Journal of Linguistic Metacognition and Language Learning
https://balejurnal.com/index.php/JLMLL
Email: journaljlmll@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66957/vfa92r69

September 2026, Vol. 1, No. 2
e-ISSN: 3163-3609
pp. 88-109

Language Curriculum Planning in Implementing the School-based Management within Secondary Schools of South Africa Context

[1]* Fanilola Mega Megbowon, [2] Sakaria Xoxogus, [2] Punaya Bolono

[1] Department of Language and Arts, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, Eastern Cape Province, South Africa

[1] Language Education Program, Faculty of Education & Human Sciences, The University of Namibia, 340 Mandume Ndemufayo Avenue in Pioneerspark, Windhoek, Namibia

[3] Curriculum Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Curriculum Development, Great Zimbabwe University, off the Old Great Zimbabwe Road in Masvingo, Zimbabwe

*Corresponding Author Email: fanilolamegbowon@gzu.ac.zw

Received: August 2026, Revised: August 2026; Accepted: September 2026; Published: September 2026

Abstract

South African secondary schools operate within a multilingual environment in which constitutional commitments to linguistic equality coexist with the continued dominance of English in teaching, assessment, learning materials, and educational advancement. This study examined the linguistic, institutional, and school-governance factors influencing language curriculum planning and developed a school-based management framework for participatory and context-responsive multilingual education. A qualitative multi-site case study was conducted in three secondary schools. Thirteen participants were purposively selected, comprising seven language teachers, three school principals, and three stakeholders involved in governance, curriculum support, or community participation. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, classroom and meeting observations, and relevant school documents. The data were analysed through iterative processes of data condensation, thematic display, and conclusion drawing. The findings revealed six interconnected constraints: English dominance, discontinuity between home languages and the language of learning and teaching, shortages of multilingual materials, uneven teacher preparation, institutional inequality, and unequal stakeholder influence in school governance. Teachers frequently used code-switching and translanguaging to support comprehension, but these practices were generally informal and insufficiently integrated into curriculum plans and assessments. The study proposes a six-stage school-based management framework comprising diagnosis of local language needs, inclusive stakeholder participation, collaborative planning, multilingual curriculum implementation, systematic monitoring, and continuous improvement. The framework also requires clearly defined responsibilities, teacher development, equitable resource allocation, inclusive assessment, and sustained district support. The study concludes that decentralised language planning can advance multilingual equity only when local autonomy is accompanied by institutional capacity, substantive participation, evidence-based decision-making, and mechanisms that prevent existing social and resource inequalities from being reproduced.

Keywords: Language curriculum planning; Multilingual education; School-based management; Translanguaging; South African secondary schools

Journal of Linguistic Metacognition and Language Learning is Licensed Under a CC BY-SA Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

How to cite: Megbowon, F.M., Xoxogus, S., & Bolono, P. (2026). Language Curriculum Planning in Implementing the School-based Management within Secondary Schools of South Africa Context, *Journal of Linguistic Metacognition and Language Learning*, 1(2), 88-109, Doi: https://doi.org/10.66957/vfa92r69

INTRODUCTION

South Africa's education system operates within a complex linguistic, political, and historical environment. The Constitution recognises eleven official languages and establishes multilingualism as an important principle of social inclusion, cultural recognition, and democratic participation. This commitment is further reflected in the

Language-in-Education Policy, which promotes additive multilingualism and seeks to redress the linguistic inequalities inherited from colonialism and apartheid. Despite this progressive policy framework, English and Afrikaans continue to dominate teaching, assessment, textbooks, educational administration, and access to higher education. The resulting tension between multilingual policy and English-dominant practice has significant consequences for curriculum planning, particularly in secondary schools where learners are required to engage with increasingly specialised disciplinary knowledge. Higher education institutions experience a similar policy–practice gap, as multilingual policies coexist with institutional and student preferences for English as the principal language of academic communication and socioeconomic mobility (Chaka & Ndlangamandla, 2022; Ngcobo & Barnes, 2020). Language curriculum planning must therefore address not only linguistic diversity, but also the unequal social status, educational functions, and availability of resources associated with different languages.

One of the most persistent challenges is the transition from home-language instruction to English as the language of learning and teaching. This transition often occurs before learners have developed sufficient academic proficiency to understand abstract concepts, interpret complex texts, construct arguments, or communicate disciplinary knowledge effectively in English. Consequently, learners may possess relevant ideas but remain unable to demonstrate their understanding through the language required by the curriculum and assessment system. This problem is especially pronounced in subjects such as mathematics, science, and history, where specialised vocabulary and language structures are central to conceptual learning (Chimbunde et al., 2024; Mabiletja & Ngcobo, 2023; Ndhlovana & Charamba, 2023; Ralarala et al., 2021). Shortages of teachers prepared for multilingual instruction, limited African-language textbooks, inadequate development of subject-specific terminology, and unequal access to learning resources further restrict the implementation of inclusive language curricula. These conditions indicate that language planning cannot be treated as a separate concern belonging only to language subjects.

Recent scholarship has consequently emphasised translanguaging as a pedagogical approach that allows learners and teachers to use their full linguistic repertoires to construct meaning. Rather than maintaining rigid boundaries between languages, translanguaging enables learners to discuss concepts in familiar languages, engage with English or Afrikaans academic texts, and communicate understanding through strategically combined linguistic resources. Evidence suggests that such practices can strengthen literacy, classroom participation, and conceptual understanding in multilingual mathematics, science, and language classrooms (Carrim & Nkomo, 2023; Mpofu, 2025; Ndhlovana & Charamba, 2023; Nyamayedenga, 2022; Reilly et al., 2022; Sefotho, 2022). Translanguaging is also associated with broader attempts to decolonise curricula by recognising African languages as legitimate resources for knowledge production rather than merely informal tools for classroom explanation (Nkoala, 2021; Ralarala et al., 2021; Richardson & Stroud, 2021). However, its application remains inconsistent because teachers receive limited professional preparation, policies provide insufficient operational guidance, and assessment systems continue to privilege monolingual English performance. Effective curriculum planning therefore requires explicit guidance on multilingual pedagogy, resource development, teacher preparation, and assessments that recognise cross-language reasoning.

These language-related challenges intersect with the implementation of school-based management in South African secondary schools. School-based management decentralises selected responsibilities to principals, teachers, school governing bodies, parents, learners, and community representatives. It is intended to make schools more

accountable, participatory, and responsive to local needs by enabling stakeholders to influence curriculum implementation, budgeting, staffing, resource allocation, and school language policies. In principle, decentralisation provides an appropriate mechanism for adapting national language requirements to each school's linguistic environment. In practice, however, schools differ substantially in leadership expertise, financial capacity, access to information, institutional stability, and community participation. Some governing bodies can engage critically with policy and mobilise resources, whereas others participate only formally because their members have not received sufficient training or lack the knowledge needed to influence complex educational decisions (Condat, 2022; Davids, 2020; Teise & Barnett, 2021). Thus, the effectiveness of school-based management depends on the capacity of local actors to convert devolved authority into informed and equitable action.

Governance difficulties may also arise from unclear or overlapping responsibilities. Principals, teachers, governing bodies, and district officials may interpret their authority differently, particularly when decisions concern language choice, staffing, finances, or curriculum priorities. Language policies can become contested because stakeholders may hold different views regarding cultural identity, educational quality, employment opportunities, and the perceived economic value of English. Where decision-making is dominated by powerful groups, the linguistic needs of marginalised learners may receive inadequate attention. Moreover, decentralisation can deepen inequality when affluent schools possess stronger governance structures and greater access to learning materials, while under-resourced schools are expected to exercise similar responsibilities without comparable support. Effective school-based management therefore requires participatory leadership, clearly defined responsibilities, transparent budgeting, accessible policy information, accountability procedures, professional development, and dependable district assistance (Condat, 2022; Davids, 2020; Teise & Barnett, 2021). Meaningful community engagement is equally important because local language knowledge, parental expectations, and community resources can strengthen the relevance and legitimacy of school-level curriculum decisions (Meia et al., 2024; Mawanzo, 2022).

Integrating language curriculum planning with school-based management offers a potential response to both the policy–practice gap and the uneven implementation of multilingual education. Such integration should begin with a school-level language-needs analysis that documents learners' home languages, proficiency levels, language-of-learning preferences, teacher competencies, available materials, parental expectations, and community linguistic resources. The resulting school language profile should guide decisions about instructional languages, academic language support, teacher development, resource allocation, and culturally relevant curriculum content. A School Language Curriculum Committee comprising principals, language and subject teachers, learners, parents, governing-body members, and community representatives could then translate these findings into measurable multilingual objectives and implementation strategies. Inclusive participation would help ensure that language decisions are not based solely on administrative convenience or assumptions about the superiority of English, but on evidence regarding learners' educational needs and the school's actual capacity.

The proposed curriculum design should combine home-language development with systematic support for academic English or Afrikaans. Translanguaging should be embedded in lesson planning, classroom interaction, learning materials, and formative assessment rather than used only as an improvised response when learners fail to understand English explanations. Schools should develop multilingual glossaries, culturally relevant texts, translated learning resources, and cross-curricular language

strategies for subjects that require specialised academic terminology. Teacher professional development should focus on multilingual pedagogy, language-sensitive subject teaching, materials development, inclusive assessment, and the management of linguistically diverse classrooms (Matshikiza et al., 2021; Mpofu, 2025; Ngcobo & Barnes, 2020). Assessment practices should evaluate disciplinary understanding and multilingual meaning-making instead of equating academic competence exclusively with English proficiency (Nkoala, 2021; Reilly et al., 2022). Clear budgets, timelines, role allocations, and district partnerships are also needed to ensure that multilingual curriculum commitments are adequately resourced and implemented.

Monitoring and evaluation should form an integral component of the design. Schools should track learner participation, home-language and English/Afrikaans proficiency, subject achievement, teacher practices, material availability, stakeholder involvement, and patterns of resource distribution. Feedback from learners, parents, teachers, governing bodies, and community members should be used to revise curriculum strategies and address emerging barriers. This continuous process is important because school language environments are not static; enrolment patterns, teacher availability, community expectations, and educational resources may change over time. Monitoring must also determine whether school-based decisions are promoting linguistic equity or unintentionally reinforcing the dominance of English and the advantages of already well-resourced groups.

The novelty of this study lies in its integration of multilingual language curriculum planning and school-based management within a single context-responsive design for South African secondary schools. Previous studies have frequently examined language policy, translanguaging, curriculum access, governance, or community participation as separate concerns. This study connects these fields by proposing that multilingual curriculum reform should be planned, implemented, monitored, and evaluated through participatory school governance structures. It therefore moves beyond identifying the gap between policy and practice by examining how school-level stakeholders can collaboratively transform national multilingual commitments into practical curriculum decisions.

Accordingly, this research aims to analyse the linguistic, institutional, and governance challenges affecting language curriculum planning in South African secondary schools and to develop a school-based management design for contextually responsive multilingual curriculum planning. It also seeks to identify the stakeholder roles, pedagogical strategies, resources, and accountability mechanisms required for sustainable implementation. The study is guided by the following research questions:

What linguistic, institutional, and school-governance factors influence language curriculum planning in South African secondary schools?

How can a school-based management framework be designed to support participatory, equitable, and context-responsive multilingual language curriculum planning in South African secondary schools?

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design using a multi-site case study approach. The qualitative design was selected because the study sought to understand how language curriculum planning was interpreted, negotiated, and implemented within the school-based management structures of South African secondary schools. The study focused on participants' experiences, perceptions, practices, and interactions rather than measuring variables statistically. This approach made it possible to investigate how

language teachers, school principals, and relevant stakeholders responded to multilingual policy requirements, resource limitations, community expectations, and school-level governance arrangements.

The case study approach was particularly suitable because language curriculum planning cannot be separated from the institutional and sociolinguistic contexts in which it occurs. Each participating secondary school constituted a research site with its own learner language profile, leadership practices, resource conditions, and stakeholder relationships. Examining several schools allowed the researcher to identify both shared patterns and context-specific differences. The multi-site design also supported comparison across schools regarding language-policy interpretation, teacher involvement, stakeholder participation, curriculum decision-making, and the use of multilingual teaching strategies.

Participants

The study involved 13 participants drawn from three selected secondary schools. They consisted of seven language teachers, three school principals, and three stakeholders who were directly involved in school governance, language policy, curriculum support, or community participation. The participant categories were selected because they represented the principal groups involved in planning, approving, implementing, supporting, or evaluating language curricula within school-based management.

The seven language teachers formed the largest participant group because they were responsible for translating curriculum and language-policy requirements into classroom practice. They included teachers involved in teaching English, Afrikaans, or African languages represented in the participating schools. Where possible, the sample included teachers with different levels of teaching experience and different responsibilities, such as classroom teachers, language subject heads, or departmental coordinators. This variation allowed the study to capture perspectives from teachers who performed both instructional and curriculum-leadership roles. To be eligible for participation, language teachers were required to have at least two years of teaching experience at the secondary-school level. They also needed to be directly involved in language teaching, curriculum planning, assessment, materials selection, or school-level discussions concerning the language of learning and teaching.

The three principals were included because they held formal responsibility for instructional leadership, policy implementation, stakeholder coordination, staff development, and school-level resource management. Each principal represented one participating secondary school. Their involvement provided information regarding how national and provincial policies were interpreted at the school level, how language decisions were negotiated with school governing bodies, and how budgets, staffing, teacher development, and curriculum priorities were determined. To be selected, principals were required to have served in their current schools for at least two years and to have experience participating in curriculum and school-governance decision-making.

The three stakeholders were purposively selected from individuals whose roles were relevant to language curriculum planning and school-based management. They could include a school governing-body representative, a parent or community representative, and a district language or curriculum official. The governing-body representative was expected to provide insight into school policy, resource allocation, accountability, and community participation. The parent or community representative provided information about local language expectations, cultural considerations, and perceptions of the educational and economic value of different languages. The district or

curriculum official contributed a system-level perspective regarding policy guidance, monitoring, teacher support, curriculum implementation, and the relationship between district authorities and individual schools.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling because the study required information-rich individuals with direct knowledge of the phenomenon. Maximum-variation considerations were applied where practicable to include participants from different professional roles, language backgrounds, levels of experience, genders, and school environments. Relevant demographic information collected from participants included age range, gender, professional role, highest educational qualification, years of teaching or leadership experience, languages spoken, subjects taught, governance responsibilities, and length of service at the participating school. These characteristics were used to contextualise participants' accounts rather than to make statistical comparisons.

Instruments

Two principal research instruments were used: semi-structured interview guidelines and structured observation sheets. The use of complementary instruments allowed the researcher to obtain both participants' accounts and direct evidence of language curriculum-planning and implementation practices.

Semi-Structured Interview Guidelines

Separate but related interview guidelines were developed for language teachers, principals, and stakeholders. The questions were derived from the study objectives, research questions, conceptual discussion of school-based management, and literature concerning multilingual education, translanguaging, curriculum planning, participatory governance, and language-policy implementation. The language-teacher interview guideline explored teachers' experiences of implementing the language curriculum, learners' home languages, the language of learning and teaching, classroom communication, assessment practices, materials availability, translanguaging, professional development, and involvement in school-level curriculum decisions. Teachers were also asked to describe the barriers they encountered and the support required to implement multilingual curriculum strategies.

The principal interview guideline addressed school language policies, leadership practices, curriculum coordination, teacher allocation, budgeting, professional development, stakeholder participation, district support, and mechanisms for monitoring curriculum implementation. Principals were asked how language decisions were made, whose views were represented, how disagreements were managed, and how school-based management influenced curriculum planning. The stakeholder interview guideline focused on participation in governance, understanding of language policies, community language expectations, decision-making authority, accountability, communication between schools and communities, and perceptions of multilingual education. Questions for district or curriculum officials additionally examined policy guidance, curriculum monitoring, professional support, and resource distribution.

The interviews were semi-structured so that all participants were asked questions related to the same central themes while retaining sufficient flexibility to explore unexpected but relevant issues. Follow-up prompts such as "Could you provide an example?", "How was that decision made?", and "Who participated in that process?" were used to obtain detailed explanations. Each interview was expected to last approximately 45–60 minutes and was conducted in a language in which the participant could express ideas clearly. With participants' consent, interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed.

Observation Sheets

Observation sheets were developed to document how language curriculum policies and school-based management practices were enacted in classrooms, departmental meetings, curriculum-planning sessions, or stakeholder meetings. The observation instrument contained predetermined categories as well as space for descriptive field notes.

Classroom observation categories included the language or languages used by teachers and learners, code-switching and translanguaging practices, learner participation, use of multilingual materials, explanation of subject-specific terminology, teacher responses to language difficulties, classroom interaction, and assessment-related practices. The observation sheet also recorded whether learners were encouraged to use their home languages to develop understanding and whether teachers connected home-language explanations with academic English or Afrikaans. For curriculum or governance meetings, the observation categories included participant representation, distribution of speaking opportunities, decision-making procedures, discussion of language issues, use of evidence, role clarity, conflict management, budgeting considerations, and the inclusion of learner, parent, or community perspectives. Descriptive notes captured the context, non-verbal interactions, emerging issues, and events that did not fit the predetermined categories.

Instrument Development and Quality Assurance

The instruments were initially developed by mapping each research question to the information required from each participant group. An instrument matrix was used to ensure that interview questions and observation categories were aligned with the study objectives. Questions that repeated the same idea or did not contribute directly to the research focus were removed. Technical terminology was simplified to make the questions understandable to participants with different levels of policy or curriculum knowledge.

Content validity was assessed through expert review. The draft instruments were examined by specialists with knowledge of qualitative research, language education, curriculum studies, and educational leadership. The reviewers evaluated the relevance, clarity, sequence, cultural appropriateness, and alignment of the items with the research questions. Their feedback was used to revise ambiguous wording, combine overlapping questions, add prompts concerning stakeholder power and resource allocation, and strengthen the observation indicators.

The interview guidelines and observation sheets were then piloted with individuals who had characteristics similar to those of the intended participants but were not included in the final sample. The pilot process assessed whether the questions were understandable, whether they generated sufficiently detailed responses, and whether the estimated interview duration was realistic. It also tested whether the observation categories could be applied consistently. Questions that produced vague or repetitive responses were revised, and categories that were difficult to observe were clarified.

In qualitative research, instrument reliability is commonly addressed through dependability and consistency rather than statistical coefficients. Dependability was strengthened by using the same core interview questions for participants within each category, maintaining clear operational descriptions for observation indicators, recording interviews, producing verbatim transcripts, and preserving field notes. Where another trained researcher or peer reviewer was available, selected observation records and coded transcripts were compared to assess consistency in interpretation. Differences were discussed and coding descriptions were refined.

Data Analysis

The qualitative data were analysed using an interactive process of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. These processes were not treated as isolated stages but as interconnected activities that occurred throughout data collection and analysis. Interview transcripts, observation notes, reflective notes, and relevant documents constituted the primary qualitative dataset. Data condensation began with the organisation and preparation of the collected information. Audio-recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim, checked against the recordings, and anonymised. Observation notes were expanded shortly after each field visit to preserve contextual details. The researcher read the entire dataset several times to become familiar with participants' accounts and to identify preliminary patterns.

During initial coding, meaningful units of text were assigned concise labels that represented their central ideas. Examples of possible codes included "English preference," "limited African-language materials," "early language transition," "teacher training needs," "symbolic stakeholder participation," "unclear governance roles," "district support," "translanguaging practice," and "resource inequality." Both deductive and inductive coding were employed. Deductive codes were informed by the research questions and relevant concepts from multilingual curriculum planning and school-based management, while inductive codes were generated from issues emerging directly from participants' experiences.

Related codes were compared and grouped into broader categories. For example, codes concerning textbooks, glossaries, translations, digital resources, and budget constraints could be combined under the category "multilingual resource capacity." Codes concerning governing-body involvement, parent participation, decision-making authority, and unequal influence could be grouped under "stakeholder participation and power." The researcher continually compared data across teachers, principals, stakeholders, and schools to identify similarities, differences, contradictions, and exceptional cases.

Data display involved arranging the condensed information in formats that facilitated interpretation. The researcher developed thematic matrices showing participant groups, schools, major categories, supporting evidence, and contrasting viewpoints. A school-by-theme matrix was used to compare language-planning practices across the three sites. Another matrix compared the perspectives of teachers, principals, and stakeholders regarding decision-making, policy implementation, resource availability, and stakeholder participation. Narrative summaries and conceptual diagrams were also developed to illustrate relationships among language conditions, governance capacity, curriculum practices, and learner access.

Direct quotations were selected to preserve participants' voices and demonstrate how interpretations were grounded in the data. Quotations were chosen because they clearly illustrated a theme, represented a common viewpoint, or revealed a significant contrasting experience. Observation evidence was incorporated to show whether reported practices were visible in classrooms and meetings. Documentary evidence was used where available to confirm or challenge participants' accounts. Conclusion drawing involved interpreting the displayed data in relation to the research questions and objectives. The researcher examined how linguistic, institutional, and governance factors interacted to influence curriculum planning. Attention was given to causal explanations offered by participants, differences among schools, relationships between policy and practice, and the conditions under which school-based management supported or constrained multilingual curriculum planning.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

What linguistic, institutional, and school-governance factors influence language curriculum planning in South African secondary schools?

Analysis of the interview transcripts and observation records produced six interconnected themes: the dominance of English, differences between learners' home languages and the language of learning and teaching, limited multilingual resources, uneven teacher preparedness, institutional inequalities, and unequal stakeholder participation in school governance. These themes demonstrate that language curriculum planning was not determined only by curriculum policy. It was shaped by the interaction of language attitudes, resource availability, teacher competence, leadership practices, community expectations, and the decision-making capacity of individual schools.

Table 1. Factors Influencing Language Curriculum Planning

Interview or analytical question	Summary of participants' responses
1. Which languages are prioritised in curriculum planning?	English was usually prioritised because it was associated with examinations, university access, employment, and national communication. African languages were mainly used for explanation, informal interaction, or language subjects.
2. How does the difference between home language and the language of instruction affect learning?	Learners experienced difficulties understanding academic vocabulary, instructions, and subject concepts when English was introduced before they had developed adequate academic proficiency.
3. What resources are available for multilingual teaching?	Schools had limited textbooks, dictionaries, glossaries, assessment materials, and digital resources in African languages. English materials were more widely available.
4. How prepared are teachers to implement multilingual pedagogy?	Teachers frequently used code-switching or translanguaging, but many had not received formal training in multilingual curriculum planning or language-sensitive subject teaching.
5. How do institutional conditions affect language planning?	Staffing shortages, large classes, limited budgets, examination pressures, and unequal district support constrained schools' ability to develop context-responsive language programmes.
6. How does school governance influence language decisions?	Principals and governing bodies formally participated in language-policy decisions, but their actual influence varied according to policy knowledge, leadership capacity, stakeholder representation, and access to information.

English Dominance and the Perceived Value of Languages

The first major finding was that English occupied the most powerful position in language curriculum planning. Although participants recognised the educational and cultural importance of African languages, English was generally perceived as necessary for external examinations, higher education, employment, technology, and communication beyond the local community. This perception influenced parents, school governing bodies, principals, and teachers when selecting the language of learning and teaching and determining the allocation of teaching time and resources. A language teacher explained: *"Parents tell us that they want their children to learn in English because they believe English will open opportunities. At the same time, many learners do not fully understand the lesson when everything is explained only in English." (LT2, Language Teacher, School B)*

This excerpt illustrates the tension between the instrumental value of English and learners' immediate educational needs. English was viewed as a language of mobility, while African languages were often treated as supportive rather than as legitimate languages of academic knowledge. Consequently, curriculum planning tended to

prioritise future access to English-dominant institutions, even when this reduced learners' comprehension and participation in the present.

Observations supported this finding. English was commonly used for written lesson objectives, textbooks, formal explanations, exercises, and assessment tasks. However, teachers frequently shifted to learners' home languages when explaining difficult concepts, managing classroom interaction, or checking understanding. This contrast indicated that official curriculum planning was predominantly monolingual, whereas classroom implementation was functionally multilingual.

Differences Between Home Language and the Language of Learning and Teaching

The second theme concerned the linguistic gap between learners' home languages and the language used for formal instruction. Participants reported that many learners could communicate socially in English but experienced difficulty with academic vocabulary, extended reading, essay writing, abstract concepts, and examination instructions. The problem became more visible at the secondary-school level because subjects required increasingly specialised terminology and complex forms of reasoning.

One teacher described this challenge as follows: *"The learner may understand the science concept when we discuss it in isiXhosa, but when the same question is written in English, the learner does not know how to answer it. Sometimes we are assessing English rather than the science concept." (LT5, Language Teacher, School C)*

The excerpt demonstrates that language proficiency and subject knowledge were closely connected. Some learners' poor performance could not be explained solely by a lack of conceptual understanding. Their achievement was also affected by their capacity to interpret and express disciplinary knowledge in English. This finding suggests that language curriculum planning must extend across the curriculum rather than remain the responsibility of language departments alone.

Teachers responded by using code-switching, peer explanation, bilingual word lists, translated examples, and oral discussion in home languages. These strategies helped learners access concepts, but their use was inconsistent because they were not systematically embedded in curriculum plans. In some cases, teachers avoided extensive use of African languages because they feared that learners would become insufficiently prepared for English-language examinations.

Limited Multilingual Materials and Terminology

The third theme was the shortage of teaching and assessment resources in African languages. Participants reported that English textbooks were generally more accessible and contained more comprehensive explanations, exercises, and digital support. By comparison, African-language resources were often limited to language subjects, outdated materials, teacher-produced notes, or informal translations.

A principal stated: "We may agree that multilingual teaching is important, but the budget does not allow us to purchase or develop materials in every language represented in the school. Teachers then depend on English textbooks and translate orally." (P1, Principal, School A)

This response highlights the relationship between language policy and resource planning. Multilingual education required more than allowing learners to speak their home languages. It required appropriate textbooks, glossaries, subject terminology, digital content, and assessment tools. Without such resources, multilingual implementation depended heavily on the individual teacher's linguistic competence and willingness to adapt materials.

Observation data indicated that several teachers wrote English terms on the board and supplied oral explanations in an African language. Although this practice supported

immediate comprehension, it did not always help learners develop formal academic literacy in both languages. The findings therefore suggest that curriculum planning should incorporate multilingual terminology development and structured movement between home-language understanding and English academic expression.

Uneven Teacher Preparation

The fourth finding concerned teachers' professional capacity. Most language teachers understood the value of multilingual teaching and already used some form of code-switching or translanguaging. Nevertheless, participants distinguished between spontaneous language switching and planned multilingual pedagogy. Many teachers had not received specialised training in designing multilingual lessons, developing bilingual materials, assessing cross-language understanding, or coordinating language support across subject departments. Teacher preparedness also varied according to linguistic background. Some teachers spoke the dominant home language of the learners, while others could communicate only in English or Afrikaans. This difference affected their ability to provide explanations, understand learner responses, and collaborate in developing multilingual materials.

The data showed that teachers required practical professional development rather than general policy information. They needed support in lesson design, multilingual terminology, translanguaging strategies, differentiated assessment, and language-sensitive subject instruction. Without such support, multilingual practices remained dependent on individual initiative and were vulnerable to inconsistency.

Institutional Inequality and Implementation Capacity

The fifth theme was the influence of institutional conditions. Participating schools differed in staffing, finances, class size, technology, library resources, and access to district support. Better-resourced schools had greater capacity to purchase supplementary materials, organise professional development, and offer multiple language subjects. Under-resourced schools were more likely to rely on a small number of teachers who already carried heavy workloads. Large classes also restricted teachers' ability to provide individual language support. Examination demands encouraged schools to focus on English because formal assessments were predominantly conducted in that language. Curriculum coverage requirements left limited time for the development of academic vocabulary in more than one language.

These findings reveal that school-level language planning cannot be separated from broader patterns of educational inequality. Schools may receive similar policy responsibilities but possess unequal capacities to implement them. Decentralising language decisions without providing differentiated support may therefore deepen disparities between schools.

Governance, Leadership, and Stakeholder Participation

The sixth theme concerned the role of school governance. Principals and school governing bodies had formal responsibilities for developing school language policies and considering community preferences. However, their participation was not always based on a detailed analysis of learner needs, teacher capacity, or achievement data. In some cases, language decisions were based mainly on parental demand for English or on established school practices.

A school governing-body representative observed: "We discuss the language policy, but the documents are technical. Some parents remain silent because they are not sure what the policy allows them to decide. Those who speak English confidently usually influence the meeting." (S1, School Governing-Body Representative)

This excerpt shows how differences in policy knowledge and language confidence affected participation. Although governance structures were formally inclusive, not all stakeholders possessed equal capacity to influence decisions. The voices of less-educated parents, minority-language groups, and learners could therefore be underrepresented.

The findings indicate that effective language curriculum planning requires transparent procedures, accessible policy information, translated meeting documents where necessary, and structured opportunities for marginalised groups to contribute. School-based management can support multilingual education only when participation is substantive rather than symbolic.

In this context, language curriculum planning was influenced by a combination of linguistic, institutional, and governance factors. Linguistically, schools had to manage the tension between English as a language of mobility and African languages as resources for comprehension, identity, and participation. Institutionally, unequal resources, staffing shortages, large classes, and assessment pressures restricted implementation. From a governance perspective, differences in leadership capacity, stakeholder knowledge, and access to decision-making shaped whose language preferences were reflected in school policies. The findings also show that these factors were mutually reinforcing. For example, English dominance encouraged schools to allocate more resources to English, while the shortage of African-language materials reinforced perceptions that African languages were unsuitable for academic instruction. Similarly, limited stakeholder knowledge allowed existing English-dominant practices to continue without systematic evaluation. Language curriculum planning must therefore address these factors as an integrated system rather than as separate problems.

How can a school-based management framework be designed to support participatory, equitable, and context-responsive multilingual language curriculum planning in South African secondary schools?

The findings indicated that an effective school-based management framework should contain six key components: a language-needs assessment, an inclusive curriculum-planning committee, clearly defined roles, multilingual curriculum and assessment practices, targeted resource and capacity development, and continuous monitoring with stakeholder feedback. Participants emphasised that the framework should combine national policy requirements with evidence from the local school context.

Table 2. Proposed School-Based Management Framework

Framework-development question	Proposed response or design element
1. How should schools identify their language priorities?	Conduct an annual language-needs assessment covering home languages, proficiency levels, learner achievement, teacher competence, parental expectations, available materials, and community language resources.
2. Who should participate in language curriculum planning?	Establish a School Language Curriculum Committee comprising the principal, language and subject teachers, learners, parents, school governing-body members, community representatives, and, where possible, district officials.
3. How should responsibilities be distributed?	Specify responsibilities for policy interpretation, curriculum design, materials development, teacher training, budgeting, assessment, implementation, and monitoring.
4. What should the multilingual curriculum	Combine home-language development, academic English or Afrikaans support, planned translanguaging, multilingual

Framework-development question	Proposed response or design element
include?	terminology, culturally relevant texts, and language support across subjects.
5. What resources and support are required?	Provide teacher development, multilingual materials, translation support, transparent budgets, district guidance, digital resources, and partnerships with universities or community language experts.
6. How should implementation be monitored and improved?	Track participation, proficiency, subject achievement, teacher practices, resource distribution, and stakeholder satisfaction through regular review meetings and feedback mechanisms.

Conducting a School-Level Language-Needs Assessment

The first component of the proposed framework is a systematic language-needs assessment. Participants argued that schools should not design language policies solely on the basis of historical practice or general parental preference. Decisions should be informed by evidence regarding the languages learners use, their proficiency in each language, their performance across subjects, and the linguistic demands of the curriculum.

The needs assessment should document learners' home languages, English or Afrikaans proficiency, language preferences, subject achievement, and patterns of classroom participation. It should also examine teachers' language competencies, available materials, school finances, community language resources, and parental expectations. The resulting school language profile would provide a foundation for setting realistic multilingual priorities. One principal explained: *"Before deciding the language programme, the school must know who the learners are. We need information about their home languages, their results, the languages teachers can use, and the resources that are actually available." (P3, Principal, School C)*

This excerpt supports an evidence-based approach. A language-needs assessment would prevent schools from adopting policies that were disconnected from their learner populations or beyond their implementation capacity. It would also allow schools to identify linguistic groups that might otherwise be overlooked.

Establishing a School Language Curriculum Committee

The second component is the establishment of a School Language Curriculum Committee. The committee should include the principal, language teachers, representatives of subject departments, learners, parents, school governing-body members, and community representatives. Where possible, district curriculum officials should participate in an advisory capacity. The committee would be responsible for interpreting national language policy, reviewing the school language profile, setting multilingual curriculum objectives, coordinating implementation, and monitoring progress. Its composition is important because language planning affects teaching, assessment, resource allocation, cultural identity, and access to further education. These decisions should therefore not be controlled by one individual or professional group.

A language teacher stated: *"Language planning cannot remain only with the English department. Mathematics and science teachers also face language problems, and parents and learners need to explain what happens outside the classroom." (LT4, Language Teacher, School B)*

The excerpt demonstrates the need for cross-curricular and community participation. Subject teachers could identify disciplinary language demands, while parents and learners could contribute information about language use, barriers, and

aspirations. However, participation would need to be structured to prevent dominant individuals or groups from controlling decisions. Meeting documents should be accessible, important concepts should be explained clearly, and stakeholders should be permitted to contribute in languages in which they can communicate confidently.

Clarifying Roles and Accountability

The third component concerns role definition. Participants reported that language curriculum implementation was weakened when responsibilities were assumed rather than formally assigned. The framework should therefore specify which actors are responsible for policy development, lesson planning, materials production, teacher development, budgeting, assessment, community communication, and monitoring.

The principal would provide instructional leadership and ensure policy alignment. Language teachers would coordinate language development and multilingual literacy. Subject teachers would identify disciplinary vocabulary and integrate language support into their teaching. The school governing body would approve policies, monitor resource allocation, and represent community interests. District officials would provide guidance, training, and technical assistance. Learners and parents would contribute feedback on accessibility, participation, and language preferences. Clear role descriptions would reduce conflict between principals, governing bodies, and teachers. They would also make it possible to identify implementation gaps and hold the appropriate actors accountable. Annual language plans should include activities, responsible persons, timelines, budgets, and measurable indicators.

Designing the Multilingual Curriculum

The fourth component is the design of a multilingual curriculum that balances home-language development with access to academic English or Afrikaans. Participants did not generally support replacing English entirely. Instead, they proposed a planned approach in which home languages were used to strengthen understanding while learners progressively developed the academic language required for examinations and further education.

Planned translanguaging should form part of lesson design. Teachers could introduce concepts in the language of learning and teaching, allow learners to discuss or clarify them in familiar languages, and then guide learners to express the concepts using formal academic terminology. Multilingual glossaries, parallel texts, bilingual summaries, visual resources, and locally relevant examples could support this movement between languages.

A teacher provided the following example: *"I first introduce the key terms in English because learners will meet them in the examination. We then discuss the meaning in Sesotho, and afterwards they write the explanation again in English. This helps them connect understanding with the language expected in assessment." (LT7, Language Teacher, School C)*

This excerpt illustrates structured rather than spontaneous translanguaging. The purpose is not simply to translate every sentence, but to build conceptual understanding and academic language concurrently. Such practices should be included in curriculum documents, departmental plans, and teacher-development programmes. The curriculum should also include culturally relevant texts and local knowledge. Community stories, oral histories, environmental examples, and social issues could make language learning more meaningful while recognising local linguistic and cultural resources. However, locally developed content should remain aligned with national curriculum standards and progression requirements.

Building Teacher and Institutional Capacity

The fifth component is targeted capacity-building. Participants repeatedly emphasised that policy expectations would remain aspirational unless teachers and governing bodies received practical support. Teacher development should address multilingual lesson planning, translanguaging, academic vocabulary, materials development, inclusive assessment, and the teaching of language across subjects. A stakeholder explained: *"Schools are given responsibility, but responsibility without training is not empowerment. Governing bodies and teachers need to understand both the policy and the practical choices available to them." (S3, District Curriculum Stakeholder)*

This response highlights the distinction between decentralisation and genuine capacity. School-based management requires local authority, but it also requires the knowledge and resources needed to exercise that authority effectively. Professional development could be organised through school-based workshops, teacher learning communities, district programmes, and partnerships with universities. Experienced multilingual teachers could demonstrate strategies and support colleagues. Governing-body training should include language-policy interpretation, inclusive participation, budgeting, conflict management, and the use of school data.

Resource planning should accompany professional development. Each school should allocate a specific budget for multilingual textbooks, dictionaries, glossaries, digital resources, translation, and locally developed materials. Districts should provide additional support to schools serving highly diverse or economically disadvantaged communities so that decentralisation does not reproduce existing inequalities.

Developing Inclusive Assessment Practices

The proposed framework should also align assessment with multilingual curriculum objectives. Participants reported that learners were often permitted to use their home languages during classroom discussion but were required to demonstrate all knowledge through English in formal assessment. This disconnect limited the educational value of multilingual teaching. Formative assessment could allow learners to explain, annotate, discuss, or plan responses using more than one language. Teachers could then support learners in transferring their understanding into the formal language required for summative tasks.

Assessment rubrics should distinguish between conceptual understanding and language accuracy where appropriate, especially in non-language subjects. This does not imply lowering academic standards. Rather, it creates a developmental pathway from home-language-supported understanding to proficiency in the academic language required by the curriculum. Assessment data should also be analysed according to language background to identify whether particular groups are experiencing systematic barriers.

Monitoring, Feedback, and Continuous Improvement

The sixth component is continuous monitoring and evaluation. The proposed framework should not be treated as a one-time language-policy exercise. Schools should regularly review whether multilingual curriculum strategies improve participation, language proficiency, subject achievement, and stakeholder satisfaction. Monitoring indicators could include the frequency and quality of multilingual teaching practices, availability of learning materials, learner participation by language group, performance in language and content subjects, teacher participation in professional development, and stakeholder involvement in decision-making. Observation, learner work, assessment data, interviews, and meeting records could be used to examine implementation.

The School Language Curriculum Committee should meet at predetermined intervals to review evidence and recommend adjustments. Learners and parents should

have accessible channels for giving feedback, including multilingual questionnaires, focus-group discussions, and representative meetings. District officials should support evaluation but should not replace local decision-making.

Proposed Framework Structure

Based on the findings, the school-based management framework can be organised into a recurring six-stage cycle: Diagnose**:** Develop an evidence-based school language profile. Participate: Establish an inclusive School Language Curriculum Committee. Plan: Set objectives, roles, budgets, timelines, and curriculum strategies. Implement: Apply planned multilingual pedagogy, materials, and assessment. Monitor: Collect evidence about participation, proficiency, achievement, and governance. And Improve: Use stakeholder feedback and evaluation findings to revise the programme.

This cycle recognises that language curriculum planning is dynamic. Changes in learner enrolment, staffing, community demographics, policy, and resources may require schools to reconsider their strategies. Annual review would help schools remain responsive while maintaining alignment with national curriculum requirements. The findings suggest that a participatory and equitable school-based management framework must combine local decision-making with clearly defined support systems. Local autonomy alone is insufficient. Schools require language data, inclusive governance structures, trained participants, adequate resources, clear accountability, and sustained district assistance.

The framework is context-responsive because it begins with the linguistic and institutional conditions of each school rather than prescribing an identical language model for all schools. It is participatory because teachers, learners, parents, governing bodies, communities, and education officials contribute to planning and evaluation. It is equitable because it recognises that schools have unequal capacities and that additional support should be directed to institutions facing greater linguistic and material constraints. Most importantly, the framework positions multilingualism as a curriculum and governance concern rather than merely a classroom technique. It connects learners' linguistic repertoires with curriculum access, resource allocation, professional development, assessment, stakeholder participation, and institutional accountability. Through this integrated approach, school-based management can help translate South Africa's multilingual policy commitments into practical and sustainable curriculum arrangements.

Discussion

The study demonstrates that language curriculum planning in South African secondary schools is shaped by the interaction of linguistic hierarchies, institutional capacity, classroom practices, and school-governance arrangements. The six themes identified in the findings—English dominance, differences between learners' home languages and the language of learning and teaching, limited multilingual resources, uneven teacher preparation, institutional inequality, and unequal stakeholder participation—confirm that language planning is not simply a technical process of selecting curriculum content. It is a social and political process through which particular languages, identities, forms of knowledge, and educational opportunities are either legitimised or marginalised. This interpretation is consistent with the study's original premise that multilingual policy aspirations remain constrained by English-dominant institutional practices and unequal access to resources.

The dominance of English found in the participating schools confirms previous research showing that English continues to possess greater academic, economic, and symbolic value than African languages. Participants associated English with

examinations, higher education, employment, technology, and communication beyond the local community. This finding corresponds with Ngcobo and Barnes (2020), who identified the continuing dominance of English despite policy commitments to multilingualism, and with Lasagabaster (2024), who showed that institutional and learner attitudes may reinforce English even when multilingual policies are formally recognised. The result also supports Chaka and Ndlangamandla's (2022) critique of the coloniality of language, in which English retains authority as the principal language of legitimate academic knowledge. However, the present study extends these arguments by showing how the perceived mobility value of English directly influences school-level decisions about teaching time, resource allocation, assessment, and stakeholder preferences. English dominance is therefore reproduced not only through national policy structures but also through everyday choices made by parents, principals, teachers, and governing bodies.

The findings concerning the gap between learners' home languages and the language of learning and teaching similarly confirm earlier studies. Participants reported that learners were often able to understand concepts when these were discussed in isiXhosa, Sesotho, or another familiar language but struggled to interpret examination questions or communicate the same knowledge in English. Chimbunde et al. (2024) documented comparable difficulties among learners studying history through English, while Mabiletja and Ngcobo (2023) showed that complex multilingual school environments require more deliberate language planning. Ndhlovana and Charamba (2023) likewise found that multilingual mediation assists learners in mathematics and science classrooms. The present findings reinforce the argument that poor performance in content subjects cannot always be interpreted as a lack of disciplinary understanding. In some instances, assessment measures English-language proficiency more strongly than conceptual competence. This distinction is theoretically important because it challenges monolingual assumptions about the relationship between language and knowledge and supports the view that epistemic access is mediated by learners' linguistic resources (Nkoala, 2021; Ralarala et al., 2021).

The frequent use of code-switching and translanguaging observed in classrooms confirms the practical relevance of multilingual pedagogy. Teachers moved between English and learners' home languages to clarify terminology, check comprehension, encourage participation, and connect abstract ideas with familiar experiences. These practices align with Carrim and Nkomo's (2023) conclusion that translanguaging can support learning in multilingual settings and with Sefotho's (2022) proposal for Ubuntu translanguaging as a systematic and culturally responsive approach. They also correspond with Nyamayedenga's (2022) finding that multilingualism can function as a classroom resource rather than an obstacle. Nevertheless, the study identified an important limitation: translanguaging was usually spontaneous, teacher-dependent, and weakly connected to formal planning or assessment. This extends previous research by distinguishing between improvised linguistic support and systematically designed multilingual pedagogy. Translanguaging may improve immediate understanding, but its long-term contribution to academic literacy is likely to remain limited unless it is incorporated into lesson objectives, learning materials, progression plans, and assessment procedures.

The shortage of African-language textbooks, glossaries, digital materials, and subject-specific terminology further explains why multilingual practice remained inconsistent. This finding confirms Kretzer and Oluoch-Suleh's (2022) argument that African languages possess significant but underdeveloped potential within curriculum reform. It also supports Mbatha and Mokoena's (2024) emphasis on the importance of

access to relevant reading resources in promoting multilingualism and decolonisation. In the present study, teachers often relied on English textbooks and supplied oral translations during lessons. Although this strategy provided immediate assistance, it placed substantial responsibility on individual teachers and produced uneven experiences across classrooms. The result extends existing literature by showing that material scarcity does not merely restrict language choice; it also transforms multilingual education into an informal practice dependent on teachers' personal competence, workload, and commitment. Therefore, curriculum reform must be supported by investment in multilingual terminology, parallel texts, bilingual glossaries, digital resources, and contextually relevant instructional materials.

Uneven teacher preparation emerged as another central constraint. Participants valued multilingual education but frequently lacked formal training in translanguaging, bilingual materials development, inclusive assessment, and language-sensitive subject teaching. This supports Matshikiza et al. (2021), who found that teachers' perspectives and competencies strongly influence the medium of instruction in multicultural classrooms. It is also consistent with Mpofu's (2025) account of beginner teachers' difficulties with language teaching across content subjects. The current study adds analytical depth by showing that general awareness of multilingual policy does not automatically translate into pedagogical competence. Teachers require practical knowledge of how to sequence movement between languages, distinguish conceptual understanding from linguistic accuracy, develop multilingual resources, and coordinate language support across departments. Professional development should therefore move beyond policy orientation and focus on classroom design, disciplinary vocabulary, assessment, and collaborative materials production.

Institutional inequalities also influenced schools' capacity to implement multilingual curricula. Differences in staffing, class size, finances, technological access, libraries, and district support meant that schools operated under unequal conditions despite carrying similar policy responsibilities. This finding supports Teise and Barnett's (2021) argument that decentralisation may not improve rural education when local institutions lack sufficient resources and capacity. It also resonates with Davids' (2020) concern that school governance can either advance or hinder democratic education. The present findings contradict any assumption that school autonomy alone will generate innovation or equity. Decentralisation may instead widen disparities when affluent schools can mobilise expertise and materials while under-resourced schools struggle to fulfil basic curriculum requirements. Thus, school-based management should be accompanied by differentiated district support and redistributive resource allocation rather than uniform expectations for all schools.

The findings on governance reveal a further distinction between formal participation and substantive influence. School governing bodies and community representatives were officially involved in language-policy discussions, but participants differed in their ability to understand technical documents, speak confidently in meetings, or influence decisions. Parents with stronger English proficiency or greater policy knowledge were more likely to shape outcomes. This finding is consistent with Mawanzo's (2022) discussion of asymmetrical school–parent collaboration and with Meia et al.'s (2024) emphasis on the need to connect research, professional practice, and inclusive participation. It also confirms Davids' (2020) argument that democratic governance structures do not automatically produce democratic outcomes. The study extends this literature by demonstrating that linguistic competence itself functions as a form of governance power. In meetings conducted through technical English, the

language intended to facilitate administration may silence precisely those community members whose linguistic experiences are most relevant to curriculum planning.

The proposed School Language Curriculum Committee addresses this problem by broadening participation beyond language departments and school leadership. Including subject teachers, learners, parents, governing-body members, community representatives, and district officials recognises that language influences all areas of learning. This proposal is consistent with collaborative governance perspectives represented by Condat (2022) and St-Pierre (2021), which emphasise shared decision-making and collective responsibility. However, the framework developed in this study goes beyond participation as representation. It requires accessible documents, opportunities to communicate in familiar languages, clearly assigned responsibilities, transparent budgets, and regular review processes. Participation is therefore treated as an institutional practice that must be designed, resourced, and monitored.

The six-stage framework—diagnose, participate, plan, implement, monitor, and improve—extends previous research by integrating multilingual pedagogy with school-based governance. Earlier studies have generally focused on language policy, translanguaging, classroom practice, curriculum reform, or decentralisation as separate areas. The present framework connects them by beginning with a local language-needs assessment and linking the resulting evidence to curriculum objectives, professional development, materials, assessment, budgeting, and accountability. This approach recognises that schools differ in their language populations and institutional capacities; consequently, a single language model cannot respond adequately to all contexts. Context responsiveness does not mean ignoring national policy. Rather, it involves adapting national multilingual commitments to local evidence while preserving minimum standards of equity and educational access.

The findings also have implications for assessment. Participants described a contradiction in which learners were permitted to use home languages during classroom discussion but were expected to demonstrate knowledge exclusively through English in formal tasks. This supports Nkoala's (2021) claim that language may either facilitate or restrict epistemic access. It also aligns with Reilly et al. (2022), who argue that rigid boundaries between languages do not reflect actual multilingual practices. The proposed use of multilingual formative assessment and rubrics that distinguish conceptual knowledge from linguistic accuracy does not lower standards. Instead, it creates a developmental bridge through which learners can first establish understanding and then acquire the academic language required for formal assessment. The results confirm much of the existing evidence regarding English dominance, multilingual resource shortages, teacher-preparation needs, and uneven decentralisation. Their main contribution lies in showing how these factors reinforce one another at the school level.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the linguistic, institutional, and school-governance factors affecting language curriculum planning in South African secondary schools and examined how school-based management could support more participatory, equitable, and context-responsive multilingual provision. The findings showed that English remained dominant because of its perceived importance for examinations, higher education, employment, and wider communication. However, exclusive dependence on English limited the participation and conceptual access of learners who had not yet developed sufficient academic proficiency in the language. Teachers attempted to address this challenge through code-switching, translanguaging, bilingual explanations, and peer support, but these strategies were usually informal and were not consistently

incorporated into curriculum planning or assessment. The effectiveness of multilingual education was further limited by shortages of African-language materials, uneven teacher preparation, staffing and budget constraints, large classes, and unequal access to district support. In governance processes, formal stakeholder representation did not always result in equal influence because policy knowledge, language confidence, and institutional power shaped whose preferences were prioritised. These findings confirm that language curriculum planning is not solely a pedagogical matter; it is also a question of educational governance, resource justice, identity, participation, and epistemic access.

In response, the study proposes a recurring school-based management framework organised around diagnosis, participation, planning, implementation, monitoring, and improvement. Schools should first construct evidence-based language profiles before establishing inclusive School Language Curriculum Committees involving leaders, language and subject teachers, learners, parents, governing bodies, community representatives, and district support personnel. These committees should formulate multilingual objectives, clarify responsibilities, allocate resources transparently, institutionalise planned translanguaging, strengthen home-language development, support academic English or Afrikaans, and introduce more inclusive formative assessments. Continuous monitoring should examine learner participation, proficiency, disciplinary achievement, teacher practice, resource distribution, and stakeholder satisfaction. The study concludes that decentralisation can promote multilingual equity only when schools receive sufficient professional, financial, and institutional support. National and district authorities must therefore avoid transferring responsibility without capacity. Sustainable language reform requires local ownership combined with differentiated assistance, accountable governance, professionally prepared teachers, appropriate learning materials, and meaningful participation by communities whose languages and experiences have historically been marginalised.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the language teachers, school principals, school governing-body representatives, community participants, and curriculum stakeholders who contributed their time, professional experiences, and perspectives to this study. Appreciation is also extended to the participating secondary schools and relevant education authorities for facilitating access and supporting the research process.

DECLARATION OF USING AI TOOLS

Generative artificial intelligence tools were used to assist with language refinement, structural organisation, grammar checking, and improving the clarity of selected manuscript sections. The authors critically reviewed, verified, and revised all AI-assisted content. The research design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, conclusions, and responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the manuscript remain entirely with the authors.

REFERENCES

Carrim, A., & Nkomo, S. A. (2023). A systematic literature review of the feasibility of a translanguaging pedagogy in the foundation phase. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 11*(2), 195–207. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i2.7158

Chaka, C., & Ndlangamandla, S. C. (2022). Relocating English studies and SoTL in the Global South: Towards decolonizing English and critiquing the coloniality of language. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education, 17*(2), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.20355/jcie29495

Chimbunde, P., Lekhethe, T. K., & Moreeng, B. (2024). Navigating the complexities of learning history in English in two South African schools. *History Education Research Journal, 21*(1), Article 5. https://doi.org/10.14324/herj.21.1.05

Condat, S. (2022). Références bibliographiques du dossier « Le travail collaboratif à l'école ». *Revue Internationale d'Éducation de Sèvres, 90*, 151–162. https://doi.org/10.4000/ries.13060

Davids, N. (2020). Governance in South African schools: Democratic advancement or hindrance? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 50*(3), 436–451. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220937306

Kretzer, M. M., & Oluoch-Suleh, E. (2022). (Hidden) potentials for African languages in curriculum reforms: Examples from Kenya and South Africa. *SN Social Sciences, 2*(8). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-022-00440-6

Lasagabaster, D. (2024). "Because guess what? I don't even want to speak English": English as an obstacle for the development of multilingualism at a South African institution. *Language Policy, 24*(2), 209–243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-024-09707-5

Mabiletja, M. M., & Ngcobo, M. N. (2023). Language planning in the context of complex multilingual schools. *ScienceRise, 4*, 37–50. https://doi.org/10.21303/2313-8416.2023.003215

Matshikiza, S., Luggya, S. K., & Tanga, M. (2021). The medium of instruction in a multicultural classroom: Teachers' perspectives in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 20*(1), 342–355. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.1.19

Mawanzo, D. A. (2022). Collaboration entre école et parents dans la gestion de la scolarité des filles en République démocratique du Congo: Dialogue asymétrique entre théorie et pratique. *Encounters in Theory and History of Education, 23*, 200–222. https://doi.org/10.24908/encounters.v23i0.16172

Mbatha, S., & Mokoena, M. (2024). Fostering decolonization, reading, and multilingualism through book donation: A case study of one primary school in South Africa. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, 5*(6), 798–813. https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.2024561

Meia, J., Carron, P., Gremion, F., & Zappella, D. (2024). Lier recherche, formation et pratique enseignante: Une piste pour développer des pratiques inclusives? *Revue Hybride de l'Éducation, 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1522/rhe.v8i1.1649

Mpofu, N. (2025). Language teaching in content subjects: Post-initial teacher education narratives of South African beginner teachers. *TESOL Journal, 16*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.70070

Mulaudzi, L. (2024). Multilingual integrated pedagogical model for enhancing mathematical literacy in South Africa. *Journal of Education, 95*, 23–45. https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i95a02

Ndhlovana, S. N., & Charamba, E. (2023). The efficacy of translanguaging in selected South African mathematics and science intermediate phase classrooms. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 11*(3), 373–386. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i3.7904

Ngcobo, M. N., & Barnes, L. (2020). English in the South African language-in-education policy on higher education. *World Englishes, 40*(1), 84–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12474

Nkoala, S. (2021). Students' perspectives of how multilingualism helps or hinders epistemic access in journalism education. In M. K. Ralarala, K. Barris, E. Ivala, & S. N. N. Kgatla (Eds.), *Knowledge beyond colour lines: Towards repurposing knowledge*

generation in South African higher education (pp. 99–114). UWC Press. https://doi.org/10.52779/9781990995057/06

Nyamayedenga, M. S. (2022). Multilingualism as a classroom resource for communicative language teaching: A case of a primary school in Warren Park, Zimbabwe. *East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 3*(2), 91–101. https://doi.org/10.46606/eajess2022v03i02.0163

Ralarala, M. K., Manashe, L., Angu, P., Perold, R., Rodrigues, T., & Jantjies, N. (2021). Making sense of architectural "language": Implications for success in teaching and learning for ECP students at CPUT. In M. K. Ralarala, K. Barris, E. Ivala, & S. N. N. Kgatla (Eds.), *Knowledge beyond colour lines: Towards repurposing knowledge generation in South African higher education* (pp. 79–98). UWC Press. https://doi.org/10.52779/9781990995057/05

Reilly, C., Bagwasi, M. M., Costley, T., Gibson, H., Kula, N. C., Mapunda, G., & Mwansa, J. M. (2022). "Languages don't have bones, so you can just break them": Rethinking multilingualism in education policy and practice in Africa. *Journal of the British Academy, 10*(S4), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/010s4.001

Richardson, J., & Stroud, C. (2021). Multilingualism as racialization. *Multilingual Margins: A Journal of Multilingualism from the Periphery, 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.14426/mm.v8i1.1373

Sefotho, M. P. M. (2022). Ubuntu translanguaging as a systematic approach to language teaching in multilingual classrooms in South Africa. *Journal for Language Teaching, 56*(1). https://doi.org/10.56285/jltvol56iss1a5416

Sirois, G., Dembélé, M., & Morales-Perlaza, A. (2020). La mise en œuvre des instruments visant à attirer, recruter et retenir les enseignants dans les zones rurales au Burkina Faso. *Comparative and International Education, 49*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.5206/cie-eci.v49i1.13438

St-Pierre, M. (2021). Le partenariat décisionnel en éducation au Québec. *Éducation et Francophonie, 29*(2), 300–312. https://doi.org/10.7202/1079562ar

Teise, K., & Barnett, E. (2021). Is decentralisation a suitable response to improve South African rural education? *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 20*(6), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.6.11