this approach, the learners and the teacher were not affected by the observer's paradox because they behaved naturally without feeling intimidated by the researcher's presence. In the English class there were 20 learners. Table 4 shows the languages that were represented in the English classroom.

Table 4. Number of Languages Represented in the English Classroom

Languages	**Number of Speakers**
English	20
Afrikaans	10
French	9
German	7
Portuguese	7
Spanish	5
Herero	2
Otjiherero	1
Damara	1
Swahili	1

The teacher was an American whose L1 was English. The teacher communicated only in English to the learners. Although he had indicated that he also knew Oshikwayama which he had learnt as an L2 in 1998 in the north of Namibia while he served as a Peace Corps volunteer , his knowledge of this language according to him was "poor". He was, therefore, the only participant in the study who was virtually monolingual. He most likely worked with "monolingual habitus" (Gogolin, 1994) with a limited understanding of how multilingual learners make use of more than one language in their everyday lives and also in learning.

The topic of the lesson was *'The Descriptive Essay'*. The teacher combined the lecture technique and question and answer sessions during the lesson. Occasionally, the learners were allowed to engage each other in discussion. As an English lesson, the MoI was English. The researcher observed that though some learners whispered in their L1 (especially the students whose L1 was Portuguese), no other language apart from English was used during the lesson. The teacher communicated only in English to the students. There was no occasion where he used his poor knowledge of Oshikwayama to explain any concept. Indeed, there was no Oshikwayama – speaking learner in the classroom. Thus, no other language functioned as a 'bridge' for the development of knowledge or was used as part of 'scaffolding' literacy practices. Though no student showed any sign of feeling marginalised because of his/her limited proficiency in English, there were a few occasions when a student sought clarification on the teacher's pronunciation of words. Some of the students explained that his accent sometimes confused them.

There were 22 learners in the Geography classroom. The reason for the difference in numbers between the English lesson and the Geography lesson is that English is a core subject at WIS and learners are equally divided between two teachers while Geography is an elective subject so the number of learners is dependent on the number of learners who sign up for the course. Table 5 shows the languages that were represented in the Geography classroom.

Table 5. Number of Languages Represented in the Geography Classroom

Languages	**Number of Speakers**
English	22
Afrikaans	12
French	9
German	7
Portuguese	7
Spanish	5
Herero	2
Otjiherero	1
Damara	1
Swahili	1

The teacher was Irish and her L1 was English. However, she had indicated earlier in the questionnaire that she knew Dutch, French and Afrikaans. The lesson was *'Urbanization'*. The MoI was English. The researcher observed a few occasions when the learners used Languages other than English (LotE). For example, students who spoke Portuguese as L1 sat together

in a row and sometimes used Portuguese to explain concepts to each other that they did not grasp very well in English. They mentioned that sometimes they used their L1 to help them to understand aspects of the lesson better.

Although the teacher's L1 was English, she did not discourage the students from using their L1. She made the point after the lesson that allowing the learners to use their L1 helped the learners to grasp the concepts better; she also felt that it facilitated the teaching and learning process. In addition, she mentioned that the learners were aware that English was the official language of communication and they could not use their L1 in contexts such as written examinations.

Throughout the lesson, she communicated only in English and the learners did not address her directly in any other language. From the observation, between the teacher and the learners, one can say that no language functioned officially as 'bridging' the development of knowledge. However, to the extent that the students whose L1 was Portuguese were concerned, code – switching was likely to act as 'bridging' the knowledge gap. There was no instance where another language was used as 'scaffolding'. In addition, no student showed any sign of marginalisation because of his/her limited proficiency in English. Indeed, all the students participated effectively in the lesson. It should be pointed out that in the classroom all the displays on the wall were in English.

8. Analysis of Data

An aim of the study was to investigate language practices from an institutional angle. The data collected by the various instruments showed that the learner/teacher – participants knew and used a tapestry of languages. The complete list of the languages that the learner/teacher – participants together knew were the following Namibian languages, namely, Afrikaans, Herero, Otjiherero, Damara, Nama, and Oshikwayanyama. The learner/teacher-participants also knew a number of African languages which are Swahili, Zulu, Xhosa, Xista, Kiswahili, Changana, Kikuyu, and Indian languages, namely, Hindi, Tamil and Kannada in addition to the following European languages: English, German, French, Spanish and Portuguese. Clearly, for all the learners and teachers, multilingualism formed part of their daily experience. They lived in a community where language diversity was part of their daily experience; they had been socialized in an environment which can be described as a multilingual reality.

The information gathered from the study also gave evidence of real-time language use in the classroom and outside of the classroom. It shed light not only on the linguistic superdiversity of the school community in the large number of different languages represented in the various repertoires, but also on the respondents' preferences in the choice of languages in different social domains. The linguistic space at WIS determined how the learners deployed their linguistic resources and skills.

The data are analysed based on the following:

1. how and in what domains English was used;
2. how and in what domains other languages were used;
3. what participants' language use preferences were; and

4. the choice of the participants' language in entertainment, such as watching television or listening to the radio, where receptive rather than productive preferences are involved.
5. language(s) participant used at home, specifically with whom the learners and teachers used specific language(s) with and for which purpose.
6. how the school responded to the linguistic diversity of its population.

9. Domains of Language Use at WIS

From the findings, it emerged that English was used both in and outside of the classroom. Since English was the MoI, every learner was expected to be proficient in it to be able to participate effectively in class. During the interview, apart from Pedro who indicated his lack of proficiency in English, the rest were confident in the use of English although in their responses to the questionnaire, the participants all indicated that they wanted to improve their knowledge of English. The classroom space at WIS could largely be described as monolingual. Thus, one way of managing language use at WIS was the adoption of the monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994) as a practical necessity for pedagogical purposes and for purposes of communicating across cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

However, in spite of the monolingual habitus in the classroom, an interesting perspective in the set of respondents came from the group of Portuguese L1 learners. In the Geography class, this group code – switched between English and Portuguese, and in the follow – up interview after the observation, the learners argued for code – switching practices on the basis of conceptual and affective reasons. The learners with better proficiency in English explained difficult concepts to their peers in Portuguese. These Portuguese learners often used Portuguese informally, among each other, inside the classroom as a means of 'scaffolding'. They bridged the gap between their L1 abilities and their English abilities in developing knowledge and were not barred from using their L1 in such a way.

In addition, all the teachers mentioned that they occasionally allowed their learners who felt comfortable in their L1s to use them as a way of bridging their knowledge. They mentioned particularly the Afrikaans learners. Very often such learners used Afrikaans when they needed explanation regarding aspects of the lesson that they did not understand.

Outside of the classroom, LotEs (Languages Other than English) were used mostly. Multilingualism was the norm. The linguistic situation outside of the classroom may, therefore, be described as one of a multilingual habitus which was constitutive and agentive. For example, the learners reported that in their interactions with their Portuguese and German teachers outside of the classroom, they sometimes used Portuguese and German. In addition, sometimes when the learners who spoke Afrikaans either as L1 or as an additional language spoke to a teacher in Afrikaans first, the teacher responded in Afrikaans although this was rare.

Moreover, the communication goals of the learners also determined their choice of language. In formal contexts such as Student Council meetings and Peer Counselling sessions, the learners indicated that they used English. However, in informal contexts such as break time, the learners used other languages, usually their L1. The learners communicated to each other in any language they felt comfortable in, but when they spoke to each other in mixed – language groupings, they used English.

Furthermore, English dominated the learners' and teachers' language preferences in media consumption, namely, entertainment and text messaging. However, the learners mentioned that occasionally they consumed media in French, Afrikaans, German and Portuguese. At home the learners and teachers mentioned that they mostly used their L1 with occasional use of English. The varieties of languages used were: English, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, French, Afrikaans, Otjiherero and Xistwa.

10. Discussion: Multilingual Practices at WIS

The linguistic space at WIS determined how the learners deployed their linguistic resources and skills. Two linguistic spaces emerged: the classroom space and the non-classroom environment. These different spaces are unequal. In other words, the language ecology at WIS demonstrates a state of diglossia, that is, a situation of linguistic hierarchy which privileges English as the most important language. The classroom space is affluent and prestigious by the nature of the linguistic habitus. English tends to enjoy a higher status (H) as compared to Languages Other than English (LotEs). The school also has a department for English as an Additional Language (EAL) which supports the teaching of "standard English" and is responsible for designing academic programmes for learners whose tested English proficiency has indicated that they need additional lessons in English to cope with the studies in the classroom and to participate effectively in the school's community. The need for the EAL department is motivated by the fact that since English is the MoI, learners need a high proficiency in English to be able to participate effectively in the lessons and also be able to write examinations which are conducted in English.

Multilingualism is, thus, practised on the basis of domains or specific activities (Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck, 2005, p. 199). As witnessed among the Portuguese L1 learners, many of them switched to their L1 in informal communication. Significantly, the Portuguese learners often spoke Portuguese amongst themselves because their proficiency in English was not high. This may signal a sense of trust among those who share the same repertoire; it may also work to exclude those who do not. The LotEs functioned as language of social communication and only occasionally were some of them used for purposes of scaffolding. If for example, two Portuguese or Otjiherero L1 speakers switched to their L1, it could function as a means of sharing, of signalling closeness, mutual understanding and social support. Much has been written on the various functions of code – switching (Aguirre, 1998), and in this school community code – switching was a regular occurrence outside of the classroom and many of the established functions of code – switching are demonstrated.

Significantly, the multilingual communicative practices did not affect the use of English as the MoI, because the learners and teachers could clearly distinguish between the different domains where they are expected to use English and their various L1s. Although the school was aware of the multilingual profile of its learners, the school had adopted this two-way approach to managing the linguistic diversity of its community of learners in the classroom. This situation left little room for real attention to other languages and thus prevented the achievement of a truly sustainable multilingualism.

One kind of multilingualism practised at WIS may be described more or less as subtractive

bilingualism. This refers particularly to learners who came to the school with knowledge of only their home language and then are immersed into the MoI which is English only. These learners were not allowed to use their L1 in the classroom and they are referred the EAL department to receive additional lessons in English. This was to ensure that they integrated into the school and could eventually benefit from the lessons. Another kind of multilingualism that the school supported and acknowledged was the offering of modern foreign languages which were taught as additional subjects apart from English, for examination purposes.

11. Suggestions

As mentioned in Section 6, Garcia et al. (2011) postulate that schools with highly linguistically heterogeneous populations have the potential to implement dynamic multilingual policies (p. 15). It is suggested that WIS should vigorously teach and encourage dynamic multilingual practices in the school. By dynamic multilingual practices, it is meant that where a learner came to WIS with little or no proficiency in English, during the EAL lessons, translanguaging must be introduced and continued over a sufficient period of time, to ensure the easy integration of the learner into the school, both inside and outside of the classroom. In order to make this effective, the L1 of learners should form part of the teaching process where he/she would be allowed to use his L1 freely during EAL lessons.

It is also suggested that in subjects other than English, the use of other languages besides the MoI should be encouraged as a means of bridging the language and knowledge gaps of learners who came with little or no knowledge of the MoI. Instead of the school supporting subtractive bilingualism, it should move towards additive bilingualism and, ultimately, support dynamic bilingualism in order to fully embrace multilingual norms.

In addition, due recognition must be given to indigenous Namibian languages. It is only through this that WIS will be seen to be meeting a fundamental requirement in IB language policy guidelines which supports the active learning and use of the host country languages where IB schools are located. This will be in keeping with Honberger's (1998) position that language education professionals can actively contribute to "the transformative processes of language revitalisation, language maintenance or indeed language shift" (p. 452). It is acknowledged, however, that the implementation of this is likely to come with its own conflicts and all efforts should be made to reduce these conflicts to the minimum.

References

Aguirre, Adalberto. (1988). Code-switching, intuitive knowledge and the bilingual classroom. In H.S. García & R.C. Chávez (Eds.), *Ethnolinguistic issues in education* (pp. 28-38). Lubbock, Texas: College of Education, Texas Tech University.

Baker, Colin & Jones, Sylvia Prys. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, Colin. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Berg, Bruce Lawrence. (2004). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences* (5th edition). New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Blommaert, Jan, Collins James & Slembrouck, Stef. (2005). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication*, *25*, 197 – 216.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garcia, Ophelia. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, Ophelia et al. (2011). Extending bilingualism in U.S. secondary education: New variations. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *5*, 1-18.

Gogolin, Ingrid. (1994). *Der monlinguale "habitus" der multingualen Schule*. Munster, New York: Waxman – Verlag.

Gynne, Annalina & Bagga-Gupta, Sangeeta. (2013). Young people's languaging and social positioning. Chaining in "bilingual" educational settings in Sweden. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*(4), 479-496.

Hornberger, Nancy Hughes. (2010). Multilingual education policy and practice: Lessons from indigenous experience. *CALDigest January*. Accessed 29th Sept 2015 from http://www.cal.org/resource-center/briefs-digests/digests/(offset)/60

Hornberger, Nancy Hughes. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record, 92*(2), 212-229.

Hornberger, Nancy Hughes. (2009). Multilingual education policy and practice: Ten certainties (Grounded in Indigenous Experience). *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *24(2)*, 1-18.

Hornberger, Nancy Hughes & Vaish, Viniti. (2008). Multilingual language policy and school linguistic practice: Globalization and English-language teaching in India, Singapore and South Africa. *A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 39*(3), 305-320.

Hornberger, Nancy Hughes. (1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. *Language in Society, 27(*4), 439-458.

International Baccalaureate Organisation. (2011). *Approaches to Learning and Teaching*. Cardiff: IBO.

International Baccalaureate Organisation. (2011). *IB Diploma*. Cardiff: IBO.

Ludi, Georges. (2000). Multilingual repertoires and the consequences for linguistic theory. In Bührig, Kirsten & ten Thije, Jan D. (Eds.), Beyond misunderstanding: Linguistic analyses of intercultural communication (pp. 11-42). Amstardam: John Benjamins.

Miles, Matthew & Huberman, Michael. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. California: Sage.

Pan, Lin & Block, David. (2011). English as a "global language" in China: An investigation into learners' and teachers' language beliefs. System, *39*, 391-402.

Pavlou, Andreas. (2010). Linguistic habitus and language policy in the Iberian Peninsula. *Debut: The Undergrauate Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, 1*(2), 56-67.

Silverman, David. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook.* London: Sage Publications.

Singh, Michael & Qi, Jing. (2013). *21st century international mindedness: An exploratory study of its conceptualisation and assessment.* The Hague: International Baccalaureate Organisation.

Singh, Navin Kumar; Zhang, Shaoan & Besmel, Parwez. (2012). Globalization and language policies of multilingual Societies: Some case studies of South East Asia. *RBLA, Belo Horizonte*, *12(2),* 349-380.

UNESCO. (2009). *Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue*. UNESCO World Report.

University of Cambridge International Examinations. (2012). *International general certificate of secondary sducation*. Cambridge: CIE.

Williams, Glyn. (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique*. London: Routledge

Wolff, Ekkehard. (2010). Multilingualism and language policies in Anglophone and Francophone Africa from a sociolinguistic macro-perspective, with reference to Language-in-Education issues. Keynote address at 5th International Expert Workshop for ganaa, held at Dakar, Senegal. Leipzig: German-African Network of Alumni and Alumnae (ganaa). Accessed 29th Sept 2015 from http://www.uni-leipzig.de/ganaa

Appendix 1. Survey Questionnaire for Learners

Managing Linguistic Diversity within and outside the Classroom in an International Multilingual High School in Namibia

Thank you for taking part in this study. Please take a few minutes to fill this questionnaire. It should take no longer than 20 minutes. Your participation is voluntary and responses are anonymous.

A. Background of Learners

Date of Birth
First Language
Country of Origin
Years as a student at WIS
Gender M F
Age

B. Linguistic Profile

Fill in all the languages you know, even if you are not very proficient in them. Then on the scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 is excellent and 5 is poor), rate your ability in each language for the skills listed in columns (ii) to (v) (understanding the spoken form, speaking, reading and writing). In the last column indicate where you use/come across each language most often.

i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi
Languages	Understand	Speak	Read	Write	When/where you use this language

1=Excellent; 2=Very Good; 3= Good; 4=Not Good; 5= Poor

C. Language Biography

For each of the languages you know, state briefly WHERE you LEARNT it or where you came across it for the first time.

For each of the languages you know, state whether you would like to learn to use it better. Briefly say what value it has for you to know that particular language.

Appendix 2. Survey Questionnaire for Teachers

Thank you for taking part in this study. Please take a few minutes to fill this questionnaire. It should take no longer than 20 minutes. Your participation is voluntary and responses are anonymous.

A. Background of Teachers

Date of Birth — Years of teaching at WIS
First Language — Gender M F
Country of Origin — Age

B. Linguistic Profile

Fill in all the languages you know, even if you are not very proficient in them. Then on the scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 is excellent and 5 is poor), rate your ability in each language for the skills listed in columns (ii) to (v) (understanding the spoken form, speaking, reading and writing). In the last column indicate where you use/come across each language most often

I	ii	iii	iv	v	vi
Languages	Understand	Speak	Read	Write	When/where you use this language

1=Excellent; 2=Very Good; 3= Good; 4=Not Good; 5= Poor

C. Language Biography

For each of the languages you know, state briefly WHERE you LEARNT it or where you came across it for the first time.

For each of the languages you know, state whether you would like to learn to use it better. Briefly say what value it has for you to know that particular language.

Author Note

Henry Amo Mensah (BA. Dip Ed; LLB; MA) and currently pursuing a D Litt et Phil in Linguistics at the University of South Africa (UNISA) is a lecturer at the department of English Language and Literature at the National University of Lesotho. He teaches media language, translation and language of business communication. His publications include: "International News as a Reflection of Cosmopolitan Ideology: Coverage of the Ivorian Crisis by CNN and the BBC" published in *Communicatio* (2013); "Language Policy in a Multilingual School: the Case of Windhoek International School in Namibia" (2015) published in *IJHCS*; and "Resilience and Sustainability in the Coverage of Political Crisis: the Case of the Arab Spring by the BBC, CNN and Alijazeera" in *China Media Research* (forthcoming). He also has extensive experience as a librarian, journalist, public relations practitioner and broadcaster.