

A Review of Issues of Inequality and Inequity in Education Concerning the San Language Minorities in Botswana – 1997 - 2023

Andy Chebanne, University of Botswana

Budzani Gabanamotse-Mogara, University of Botswana

Abstract

Research now abounds on the issues that bedevil the education of minority ethnic groups in Botswana. If a consideration is made about language as a human right, the right to learn in one's language becomes fundamental. Indeed, issues of equality and equity in education are subsumed in many strategies, policies, and laws that define the education of a nation. If Education is concerned with societal knowledge and cultural values systems, then there is no equity in access in Botswana as equality assumes that learners have equal linguistic competence. The paper will argue against the belief that homogeneity equalizes the learners. A point will be made that minority language speakers, such as the San (Khoisan), suffer from being overlooked and rendered irrelevant in education as they encounter school languages for the first time in the classroom. The paper will underscore the fact that matters of mother tongue education, culture-infused curriculum, and teacher training are key in education. The thesis of this paper is that a meaningful education should, underline equitable principles that bring about inclusive and constructive development of the self, democracy, self-reliance, and cherishing of unity in diversity. The methodology of the discussion will be guided by a critique of existing policies and their philosophy of education that does not value a culture-based and all-inclusive education that can benefit the Khoisan learner.

Dipatlisiso di dintsi tse di supang dintlha tse di thatafatsang thuto ya ba merafe e mebotlana mo Botswana. Fa go ka akanngwa gore puo ya motho ke tshwanelo ya setho, tshwanelo ya go rutwa ka puo ya motho e nna konokono. Ka jalo, dikgang tsa tekatekano le tshiamisetso mo thutong di tshwanetse go akarediwa mo ditogamaanong, le mealo ya tsamaiso, le melao e e tlhalosang thuto mo setšhabeng. Fa go ka lebelelwa gore thuto e akaretsa le go itebaganya le dikitso tsa setšhaba, le boleng jwa ngwao, go tlaa itshupa gore ga go na tshiamisetso mo go tseneng mo dithutong fa go sa lebelelwe letlhoko la ba dipuo tse di sa dirisiwang mo sekolong. Pampiri e, e tlaa baya pele mabaka kgatlhanong le megopolo e e akanngwang ya go tshwantshanya baithuti ba ba farologanang ka ditime, ka gore, ga ba lekane, ba bangwe puo ya bone e a dirisiwa, ba bangwe ya bone ga e dirisiwe mo dithutong. Lebaka le tlaa bewa pele la gore babui ba dipuo tsa Sesarwa, ba ba leng palo potlana, ba bewa fa mosing, ba bo ba ikgatholosiwa, jaaka e le gore ba kopana le dipuo tsa sekolo e le lantlha mo dithutong. Pampiri e, e tlaa gatelela lebaka la gore dikgang tsa puo ya ngwana go tswa lapeng, le thulaganyo ya dithuto e e akaretsang ngwao ya moithuti, le ikatisetso barutintshi, ke dikgang tsa konokono mo thutong. Mogopolo kakanyetso wa pampiri e ke gore thuto e e maleba, e tshwanetse go tswamaisiwa ka dintlha tsa tshiamisetso moithuti, le go akaretsa thuto e e agang boleng jwa motho, le go mo dira motho ka batho; go ipelega, go lebelelwe popagano ya setšhaba se se merafe le dipuo tse di farologaneng. Megopolo e e tsamaisang puisano ya pampiri e, e tlaa tsewa mo ditsamaisong tsa dithuto tse di leng teng tse di bolelwang ke babatlisisi, le go lebelela megopolo ya thuto e e sa tseyeng tsia botlhokwa jwa ngwao le puo, le go sa akaretseng thuto e e molemo mo baithuting ba dipuo tsa Sesarwa.

Keywords: *Botswana, Language policy, San minorities, inequality, inequity, mother tongue*

1 Introduction

Despite Botswana's reputation for having one of the most generously funded educational systems globally, the consequences of the current policies indicate significant failures. Inequalities and inequities still persist. This is essentially due to the missing of link between minority languages and lack of their role in education. Contrary to the common perception of Botswana as an ethnically homogenous Tswana nation, the country is actually home to a rich diversity of ethno-linguistic communities. This diversity is often overlooked in governmental documents and public discourse, which typically emphasize the homogeneity of Botswana people. However, the reality is that Botswana hosts vibrant Khoisan ethnic populations, including different speech communities such as ǀAni, Buga, Cua, Glui, Glana, Naro, Shua, Cire-cire, Cua, Tsíxa, Sasi, ǁHuan, Taa, and Jul'hoasi, alongside other Bantu languages like Shiyeyi, OtjiHerero, Shekgalagari, IKalanga, ThiMbukushu, and Chiikuhane, as well as Afrikaans, which is spoken in the southwestern parts of the country (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023; Chebanne, 2023; Molosiwa & Chebanne, 2023). These communities, apart from Setswana speakers, are often referred to as minorities or marginalized groups. The San people, known historically and culturally for their nomadic lifestyle and diverse linguistic variations, have faced significant marginalization and assimilation pressures. Despite living in small, linguistically varied communities, these groups maintain vibrant languages that serve as essential tools for cultural knowledge and communication within their communities (Chebanne, 2015a, 2015b, 2020).

The objective of this paper is to contribute to debates on mother tongue policy and linguistic human rights. This will help position the San's lack of linguistic and cultural representation within the social framework and the education system that exclude their most important resource, which is language (Mogara & Chebanne, 2023; Botswana Government, 1993). The delimitation of the discussion to the San communities is a conscious one, reflecting the prominence of the problem concerning indigenous minorities and marginalized ethno-linguistic groups in Botswana. The problem is that the San present a peculiar case in Botswana because of their ethnic and linguistic precariousness, leading to endangerment and language death. There are several explanations for this state of affairs. Firstly, due to their ethnic way of life in rural areas and marginalized ethnicity, the San are easily abused by the majority population. Secondly, San communities undergo marginalization of their languages and are increasingly being assimilated by Tswana people, who constitute the mainline society. Thirdly, San languages are not only threatened with marginalization and oppression in the school system but are also endangered as they are limited to insignificant domains (Batibo, 2015; Chebanne 2015a; Mazonde, 2002).

Saugestad, 2001; Cassidy et al., 2001). It is hoped that this discussion will contribute to a better understanding of the San social situation in Botswana.

The paper is structured according eight sections. Section 1 is the introduction and it provides information on the issues that characterise the San ethnic communities in Botswana. Section 2 is the methodology, and it informs on the sources of data that facilitated the paper. However, section 3 is the problem statement, and presents some critical issues raised in research on the situation of the San in Botswana. On the other hand, section 4 deals with the theoretical frame that presents research on social issues that help interpret the linguistic and cultural situations of the San. Section 5 deals with challenges of the San within the Botswana social context and discusses the realities that the San experience in Botswana in critical social and developmental domains. Further, section 6 discusses strategies towards the integration of the San in Education which is what research has perceived as a way to promote education for all and for the San learners also. Section 7 presents ideas that can help promote the education and the participation of the San as equals in the learning processes. Lastly, section 8 is the conclusion that summarises the discussion.

2 Methodology

The discussion draws data from publications on the social situation of the San in Botswana. Desktop review of books, journals, dissertations, theses, reports, and official government publications were consulted. Primary sources in form of research, government and corporate reports were quite adequate and very useful to this discussion which aims at illustrating how the San issues are handled and possibly mismanaged. International best practice reports will also bolster the information that is used to develop arguments for the lack of equity in the Botswana social and education policies. The online (internet) sources were very helpful as they provided valuable data that could not be accessed physically. Even though secondary sources were adequate, specific research on equality and equity in Botswana social systems are inadequate.

3 The Problem Statement on Inequality and Inequity Affecting the San

The problems and challenges of education for the minority San begin with the curriculum content and strategies that put ethnic linguistic communities in a straitjacket, assuming that what is good for Setswana speakers is good for all learners (Chebanne, 2022). The curriculum content and pedagogical consequences of Botswana's educational language practices have been critically

documented and analyzed by Nyati-Ramahobo (2006, 2004, 1991, 1997) and Jotia and Jankie (2015), who argue against the curriculum policy that favors mono-ethnicity and mono-culturalism. Consequently, the de facto homogeneous ethno-linguistic state construct and curriculum policy on education have relegated anything to do with minority or marginalized languages and their cultural expression to oblivion (Chebanne, 2015a). Effectively, the country has upheld a hegemonic and supremacist view in matters of language and culture in formulating its philosophy of education and access (Chebanne & Kewagamang, 2020; Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017). This has occurred despite global examples of educational policies that favor mother tongue instruction in the formative years of education (Mogara & Chebanne, 2023; Chebanne, 2015a; Nyati-Saleshando, 2010).

Since Botswana gained independence in 1966, policy documents such as the National Development Plans (NDPs) (Botswana Government 1967-present) have been unambiguous on the issue of creating an enlarged school access, and importantly on the question of equality in access and the guarantee of ten years of basic education for all (cf. RNPE, 1994; National Development Plan Eight (Botswana Government: NDP 8, 1997). All policy evidently symbolizes and refers to government power, and in matters of education, this power is the State and its political vision (Mogara et al., 2023; Chebanne, 2008). Hence, education policy in Botswana encounters theoretical challenges that must be assessed to progress in this discussion on issues of equality and equity (Chebanne, 2008). Since independence, education has been characterized by the "education for all" (Botswana Government, 1994; Botswana Government: Kagisano, 1977) type of mass education, where the state, by all means bearable, financially speaking, went on to provide free education at all levels of school. However, as Chebanne and Moumakwa (2017) argued, minority San did not benefit from this dispensation chiefly because of language challenges. While this government "education for all" stance has created a belief that there was equality in education and provided arguments for it, it effectively did not empower the San children to receive an education (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023; Mogara & Chebanne, 2023). The San education in their language is crucial. There is a need for a conscious policy mission to correct the situation, which is the non-representation of their ethnicity. Namibia has done much better for its ethnic and linguistic situations to promote mother tongues in education as a right (Haingura, 2016).

Without that consideration for mother tongue in education as a right, the threat to their languages and identity is real, as they will be lost, and the entire ethnic communities will be assimilated into the mainline society (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023; Mogara & Chebanne, 2023; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2006). The very fact that these tiny communities' speech and cultures

still exist calls for intervention to facilitate their education in their languages (Motshabi & Suagestad, 2004).

4 Theoretical Framework

This discussion takes from the debates and arguments pioneered in Botswana by Nyati-Ramahobo (1997) who viewed language practices in education as a source of social strife and conflict. This conflict resulted in the hegemony of the majority on ethnic linguistic minorities whose languages were not given a role in education. Consequently this social conflict in education engendered injustice as only the language and culture of the mainline Setswana society benefited, and minority languages speakers were left to assimilate and discard their languages. Consequently this violated and infringed on their cultural and linguistic rights (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2006). When languages are dominated by other languages, the consequences are negative in the cultural and communication spheres (Ammon, 2006). In Botswana, Batibo (2005) lamented the decline and death of minority languages, especially the San languages which he qualified as losing the battle for survival (2010). The languages in education practice in Botswana creates a serious situation that Nyati-Ramahobo (1997, 2006) qualified as the loss of quality of life for the minorities. Such situations of linguistic conflict and dominance characterise the situation of the San ethnic languages speakers (Batibo, 2015b).

In Jotia and Jankie (2015) the argument made is that when languages do not feature in education, inequalities and inequities will subsist because the culture of the speakers will also not feature. This in turn creates a situation of hegemony and assimilation which in themselves are consequences of social conflict and inequity (Jotia & Jankie, 2015; Chebanne, 2015a; Batibo 2006). When the Botswana slogans of equality in education are uttered, the reality is that some ethnic groups go to school without equal opportunities and equal rights in learning (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2006; Batibo, 2006; Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017). In their recent publication, Chebanne and Monaka (2024) argued that the exclusive use of Setswana, the majority and national language of Botswana constitute a form of a weapon that killed the minority languages such as those of the ethnic San communities. As argued by Chebanne (2020) San language speakers in Botswana can be qualified as being under internal colonisation and this situation does not give them linguistic and cultural rights – only the language and culture of the hegemonic society are available for their education and social life. In theory and practice, therefore, these are the indices of linguistic precariousness of the San languages speakers in Botswana (Batibo, 2006; Chebanne 2002). Comparatively neighboring countries to Botswana,

such as Namibia and South Africa, albeit they introduce English at Grade 4, are doing better by promoting all their languages in education and in appropriate language use social communication domains (Batibo, 2015a) and how these compare with similar indices established in the literature (Haingura, 2016; Batibo, 2005, 2010; Brenzinger, 1992).

Moreover, in Botswana, the current situation of marginalization of the San has created what some have compared to linguistic apartheid (Chebanne, 2020; Mazonde, 2002; Saugestad, 2001). While languages falling under the Bantu group are readily acknowledged as distinct languages with their own authentic cultures, the same recognition is not easily extended to the San languages (Mazonde, 2002; Saugestad, 2001). These languages are often grouped together in a manner that erroneously suggests they are linguistically and culturally homogeneous, which is misleading (Chebanne, 2020; Güldemann & Vossen, 2000). However, linguistic and ethnographic research distinguishes between the Khoe and the San (Güldemann & Vossen, 2000). Apart from some lexical borrowings and the phonological phenomenon of clicks, which typify the languages of the Khoe and the San, they belong to different language families (Chebanne, 2020; Güldemann & Vossen, 2000). Research by Smeija (2003) and Anderson and Janson (1997), and recent surveys by Chebanne and Mogara (2022) and Nthapelelang (2000) and RETENG (a coalition of Language and Cultural Organizations) have established that Botswana is a multilingual and therefore a multicultural nation (Chebanne, 2010, 2015a). According to these sources, Botswana hosts at least 16 languages (Chebanne & Mogara, 2022, 2018). However, in terms of educational processes and access to cultural knowledge, San languages are not catered for, only Setswana enjoys the privileges and means conferred by language use practices in education (Molosiwa & Chebanne, 2023) and several mentions in the Constitution (Mogara et al., 2023; Nyati-Ramahobo, 1991, 1987). Since independence the partiality has been that Setswana is the only language that benefited from socio-cultural developments (Nyati-Saleshando, 2010; Chebanne, 2010). Conversely, to appreciate the ethnic composition of Botswana, one must understand the language situation of the country (Chebanne & Nyati-Ramahobo, 2003; Anderson & Janson, 1997).

5 The Challenges of the San in the Botswana Social Context

In all social contexts, the San languages are marginalised in Botswana. This is evident from the research literature on the social situation of the San languages' speakers in Botswana abounds (Chebanne, 2015a, 2015b; Skold et al., 2015; Mazonde, 2002; Kamwendo et al., 2009). Since the assessment made in 2000 by the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa

(WIMSA, 2000), it became apparent that the inequality gap between the ethnic minorities of the San and the national principles in education was not closing (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2010; Kamwendo et al., 2009). The national development agenda and educational aspirations were, and still are, not equitable for the San (Kamwendo et al., 2009). Motshabi and Saugestad (2004) and WIMSA (2000) highlighted several issues: San communities were excluded from policy formulation processes, lacked representation in government, and faced significant educational barriers, including language challenges and a lack of culturally relevant curriculum (Jotia & Jankie, 2015). Additionally, the dominant educational policies led to cultural erosion, and the San remained economically disadvantaged with limited access to resources (Chebanne, 2010; Chebanne, 2015a, 2015b). They also experienced social exclusion and discrimination, hindering their participation in national development. Health disparities further marginalized the San, with limited access to healthcare services and poor health outcomes (Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017). These issues underscore the systemic challenges faced by the San in Botswana and highlight the need for inclusive policies that address their unique needs and promote their development (Chebanne, 2015a, 2015b; Chebanne & Kewagamang, 2020).

Since independence, there have been only two educational commissions, the Education for *Kagisano* (Botswana Government, 1977), and the National Commission on Education (Botswana Government, 1993). Both education policy documents did not cater for the minority San languages (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023; Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017; Motshabi & Saugestad, 2004; Mazonde, 2002). The Revised National Policy on Education (Botswana Government, 1994), as derived from the Report on the National Commission on Education (Botswana Government, 1993), highlights several critical issues regarding the San community's educational experiences:

- a) ***Alienation through Language:*** Despite efforts to promote educational access, the San community's situation did not improve. The school languages (English and Setswana) alienated the San people, assimilating them and causing family disintegration (p. 17).
- b) ***Social Crisis and Cultural Trauma:*** The education system caused social crises and cultural trauma, particularly affecting San language speaking children at the primary school level (p. 18).
- c) ***Foreign Languages in Education:*** The languages used in education were foreign to children starting primary school. None of the San languages was used in Botswana's education system (p. 19).
- d) ***Abuse and Discrimination:*** In public or general Educational institutions San children

suffer abuse and discrimination, including emotional, sexual, and corporal punishment (p. 19).

As other researchers confirmed, these are serious strategic problems that entrench inequalities and lack of equity in education, and approaches to resolve them will be overwhelming (Chebanne, 2020, 2008; Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017; Nyati-Saleshando, 2010; Batibo, 2015). It is consequently apparent that things cannot be left on their own account, and the solution lies in creating an empowering environment within the education system (Skold et al., 2015; Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017). Such an environment would enable San ethno-minorities to appreciate the education they receive and participate meaningfully in the country's development. Decades ago, in an assessment of the San in Botswana, Good (2001, p. 73 in Cassidy et al., 2001) stated:

Indigenous languages should be integrated into the school curriculum, and respected and developed within national formal education. Incorporating San culture, languages, and history in school teaching is an essential step towards recognizing San national affairs and, more importantly, providing an education system better suited to the special needs of San learners. Quality education is vital if the San are to be better equipped to lift themselves out of poverty and powerlessness (Good, 2001, p. 73; par 6.3.6, in Cassidy et al., 2001).

As argued by Chebanne and Moumakwa (2017), Chebanne (2008), and Nyati-Saleshando (2010), education is more than just opening admissions to all as equals; it involves providing an equitable learning environment where every learner feels welcome and finds relevance in their education. Mother-tongue education is a crucial way to ensure that learning experiences are less traumatizing for every learner (Skold et al., 2015; Kamwendo et al., 2009). Therefore, when defining the objectives, outlines, and conditions for the success of an education policy, the issues of equality, equity, and quality are ever-present, with equity being primordial (Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017; Chebanne & Kewagamang, 2020). Educational values are not exoteric but stem from positive learning experiences of citizens—when education responds to aspirations, reaffirms cultural values, and empowers communities to be self-reliant rather than dependent on the state (Chebanne, 2008, p. 207). The significance of this cannot be overstated, as shown in other Botswana reports (Jotia & Jankie, 2015; Chebanne, 2015a; Kamwendo et al., 2009).

When children of Setswana speakers go to school, they arrive with linguistic and cultural advantages that the San languages' children do not have (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023; Chebanne, 2015a). For the Khoisan child, education is not just a hegemonic force but a

nefarious, alienating, and elitist force (Chebanne, 2023; Motshabi & Saugestad, 2004; Mazonde, 2002). This situation can only change with language inclusion in education and the consequent elimination of ethnic stigma (Mazonde, 2002, p. 65). As Chebanne (2023, 2022), Mogara and Chebanne (2022), and Batibo (2015) contended in their research that language policy has evidently not responded to these issues of inequality and inequity in education up to the present. Language pluralism seems to present an undeclared obstacle or problem under the guise of fearing the risk of ethnic conflicts and social quandary (Chebanne, 2023). This revolves around an ideal that rejects cultural pluralism in favor of "national construction," "national unity," and "national education" (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023). But the question remains: what kind of unity and equality exists when there is no equity in education? Instead of integrating indigenous content that reflects people's identity and values, the education system adopts a wholesale Western model, allowing it to permeate all sectors of development (Chebanne, 2022). If the country sincerely wants to address education for all and equality issues, it needs to understand the elements that factor equity—namely, mother tongue education (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023; Chebanne & Monaka, 2009) and culture-infused education (Jotia & Jankie, 2015). In the context of our discussions, these elements must be explicit in the Education and Curriculum Policies—language and culture must be considered questions of equity. This aligns with what Nyati-Ramahobo (1997, 1998) qualified as education and quality of life for all citizens of Botswana, achievable when equitable elements of education feature in the education of Botswana pupils in their ethno-linguistic diversity (Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017).

6 Towards strategies to integrate the San in the national education system

The idea of a vision for the assessment of social and economic development of Botswana was hailed a one way the country could democratically and innovatively transform itself (Botswana Government, 1998) . The first national Vision 2016 (Botswana Government, 2017) anticipated a Botswana that would have quality education that would make the country adaptable to the changing needs of the country as the world around changed. The vision sought improvements in the relevance, the quality, and the access to education. Through education it was proposed that citizens would be empowered to become innovators, entrepreneurs and producers of goods and services that would create employment through the establishment of new enterprises. Public education was planned to raise awareness on skills needed for life. The citizen would have the opportunity for continued and universal education. Importantly, Vision 2016 intended the education system to recognise, support and strengthen Botswana's wealth of different languages

and cultural traditions. It also claimed that there would be no disadvantage suffered by any citizen in the education system as a result of a mother tongue that differs from the country's two official languages (Botswana Government Vision 2016, 2017, p. 5). Evidently all these lofty ideals were not achieved (Chebanne, 2022; Mazonde, 2002).

Vision 2036 (Botswana Government, 2016) builds upon Vision 2016 (Botswana Government, 2017) which sought to achieve prosperity for all. Vision 2036 (Botswana Government, 2016, p. 10) acknowledges that Vision 2016 did not achieve its goals due to lack of a strong delivery system, and also lack of monitoring and evaluation capacity. It also sought to align itself with the National Development 12 (Botswana Government, 2019) which sought to anchor the country on democracy, economic prosperity, sustainable development, self-reliance, unity, and *Botho* (positive character). Attended to these are ideals for a knowledge economy, development in infrastructure, agriculture, services sector, ICT, finance and business and governance. The pillars of Vision 2036 also seek to build a peaceful and secure nation, a constitution of human rights, efficient civil society, modernised traditional institutions (chieftainship), religious freedom, transparency and accountability and political transparency. Related to the concerns of Vision 2036 are climate resilience, decent human settlement, effective management of natural resources (water, energy, land, and mineral). As it can be observed, Vision 2036 utterly avoids the promises to support and strengthen Botswana's wealth of different languages and cultural traditions. Clearly, Botswana seems to have a problem with the promotion of local or indigenous languages in education (Mogara et al., 2023).

In the arguments of Jotia and Jankie (2015), Chebanne (2008) and Kamwendo et al. (2009), efforts to develop San languages have primarily been driven by linguists, NGOs (championed by RETENG), religious organizations, and various international activists (WIMSA & RDU 2000; Saugestad, 2001). However, none of these activities are directly connected to any policy in Botswana aimed at promoting the welfare of the San (Mogara & Chebanne, 2022). The lack of action in developing an ethnic-language-based curriculum and cultural domains rooted in mother-tongue education (Botswana Government: Education and Training Sector Strategic Plan, 2012) suggests a distrust or lack of will to include these concerns in the national development agenda and democratize education (Chebanne, 2023; Chebanne, 2022). This is in stark contrast to the advanced initiatives in other developmental areas (Vision 2036; Botswana Government: NDP 12, 2023), where technology is prioritized. Yet, technology without the human values of language, culture, and respect for identity becomes a destructive force (Chebanne, 2015a, 2008). A curriculum reflecting cultural pluralism has never been seriously considered (Jotia & Jankie, 2015). Even the well-intentioned recommendation from the Revised National Policy on

Education (RNPE 1994) for a third school language from an ethnic minority has been met with reluctance and delays (Chebanne, 2008). As highlighted by Motshabi and Saugestad (2004), the dialogue on these issues is seen differently by the government and the spokespersons of the San communities. Education cannot merely be a matter of budgets; democratic education is fundamentally a human value, justified by its relevance to the nation and its constituent communities (Mogara & Chebanne, 2020; Chebanne, 2008).

A participant challenged government's boast that it does not have separate programmes because it wishes to treat everyone equally (...) we must recognize that Basarwa are unique and should be treated accordingly...making the government aware that RADP (Remote Areas Dwellers Programme) needs to be made ethnic-specific to truly assist Basarwa (San). (Motshabi & Saugestad, 2004, p. 72)

Concerning the education of the minority San, Botswana's education system is in a deadlock and cannot creatively cater to the San without a significant reform (Chebanne & Kewagamang, 2020; Chebanne, 2008; Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017). The relationship between education language practice and the minority San is shaped by a centralization model marked by an uncompromising attitude, leading to growing inequalities between different minority communities and the mainline society (Mogara & Chebanne, 2023). The representation of the San's aspirations, identity, and self-definition remains elusive (Chebanne, 2008).

The appeal for an innovative policy in Botswana's education system emphasizes the need to integrate mother tongue languages, particularly those of the San community, to foster inclusivity and representation (Batibo, 2015; Kamwendo et al., 2009). In the argument of Mogara and Chebanne (2023) and Chebanne (2023), this approach recognizes that local languages are vital for democratic development and social advancement, and it advocates for their meaningful incorporation into the curriculum without dismissing existing language policies. Essential to this integration is the recruitment and professional development of San teachers, especially at the primary education level, to address community-specific issues and promote culturally relevant pedagogy (Jotia & Jankie, 2015). By prioritizing this integration, the education system not only enhances the learning experience for San pupils but also empowers them through role models from their own communities (Chebanne, 2015a; Jotia & Jankie, 2015). In the argument of Gabanamotse-Mogara et al. (2023), proactive and creative rethinking of the educational curriculum that embraces linguistic and cultural diversity is crucial for creating a more equitable environment that supports the rights and identities of marginalized groups while enriching the overall educational landscape in Botswana. The Botswana language use practice relegates all San languages to non-functional domains. In this relegation, San languages speakers can only shift to



those other languages that have demographic advantage of official status. This state of language shift can lead to language death (Batibo, 2015a; Brenzinger, 1992) with all the nefarious consequences (Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017) conceivable as demonstrated in Table 1 below.

Language	Language use domain	Comment
Setswana	School; public information; national programmes	Used by public and private information systems especially in rural areas
English	School; public information; national programmes	Language of public administration and education. It has limited usage in rural areas
San marginalized minority languages	Family and personal domain	Mainly used in rural and family domains. Children under 6 years would have rarely heard Setswana and English spoken. This situation does not favour revitalization of these languages.

Table 1: Botswana languages use domains and marginalization of ethnic languages (adapted from Chebanne, 2008)

From the above table, it can be observed that San marginalized minority languages remain confined to rural areas. The fact that these languages feature in non-functional language use domains leads to serious linguistic difficulties in accessing education (Chebanne, 2015a, 2015b; Chebanne & Mogara, 2022). Chebanne and Kewagamang (2020) and Chebanne and Monaka (2005) identified these consequential problems as psychological, cultural, and educational in the school process for marginalized community children (Chebanne, 2018; Cassidy et al., 2001; Nyati-Ramahobo, 1997; WIMSA, 2000). Insisting on the exclusive use of English and Setswana as the only school languages, as presently provided in the education policy (Molosiwa & Chebanne, 2023; Botswana Government, 1994; Botswana Government, 1993), imposes a language handicap and trauma on San children and exacerbates their social exclusion (Jotia & Jankie, 2015). Additionally, the relocation drives that the San population undergoes lead to alienation through scholarization, further fragilizing the San, both socially and linguistically (Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017; Batibo, 2015a, 2015b; Cassidy et al., 2001; Chebanne & Monaka, 2005).

Thus far, the discussion has demonstrated a perturbing inclination in Botswana's education policy formulation that aligns with a one-size-fits-all approach, promoting linguistic, cultural,



and political homogeneity that serves specific political ambitions or the illusion of a unified nation (Mogara & Chebanne, 2023). This perspective is fundamentally flawed, as it disregards the inherent diversity within nations; complete homogeneity is never attainable (Chebanne, 2023; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004). Despite Botswana's self-identification as a homogenous society derived from a mono-ethnic framework, significant differences exist in social class, socio-economic access, language, and political contexts, all of which require tailored developmental responses (Mogara & Chebanne, 2023). The issue of ethnic diversity in Botswana is further complicated by a political narrative that has been intentionally designed to downplay linguistic diversity in favor of maintaining the existing inequitable status quo (Chebanne, 2023, 2020; Batibo, 2025a, 2015b). This stance erroneously implies that acknowledging linguistic diversity would undermine educational standards. In reality, embracing such diversity enriches the educational landscape and fosters a more inclusive environment, contrary to the notion that it would dilute common educational benchmarks (Chebanne, 2015a; Nyati-Ramahobo, 1997).

There was hope that when the pathways to establishing an equitable curriculum policy in Botswana were presented in Vision 2036 and in the Education and Training Sector Strategic Plan (ETSSP), there would be a brighter social future for the nation (Botswana Government, 2017, 2012). However, for these visions and plans there is effectively no operationalization to implement a comprehensive language and cultural policy. Therefore, there is still a need for a fundamental shift in Botswana's national ambitions, reorienting the focus from infrastructure development toward prioritizing the dignity and needs of the human person (Chebanne, 2020). Education loses its meaning when it fails to resonate with the social and cultural identity of all citizens—resulting in a hollow experience that equates certification with education rather than meaningful learning (Mogara et al., 2023). Additionally, it is counterproductive for Botswana to be recognized for its infrastructural advancements while its citizens grapple with a disconnection from their authentic ethno-culture and language. The San community, in particular, has suffered from this developmental approach, which often overlooks the importance of cultural richness and diversity (Chebanne, 2008). By aiming too high in broad national objectives, Botswana risks neglecting the small yet invaluable aspects that contribute to a proud and cohesive national identity, rendering grand aspirations in education ineffective and ultimately unfulfilled (Batibo, 2015; Skold et al., 2015).

7 Going Forward: Addressing Language Related Policy Issues

The current situation presented in this discussion demonstrates that the San are not facilitated to

resist or agitate for their rights socially, and educationally. Development policy generalizes rather than specifically intervening for the San in their battle for survival and social justice. Whilst equality in education is not a panacea with equity, it is important to also consider other elements and dimensions in the making of education as a right. The following sub-section provides strategies that can assure the participation of the San in education and other social domains as equals. This also calls for the democratization of the curriculum and various development policies that the Government has put in place (Botswana Government, 1998, 2017).

7.1 Mother Tongue Education in Early Years of Learning

The arguments and observations by Mogara et al. (2023), by Mogara and Chebanne (2023), Chebanne (2023), and Chebanne and Monaka (2005) provide evidence that the education process among San communities was fraught with stigmatization, traumas, domination, and overall alienation. Pupils felt they did not belong, and the school environment was hostile and inhospitable. These negative experiences corroborated the findings of the Working Group on Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) and the University of Botswana Research and Development Unit (UB-RDU) (2001). The arguments by Cassidy et al. (2001) are crucial to appreciating the situation in which the San find themselves.

Formal education sector is another special area in which San perceive themselves to be clearly discriminated against by the more powerful Non-San Batswana. (Mazonde, 2001, p. 64; par. 5.5, in Cassidy et al., 2001)

The challenges perceived by Cassidy et al (2001) and Motshabi and Saugestad (2004) regarding the Botswana San are both developmental and social. They state that San communities are not integrated into social development as equals. Jotia and Jankie (2015) argue that the education curriculum must proactively and innovatively respond to situations that, if left unchecked, lead to intricate crises, which are construed as developmental crises or failures of educational development policies (Nthomang, 2004). Chebanne (2022), based on Motshabi and Saugestad (2004) and Cassidy et al. (2001), raised the following arguments:

- a) The San educational status is intimately tied to their relative economic poverty, their socio-economic relationship with others and the livelihood strategies necessitated by this;
- b) The language issue is a major problem for San learners, who must of necessity

study in either English or Setswana,...moreover, there are few teachers proficient in any of these languages;

- c) The abuse of and discrimination against San learners in school are widespread and are practiced not only by other students, but in some instance by staff;
- d) The existing school system lacks the flexibility necessary to accommodate the special needs of San learners for whom the formal education process is often alienating and socially disruptive.

Chebanne and van Pinxteren (2021) emphasise the critical need for a gradual transition to the inclusion of Botswana's ethnic languages in higher education. They argue for a language policy in education that prioritizes the empowerment of ethnic languages within the classroom setting. This discussion contends that the existing educational paradigms in Botswana, when subjected to thorough scrutiny, reveal that current policies have indeed exacerbated the linguistic marginalization of the San ethnic groups and their languages. The educational policies implemented have resulted in narrow and distorted understandings of educational attainment and standards (Batibo, 2015; Chebanne, 2015a, 2015b; Kamwendo et al., 2009). Policymakers and curriculum developers have tended to focus on quantitative measures—such as sheer enrollment numbers, a one-size-fits-all curriculum, and literacy rates—while neglecting the deeper, qualitative issues that determine the relevance and effectiveness of these strategies for all learners (Chebanne, 2023). For meaningful progress to occur, it is essential to address equity and equality across three fundamental pillars: language use, curriculum content, and teacher and classroom practices (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023; Jotia & Jankie, 2015; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2006). These components are crucial to establishing an equitable educational process that not only recognizes linguistic diversity but also actively incorporates it to ensure that all learners, particularly those from marginalized communities like the San, can engage meaningfully with their education and achieve authentic learning outcomes. Without such deliberate and inclusive measures, the overarching goal of an equitable education system will remain unfulfilled:

- a) Classroom processes: Ethnic minorities of the San should as much as possible be taught in their languages at formative years, that is, at lower primary. This will improve retention by lessening linguistic and cultural trauma. The provision of a viable approach to the definition of our national culture through the curriculum will create identification and association with the education system;
- b) Curriculum content: in the areas where the San are a majority, curriculum content must

reflect their cultural values so as to enhance self-identity and self-respect, and the aim should be to link school knowledge with social and cultural experience. The development of a curriculum that systematically promotes the use of traditional and cultural knowledge and know-how is the optimum for the San;

- c) Teachers' adaptability: teachers all over the country in general, and those assigned to teach among the minority San communities, must undergo a culture and ethnicity tolerance training to improve relationships between them and the minority San pupils.

7.2 Languages Policy in Education

The current languages policy in education (Gabanamotse-Mogara et al., 2023), which underpins Botswana's educational system, requires significant reforms to genuinely empower curriculum development and align with the national aspirations outlined in Vision 2036 (Government of Botswana, 2017) as analysed in section 6 above. Implementing mother tongue education specifically the use of ethnic languages - represents a practical approach to realizing this vision of social equity and development (Chebanne, 2022). To ensure that the education system remains relevant, the curriculum content must incorporate cultural knowledge and ethnic practices in its formulation. Recommendation 32 from the 1994 education policy advocates for the inclusion of a third language in the curriculum, and this would powerfully address the arguments presented here if that third language were selected from among community languages, regardless of community size (Botswana Government, 1994). Without such inclusion, the San community risks marginalization and potential cultural and linguistic extinction due to their smaller population numbers (Chebanne, 2022; Batibo & Chebanne, 2020). Utilizing mother tongue instruction, particularly at the elementary levels, can foster a sense of educational belonging for the ethno-linguistic communities of the San (Chebanne, 2015a, 2015b) while reducing the existing inequalities in educational and curriculum processes. This shift can transform education from a superficial exercise into a vital necessity that acknowledges and addresses the unique cultural and linguistic contexts of all learners (Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017).

7.3 Teacher Training for Minority Languages

Additionally, institutions such as the Curriculum Development and Teacher Training Departments should be restructured to adopt research-based processes (Jotia & Jankie, 2015; Chebanne, 2015a). This shift would enable them to confront educational challenges with solutions grounded in researched and objective facts related to ethnic community languages. It is

crucial that research and educational data challenge the prevailing ideological narratives in education, which have historically shaped educational frameworks in Botswana based on perhaps necessary but outdated perspectives established at independence (Kamwendo et al., 2009). This socio-political approach, aimed at managing the ethno-linguistic diversity of the population while neglecting the human rights of all citizens, is no longer tenable (Kamwendo et al., 2009; Chebanne, 2010). Many crises and issues stem from such policies, which, although often idealized due to their ability to avoid immediate chaos, fail to address fundamental challenges and disparities (Okoth-Okombo, 1999; Motshabi & Saugestad, 2004). Consequently, the perceived benefits of these philosophical approaches do not translate into tangible improvements, as the realities on the ground starkly contrast with the lofty ideals espoused in policy documents (Skold et al., 2015; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2006).

Education policy must therefore align with the principles of equitable and harmonious learning experiences, as any form of prejudice, antagonism, or ethnic conflict can turn educational environments into horrific experiences (Mogara et al., 2023; Batibo, 2015). Education cannot be divorced from the value system of a society; consequently, neglecting the positive aspects of culture within education has resulted in diminished value and significance in the educational system, leading to the absurdity of students being certified rather than genuinely educated, and curricula serving as mere rubber stamps rather than critical evaluators of educational policies (Chebanne, 2022). In this context, it is challenging to discuss quality assurance objectively when the educational experience is not equitable. Education, therefore, functions as both a mediator of social inequalities and a driver of equitable socio-development programs. It cannot be seen solely as the provision of facilities, but rather as the success of a humane system that considers the diverse needs and concerns of all citizens in their ethno-linguistic diversity (Motshabi & Saugestad, 2004; Chebanne & Moumakwa, 2017). The discussion has centered on language use policy, curriculum content modernization, and teacher training, highlighting the complexities of educational processes in Botswana. It is essential to recognize that the dominant socio-political narrative creates an ideological confrontation between the government and marginalized communities, which is likely to persist (Chebanne, 2019; Kamwendo et al., 2009). Without a well-articulated mother-tongue education policy, it is challenging to envision how Botswana can meet the educational aspirations of its Vision 2036 framework.

As Mogara et al. (2023, p. 211) argued, there is a need for a paradigm shift as it has already been argued for by researchers on Botswana languages situation and its implication for the quality of education. Researchers have lamented the lack of practical action on the part of the

Government of Botswana to provide minority groups with mother tongue education, as this has generally made the country to lag behind in language rights affirmation (Chebanne, 2019; Skold et al., 2015; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2006) . An assessment of research conducted in several African educational contexts has revealed that language is one of the key determinants of success in education. In such a dispensation, mother tongue education is the key component in the lower levels of primary schools to enhance learner performance. Without this critical consideration, the impression is given that African languages contribute to illiteracy and therefore are not suitable to play the role of media of instruction in upper primary, secondary and post-secondary levels of education.

8 Conclusion

The preceding discussions is predicated on the principles of equity, prioritizing it over mere equality, as well as advocating for natural and national justice in educational provision and policy formulation. A critical reevaluation of education that challenges the prevailing socio-political dominance is essential for genuine liberation. The education system must effectively engage all individuals, regardless of their ethno-cultural backgrounds—majority or minority, rich or poor—to foster a sense of collective ownership over educational processes and outcomes. Without this inclusive approach, the quality and value of education cannot be guaranteed to benefit everyone equitably. Education should be an intentional process that upholds the fundamental ethno-linguistic and cultural rights of individuals, enabling them to be self-respecting and self-identifying. For any community to thrive in its ethnic choices, individuals must possess the right to learn and be taught in their native language, the right to self-identification, and the right to protection against the homogenizing and globalizing pressures of contemporary society. Moreover, they must have access to their meaningful language and culture, which are critical components of their identity and agency. It is through such principles that education can truly reflect and respect the diversity of human experiences, fostering an environment where everyone feels valued and empowered.

Botswana currently stands at a pivotal juncture, presenting an opportunity to implement a curriculum that recognizes and incorporates minority languages and cultures to ensure equality and equity. This shift is essential not only for cultural inclusivity but also for equipping educators with effective strategies to address the linguistic and cultural challenges faced by diverse populations. It is imperative that the Curriculum Development and Evaluation Department refocuses its efforts on conducting primary research regarding the educational materials used in

classrooms, critically assessing their outcomes using objective research instruments across different regions.

The theory of mother tongue education is central to fostering an innovative approach to San education. Further, this discussion has highlighted several key issues that must be prioritized in the pursuit of educational transformation towards equity. Concerns about the potential for increased tensions arising from a more liberal education policy are unfounded. The success of such a policy hinges on effective governance and the approach taken in designing and implementing educational policies. Currently, the San people remain marginalized and largely illiterate, underscoring the urgency of this transformation. The way forward involves a decisive rejection of the existing educational philosophy in favor of a more humane and humanistic system that genuinely addresses the needs and aspirations of all learners. By embracing a more inclusive educational framework, Botswana cannot only uplift marginalized communities but also enhance the overall quality and relevance of its educational system, fostering a society that values diversity and promotes equity for all its citizens.

References

- Ammon, U. (2006). The dominance of languages and language communities in the European Union (EU) and the consequences. In M. Pütz, J. Fishman & J. Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds.), *'Along the Routes to Power': Explorations of Empowerment through Language* (pp. 217-240). Mouton De Gruyter.
- Anderson, L. G. & Janson, T. (1997). *Languages in Botswana: Language ecology in Southern Africa*. Gaborone Longman Botswana.
- Batibo, H. M. (2015a). An ideal language policy for an inclusive and sustainable development in Africa. In P. Skoeld, M. Sondstroem, & M. Bolaane (Eds.), *Under the Same Sun: Parallel Issues and Challenges for the San and Sami Peoples*, (pp. 71-78). Umea: Umea University Press.
- ____ (2015b) Patterns of identity loss in trans-cultural contact situations between Bantu and Khoesan groups in Western Botswana. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 11(1), 1-6.
- Batibo, H. M. (2015c). Ten Commandments for Setswana to be a resourceful vehicle of development in Botswana. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 25, 41-54.
- Batibo, H.M. (2006). Marginalisation and empowerment. In M. Pütz, J. A. Fishman & J. Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds.), *Along the Routes to Power: Explorations of Empowerment through Language*, (pp. 261-283). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Batibo, H. M. (2010). Fighting a losing battle? Assessing the impact of mother tongue education

- advocacy in a hostile environment. *Plurilingual Education Conference*, SOAS (19th to 20th February 2010), London. Keynote Address.
- Batibo, H. M. (2005). *Language Decline and Death in Africa: Causes, consequences and challenges*. Multilingual Matters.
- Botswana Government (2017). *Vision 20236: Achieving Prosperity for All*. Gaborone.
- ____ (1993). *Report of the National Commission on Education 1993*. Government Printing, Gaborone, Botswana.
- ____ (1994). *Revised National Policy on Education*. Government Printing, Gaborone, Botswana.
- ____ (1998). *Vision 2016: Report on the Long-Term Vision for Botswana. Presidential Commission on the Long-Term Vision*. Government Printing, Gaborone, Botswana.
- ____ (1977). *Education for Kaggisano*. National Commission of Education. Gaborone.
- ____ (1965, reprinted). *Botswana Constitution*. Government Printing, Gaborone. Botswana.
- Brenzinger, M. (Ed). (1992). *Language Death: Factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cassidy, L., Good, K., Mazonde, I. & Rivers, R. (2001): *Regional assessment of the status of the San in Southern Africa: An assessment of the status of the San in Botswana. Report Series No. 3 of 5*. Legal Assistance Centre (LAC), Windhoek, Namibia.
- Chebanne, A. (2023). Botswana language policy implications for educational and cultural domains of Khoisan Minorities. In S. R. Simango (Ed.), *A Southern Africa perspective on language: Language policy, planning and practice in the era of linguistic decolonialization* (pp. 207-222).
- ____ (2022). Language in education policy in Botswana – some critical issues. In R. Kaschula & M. Kretzer (Eds.), *Handbook of language policy and education in countries of the Southern African Development Community (SADC)* (pp. 59-78). Brill's Handbooks in Linguistics, Volume 3: Handbooks of Language Policies in Africa.
- ____ (2020). The internal colonisation of the San Peoples of Botswana. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 32, 16-38.
- ____ (2019). Botswana implicit language use policy deficiencies and its Impact on linguistic and cultural rights development. In, F. Banda (Ed.), *Commemorative volume in honour of M. Wakumelo-Nkolola*, (pp. 197-214) CASAS-UWC Book Series 130.
- ____ (2015a). Negative multicultural consequences of Botswana restrictive language policy in education: Mourning the loss of Khoisan Languages. In A. Jotia & D. Jankie (Eds), *Multicultural education discourses: Breaking barriers of exclusion in selected African*

- contexts* (pp. 5 – 24). Zebra Publishing.
- ____ (2015b). The lack of multilingual education in Botswana: Tragic consequences for the Khoisan Languages. In Sköld, M. Sandström, & M. Bolaane (Eds.), *Under the same sun: Parallel issues and mutual challenges for San and Sami peoples and research* (pp. 133-145). Vaartoe/ Center for Sami Research (CeSam): Umea (Norway).
- ____ (2008). San languages speakers in Botswana and issues of equality and equity in education. In D. E. Mutasa & E. E. Ogutu (Eds.), *Teaching and administration in African languages: A road map to African renaissance* (pp. 189-213). Simba Guru Publishers.
- Chebanne, A. & Monaka, K. (2024). The weaponization of Setswana: Implications for marginalized languages in Botswana. In L. Cassidy, K. Good, I. Mazonde, & R. Rivers (Eds.), *The weaponizing of language in the classroom and beyond* (pp. 127-146). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Chebanne, A. M., Chebanne A., & van Pinxteren, B. (2021). Why is a gradual transition to Botswana's languages in higher education necessary? How can it be achieved? *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 39(4), 390-403.
- Chebanne, A. & Gabanamotse-Mogara, B. (2022). Theory and practice of multilingual and multicultural education in Botswana lower primary schools. In E. Chramba (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching in multicultural and multilingual context* (pp. 287-301). IGI Global.
- Chebanne, A. & Kewagamang, P. (2020). A model for introducing marginalized indigenous languages in the Botswana education system. *Mosenodi Journal*, 23(1), 4-23.
- Chebanne, A. & Dlali, M. (2019). Cua language of Botswana: Resilience or a longer road to language loss? *South African Journal of African Languages* 2019, 40(2), 219-233.
- Chebanne, A. & Monaka, K. C. (2020). A note on multilingualism in Botswana and implication for learning and teaching. *Lonaka Journal of Language Teaching*, 11(2), 57-66.
- Gabanamotse-Mogara, B., Ramotlabaki, L. & Chebanne, A. (2023). Proposed introduction of Botswana local languages in primary school: A critical assessment of its implications. *Journal of Educational Studies Special Issue*, 198-216.
- Good, K. (2001). Conclusion. In L. Cassidy, K. Good, I. Mazonde, & R. Rivers (Eds.), *Regional assessment of the status of the San in Southern Africa: An assessment of the status of the San in Botswana. Report Series No. 3 of 5* (pp. 71-75). Legal Assistance Centre (LAC).
- Güldemann, T. & Vossen, R. (2000). Khoisan. In B. Heine & D. Nurse (Eds.), *Khoisan studies* (pp. 99-122) Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Haingura, P. (2016). A critical evaluation of the development of Rumanyo as a national language in Namibia (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Western Cape, South Africa.

- Hitchcock, R. K. (2002). “We are the first people: Land, natural resources and identity in the Central Kalahari, Botswana”, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 28(4), 797-824.
- Jotia, A. & D. Jankie (Eds.). (2015). *Multicultural education discourses: Breaking barriers of exclusion in selected African contexts*. Zebra Publishing.
- Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D., & Chebanne, A. (2009). In Names of Editors (Eds.), *Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa*. Gaborone: UB-Tromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building.
- Mazonde, I. (2001). San perceptions. In L. Cassidy, K. Good, I. Mazonde, & R. Rivers (Eds.), *Regional assessment of the status of the San in Southern Africa: An assessment of the status of the San in Botswana. Report Series No. 3 of 5* (pp. 59-70). Legal Assistance Centre (LAC).
- Mazonde, I. (Ed.). (2002). *Minorities in the millennium: Perspectives from Botswana*. Light House Publishers/Lentswe la Lesedi.
- M’bokolo, E. (1995). Cultural policy: National, regional, and continental. In *Conflict and culture in Africa: Proceedings of an International symposium on the role of culture in the prevention and resolution of conflicts* (pp. 74-94). University of Botswana-National Institute of Development Research and Documentation.
- Mogara, B. & Chebanne, A. (2023). Local languages as a resource for sustainable development: Way forward for implementing local languages teaching in Botswana. *Mosenodi Journal*, 26(1), 1-12.
- Molosiwa, A. & Chebanne, A. (2023). Historical development of Setswana and the teaching of literacy in Botswana. In R. Joshi, C. A. McBride, B. Kaani, & G. Elbeheri (Eds.), *Handbook of literacy in Africa. Literacy Studies 24* (pp. 487-506). Springer Nature.
- Motshabi, K. & Saugestad, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Research for Khoe and San development: Proceedings of International Conference*. University of Botswana, 10-12 September 2003. University of Botswana – University of Tromso.
- Nthomang, K. (2004). From dependency to self-reliance; Piloting a shift. In *Research for Khoe and San development: Proceedings of International Conference* (pp. 49-51) University of Botswana, 10-12 September 2003. University of Botswana – University of Tromso.
- Nyati-Ramahobo, L. (1997). ‘*Language in education and the quality of life in Botswana*’. In D. Nteta & J. Hermans (Eds.). *Poverty and plenty: The Botswana experience* (pp. 251-269). Botswana Society.
- ____ (1995). ‘*A review of the Setswana program to implement the revised National Policy on Education for Ten years of basic education*’. A Report submitted to Curriculum Development Division. Ministry of Education.

- ____ (1991). Language planning and education policy in Botswana. (Doctoral dissertation). Microfilm International.
- ____ (2000). The language situation in Botswana. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1(2), 243-300.
- ____ (2006). Language policy, cultural rights and the law in Botswana. In M. Pütz, J. Fishman, & J. Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds.), *'Along the Routes to Power': Explorations of empowerment through language* (pp. 285-304). De Gruyter.
- ____ (1987). *Minority language users in a multilingual society and early educational hurdles: A case of Botswana*. Paper presented to the Second Conference of the Association of University Teachers of Literature and language. Harare, Zimbabwe.
- RETENG. (2006). *Multicultural Coalition of Botswana*. Retrieved October, 2006, from www.reteng.org.
- Skold, P., Sandstrom, M. & Bolaane, M. (Eds.) (2015). *Under the same sun: Parallel issues and mutual challenges for San and Sami Peoples and Research*. Vaartoe/ Center for Sami Research (CeSam): Umea (Norway).
- WIMSA (Working Group on Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa) & RDU (Research and Development Unit) (UB). (2000). *Education for remote area dwellers in Botswana: Problems and perspectives*.