Africa's Lingual-Balknization: Colonial Language Dividies, Regional Integration and Political Mobilisation

EZE, George Ogazi Mani (PhD, mnipr).

Department of Mass Communication, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education,
Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6765-6123
(+234) 805 600 6284; 803 867 1590.
george.eze@iaue.edu.ng

Abstract

The intricate linguistic landscape of Africa is largely a direct consequence of colonialism and the imposition of European languages—English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian—on heterogeneous indigenous populations.This phenomenon, often described as linguistic balkanization, has over time produced enduring linguistic segmentation that continues to shape political mobilisation, regional integration, and the construction of national identity. Colonial language policies were not merely instruments of administrative convenience; they also generated deep cultural and communicative rifts among African states, fostering dependence on external linguistic structures and undermining continental cohesion. Integration efforts by the African Union and sub-regional organisations such as ECOWAS and SADC are often disadvantaged by linguistic divergence, which frequently undermines their functional effectiveness and institutional legitimacy. As a powerful instrument of identity and mobilisation, language simultaneously operates as an enabling and constraining force: it facilitates transnational elite discourse through colonial languages while marginalising indigenous linguistic epistemologies.

This dynamic complicates pan-African political organisation and grassroots participation, as vernacular languages remain systematically undervalued in political processes. Moreover, linguistic divisions often intersect with geopolitical contestations and ideological cleavages, contributing to structural incapacities within post-colonial states. Drawing on examples from Francophone, Anglophone, Lusophone, and Arabophone regions, this paper examines how colonial language legacies shape regional affiliations, diplomatic relations, and electoral communication strategies. The study interrogates the paradox of language as both a unifying and divisive force within the African polity. Employing critical discourse analysis and a historical-comparative approach, the study demonstrates how language policies may either bridge or deepen existing sociopolitical cleavages. The paper concludes by proposing a model of moderate linguistic pluralism that prioritises indigenous languages as strategic instruments in diplomacy and development. Such recalibration may advance Africa's pursuit of deeper integration, cultural decolonisation, and enhanced political inclusion across the continent.

Keywords: Colonial languages, lingua-balkanization, regional integration, political mobilization, African identity, linguistic fragmentation.

Introduction

Colonialism in Africa did not only leave imprints on political and economic systems, but the linguistic divisions that were engraved and are still present to a large extent, have left their mark on identity, leadership, and cooperation with neighboring regions/countries. In the course of colonization, the European powers inflicted their languages of English, French, Portuguese, Spanish and Italian on the various African societies thus marginalizing the indigenous languages as well as reorganizing the communicative ecologies in the entire continent (Mazrui & Mazrui, 1998). The resultant effect of such has been that Africa has become not only linguistically but also politically and ideologically fragmented. Most of the African states remain officially under the use of the colonial languages as instruments of administration, law and even education, an enterprise that Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) asserts perpetuates a colonial alienation and dependency of knowledge.

In this paper, the study is interested in how these colonial linguistic heritages impede regional integration and thwart attempts at political mobilization across states and within African states. The problem statement is based on the contradiction which has become evident in the difference between rhetoric, in that Africa has had ambitions to be united (such as under the African Union) and the reality of the use of language, which supports this rhetoric because of the presence of linguistic diversity. While language should serve as a bridge, it has become a barrier to cross-border engagement and inclusive participation in democratic processes.

The aim of this study is to examine how colonial language divisions have affected regional integration and political mobilization in Africa. Specifically, it seeks to: (1) explore the historical foundations of Africa's linguistic fragmentation; (2) analyze how language impacts regional alliances and communication within political movements; and (3) propose frameworks for linguistic inclusion that support both national identity and continental unity.

The significance of this research lies in its contribution to debates on decolonization, identity politics, and African development. However, the study is delimited to select Anglophone, Francophone, Lusophone, and Arabophone regions, emphasizing the comparative political and communicative dimensions of language without exhaustively treating all linguistic communities in Africa.

Research Questions

1. How have colonial language policies contributed to linguistic fragmentation and political division in postcolonial Africa?
2. In what ways does linguistic diversity rooted in colonial legacyn affect regional integration efforts across Anglophone, Francophone, Lusophone, and Arabophone African regions?
3. How do political actors and institutions use colonial and indigenous languages for mobilization, inclusion, or exclusion in electoral and policy processes?
4. What strategies can be adopted to reconcile linguistic pluralism with the goals of regional integration and inclusive political participation in Africa?

Related Literature
Colonial Language Legacy in Africa

The linguistic fragmentation of Africa is deeply rooted in its colonial past, where European powers imposed foreign languages as tools of domination and control. This legacy persists in contemporary African governance, education, and diplomacy. According to Mazrui & Mazrui (1998), " language became not only a medium of instruction and administration, but also a marker of class and colonial loyalty" (p. 41). English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Arabic remain dominant in political and institutional contexts, despite the continent' s rich tapestry of indigenous languages. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) strongly criticizes the postcolonial reliance on colonial languages, arguing that " language carries culture, and culture carries…the entire body of values by which we come to perceive ourselves and our place in the world" (p. 16). His work calls for the decolonization of African minds and institutions through the revival and elevation of indigenous languages in all spheres of life.

Language and Regional Integration

Language plays a central role in regional cooperation and identity. However, Africa' s regional blocs such as ECOWAS (English-dominant), UEMOA (French-dominant), and SADC (a mix) often replicate colonial linguistic divides. Bamgbose (2000) notes that " regional organizations have inherited the language biases of their founding members, making it difficult to achieve communicative parity across linguistic zones" (p. 84). The African Union, though symbolically inclusive, primarily functions in English, French, and Arabic, marginalizing indigenous languages and complicating regional policy harmonization. Prah (2009) asserts that " the development of African languages for scientific and administrative purposes is indispensable if regional integration is to be meaningful" (p. 7). His argument stresses that linguistic equity is not just a cultural issue, but a structural requirement for effective continental collaboration.

Political Mobilization and Language Use

Language is a core tool for political mobilization, yet its use in Africa remains uneven. Political elites often use colonial languages in policy and legal discourse while resorting to local languages for grassroots campaigning. This strategic code-switching, as Blommaert (2005) explains, reflects " the unequal allocation of communicative resources in postcolonial societies" (p. 107). While this tactic may enhance political reach, it also exposes the underlying exclusion of indigenous epistemologies from governance. Empirical studies have highlighted the consequences of linguistic exclusion. Ouane and Glanz (2010) found that citizens who are not proficient in official colonial languages often lack access to political information, civic education, and justice. This inequality limits full democratic participation and sustains elite dominance.

Linguistic Nationalism vs. Pan-Africanism

A growing number of scholars argue that Africa must reconcile linguistic nationalism with continental unity. Chumbow (2011) cautions that " linguistic nationalism must not be confused with linguistic parochialism; promoting national languages should enhance rather than restrict cross-border understanding" (p. 22). Efforts to elevate Swahili as a Pan-African language reflect this vision but face resistance from states deeply entrenched in colonial language identities.

The reviewed literature demonstrates a consensus on the challenges posed by colonial language legacies. These challenges permeate governance, regional integration, and political mobilization. While there is strong normative support for linguistic decolonization, practical implementation remains weak due to political inertia, lack of investment in indigenous language development, and elite preference for the global utility of colonial languages.

The literature also identifies a paradox: while indigenous languages are key to democratic inclusivity and identity affirmation, colonial languages continue to be seen as neutral and unifying tools across multiethnic states. This strain makes it difficult to have a linguistically integrated African polity.

Conceptual and Empirical Review

The figure of lingua-balkanization in Africa borrows on both the linguistic anthropology and postcolonialism. It means the spread-out division of a region willfully or cleansing along linguistic framing frequently over the grounds of colonial policy. Such linguistic fragmentation brings about epistemic and communicative barriers, thus cohesive governance and regional integration is hard. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) represents this fact by stating that the colonialism has impoverished African languages in the circle of power (p. 4). As a result of that there has been an established linguistic elitism that given a priority to foreign languages in the state matters. The centre of this debate is language policy. The term language policy in Africa has been defined as political and ideological choices regarding the usage of language in a society (Spolsky, 2004). The result of such a definition is that language policy in Africa tends to maintain patterns of colonialism. For example, despite independence, most African states continue to use colonial languages, English, French, Portuguese, and Arabica's official or national languages, sidelining indigenous tongues.

Furthermore, language ideology, the set of beliefs and attitudes people hold about different languages has sustained these inequalities. As Blommaert (2005) observes, " language ideologies structure access to resources, institutions, and legitimacy" (p. 45). In Africa, colonial languages are often viewed as neutral, modern, and unifying, while indigenous languages are seen as local, divisive, or backward. Conceptually, language also intersects with identity, power, and participation. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis or linguistic relativity theory (Whorf, 1956) posits that language shapes how people think and experience the world. This view supports claims that limiting political participation to those fluent in colonial languages not only excludes millions but also shapes the dominant worldview in governance and policy-making.

Empirical studies across the continent demonstrate the enduring effects of colonial language policies on political and regional structures. For example, Ouane and Glanz (2010), in a UNESCO report, observed that the continued use of foreign languages in African education and politics " hampers access to knowledge, public discourse, and civic participation for the majority of African citizens" (p. 15).

In a study of West African states, Bamgbose (2000) found that " regional groupings such as ECOWAS or UEMOA mirror the linguistic affiliations of their founding members," leading to operational inefficiencies and limited integration across blocs (p. 90). Similarly, Mazrui & Mazrui (1998) argue that Africa's colonial linguistic geography has created "an axis of division Francophone vs. Anglophone that continues to influence political alliances and ideological orientations" (p. 33).

In East Africa, where Kiswahili has been elevated as a regional lingua franca, Chumbow (2011) notes some success in reducing linguistic tension. However, he cautions that "a lingua franca cannot erase the marginalization of minority languages unless supported by inclusive policy and political will" (p. 25).

Electoral studies also underscore languages role in political mobilization. In multilingual states like Nigeria, politicians often campaign in vernaculars while governing in English. Afolayan (2004) warns that this duality " creates a two-tiered polity: one for the formally educated and another for the linguistically marginalized" (p. 110). Moreover, media research reveals that colonial languages dominate pan-African

news coverage, limiting accessibility for rural and less-educated populations. Mwesige (2009) found that in Uganda, only 23% of rural citizens could fully comprehend policy news presented in English, highlighting the exclusionary nature of elite media discourse.

The conceptual and empirical evidence strongly converges on the idea that language in Africa is a structural barrier to inclusive governance and integration. While colonial languages enable administrative cohesion and international diplomacy, they also serve as filters that determine who participates in political life. The continued exclusion of African languages undermines democratic consolidation and reinforces postcolonial dependency.

Therefore, breaking the language barrier in Africa demands two-pronged political solution: a value change in ideology in the relevance of the indigenous languages, good institutional policies to accommodate multilingualism in administration, schooling and in the media. The changes are crucial to the destruction of what Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) refers to as the linguistic prison of colonialism.

Theoretical Lens
The research is grounded in two related theoretical grounds, which are the Postcolonial Theory and Linguistic Relativity Theory, which form valuable critical understandings of power relations and sociopolitical aspects of language in postcolonial African cultures.

Postcolonial Theory, which is elaborated by such authors as Edward theory asks questions as to how the same colonial languages remain the hegemonic, alienating, and structurally excluding tools. In Decolonising the Mind, which should be read as a reminder that language carries culture, and culture carries the entire body of values that shape our perceptions including how we perceive ourselves and our place in the world (1986, p. 16), Ngκgu has highlighted the problems therein concerning language and culture in the context of which a linguist is defined. The theory can be used to explain why the colonial linguistic hierarchies still persist and what it implies on the issue of national identity and regional unity.

To add to this is the Linguistic Relativity Theory or otherwise known as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis which says that the structure of language and its vocabulary affect the world view and cognitive processes of the speaker (Whorf, 1956). The African variation of the concept explains how language determines political awareness, civic engagement and between and among groups. Introduction of foreign languages as official mediums may thus be biased in thought patterns into Eurocentric thought patterns and periphery the indigenous thoughts and epistemologies.

Cumulatively, these frameworks inform us to understand why language is not only an instrument of communication but that it is a place of ideological struggle, identity negotiation and power game. They offer a very solid lens through which one will attempt to analyze how colonial language barriers frustrate regional integration and complicate political mobilization on the continent. Such theoretical collaborations help to gain insight into how language choices can efface and reiterate structural inequality at large in the postcolonial African scenery.

Methodology
This paper adopts a qualitative research method based on critical discourse analysis (CDA) and comparative historical analysis, which are viable in the exploration of the sociopolitical implications of

language use in a postcolonial situation in Africa. The qualitative method enables in-depth exploration of the issue of language as the bearer of power, ideology and identity over time and space in detail.

The approach adopted to examine the conceptions of power and the way it is represented and supported in the use of language within the political and regional integration narratives is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as developed by Norman Fairclough (1995) and Teun van Dijk (1998). The approach is effective in the analysis of speeches, policy texts and media texts, as well as regional charters, which rekindle linguistic ideologies and the persistence of colonial language hegemony. CDA approaches both the text and the context, which is why it is well suitednto investigate the further influence of colonial languages on discourse among elites and citizens.

The comparative historical analysis is also employed in the study to trace the colonial backgrounds and independence trends of the linguistic policies in selected African contexts, namely, Anglophone, Francophone, Lusophone, and Arabophone regions. Such an approach facilitates the establishment of trends and deviations when the use of language through the prism of regional integration processes and political mobilisation in various geopolitical blocs.

The information will be selected on a purposive sampling basis on official writings, such as that of the African Union protocols, ECOWAS and SADC charters, electoral campaign literature, political speechwriting and regional media output between 2000 and 2024. Along with that, interviews and secondary data will be used as contextual validation and analytical depth in the scholarly works.

The themes identified through the theoretical models will guide the analysis, with linguistic representation, ideological positioning and communicative exclusion or inclusion as the main ones. The research will be conducted ethically by ensuring that appropriate referencing has been undertaken and publicly available data were used. The research is restricted to documentary and discourse resources, neither psycholinguistic nor ethnographic fieldwork is involved.

Data Presentation
The information presentation in this research synthesizes the results of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Comparative Historical Analysis (CHA) and presents findings in the form of thematic organisation to attribute patterns of Linguistic domination, identity negotiation, political mobilization and regional integration. Such data is divided along geopolitical language blocs Anglophone, Francophone, Lusophone, Arabophone, to capture the postcolonial linguistic stratification of Africa.

Table 1:   Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Findings
Using Norman Fairclough's three-tier model (textual analysis, discursive practice, and social practice), political speeches, official documents, and media texts were analyzed from each bloc.

Theme	Data Source	Observations	Implications
Linguistic Elitism	AU Declarations (2002☐2024)	Language of policy documents overwhelmingly in English and French, marginalizing local languages.	Reinforces elite political dominance and alienation of grassroots populations.

Identity Politics	Presidential Speeches (Nigeria, Senegal)	Leaders often switch between colonial and local languages to appeal to different classes or regional identities.	Demonstrates strategic language use for inclusion/ exclusion and voter segmentation.
Discourse of Integration	ECOWAS, SADC, EAC Charters	Lexical choices promote ☐unity☐ but linguistic implementation remains fragmented.	Contradicts integration rhetoric and perpetuates colonial divides.
Media Framing	Pan-African newspapers (2020☐2024)	Reports on political events use colonial languages, sidelining indigenous linguistic framing.	Shifts interpretive power to externalized frames of reference.

.

Table 2:   Comparative Historical Analysis (CHA) Findings.

A longitudinal analysis of language policy trajectories from independence to present reveals diverging paths among language blocs.

Region	Colonial Legacy	Post-Independence Language Policy	Effect on Integration & Mobilization
Anglophone (Nigeria, Ghana)	British education & governance in English	Retained English as official language; indigenous languages regionalized	Ethnic mobilization persists; regional blocs like ECOWAS linguistically imbalanced
Francophone (Senegal, Côte d☐Ivoire)	Assimilation under French rule	Strong French retention; weak indigenous language support	Regional communication within UEMOA aligned but exclusionary to non-Francophone blocs
Lusophone (Angola, Mozambique)	Portuguese as identity enforcer	Strong monolingual policy in Portuguese; minimal indigenous promotion	Integration into wider African linguistic spheres remains slow
Arabophone (Algeria, Egypt)	Arabic colonially shaped or imposed	Classical Arabic retained; vernaculars suppressed	Strong Arab regional alignment but weak continental communication with sub-Saharan states

The CDA reveals how current linguistic practices sustain the structural inequalities instituted by colonialism, while the CHA underscores the historical continuity and policy decisions that have entrenched linguistic fragmentation. Together, both methods expose the contradictions in Africa's political communication and regional integration efforts where colonial languages dominate institutional spaces,

while indigenous languages remain politically and diplomatically marginalized. The triangulated findings set the stage for further analysis and discussion on how inclusive language policies could strengthen pan-African political identity and cooperation.

Table 3: Textual Analysis of Political and Institutional Language Use

Source/Genre	Textual Features	Interpretation
AU Speeches and Charters	Use of formal, abstract nouns; repetitive use of 'unity', 'development', and 'solidarity'	Symbolic performance of unity while masking deep linguistic and political divides
Electoral Campaign Materials	Code-switching between colonial and indigenous languages	Strategic appeal to both elite and grassroots audiences, depending on context
Regional Media Reports	Dominance of colonial language headlines; sparse indigenous vocabulary	Media reaffirms postcolonial linguistic hierarchy and narrows inclusivity

Table 4: Contextual Discursive Strategies in Political Communication

Strategy	Application Context	Function/Impact
Code-Switching	Electoral campaigns in multilingual states	Mobilizes ethnic solidarity and enhances relatability
Language of Legitimacy	AU declarations and state speeches	Constructs institutional authority through colonial linguistic norms
Selective Translation	Regional organization documents	Prioritizes dominant colonial languages over inclusiveness

Table 5: Contextual Discursive Analytics Across Language Blocs

Language Bloc	Dominant Discourse	Discursive Tensions	Political Implication
Anglophone	Meritocratic and democratic language	Tension between elite discourse and vernacular exclusion	Political alienation of rural communities
Francophone	Republicanism and centralized governance	Disconnection between rhetorical unity and linguistic assimilation	Weak vernacular mobilization
Lusophone	Nationalistic and anti-imperial tone	Marginalization of local languages	Limited civic participation

Arabophone	Islamic and Pan-Arab rhetoric	Suppression of indigenous/Amazigh languages	Linguistic homogenization and identity erasure

This analysis integrates the findings from the three levels of linguistic and discursive interrogation: **textual analysis, contextual discursive strategies,** and **contextual discursive analytics**, to reveal how colonial language legacies manifest and are manipulated within political communication and regional integration discourses in Africa.

Textual Analysis: The textual data reveal that political and institutional texts in Africa consistently display a formal register, dominated by colonial languages, particularly English and French, loaded with ideologically charged terms such as "unity," "development," and "sovereignty." These terms, while promoting ideals of Pan-Africanism and cooperation, are abstract and often detached from lived linguistic realities. As Fairclough (1995) notes, such abstract nominalizations allow the…The exuberance of code-switching in campaign literature only reflects how language is tactically employed to control various audience expectations colonial languages to accommodate elite and institutional encounters, indigenous languages to make emotive and cultural connections.

Contextual Discursive Strategies: A variety of discursive practices that are anchored to context-bound distribution of power underpins the approaches by political actors in Africa. The concept of code-switching comes out as a tactic of inclusion and exclusion that mobilizes ethnic sentiments at local levels but provides authority in globalized ones. Legitimate language is used commonly in both AU and state statements and it is based on the mystique of colonial languages to build up the bureaucratic and moral impression. Discriminatory language translation, e.g. publishing of policy papers in very limited number of influential languages, also contributes to such linguistic hierarchies. These of above strategies indicate how language is not only means of communication, but a weapon of power, place and dominance (van Dijk, 1998).

Contextual Discursive Analytics: The intensity of ideological and structural divisions is displayed in the analytics by language blocs. The Anglophone Africa is filled with the dynamics on how the democratic discourse is dispersed but there is a disconnect between the voices of elites in English and the vernacular political requirements of base. States belonging to the francophone region have been influenced by the French assimilationist model and thus they have a high degree of rhetorical unity yet they are centralized, which does not permit local inclusion in language. Paradoxical nationalism is represented in Lusophone African countries condemning imperialism and it considers Portuguese as the only linguistic currency and sidelines local identities. Pan-Arab ideology can therefore be seen in the context of Arabophone lands with non-Arab native languages being enforced to the ground like the Amazigh thereby limiting the plurality of identities and excluding minorities.

In most of the blocs, colonial languages have remained the lingo of government and its statecraft, diplomacy, and media as a source of unifying elites authority and suppressing the broader political space. These idiosyncrasies of elevating these languages and degrading the indigenous ones feeds a communicative imbalance, which challenges the democratic inclusiveness and unity in the region. Language is never neutral as it carries culture and consciousness as Ngungi wa Thiong Om (1986) asserts. In Africa, entrenchment of colonial languages thwarts the development of other political imaginaries that take off based on indigenous worldviews.

The analysis illustrates that linguistic balkanization in Africa is not a residue of the past but a continued practice of discourse, which has hugely political implications. Although language as a strategic factor is

employed in the objectives of integration and mobilization, it tends to compound the exclusionary proclivities in cases where it is applied without cognizance of regional linguistic contexts. There is need to provide a recasting of the levels of language policy that would balance between languages of colonization and those that are indigenous and which will support inclusive governance, regionalization and democratic practices on the continents.

Discussion

This particular study has further confirmed the idea that language in postcolonial Africa is no longer a mere means of communication, but it is rather a politically loaded tool that reflects the legacies of colonialism, defines identity politics, and determines access to power. Domination of colonial languages in political rhetoric and text, regional charter, and integration programs despite the rhetoric embracing Pan-African ideals in the continent- reveals a mismatch between the rhetoric on unity and the reality of language exclusion.

This conflict is in line with the discussion by Ngungi wa Thiong (1986) that official languages as national languages and colonial languages reinforce both the cultural alienation and epistemic dependency. Although colonial languages allow diplomacy and coordinate the actions of elites across different countries, they always relegate local languages which serve as the foundations of cultural and emotional identity of millions. One can see this marginalization as expressed in how regional organizations such as the African Union or ECOWAS proceed to communicate in mostly English and French languages thereby solidifying what was once referred to as linguistic dependency (Mazrui and Mazrui 1998).

Such deliberate manipulation of language is evident in the use of strategy code-switching typical of the communication used during campaigns, to reach segmented audiences. Due to its great stratification and indexation with social hierarchies, the discourse of language use in politics is highly indexed (as Blommaert, 2005 argues). Politicians switch between languages to appear inclusive, but this often masks structural exclusions especially when policies and governance remain monolingual in colonial languages.

Further, the selective translation of regional documents, or the complete omission of indigenous languages in formal proceedings, reflects a colonial hangover that positions some languages as politically superior. This confirms Prah's (2009) assertion that language in Africa remains the most visible marker of continued coloniality.

Findings

Colonial languages remain the dominant medium of political communication, policy formulation, and regional diplomacy across most African states.

Code-switching and language hybridity are common in political mobilization, particularly during election campaigns, revealing strategic audience targeting.

Indigenous languages are marginalized in official statecraft and regional integration discourses, resulting in limited grassroots participation.

Language barriers are most of the times parallel with geopolitical blocks, as the Anglophone and Francophone areas, which do not permit the cross regional unity. Most language policies are assumed

directly that was there in the colonial regimes without much assimilation of the indigenous language structures.

Conclusions

The linguistic balkanization of Africa is not just a remnant of colonialism but an ongoing socio-political process that is recreated in practice by state policy making, by institutional actions, and by elite rhetoric. Although colonial language could be beneficial in enhancing administration operations and global relations, it is also limiting when it comes to promoting democracy and autonomy of the culture. This is complicated still further by the fact that the colonial language blocs (Anglophone, Francophone, Lusophone, and Arabophone) exacerbate regional integration by deepening the geopolitical cleavages based not so much on African unity but rather oncolonial interests. Politics of language in Africa ought to be viewed, therefore, a cultural as well as structural and strategic problem that can only have repercussions on governance, development and identity.

Recommendations

1. Adopt Multilingual Language Policies: The governments of Africa and regional entities ought to institutionalize multilingualism comprising of both colonial and the major indigenous languages to increase its inclusivity.

2. Promote Indigenous Languages in Education and Media: Improvement in the use of indigenous languages in education, national broadcasting and civil service can enhance civic roles and decolonize knowledge frameworks.

3. Establish Regional Translation Frameworks: The African Union and sub-regional organizations are expected to invest in translation infrastructure and interpretation establishment so as to achieve diversity in linguistic representation across the blocs in policy and diplomacy.

4. Encourage Cross-Linguistic Civic Education: Political education programs need to be implemented in local language so as to reduce the Widening gap between policy talk, and grassroots comprehension.

5. Deconstruct Linguistic Hierarchies in Governance: The government policy concerning the language should be repackaged in a manner to acknowledge all languages as equal vehicles of meaning, identity, and validity.

References

Afolayan, A. (2004). The alienated role of African languages in African education. Language and Development in Africa, 107−120.

Bamgbose, A. (2000). Language and Exclusion: The Consequences of Language Policies in Africa. LIT Verlag.

Blommaert, J. (2005). Discourse: A Critical Introduction. Cambridge University Press.

Chumbow, B. S. (2011). Linguistic diversity, pluralism and national development. In B. A. Ogot (Ed.), Alternatives to Conflict: African Perspectives on Conflict Resolution (pp. 17−28). African Books Collective.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. Longman.

Mazrui, A. A., & Mazrui, A. M. (1998). The Power of Babel: Language and Governance in the African Experience. University of Chicago Press.

Mwesige, P. G. (2009). Journalism education and training in Africa: Is there a way out? *Journal of African Media Studies, 1(3),* 429– 448.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature. James Currey.

Ouane, A., & Glanz, C. (2010). Why and How Africa Should Invest in African Languages and Multilingual Education. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Prah, K. K. (2009). The Language of Instruction Conundrum in Africa. CASAS.

Spolsky, B. (2004). Language Policy. Cambridge University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach. Sage Publications.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. MIT Press.