Foreign Languages as Languages of Instruction, Liberating or Silencing: A Critical Analysis of Tanzania and Rwanda

*Corresponding author: Patrick S. Kavenuke
patrickkavenuke@yahoo.com; patrickkavenuke@gmail.com
+86 188 1303 0257 and +255 759 100 006
Institute of International and Comparative Education
No. 19 XinJieKouWai Street, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 10085, P. R. China
&
Emile Uwamahoro
emiluwa@gmail.com
+86 157 2730 2088
Institute of International and Comparative Education
No. 19 XinJieKouWai Street, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 10085, P. R. China

Abstract
The debate of language of instruction particularly in Tanzania and Rwanda has drawn attention to policy makers, researchers and the entire public. The study examined the factors to be considered in introducing a foreign language as a language of instruction (LOI). It also analyzed how the selection of a given foreign language to be a LOI liberates or silences learners in the learning process. It adopted document analysis where documents such as language policy, education policy, curriculum development, language studies and previous studies related to the topic under scrutiny were reviewed. It concludes that the aim is neither to ban the use of foreign languages as languages of instruction nor to ban the use of local languages or lingua franca, given the advantages attached to each medium. Rather, it intended to critically analyze how liberating and silencing is the language adopted to become a LOI in the entire learning process. The study recommends teachers and students to be allowed to code switch and translate in their language, when need arises. Being too rigid to policy statements on the LOI, only propagate teaching but not learning.

Key Words: **Foreign languages, Language of instruction, Liberating learners, Silencing learners, Tanzania, Rwanda**

1.0 Introduction
The debate of Language of Instruction (hereafter LOI) in African countries, Tanzania and Rwanda in particular has drawn attention to policy makers, curriculum developers, researchers, academicians and the entire public. In Tanzania and Rwanda where the countries have their own local languages and lingua franca respectively, the situation is more critical. The level of drop out and repetition rate is high (UNESCO, 2014). One of the factor necessitating this drop out and repetition rate increase is the issue of the LOI used in classrooms. UNESCO (2010) and UNESCO (2014) asserted that many learners cannot read and write in their local languages or lingua franca. The situation becomes tenser when the LOI that is adopted is a foreign language.

According to Freire (2005) children learn and develop critical thinking skills when they dialogue, pose questions, reflect and act on the situations around them. Since learning takes place where dialogue exists, learners have to understand the LOI, be able to use it in questioning and making dialogue with the teacher and fellow learners. Additionally, studies (Brock-Utne, 2004; Sa, 2007; Qorro, 2006; UNESCO, 2008) have indicated that learners are more comfortable and free to express

their ideas when they use their local languages or lingua franca which they usually speak in day-to-day life than foreign languages. This is because the use of foreign language as a LOI limits interactive teaching and learning. The phenomenon discourages the development of critical thinking skills as learners are forced to adapt to rote learning and memorizing of facts.

1.1 Language policy in Tanzania and Rwanda after independence

The ideologies that countries have undergone, generally impact its LOI in schools. Tanzania, the then called Tanganyika continued to inherit colonial education, even after getting independence from the British colonial rule in 1961. In 1964, there was a union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar to form the current Tanzania. From 1961 to 1966 Tanzania practiced the capitalist ideology. From 1967 to 1980's Tanzania was under the socialist ideology. Given the global changes and the restructuring of the capitalist economy in the 1980's to the present, Tanzania has made a backward move to capitalist ideology. Swilla (2009) posited that in the first phase (1961-1966), Tanzania government maintained the curriculum and languages of instruction used during colonial era. Thus, Swahili remained a LOI in the first five years of primary education and English remained the LOI from the sixth to secondary and post secondary education levels.

During the second phase (1967-1980's), Tanzania came up with Education for Self Reliance. Since, its purpose was to prepare individuals who have the education complete in itself at any level attained, the use of Swahili (which was widely spoken) as a LOI in the entire primary level of education was deemed important. Despite the presidential commission recommendation on the use of Swahili as LOI at all levels of education (United Republic of Tanzania [URT], 1984), evidences have indicated that such a government statement has so far neither been adopted nor implemented (Swilla, 2009).

Furthermore, the 1980's to date is a phase which has experienced tremendous changes in the education system, particularly the language policy. It has to be noted that this was a period of capitalist restructuring in the world in which most of African countries were affected. New policies such as free market economy, liberalization, privatization and education democratization came into existence. The policies affected the education and the language policies in particular. At that time Tanzania was purely operating under capitalist system although it preached socialism. It was a socialist society under the umbrella of capitalism. The situation may be equated to what Makulilo (2012) called it suffering from ideological crisis which caused complexities in many developmental agendas including the issue of LOI. Swilla (2009) highlighted that by 1992 the use of English as a LOI in private primary schools was legalized and Swahili remained the LOI in government primary schools.

Till now, there is no clear guideline on the implementation of the new 2014 Tanzania language policy statements. The new Tanzanian education policy of 2014 (Ministry of Education and Vocational Training [MoEVT], 2014) is still more or less neutral on the use of the two languages as languages of instruction. It just stipulates policy statements on language that Swahili will be used as a LOI in all levels of education. It also highlights that there is a need to continue consolidating the use of English as a LOI in all levels of education. The continued emphasis and consolidation of the use of English in all levels of education is due to the observation that both teachers and students struggle to clearly express themselves in English. Teachers and students struggle because they have not mastered it, as they were (are) not taught in a language they speak or fully understand (UNESCO, 2016). The current status of English and Swahili in Tanzania as subjects is that they are

both taught as subjects in primary and lower secondary levels. The two languages are also taught in high schools and in universities for students who opt for combinations having these subjects.

Just like in the previous, before the new policy was launched, the current experiences and practices indicate that English is used in post-secondary levels of education. However, studies such as Sa (2007) have well documented that students in transition to secondary schools are ill-prepared for using English as a LOI. An obvious assumption is therefore made that those who attend primary schools using English (private English-medium primary schools) as a LOI have an advantage over those attending primary schools using Swahili as a LOI.

Statistically, Kiswahili language in Tanzania, as a lingua franca, a second language and a straightforward choice for a national language, to the majority of the Tanzanians is spoken by 95% of the population (Brock-Utne, 2004). This tells us that the language is known to many when compared to other foreign languages such as English.

Comparatively, Rwanda, which was under the Belgium colonization (1890-1962), just after the independence, French was used as an official language besides the mother tongue Kinyarwanda. French language introduced by the Belgian colonial power that began the formal education system, was used as LOI from primary schools to tertiary education up to 1996. After Genocide perpetrated against Tutsis and following the massive number of repatriates from neighboring countries using English as an official language, English was accorded equal status with French and Kinyarwanda (LeClerc, 2008). Since then, in the education system of Rwanda, Kinyarwanda was used in lower primary schools while French and English were the languages of instruction in upper levels of primary school, high schools depending upon the choice of the owners of schools or students (Tabaro, 2015). Students entering tertiary education were expected to do academic work equally well in French and English after one preparatory academic year of languages in French or English (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010).

As the process of reconstruction of Rwanda, the major reforms were undertaken in various sectors including education. By the end of 2008, the major reform in Education was the drop of French as one of languages of instruction to exclusively switch to English as the only LOI from grade four of primary education up to the tertiary education (Gahigi, 2008). The Rwandan government justified the switch to English as LOI by pointing to the global and regional growth of English as the leading language of science, commerce and economic development (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; Tabaro, 2015).

Currently Kinyarwanda is used in lower primary schools and English is used as LOI from grade four up to tertiary education (Government of Rwanda [GoR], 2015). Like Tanzania for English and Swahili, in addition to French, English and Kinyarwanda in Rwanda, remain as subjects taught in primary schools and they are still part of language combinations or options in high schools. Though English is an official LOI, the three languages French, English and Kinyarwanda rest the official languages in the public affairs (Government of Rwanda [GoR], 2015; GoR, 2016).

Statistics from the 2012 general census indicated that 6.6% of the Rwandan population aged 15 and above can speak Kinyarwanda and English while 3.1% can speak French and Kinyarwanda. The figures show that the biggest portion of the Rwandan population can only speak Kinyarwanda (National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda [NISR], 2014). Just like Tanzania with the mass population using Kiswahili, in Rwanda, Kinywarwanda is a language spoken by many.

2.0 Statement of the problem

Numerous studies (Brock-Utne, 2004; Gahigi, 2008; LeClerc, 2008; Qorro, 2006; Sa, 2007; Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; Swilla, 2009; Tibategeza, 2010) and policies (GoR, 2015; MoEVT, 2014) have been conducted and stipulated respectively on the role of LOI on learning. Nevertheless, there are no or few studies conducted to study the factors that the governments have to consider when choosing a particular language to be a LOI in schools. On the other hand, little is known on how a foreign language chosen to be the LOI liberates or silences learners in the learning process. In attending to this, the study intends to generally explore the politics of the selection of the LOI in Tanzania and Rwanda. It was guided by the major question "how does the selection of foreign language to become a LOI in schools liberate or silence learners?" More specifically, it intended to answer the following research questions:

- What are the factors to be considered in introducing a foreign language as a LOI?
- In what ways is the chosen foreign language liberates or silences learners in the learning process?

3.0 Methodology and approaches to information sources

Methodologically, the study adopted the documentary analysis approach to information sources. Documents related to language policy, education policy, curriculum development, language studies and previous studies related to the topic under scrutiny were reviewed.

With regard to the first research question, before exploring the factors to be considered in introducing a foreing language as a LOI, we reviewed the sources to firstly find out the factors that have since then been considered in introducing a foreing language to be a LOI. We noted that many countries adopt a particular foreign language to be a LOI due to a number of factors such as these explicated hereunder.

International influences

The decision on the LOI in many African countries is generally under both internal and external forces, although the external forces are more dominant (Brock-Utne, 2012). For instance the Tanzanian Education policy of 2014 emphasized the continued use of English due to globalization and its related influences (MoEVT, 2014). The continued consolidation on the use of English puts Tanzania in the international academic, scientific and business world position. Swilla (2009) also pointed out that the country's membership in regional and international communities, where knowledge of an international language is important may also influence the choice of the LOI. Given the fact that many interviews for jobs are conducted in English, Sa (2007) maintained that immigrants from neighboring countries such as Kenya, Uganda, and Zambia who are exposed to English at a younger age are often likely to be more qualifying to take high-paying jobs in Tanzania given their English skills than their counterparts Tanzanians.

The case is similar to Rwanda as the choice of foreign languages has some kind of the external forces including seeking membership to different regional and global organizations. According Samuelson & Freedman (2010) the demand for membership to Commonwealth and East African Community was partly the factor considered for Rwanda to shift from French to English as a LOI in Rwanda and in recognition of the growing use of English as the leading language of science, commerce and economic development.

The global market where the country exports its products is likely to influence the choice of the LOI. Rwanda has acknowledged the role of English in global business and according to McGreal

(2009) since 2008 much emphasis has been placed on English in academic and political life. In linking the choice of the LOI and other educational policies to the global market and economy, Suárez (2005) and Nizonkiza (2009) used English as an example of foreign language to highlight the link between countries' educational and economic policies on English. Suárez (2005) found that "countries pursuing an economic strategy based on exports and the attraction of foreign capital should adapt their language education policies to the requirements of that economy strategy" (p. 459).

It is evident that Rwanda took the same pursuit as indicated by the Director of Policy Planning at the Rwandan Ministry of Education call for the need of English as a LOI. McGreal (2009) asserted that English is now a world language, especially in trade and commerce and thus, Rwanda is trying to attract foreign investors—most of these people are English speakers. This shows how the economic and political reasons, mainly from external forces are determinant of foreign language as LOI though it may not be on the benefits of the learners. The language itself cannot give assurance that learners have mastered the subject matter, skills and competence required to become competitive in the global market.

Levels of education

In lower levels of learning, children are normally very curious and eager to learn. Realizing that both Tanzania and Rwanda have opted for Kiswahili and Kinyarwanda respectively to be used as languages of instruction in lower levels of education. Teaching and learning of different concepts to children requires a teacher to elaborate to make the concepts more clear. In this way, if language is a barrier, children even adults in high levels are likely to be silenced from asking questions, requiring clarifications and giving their own views on the world around them. There exists a dilemma on the appropriate age and levels of education on the introduction of foreign language. Some researchers propagate introducing in lower levels, some in higher levels. However, the fact is that whether introduced at lower levels or high levels of education, there still exist complexities in students' learning. For instance, in Tanzania where currently the LOI in secondary and post secondary levels is English, studies (Biswalo, 2010; MoEVT, 2015; Tibategeza, 2010; Qorro, 2006) have indicated that teachers and students in classrooms are struggling to use foreign languages; they are sometimes forced to breach the policy statements by code switching and translating. This illustrates that more learners cannot participate in learning process if code switching and translating are not used—the practice which according to language policy documents is not allowed. In Rwanda where the foreign language is used in lower levels of education, the situation is similar to that of Tanzania. The mixture of languages is more apparent in primary and even in higher levels of education. Tabaro (2013) and Tolon (2014) found that code switching in three languages (Kinyarwanda, French and English) is common in primary and secondary schools in Rwanda.

When in fact the international influences and the level of education have been the major factors considered in the selection of a particular language to be used as a LOI, there are many other factors that have to be considered when selecting a particular language to be a LOI. Such other factors are explained hereunder.

Serving learners' learning purpose

Since Swahili is spoken and understood by the majority of Tanzanians, its choice to be used as a LOI in lower levels seem to have considered the desire to serve the learner's learning purpose. Teachers can easily use the language to educate learners and learners can use it to ask for clarifications from the teacher and fellow learners if the need arises. According to Qorro (2006)

classroom activities such as discussion, asking and answering questions, making dialogue, debate are pre-requisite to learning and they serve learners' learning purpose, if the language used is clear to both teachers and learners. On the other hand, studies (Brock-Utne, 2004; MoEVT, 2014; Sa, 2007; Qorro, 2006) unveiled that foreign languages such as English are silencing learners from participating actively in the whole learning process. In that respect, the choice of English as a LOI in Tanzania seems not to have considered serving learner's learning purpose.

Likewise, in Rwanda, educational purpose for the choice of foreign language as LOI has been given less attention. As stated earlier, the main reasons to use the foreign language as LOI seem to be more economic and political than educational. Most of the teachers could not explicitly speak the foreign language, leave alone students who are even still struggling with the local language. For instance more than 85% of the primary school teachers are at the beginner level of English proficiency (USAID, 2012).

For learning to take place, there must be an effective communication between teachers and students. This is a two way communication in which teachers and students establish conversation about the matters on hand. The teacher who feels uncomfortable with the foreign language to teach, he/she either uses chalk and talk in his/her teaching or switches to the local language. Additionally, Malik, Gasana, Raab, Cha & Goldenberg (2014) in their survey, reported that students do not ask questions during lesson in classroom—language barrier being partly a major factor. It can be argued that without the mastery of the language, the situation for the students to be able to learn becomes very critical and even worrying.

Learners' mastery of the local language or Lingua Franca

Teaching using the second or the third language to a greater extent depends upon the mastery of the first language. In the Tanzanian context where the number of individual languages listed is 127 (Lewis, Gary & Charles, 2015), Swahili is a second language to many users and English is the third language. In this manner, teaching using a foreign language such as English as a LOI presupposes very much the mastery of the first language and/or second language for code switching or translation purpose. Researchers in the field of language in education such as Richards and Rodgers (1999) asserted that there are cases where the learners' native language is used as a LOI to facilitate learning. The choice of English as a LOI might have considered this factor, but the policy on LOI is too rigid, forcing teachers not to code switch and make use of total translation for learners to learn effectively.

Contrary to Tanzania, Rwanda is one of the only countries with one local language. Some students still lag behind in reading, writing and comprehending in Kinyarwanda—the local language. The use of foreign language from primary may even complicate the matters for the students who do not have the mastery of the first language. According to DeStephano, Ralaingita, Costello, Sax & Frank (2012) reading, writing and comprehending in Kinyarwanda and English is very low in Rwanda. The same study found that 26% of grade four students could hardly read a single word of grade two to grade three level text while 32% of grade six could read 50 words of the same grade two to grade three level text per minute—a measure which is far from the minimum of requirement of sixty (60) words per minute.

For students to learn, they need to read, write but more importantly comprehend what is read and written. As indicated above, the language skills level was not only low in oral reading but also in comprehension in both Kinyarwanda and English. The evidences have indicated that many students after five years of schooling could not read with sufficient comprehension to use text to support

their learning of subject area content. For instance, the study showed that only 11% and 16% of grade six pupils had a required English reading and listening comprehension respectively (DeStephano, Ralaingita, Costello, Sax & Frank, 2012). It can clearly be argued that the performance in foreign language is worst compared to the local language in Rwanda to confirm whether students are really learning. Based on these facts, it is argued that the level of mastery of the first language and second language in Rwanda and Tanzania have not been taken into consideration in adopting the foreign language. In that respect, learners would find more difficult when they are taught in foreign languages.

The rural-urban differences

The use of foreign language as LOI does not consider the existing rural-urban differences. It is likely to widen disparity in education in terms of learners' performance among those from rural and from urban. Many children from rural areas are familiar with their first language (mother tongue) which is not used in schools than the foreign languages which are mostly used in schools. This makes it more difficult to get support from parents in their learning because of high rates of illiteracy not only in foreign languages but also in local languages. For instance, Tolon's (2014) study in Rwanda observed that the level of English literacy is low in rural areas. The study also unravelled that English speakers in rural areas are almost nonexistent. In addition to the lower literacy rate in rural areas, even few literate parents in the local languages may not be able to provide support to the children when the foreign language is used as a LOI. The case is different from the children in urban areas where parents are more likely to be literate in the language used as a LOI. Moreover, for the case of Tanzania, Biswalo (2010) found that the establishment of a new policy that was about to come emphasizing on the use of English from lower levels may not work in rural areas since most of them cannot speak even Swahili. He added that, the trail may be possible in urban areas. This indicates that children in urban areas are advantaged in that from childhood are exposed to foreign language speaking as compared to those in the rural areas.

Developmental factor

Sa (2007) argued that if foreign languages such as English can be used as a LOI without compromising educational quality and equity, it may be a worthwhile investment. In contrast to this argument, the fact is that, given the existing socio-economic disparities, the use of foreign languages as languages of instruction is likely to widen both educational inequality and inequity. This finally compromises the provision of quality education (Qorro, 2006). We also take a different view in that, having competence in foreign language use does not necessarily require one to use it as a LOI. One may be competent in a given foreign language by studying that language as a subject. In that respect, what matters are the skills and competences that a learner achieves and puts into practice. There is no evidence that a foreign language can be only acquired when it is used as a LOI. Our belief is that as long as a learner has acquired that language competences and skills when taught as a subject, he/she can learn language skills and competences related to any subject matter. In addition to that view, evidences have shown that there are many developed countries which use their languages as languages of instruction, yet they are developed. Having a look at UK, Finland, Russia, China, South Korea, Japan to mention but a few, an observation is made that the countries are developed in all aspects of life be it socially, economically, politically and culturally. In this way, we are tempted to assume that using local languages or lingua franca as a LOI influences country's entire development.

Regarding the second research question, the choice of foreign language as a LOI seems to liberate learners and at the same time silence them. The few who are advantaged in the system are liberated

but those who are in one way or another disadvantaged by the system are silenced. The studies reviewed indicated that those who are silenced be it by the teacher and his/her teaching approaches (Freire, 2005; hooks, 2010) or the languages of instruction (Sa, 2007) are passive and docile in the classrooms. They are likely to end up either repeating classes or dropping out of the school—we call it being pushed out of the school. To highlight on this observation, an inadequate command of English, could cause a student to fail his/her national examinations and prevent him/her from graduating and moving on to other levels such as university education (Sa, 2007). This experience prohibits students from maximizing their fullest potentials. This is more or less like punishing learners because of the country's education system and its choice of the foreign language being the LOI.

As stated earlier, failure to clearly follow the LOI, subsequently leads to poor performance and eventually being pushed out of the school system. Unknowingly, the school system prepares individuals who after being pushed out of the system engage in theft, robbery, sexual harassment, oppression and all other forms of violent behavior. In support of this view, Masath (2013) observed that poor school performance was seen to be a factor to moral deterioration that has led to violence in his study area in Tanzania. In this view, the use of foreign language as a LOI in Tanzania and Rwanda and its consequences is seen as a form of oppression which leads to another oppression in the society.

The choice of the LOI that is silencing learners in classroom has impact not only to learners in the schools but also in communication in the society. Majority of those who happen to be liberated by the system (the elites) tend to write their articles and papers for the public in the language of the foreigners. Unfortunately, many of the population they write for cannot read the articles written in the language they are writing. While writing this paper, we still critically think of ourselves, for whom are we writing? Is it for the whole population of Tanzania and Rwanda or only for those who can comprehend this language?—a language which other researchers have called it a language of domination as it plays a greater role in the death of other languages (Rohmah, 2005).

Moreover, the choice of the foreign language being a LOI develops some sorts of stereotyping (Brooks-Lewis, 2012). In most cases, text books are printed by the owners of the language used in the textbooks. The content and examples given in those textbooks are likely to embrace the foreign culture. As the textbooks are included in the school curriculum, learners are likely to develop a thinking that considers Western ideas being better than theirs. This is essentially abandoning the Tanzania and Rwandan culture and adoring the foreign culture.

Looking upon the road signs and place directives, many of them in Tanzania and Rwanda are exclusively in foreign languages. This is a result of adopting the foreign languages as languages of instruction in schools assuming that all were liberated from it, when the fact is that some were silenced by it. This affects the communication as some may not understand the words used in giving directives and warnings especially if no symbol is used. For instance Rosendal (2009) study in Rwanda observed that English and French dominated the billboards advertising and shop signs. Failure to read such directives may lead to committing a breach hence falling under custody—another form of oppression.

On the issue of literacy, the level of illiterate population increases not only because of a portion of the population which might have not attended school, but also because there is another population which can only read, write and speak local languages or lingua franca. Unfortunately, those who are

fluent in local languages or lingua franca are likely to be incapable of reading and translating the information on sign posts if it is in foreign languages.

Additionally, in regret, experiences have shown that many schools in Tanzania and Rwanda where foreign language is used learners have been punished for not using English or French in the school compound and/or in the classrooms. Moreover, there are cases where learners who are found using local languages or lingua franca are given labels, in form of a wood or a card. At the end of the day, those with the labels are punished for not speaking that foreign language. Also, there are phrases such as "speak English only" or "No English No Service" that have been so common in the schools in these countries. In support of this, Tibategeza (2010) observed that it is common in most of the secondary schools in Tanzania to find the signboards around the school compound such as "Speak English" and corporal punishment is applied to those who do not abide by this rule.

The use of corporal punishment as noted in Tibategeza (2010) seemed to be common as teachers and heads of school viewed as a way to help students improve their language skills, subsequently understanding the instruction given in the examination. Teachers and heads of schools did not consider punishment as a hindrance to learning. They emphasized on it to those who use Swahili to help them familiarize with the use of English which is not commonly spoken in the streets like Swahili. In Tibategeza (2010), teachers and heads of schools underscored that:

> It is like a tradition in Tanzania for learners to be punished to get them to learn what the teacher wants them to…if students are left to do what they want; it is obvious that English will remain a barrier to learning. (p. 236)

From the above quotation, it seems that punishment has become a norm and a tradition in Tanzania. We view corporal punishment as a major barrier to learning since it may cause physical injuries and psychological trauma. The fear in students of being punished may lead to students not to question, to dialogue and participate in different learning tasks. Yet questioning, dialogue, participation are the prerequisite for the promotion of critical thinking skills in order to get engaged in knowledge creation (Freire, 2005; hooks, 2010; Qorro, 2006). In this way, learners are silenced as they become passive listeners in the classroom and the student-teacher relationship also becomes questionable. This is due to the fact that students do not ask as they cannot comprehend the language used and cannot express in their local languages or lingua franca in fear of being punished. Teaching then, becomes more of banking (Freire, 1993) because there is no mutual and reciprocal relationship between students and teachers.

Related to punishment, according to Osterholm, Nash and Kritsonis (2007) the use of labels in form of wood or cards as described in the previous paragraphs has impact on learning. It can be argued that fellow learners who see a student with a label hanging on the neck do not only think of him/her as being unable to speak English but also a weak and a dull student. This is ought to have psychological impact on the learner because of different forms of harassment such as bullying and mockery. Having a label hanging on the learners' neck with all these forms of harassment makes a student not to concentrate on the lessons taught but rather thinking all day long on how to pass that label to another student. These issues associated with labeling may finally lead to low performance, low motivation and hence being pushed out.

Comparably the use of punishment and labels in silencing, using school signboards such as "Speak English Only", "No English No Service" is another form of silencing learners. The impact of using foreign language in schools goes beyond silencing learners. It further deprives them of their rights

and freedom of expression. A phrase such as "No English No Service" is more of a threatening phrase than a motivating one. Keeping these words in their minds, an individual learner who has a particular problem related to learning or family issues may not see the teacher completely or sometimes go to see the teacher but end just at the threshold of the teachers' office due to limited language skills for expressing his/her concerns. This subsequently leaves the student suffering alone with the problems unsettled.

4.0 Conclusion and recommendation

Given the incontestable global role of the foreign language such as English as a LOI, it should be noted clearly that the focus of this paper was not to ban the use of foreign language as a LOI and promote Kiswahili and Kinyarwanda. On the other hand, not being too inconsiderate to one's culture, the paper did not intend to ban the use of Kiswahili and Kinyarwanda and promote the use of foreign languages as languages of instruction. Rather, the paper intended to uncover the factors to be considered in the adoption of a given foreign language to be a LOI. It also intended to unveil the pros and cons of using foreign language as a LOI by critically analyzing how liberating and silencing is the language selected to become a LOI in the entire learning process.

We therefore argue and recommend that teachers and students should be allowed to use local languages or lingua franca at any point in the classrooms and around the school compound when need arises. Strategies such as total translation, code-switching may help teachers and learners to learn. Being too rigid to policy documents and statements on the LOI, may only propagate teaching but not learning. In this way, policy makers are alerted that when adopting a policy on the LOI, the interest of educational orientation should be given priority than the political orientation. The educational orientation focuses on learning purposes whereas the political orientation focuses on economic and political reasons that may not have a direct impact on students' learning.

The adoption of a foreign language should consider the fact that it does not compromise the educational quality and equity. Finally, it should not be taken that the use of foreign language as a LOI is the only way of mastering the skills and competences required in the foreign language. Students may study in their local language or lingua franca and put much emphasis on the teaching of foreign language as a subject as a better way of mastering the skills and competences required in that language.

References

Biswalo, T. A. (2010). Policy processes in relation to language in Tanzania: Examining shift in language policy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois. Urbana-Champaign, USA.

Brock-Utne, B. (2001) Education for All: In whose language? *Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 27, 1,* pp. 115-134.

Brock-Utne, B. (2004). English as the language of instruction or destruction – how do teachers and students in Tanzania cope? General and theoretical paper No.598, Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg (LAUD), Essen.

Brock-Utne, B. (2012). Language and inequality: Global challenges to education, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, Vol. 42, 5,* pp. 773-793.

Brooks-Lewis, K.A. (2012) Stereotyping in a Foreign Language Education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 51,* pp. 523-526.

DeStephano, J., Ralaingita, W., Costello, M., Sax, A., & Frank, A. (2012). Task order 7 early grade reading and mathematics in Rwanda, Final Report, USAID.

Freire, P. (1993). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum Books.

Freire, P. (2005). Pedagogy of the oppressed. In P. Freire (Ed.), Pedagogy of the oppressed (pp. 49-64). New York, NY: Continuum.

Gahigi, M. (2008). Rwanda: English language teaching kicks off. Retrieved from http://allafrica.com/stories/200812010940.html on 9th December, 2017.

GoR (2015). The constitution of the Republic of Rwanda of 2003 revised in 2015.

GoR (2016). Ministerial order No 006/2016 of 08/01/2016 determining curriculum, teaching hours and the language of instruction in primary, secondary and specialized school.

LeClerc, J. (2008). Rwanda. L'ame'nagement linguistique dans le monde. Retrieved from http://www.axl.cefan.ulaval.ca/afrique/rwanda.htm on 9th November, 2017.

Lewis, M. P., Gary F. S., and Charles, D. F., (Eds.). (2015). Ethnologue: Languages of the World, *18th edition.* Dallas, Texas: SIL International.

Makulilo, V. (2012). Where is socialism in Tanzania? *Elixir International Journal of Social Science 46,*pp. 8170-8180.

Malik, S., Gasana, J., Raab, E., Cha, K. & Goldenberg, C. (2014). Literacy boost Rwanda: Teacher survey and observation report.

Masath, F. B. (2013). Moral deterioration: The reflection on emerging street youth gangs in Musoma, in Tanzania. *SAVAP International Journal, Vol. 4, 1,* pp. 101-111.

Mazrui, A. (1997) The World Bank, the language question and the future of African education. *Race & Class, Vol. 38, 35,* pp. 35-48.

McGreal, C. (2008, October 14). "Rwanda to switch from French to English in schools". *The Guardian.*

McGreal, C. (2009, January 15). Why Rwanda said adieu to French. *The Guardian.*

MoEVT (2014). Sera ya Elimu na Mafunzo ya mwaka 2014 [Education and training policy of 2014]. Retrieved from http://www.necta.go.tz/files/SERA2.pdf on 19th September, 2017.

NISR (2014). Rwanda general census of population and household report. Kigali, Rwanda.

Osterholm, K,. Nash, W. R., & Kristsonis, W. A. (2007). Effects of labeling students "learning disabled": Emergent themes in the research literature 1970 through 2000. *Focus on colleges, universities, and schools, Vol. 1,1,*pp. 1-11.

Qorro, M. (2006). Does language of instruction affect quality of education? Retrieved from http://hakielimu.org/files/publications/document101does_lang_instruc_fct_qual_edu_en.pdf on 20th August, 2017.

Richards, J. C., & Rogers, T. S. (1999). Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Rohmah, Z. (2005). English as a global language: Its historical past and its future. *BAHASA DAN SENI, Vol. 33, 1,* pp. 106-117.

Rosendal, T. (2009). Linguistic markets in Rwanda: Language use in advertisements and on signs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Vol. 30,1,* pp. 19–39.

RTI International (2012) EdData II Task Order 7 Early Grade Reading and Mathematics in Rwanda Final Report, United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Sa, E. (2007). Language policy for education and development in Tanzania. Retrieved from https://www.swarthmore.edu/sites/default/files/assets/documents/linguistics/2007_sa_eleuthera.pdf on 19th February, 2017.

Samwelson, B. L., & Freedman, S.W. (2010). Language policy, multilingual education and power in Rwanda. *Language policy, 9,* pp. 191- 215.

Suárez, S. L. (2005). Does English rule? Language of instruction and economic strategies in Singapore, Ireland and Puerto Rico. *Comparative Politics 37(4),* pp. 459-478.

Swilla, I. (2009). Languages of instruction in Tanzania: Contradictions between ideology, policy and implementation. *African Study Monographs, 30(1),* pp.1-14.

Tabaro, C. (2013). Code- switching in Rwanda. A case study of Kigali City Secondary school in Rwanda. *Southeast Asia: A Multidisciplinary Journal, Vol. 13,* pp 14–26.

Tabaro, C. (2015). Rwandan's motivation to learn and use English as medium of instruction. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 5, 2,* pp. 78-85.

Tibategeza, E. R. (2010). Implementation of bilingual education in Tanzania: The realities in the schools. *Nordic Journal of African studies, Vol. 19, 4,* pp. 227–249.

Tolon, C. (2014). Teachers experience during the shift in medium of instruction in Rwanda: Voices from Kigali public school. Unpublished Master thesis. Sussex University, UK.

UNESCO (2008). Mother tongue matters: Local language as a key to effective learning. UNESCO, Paris-France.

UNESCO (2010). EFA global monitoring report: Reaching the marginalized. Paris, UNESCO.

UNESCO (2014). EFA global monitoring report: Teaching and Learning: achieving the quality for all. Paris, UNESCO.

UNISECO (2016). EFA global monitoring report: Education for people and planet: Creating sustainable futures for all. Paris, UNESCO.

URT (1984). Educational system in Tanzania towards the year 2000: Recommendations of the 1982 Presidential Commission on Education. Ministry of National Education, Dar es Salaam.