

COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 37
March 2026

No End in Sight to the Long Walk to 'Where things are their names': Reflecting on the Language Debate in South African Higher Education

Abstract

One of the current discourses within higher education in South Africa is the suitability of indigenous African languages for use as mediums of teaching and learning, research and scholarship. The discourse is at a stage at which the Black South Africans are expected to believe that their languages are not fully developed to serve as effective mediums of teaching and learning the sciences, law, economics and other subjects. Apparently, they are also not fully developed to be used in research and scholarship. The *Language Framework Policy for Public Higher Education Institutions, 2020*, recognises English as the *de facto* language of teaching and learning in higher education. That seal of approval of English as *primus inter pares* among the official languages in South Africa means that indigenous African languages remain relegated to the periphery of higher education and the knowledge project. The nearest that these languages can come to higher education and the knowledge project, broadly, is through translanguaging, which is increasingly being portrayed as a progressive development in the language debate in higher education. This piece of *Briefly Speaking* contests the packaging of translanguaging as a progressive step towards addressing the language question.

It contends that translanguaging has a long history which can be traced back to the colonial and apartheid eras in the South African education and training system. Black Africans who were educated during these dark periods in the history of South Africa were compelled by circumstances to adopt some forms of translanguaging as a mechanism for adapting to the reality that English was the main language of teaching and learning in higher education. This used to be the case even in the universities in the homelands of Bophuthatswana, Transkei, Venda and Zululand, which were established as Black African universities. Translanguaging does not mark the conclusion of the language debate in higher education. This debate is likely to continue until these marginalised languages are recognised for use in teaching and learning, research and scholarship, in higher education. Such recognition will mark the beginning of the end to the belief of equating knowledge to the Western epistemes at the expense of African Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS).

Keywords: Episteme(s), higher education, language, translanguaging, teaching and learning, research, scholarship

Introduction

The *Language Policy Framework for Public Higher Education Institutions* (DHET, 2020) recognises English as the *de facto* language of learning and teaching across South African higher education institutions, and calls on higher education institutions to support students for whom English is not their first language or mother tongue, to ensure their academic success. It also urges the higher education institutions to have plans to invest in the development of official languages into languages of teaching and learning, scholarship and research. There are four key messages that could be decoded or deduced from these pronouncements of the Policy Framework.

The first is that English is recognised as *primus inter pares* among the South African official languages, and therefore, it has the 'divine' status of being ordained as the only language most suited to being used in teaching and learning, research and scholarship work in higher education. The second is that higher education institutions should develop and implement interventions aimed at assisting students who are not English native speakers to access and assimilate the knowledges that are conveyed using English as the medium. The third is that indigenous African languages are not mature enough to be used in the knowledge business of teaching and learning, research and scholarship. The fourth is that higher education institutions should have plans to invest in the work of developing the indigenous African languages into 'mature' languages that could be used as mediums of teaching and learning, research and scholarship. This piece of *Briefly Speaking*

addresses these four key messages decoded and deduced from the Policy Framework.

English as the *de facto* recognised language of teaching and learning, research and scholarship

English is the language that was introduced to South Africa by the British as colonial masters. It was the language of colonialism and remains the hegemonic language. From the outset, English was positioned as the language of civilisation whereas the indigenous African languages were considered the mediums of darkness, evil and backwardness. Education, as one of the pillars of the 'colonial civilisation' had to be conducted in English as the language of teaching and learning, research and scholarship. Even when 'Black Universities' were established, they were 'Black Universities' only in so far as they were meant to serve Black students. They were not 'Black Universities' in the sense that the epistemes were African, nor in the sense that the indigenous African languages would be used in teaching and learning, research and scholarship. There was nothing about African languages and culture in the 'homeland universities' in the autonomous 'republics' of Bophuthatswana, Transkei and Venda, for example. Education and the knowledge project were part of the civilisation, and therefore could only be transacted in English. It was assumed and believed that the colonised Africans, considered as uncivilised, had nothing that could be recognised as scientific,

philosophical, economic, legal and cultural knowledges (Murove, 2018).

The assumption and belief that Africans never had recognised scientific, philosophical, economic, legal and cultural knowledge systems are unfounded. On the contrary, it has been discovered that Africa and African communities have rich histories of engagement in and with knowledge, including in domains such as sciences, economics, literature, and culture. They have had knowledge systems that the colonial project sought to obliterate in favour of the Western epistemes based on the malicious belief that they were evil and barbaric. These indigenous knowledge systems have much to contribute to the social, economic, scientific and cultural development of South Africa, if only the country invests in documenting and preserving them (DST, 2009). Continuing to recognise English as the *de facto* language of learning and teaching across South African higher education institutions appears to contradict the understanding that South Africa has a rich indigenous knowledge system that, if students were to be educated about and on it, the students would emerge from the education and training system imbued with knowledge that is contextually appropriate and relevant, and which could make them good and proud Africans, ready to contribute meaningfully to African renaissance. Therefore, the Policy Framework holds a position that is contestable,

more so in the wake of calls for the decolonisation of higher education.

Wicomb ([1991]/2018:45) writes that “culture is a ‘system of exclusions legislated from above ... by which such things as anarchy, disorder, irrationality, inferiority, bad taste, and immorality are identified, then deposited outside the culture and kept there by the power of the State and its institutions.’” The logic that Wicomb identifies—where state institutions legislate culture by exclusion—applies equally to the realm of science. What constitutes scientific inquiry in a world predetermined by English (and to some extent, Afrikaans) are the things speakable, ‘sayable’, in the languages of those who govern.¹ This orientation shapes reality insofar as the realities that exist outside of these linguistic constraints — the African languages — are not only unspoken and unsayable, but also unimaginable.

To say that the realities of the epistemic frames of indigenous African languages are unsayable is premised on the fact that in the halls of Western knowledge, the languages of science are predefined, or better yet, science does not exist in the African languages and epistemologies. Just as the nation is imagined through proscriptions, national culture was policed; so too were the terms of epistemic legitimacy defined narrowly through English. In the continuing use of English as the language that determines what is epistemic (what is known and knowable through definitions of

¹ It might be useful to indicate that under democracy and in a world where the ruling class are no longer constrained using only English and Afrikaans, the scientific system has not fundamentally changed. Adopting the reigns of rulership, with its infrastructure and architecture, meant that under democracy those who rule only tinkered with the system and did not radically redefine the systems they inherited.

rationality), the knowledge(s) of the majority continue(s) to exist as mere fiction and irrational, outside the university. When permitted inside, through departments such as African Languages, they never rise to the status of theoretical disciplines capable of challenging dominant Western frames. By delimiting science's definition as only legible in English (and to some extent, Afrikaans), African languages are thereby defined as inferior, unscientific, and of bad taste. They are subsequently kept outside of the domain of science.

The epistemic implications of this reality can be summarised by drawing on the concept of epistemic injustice presented in Fricker's (2006) work. Detailing what she terms *hermeneutic injustice*, which is injustice that denies the speaker the frames of reference to make sense of their reality, wherein the injustices that they have suffered are inarticulable—unsayable—owing to the conditions that the victim of the said injustice lives under, Fricker (2006) gives us a valuable tool to understand the situation that is detailed here. Not only is the linguistic ghettoisation detailed above 'unsayable' because there are no institutional mechanisms that would permit its articulation, but also the conditions of the disciplines in the arts, humanities and social sciences—let alone the natural sciences—deny African languages the status of a theoretical discipline. These languages are treated as anthropological objects, incapable of providing us with new modes of seeing, understanding, and theorising the world. In this sense, African languages suffer an epistemic injustice that is characteristic of the hermeneutic injustices detailed by Fricker (2006).

What emerges from this condition is a predicament in which the Black/Indigenous intellectual is consigned to be responding through protest, attempting to prove that their people had science, were bearers of culture, and could carry the disciplines in their native tongue. However, instead of getting on with the business of doing such work, the decolonial trap has resulted in the Black/Indigenous intellectual reciting the problems of colonial incursion, even after democracy's arrival. It is this reality that leads Morrison (1993) to the observation that the "function, the very serious function of racism is distraction. It keeps you from doing your work. It keeps you explaining, over and over again, your reason for being." The implications for policy frameworks, such as the Education White Paper 3 of 1997, can be observed in the move to call for decolonisation without doing scientific research in the languages, always having to justify that such a move is necessary in alignment with the calls of historical redress, without ever historically redressing the scientific system.

In his 'Fiction by Black South Africans', Nkosi ([1981]/2005) gave a critical examination of the state of letters, as Black writers developed it. His analysis, although it seems historical and dated, substantiates the position proposed here, namely, that Black/Indigenous intellectuals constantly protest the conditions of their existence without acting to change them in substantial ways. Nkosi (1981) argued that Black South African literature had become dominated by protest writing, leading to what he called the 'banality of moral earnestness', which he formulates as follows (Nkosi [1981]/2005:247):

Yet without this power for so re-ordering experience, and for so transmuting the given social facts that we can detect an underlying moral imagination at work, it is difficult to see why we should give up the daily newspaper in favour of creative fiction, for the newspapers would tell us just as much about life.

His displeasure with the South African novel was framed in terms that can be understood as having drifted into the realm of reportage, with this shift sacrificing creative writing methods at the altar of anti-apartheid resistance. Contemporary theoretical positions are doing much the same, sacrificing theoretical innovation for reportage of what we know to be the challenges that bedevil the system we inherited. To read Black writing generously, however, one ought to consider the reality that such a moment was characteristically defined by the palpable understanding that both creative and journalistic pressure needed to be applied to the apartheid state to end the unjust mode of governance. However, having achieved democracy and with legislation that aims to undo the historical reality of injustice and oppression, the question can be posed: why have we remained in the realm of merely describing the problem without substantial solutions and interventions that would radically reimagine our realities?

Supporting students who do not speak English as their home language

One of the critical approaches to supporting students who do not speak English as their home language is translanguaging, which is defined as the practice of processing in a different language

a message which has been conveyed in another language to facilitate and enhance understanding (Poza, 2017). In education, translanguaging pedagogical practices are used to assist students whose home language is not the language of teaching and learning, to process educational lessons into their language to develop good understanding, to recall the knowledge and to apply it. One aspect of translanguaging pedagogy is encouraging students to discuss what has been learnt using their home languages (Wei and Gracia, 2016). Translanguaging has proven to be an effective pedagogical tool that can be used in the process of teaching multilingual students universally, and studies have demonstrated that translanguaging can be used to break the common conviction of 'monolingual bias to eradicate the disadvantages it inflicts on multilingual students (Mashala and Sanders, 2025). The promotion of translanguaging as a solution to the language barrier that Boughey and McKenna (2016) have identified as hindering students' access to powerful knowledge is crucial if South Africa is to reach a point where the insights of African languages are appreciated in mainstream disciplines.

Translanguaging represents a struggle to access knowledge, and that local struggles over language are also struggles over the possibilities of knowledge, innovation, and belonging in a university. For these reasons, the debate about translanguaging should be of interest to all disciplines and should not be considered to be confined to the disciplines of languages, literature, and African languages specifically. The issue of language is at the centre of the knowledge and intellectualism in Africa and other formally

colonised regions and communities across the globe. This is in addition to the universal understanding that language is the embodiment of culture, and that culture is tied to history. Accordingly, debating the issue of language in higher education outside of higher education's historical context could be regarded as counterintuitive.

In effect, translanguaging is an adaptation to make people cope with a problem of accessing 'foreign' epistemes using a 'foreign' language medium. It is not a solution to the problems of accessing 'foreign' epistemes using a 'foreign' language medium; nor is it a solution to the problems of having African students being coerced into learning foreign epistemes, and of marginalising of African languages as unintellectual (Mahan, Phatudi and Modise, 2024). In this regard, touting translanguaging as a novel development that could address the problem of viewing African languages as unintellectual, and not mature enough to be used teaching and learning, research and scholarship, is disingenuous. On the contrary, it can be considered as a mechanism for entrenching the treatment of these languages as anthropological objects with no potential for innovative and contextually responsive theory development in the mainstream disciplines (Morove, 2018).

Alleged immaturity of indigenous African languages for intellectualism

The literature is inundated with arguments to the effect that African languages are not mature enough to be used as mediums of teaching and learning, research and scholarship. They are

portrayed to be in need of capacitation to develop the appropriate vocabulary, terminology and expressions to convey scientific facts, to present economic principles, to formulate and present theories, and to communicate research findings (Alexander, 2007). In addition, it is argued that there are no experienced people to train the next generation about teaching in indigenous African languages, or to publish scholarly articles in indigenous African languages. Therefore, unless there are huge investments into the development of these languages, and in the training of researchers and scholars on how to use these languages in research and scholarship, the *status quo* will remain, and the dominance of English in higher education will continue. As if this is the intention, departments or schools of African languages in public universities continue to be closed and/or merged. They have fewer students and less research funds, and they continuously lose their capability to develop in those aspects that they are deemed to be lacking in terms of intellectualism (CHE, 2025). This leaves one wondering whether the policy positions articulated in the Policy Framework are sheer rhetoric, because reality shows that the priorities of investment in public higher education are not in indigenous language laboratories and/or studies. The priorities are in the science laboratories, and in activities that have the potential to earn them good showings in the global ranking systems (Saidi and Boti, 2023). Granted that the closing and merging of language schools or departments appear to be a global phenomenon (CHE, 2025) but what is surprising is the heightened level of enthusiasm that South African universities demonstrate in merging and/or closing their African language departments. They do so with

high levels of insensitivity as if they do not understand the potential that these languages possess for unlocking the rich African knowledge systems for the benefit of society.

On the assertion that the indigenous African languages are intellectually immature, the evidence, in the form of indigenous knowledge systems suggest differently. There are well-curated indigenous knowledge bodies in as many domains as the Western knowledge system. These include knowledge domains such as agriculture, astronomy, botany, chemistry, climatology, construction engineering, economics, geography, healthcare, herbalism, hydrology, taxonomy and physics, to mention but a few (DST, 2009). Therefore, the assertion that indigenous African languages are immature for the purpose of knowledge generation, knowledge transfer and knowledge application is not supported by evidence. Perhaps the argument should be that the indigenous African languages are not fit for purpose for teaching and learning, research and scholarship when the knowledge systems are colonial and Eurocentric, which would be understandable because these African epistemes are, in many respects, the antitheses of the colonial and Eurocentric epistemes.

Plans to invest in work of developing the indigenous African languages

The Policy Framework also urges higher education institutions to invest in the development of the indigenous African languages. As indicated earlier, this assertion appears to be an unnecessary barrier than a valid reason why institutions fail to use the African languages as mediums of teaching

and learning, research and scholarship (DHET, 2015). It is ironic that the Policy Framework makes this call when state funding to public universities is increasingly proving to be insufficient, and when schools and/or departments of African languages in many public universities are facing closure or mergers (CHE, 2025). Universities are less likely to make the required huge investment in subject areas that are not contributing much to institutions' enrolment and graduation numbers, to the amounts of revenue brought in by means of research grants, and to improvement in their rank positions in the global and/or African university ranking systems (Saidi and Boti, 2023).

Translanguaging: old wine in a new bottle

As discussed earlier, translanguaging is presented as a solution or near solution to the language problem in higher education. It has also been argued that, in effect, translanguaging is an adaptation mechanism that enables Black Africans to survive and succeed in a higher education system anchored in colonial epistemes and transacted using the medium of a colonial language, English. The other important dimension about translanguaging is that it is not a novel development. Its history is inextricably linked to the history of Western education and training in Africa. Black African students in the homeland and township 'historically Black Universities' used some forms of translanguaging to be able to access, process, recall and apply colonial knowledges taught to them in English. Without some forms of translanguaging, there was little chance that the Black African students could succeed in their studies and earn their higher education

qualifications. If translinguaging is understood within its historical context, then it does not qualify to be regarded as a novel development that can be considered as heralding a new era of recognising the potential of these languages for use in teaching and learning, research and scholarship work in higher education. This argument is advanced in the ensuing paragraphs with examples from literary studies.

Faced with the dominance of English in the field of literature, Mphahlele (1984) advocated for translinguaging involving English as a domesticated medium through which African writers could develop new idioms. In Mphahlele's (1984) 'Prometheus in Chains', one finds a probable solution to this crisis of petrification. That is, his suggestion in the domestication of language was styled as a way out of this reportage form of writing. In it, one reads the ability to innovate, to think within the conditions that define our context and respond meaningfully. Whether the reader agrees with him or not, Mphahlele (1984:93) advocates for the adoption of English, arguing that "Frantz Fanon has told us that the use of language 'means above all to assume a culture, to support the weight of a civilisation.'" Again, the colonised person is 'elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country's cultural standards.' His analysis aligns with the proposition that people in South Africa have domesticated the English language and must

assume it their own if a true national consciousness is to arise or if they are to move beyond mere descriptions. However, this suggestion poses challenges, regarding the need to confront epistemic possibilities against the fact that relegating African languages to the status of anthropological objects forecloses the ability to innovate.

Mphahlele (1984) gives weight to his assertion in the following formulation: "Exciting when you try to hammer out an idiom that will do justice both to English and to Allegory, metaphor and symbolism inherent in your native being; when you compose or replay an African song in English which brings with it its lyrical and dramatic qualities." The excitement comes as an alternative viewpoint from a state of ambivalence, wherein the adoption of the colonial language is both a tool for development and the very thing that can cause the native subjects to forget their very being. The English language, in this sense, was regarded as a tool of both resistance and the very thing that held the promise of development for the native.²

However, what brings closer to the ambitions contained in the Education White Paper 3 (Department of Education, 1997) is the literary criticism of Coetzee (1988), in his *White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa*, wherein he makes the case for an Adamic language, where things are their names and there is no distinction

² Development, in this sense, should not be taken in the Hegelian sense of the African arriving at the foothills of western civilizational conceptions of development. Rather it should be understood as a process of changing the conditions that define(d) Native life. Opening new possibilities that transcend the limitations and constraints of a state that ruled with tyranny over the majority.

between the signifier and the signified. Whereas Mphahlele (1984) focused on adopting and adapting English, Coetzee (1988) turned toward imagining an Adamic language—a mode where signifier and signified collapse, offering a more radical possibility of cultural expression. Both Coetzee (1988) and Gordimer (1988) are aware of the importance of an authentically articulated cultural claim. It is for this reason that Gordimer's (1981) *July's People* tells the story it does, wherein the collapse of society is imagined, and those who once held power are forced to flee the comfort of their society.

The turn to an African vocabulary saw scholars like Kunene (1992) challenging the claim of having domesticated the English language, as witnessed in Mphahlele's (1984) thinking. Moreover, the historical debates of the 20th century resulted in the proposition first articulated by Alexander (2007), who writes about the necessity to 'intellectualise African languages.' This proposition has led to the proliferation of scholarship, which has identified opportunities for developing pedagogic strategies that utilise translanguaging in the classroom context. As Kumalo (2022) has substantively dealt with the objections to the notion of African language intellectualisation, this is not dealt with substantively here, save to mention that this rise conveys a misrepresentation, at best, of the underlying intentions around the uptake of African languages and their use in the contemporary university.

In the development of these strategies, there exists no formal policy outline that effectively guides the development of these languages, allowing for their extensive use in the scientific project. The case studies often published are limited to singular

departments in the arts, humanities, and social sciences across a few universities, lacking the scaffolding support that would enable this mode of teaching, learning, and research to become a tangible and replicable framework across the national sector's disciplines.

What this genealogy ultimately reveals is that contemporary calls for translanguaging cannot be advanced as policy solutions unless they are embedded within this more extended history of linguistic exclusion and epistemic foreclosure. Without such grounding, translanguaging risks becoming yet another technocratic fix—celebrated rhetorically but structurally insignificant—because it does not unsettle the deeper epistemic commitments that continue to define what counts as knowledge in South Africa's universities. The task ahead, therefore, requires a deliberate policy strategy that moves beyond critique: one that identifies the specific institutional sites where linguistic exclusions are reproduced; clarifies the mechanisms through which African languages can be repositioned as theoretical resources rather than anthropological curiosities; and aligns these interventions with the redistributional ambitions already housed within Education White Paper 3 (Department of Education, 1997), and the Higher Education Act No. 101 of 1997, as amended. In other words, a historically grounded understanding of translanguaging opens the door for a set of concrete policy levers—curriculum standards, research funding architectures, staffing models, professional development pathways, and quality assurance frameworks—that can meaningfully translate epistemic redress into institutional practice.

Concluding remarks

The discussion in this *Briefly Speaking* piece makes it clear is that the discourse or debate on language in higher education in South Africa is far from being concluded. There are indications that critique has outpaced structural courage. The challenge, then, is not to multiply interventions such as translanguaging, that gesture at transformation, but to confront directly the epistemic architectures that continue to render African languages peripheral to the scientific project. The work here seeks to acknowledge that the language question in South African higher education cannot be concluded. At the same time, the policy interventions required to transform the scientific system remain absent. The country should be concerned about the false closure of the language debate, recognising that any definitive ending would betray the unresolved historical and structural conditions that continue to marginalise African languages. This posture gestures toward the open-endedness of the debate, not as a matter of scholarly preference but as a consequence of epistemic architectures that have not yet been dismantled. Such a conceptual mode of structuring the conclusion resonates with the argument's vocabulary—from Morrison's account of distraction to Fricker's notion of hermeneutic injustice—each pointing to processes that resist finality. This aligns with the literary genealogy invoked throughout: a tradition in which speculative futures, deferred resolutions, and ruptured forms challenge the politics of premature endings.

References

- Alexander, N. 2007. The Role of African Universities in the Intellectualisation of African Languages. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa* 5(1): 29—44.
- Boughey, C., & McKenna, S. 2016. Academic Literacy and the Decontextualised Learner. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning* 4(2): 1—9.
- Coetzee, J. M. 1988. *White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa*.
- Council of Higher Education (CHE). 2025. The humanities in the time of turbulence. *Briefly Speaking* No. 32. Pretoria: CHE
- Department of Education. 1997. *Education White Paper 3: A programme for the Transformation*. Pretoria. Government Gazette.
- Department of Higher Education and Training. 2015. *Report on the Use African Languages as Mediums of Instruction in Higher Education and Training*. Pretoria: DHET.
- Department of Higher Education and Training. 2020. *The Language Policy Framework for Public Higher Education Institutions*. Pretoria: DHET.
- Department of Science and Technology. 2009. *Indigenous Knowledge Systems*. Pretoria: DST.
- Fricker, M. 2006. *Epistemic Justice: Power and the Politics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kumalo, S.H. 2023. Can Iqaba Possess Ontological Legitimacy? *Critical Philosophy of Race* 11(2): 378—407.

Kumalo, S.H. 2022. 'Revealing the Power of Language and Developing Theory from Historical Artefacts', in D. Boucher (ed.) pp. 113—134. *Language, Culture and Decolonisation*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Kunene, M. 1992. Problems in African Literature. *Research in African Literature* 23(1): 27—44.

Mahan, S. J., Phatudi, N. C., & Modise, M. R. 2024. Translanguaging as a strategy for navigating multilingualism in peri-urban preschool classrooms. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*. 14(1) a1478. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v14i1.1478>

Mashala, M. & Sanders, D. A. 2025. The use of translanguaging to support the teaching of literacy: Intermediate phase teachers' perceptions. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 22(4): 2876 – 2893.

Mphahlele, E. 1984. Prometheus in Chains. The Fate of English in South Africa. *English Academy Review* 2(1): 89—104.

Morrison, T. 1993. Interview with Charlie Rose, *The Charlie Rose Show*, PBS.

Mostov, J. 1994. Democracy and the Politics of National Identity. *Studies in Eastern European Thought* 46(1&2): 9-31.

Murove, M. F. 2018. Indigenous knowledge system discourse and inclusionality: An Afri-centric quest for recognition in a globalised world. for

recognition. *Journal of the Study of Religion*, 31(1): doi.org.17059/2413-3027/2018/v31n1a9.

Nkosi, L. 1989. Review: White Writing. *Third World Quarterly* 11(1): 157—161.

Nkosi, L. [1981]/2005. 'Fiction by Black South Africans', in L. Stiebel and L. Gunner (eds.) pp. 245—256. *Critical Perspectives on Lewis Nkosi*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Poza, L. 2017. Translanguaging: Definitions, implications and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkely Review of Education*, 6(2): 101 – 128.

Saidi, A. & Boti, Z. 2023. Revisiting community engagement in higher education in South Africa from a vantage point of the notion of third mission. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 37(1): 72 – 91.

Smith, R. M. 2003. *Stories of Peoplehood: The Politics and Morals of Political Memberships*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wei, L. & Garcia, O. 2016. From researching translanguaging to translanguaging research. In: King, K., Lai, Y. J. & May, S. (Eds.) *Research Methods in Language and Education: Encyclopaedia of Language and Education*. Springer: New York City, pp 1 – 16.

Wicomb, Z. [1991]/2018. Tracing the path from national to official culture', in *Race, Nation, Translation: South African Essays, 1990—2013*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Disclaimer and acknowledgements

Briefly Speaking articles are prepared to stimulate discourses on topical matters of interest to higher education. The contents of *Briefly Speaking* articles do not reflect and/or represent the official position(s) of the Council on Higher Education on the subject matter addressed by the articles. Furthermore, the Council on Higher Education bears no responsibility for possible inaccuracies in the data and /or figures presented, nor for the possible gaps and/or flaws in the arguments proffered in the *Briefly Speaking* articles.

The CHE expresses its profound appreciation to the peer reviewers who contributed immensely to shaping this specific issue of *Briefly Speaking*.

Comments should be addressed to
research@che.ac.za.