

The Need to Teach and Learn Indigenous Languages as General Courses in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions for National Cohesion

Angela U. N. Nwankwere (Ph.D)

Department of Linguistics

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

au.nwankwere@unizik.edu.ng; 08038851236

Abstract

This paper focuses on the need for teaching and learning indigenous languages as general courses (GS) in Nigerian tertiary institutions. The purpose is to increase awareness on the need for Nigerians to adopt positive attitudes towards indigenous languages outside theirs in order to promote national cohesion, a necessary condition for developing Nigerian languages to full potentials. Using the schooling languages perspective, factors discussed include, Nigeria's language education policy *vis a vis* the status of indigenous languages, and attitude of Nigerians towards indigenous languages, which promote or disrupt national cohesion. The paper discovers among others that negative attitude militates against national cohesion and jeopardises sustained development of respective Nigerian languages to L2 status in comparison with foreign languages studied in Nigeria and elsewhere; while positive attitude, exemplified in Nwankwere (2019a), enhances these potent attributes and is a great motivator of effective economic and optimal national development. Nigeria can achieve national cohesion through greater effectiveness in already established Nigerian languages, like Igbo, as GS courses. Furthermore, the prospects of establishing and propelling all Nigerian languages from languages for general purposes to languages for specific purposes can be harnessed and actualised. Some recommendations are made: initially establishing at least Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba as GS/L1 and GS/L2 courses in Nigerian tertiary institutions; making such GS courses more learner-centred; inculcating modern principles of L1/L2 pedagogy; designing, redesigning official learner-centred, needs-based indigenous general language courses; staff, infrastructural development; content-based teaching.

Keywords: *attitudes, indigenous languages development, languages for general purposes/specific purposes, learner-centredness, needs analysis*

Introduction

The teaching and learning of general courses characterise the education process through the school system. One of the purposes of such courses is to avail students the opportunity of acquiring general or basic knowledge of vital phenomena in their environment and of important disciplines or areas of life outside their individual disciplines of specialisation. Such knowledge is meant to equip them with attributes that will aid in propelling them to play invaluable roles in the world in general in their overall existence throughout life after graduation. One major general course in the educational system consists of the language course(s) which is/are meant to equip students with the communicative skills for effective participation in their educational career and subsequent participation in the world for life outside school. Education through the school system is transmitted through the language medium and is backed by law known as language (education) policy. In ideal contexts, the language course(s) start(s) on a general note and graduates to acquisition of the target language (TL) for discipline based special or specific purposes.

In his view on language in education in Nigeria, Olaoye (2013: 748) states, “Indigenous language is the most important tool with which society is organized, and it is hardly possible to talk of national development without including the language with which the people formulate their thoughts and ideas.” Education can be attained through one or more languages. According to Ogbonna (2010), education in two or more languages is known as bilingual education. Crawford (1989) quoted in Ogbonna (2010: 361) states, “Bilingual education can fulfill one of two purposes: to enable students to acquire and develop skills in two languages, or to prepare students to enter dominant language classrooms within a transitional period lasting between two to three years.” Commenting on the objective of bilingual education in the United States, Foster (1982) quoted by Ogbonna (2010: 361) emphasises that it “is to impart English language skills to the non-native speaker within as short a time as possible”. As such, Ogbonna posits that such a system for Nigeria as proposed by the Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004) (FRN, hereafter) through the *National Policy on Education* (NPE, hereafter) stands to be condemned and rejected since it follows America’s transitional model; and as Ogbonna (2010: 361) rightly points out, such a system cannot guarantee the achievement of full bilingualism in English and Nigerian languages. What Nigeria needs is a bilingual education policy that encourages Nigerian children to acquire full literacy and oracy skills in English and their mother tongue, referred to as additive bilingualism, not one that leads to the acquisition of English language skills at the expense of the mother tongue, replacive bilingualism.

While this paper completely agrees with Ogbonna, the paper further states that in addition to additive bilingualism, Nigeria needs to develop her indigenous languages, for instance Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba, and elevate their status as second languages (L2) to be taught and learnt as general courses at all educational levels, particularly the tertiary level, which will enable them to develop from being learnt and used from general to specific purposes. Adopting Council of Europe’s languages of schooling programme as a model, the paper briefly discussed Nigeria’s language education policy focusing on the attitudes of Nigerian government and people towards indigenous languages: either to promote or disrupt national cohesion and optimal development.

Council of Europe’s languages of schooling programme: A model

The Council of Europe (n. d.) proposes two types of languages as general courses, known as ‘languages of schooling’, for use in their educational system. They are: language as a subject and language(s) in other subjects. Council of Europe (Portal, n.d.) defines ‘language as a subject’ as is quoted, “languages taught as subjects in their own right (literacy, reading, writing, literature, thinking about language, etc.)”. Again, they define ‘language(s) in other subjects’ as is quoted, “languages used for the teaching of other subjects (maths, biology, history, geography, etc.)”. The need for this model stems from the fact that all languages need both types of languages of schooling to develop optimally. Some of the reasons include that with regard to ‘language as a subject’, effective language teaching requires equipping learners with adequate knowledge of the TL resulting in learners’ communicative ability evident in their effective performance in meeting up with their daily communicative needs, i.e., at any given context. At this level, language knowledge is for general purposes (LGP). To facilitate learner comprehension, the TL may not be the medium of instruction, for instance, if

knowledge of the TL is just for its structural pattern and grammar to enable the learners (e.g., linguists) be able to handle data in TL. The TL may also be taught in a mixed medium with L1 or another language which is commonly understood by the teacher and all learners. For example, in teaching Elementary and Intermediate French in Nigeria, English, which is common to all, can be used in a code-mix with French. In relation to 'language(s) in other subjects', an advanced stage of language teaching, language knowledge is for specific purposes, like vocational, academic, professional, etc. Here lies the thrust of language teaching that leads to all round national development because effective language teaching requires equipping learners with adequate knowledge of the TL resulting in meeting learners' vocational, academic, professional, and other specific needs. At this stage, TL must be the sole medium of instruction and is employed in teaching all subjects and disciplines using different types of communicative language teaching, like content based language teaching.

The above explication reveals that the language plan of Nigeria's NPE with regard to teaching Nigerian languages is highly faulty. Obviously, in the current dispensation, Nigeria particularly needs the second type of languages of schooling, which is the foundation of not just language development, but effective economic and national development to optimal levels. This system has been the case for all developed nations of the world, where content based language teaching and learning (among other communicative methods), has been the major driver of their overall language and national development. Regarding teaching Nigerian languages, 'language(s) in other subjects' is completely and conspicuously absent in Nigeria's educational system, particularly from senior secondary to tertiary levels. And, no thought seems to be given to it whatsoever in this modern technological age where nations are striving to enlist their heritage through their language(s) in a global village.

The Council of Europe launched the schooling languages programme to help their member states to address the major challenges of drop-out and failure at school. It then becomes pertinent that Nigeria with a high rate of out of school children needs to align her indigenous languages to embrace similar system very urgently, giving the fact that the language element in her educational system is counter developmental. This is so because a greater majority of Nigeria's so called educated children are drifting with little or no proficiency in either the highly cherished and promoted English or the down trodden indigenous languages.

Ogbonna (2010) expresses this opinion bitterly against the type of bilingual education Nigeria provided for her children in the NPE. While Ola-Busari (2014: 237) describes it as a linguistic crisis emanating from the lack of connection between English language teaching and indigenous languages, a situation manifesting in more and more young people becoming incapable of mastering any language, English or their mother tongue or first language. The ugly situation arises as a result of negative policy plan: subtractive bilingualism and poor implementation at the lower levels; and, lack of any language provision for the tertiary level. In actual fact, Nigeria has made some provision for teaching her languages from the very foundation of schooling through the language of the immediate environment or community (LIE/C) of the NPE. But this provision has been grossly flouted by particularly privately owned schools, and is poorly implemented in the government schools.

Nevertheless, it is unfortunate that despite her natural multilingual endowment, Nigeria has not appreciated the need to provide for her indigenous languages to be used as language(s) in

other subjects from the secondary to the tertiary levels. She has scarcely provided for them to be taught as subjects up to senior secondary and not to the extent of using them as media for teaching all disciplines in her school system. The government and people of Nigeria neglected the Divinely given phenomenon of multilingualism in which people naturally and orally interacted and acquired their first language and learnt other languages they came in contact with based on their linguistic needs and/or the requirements of their daily life and existence in the given environment or context.

Ola-Busari (2014) rightly observes that the quality of English competence by Nigerians from the onset of adopting English as the official language of Nigeria was high. Concurring with this observation, Nwankwere (2019bi and ii) notes that when western education came into the lives of Nigerians (for instance, the Igbo), they coped well at the beginning, leading their children to maintain their heritage language and culture at home and in the community, while imbibing the western language and culture through bilingual education at school. Nwankwere (2019bi and ii) further adds that one of the major reasons is that the learners had already acquired their respective MTs as L1 at home before embracing the white man's schooling. This view is in consonance with language experts' (e.g., West Virginia Department of Education, 2013-2014) proclamations that acquisition of L1 facilitates the learning of other languages in formal settings, especially by adults. Ogbonna (2010) explains that Nigeria's bilingual education adopted the two conditions of UNESCO (2003): medium of instruction and learning the language as a subject; though, in a very negative way known as transitional bilingualism, as against the positive and preferable maintenance bilingualism, both of which are contained at the Council of Europe's language as a subject level.

The status given to languages indicates the relative importance of each of those languages according to the function allocated to them from the school system. The low status given to Nigerian languages in education is a situation which has proven to be worse for Nigerian languages and has grievously jeopardised their growth and development, and has belied the actualisation of Nigeria's Vision 20: 2020, a fear expressed by Olaoye (2013). Worst of all is the fact that Nigeria has not made any move to correct the anomaly what more instituting for her languages any programme similar to the development oriented Council of Europe's 'language(s) in other subjects' programme. This paper strongly states that with the current situation of things, no Nigerian language, not even the big three: Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba, can ever develop in the real sense of it. The paper supports Ogbonna (2010: 363) in calling for a shift in policy to maintenance bilingualism "that promotes additive bilingualism where children acquire full language skills (understanding, speaking, reading and writing) in English and Nigerian languages, leading to what NPE itself refers to as 'permanent literacy' in English and Nigerian languages." It is to this end that the paper commends the establishment of a Nigerian language, Igbo, as a general course in a number of tertiary institutions in Igbo land. In UNIZIK, Igbo general course has two streams: general Igbo for all first year Igbo indigenes (Igbo GS/L1) and general Igbo for all first year non-Igbo indigenes (Igbo GS/L2). These tertiary institutions, include: Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka; Chukwemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Uli; Nwafor Orizu College of Education, Nsugbe and Federal Polytechnique, Oko all in Anambra State; University of Nigeria, Nsukka and Institute of Management and Technology both in Enugu State; and Federal University of Technology, Owerri in Imo State.

By taking this bold step, these tertiary institutions have made what NPE itself calls educational revolution. They were aware of the long standing yawning gap existing in the NPE's language provisions with respect to tertiary education. Again, they observed the communication difficulties being experienced by their newly admitted students, particularly the non indigenes, in the Igbo speech community as they encounter native speakers. Moreover, they felt the urge to satisfy some immediate societal needs, for instance, to encourage the use of Igbo in Igbo land and to save Igbo from going into extinction. Consequently, it was expedient to take this proactive measure instead of waiting for endless debates about the appropriateness or otherwise of the right policy. The paper thus calls on all other tertiary institutions in different parts of Nigeria, which speak different Nigerian languages, to emulate this laudable feat. In addition, the paper strongly advocates for a potent developmental disposition by way of adopting the status of language(s) in other subjects for all Nigerian languages, particularly Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba. The language(s) in other subjects' programme goes hand in hand with CLT, for example a process known as content-based language teaching, in this regard, of Nigerian languages; more especially, Igbo, which has already been strongly entrenched into tertiary education as a GS. Sustained relevant steps, for instance, in the area of vocabulary development, towards realising such a gargantuan project should be put in place and already established ones expanded without delay. A brief discussion of content-based method of teaching is culled from Nwankwere (2019a) and represented below.

Content-based language teaching

According to Sasidharan (2012), content-based language teaching (CBLT) is described as a pedagogical approach with dual focus. It involves the integration of (second, foreign or target) language study with the study of a subject domain instructed in that language. It is an approach for learning content through an additional language (second, foreign or target). This language teaching method is popular with regard to the use of different languages of the world in teaching in universities with interdisciplinary programmes and is called content and language integrated learning (CLIL). Marsh (1994) created the term 'CLIL' as a methodology similar to but distinct from language immersion (LI) and content-based instruction. CLIL is an umbrella term encompassing different forms of using language as the medium of instruction. It entails a lot of training for the teachers in several high level and tasking approaches and methods. CLIL is very popular in Europe (see for instance, Mehisto, Marsh and Frigols, 2008; Coyle, Hood and Marsh, 2010; Garrido and Fortanet, 2010 for CLIL in action).

CLIL experts propose some considerations and needs that would aid in implementing CLIL programmes successfully. They include: considering the environment in which the action takes place (involvement and support of stakeholders); learning environment; the personal information about the learners (employment of learner-centredness); their language needs (employment of needs analysis: NA); the positive involvement of the social environment and so on. Garrido and Fortanet (2010) classify stakeholders into internal, such as the decision makers and the policy makers; and, external, like teachers and students who are assigned roles in the system. In their view, future students, employers, insitutions, and even teachers not directly involved in CLIL programmes should be made to know and value CLIL. CLIL programme should be presented in such a way that will make for social acceptance. This, they further remark, entails that in addition to conducting needs analysis (NA) to get information

from the stakeholders, the internal participants should be informed of how the appropriate programmes could be of use to/for their institutions. They also note the importance of collaborative team teaching between subject or content teachers and language teachers no matter how difficult it is. Such an enterprise, however, must have the full institutional support and the design should suit local conditions. They propose a gradual implementation of such a programme in an institution, first as an experiment before its extension.

Sasidharan posits that in the CLIL approach, teachers should be trained to understand the system for effective performance and high productivity. For instance, language teachers should be made to know the types of texts used in each discipline, understand why a particular discipline-based text recommended for CLIL teaching is being taught, how to teach with such texts, and so on. As a result of this type of demand on teachers by various disciplines or professions, it is obvious that mere linguistic knowledge cannot suffice for teachers to perform effectively. It then becomes necessary that teachers should have knowledge of the genres used in a profession and the contexts of their use. In addition, it is noted that teachers need to possess lexico-grammatical, semantic-pragmatic and discourse resources of discipline-specialist language. The reason for these demands being made on teachers is that in European and other contexts where CLIL is practised, students are themselves required to produce a variety of genres in their future work places. However, as Sasidharan notes, these scholars agree that it is not possible to predict in the classroom all the relevant genres in CLIL. For this purpose, genre based instruction (GBI) became very essential. At the higher levels of education, CBLT is believed to develop more into genre-based approach to language teaching which is vital in language for academic and other specific purposes (see Long, 2005; Sasidharan, 2012 and others for details).

Though CBLT has challenges, like needing social acceptance, being highly cost intensive, time consuming and tedious for both language and content teachers, among others, it has a myriad of advantages. As an offshoot of CLT, it identifies the role of language learning as the ability of the learner to communicate. As well, it recognises the learner as a social person whose communication needs require performing different kinds of roles effectively at various contexts. Thus, CBLT is learner-centred. Consequently, it recognises learner voice in the teaching and learning enterprise and incorporates this entity through needs analysis (NA) to cater for learner needs and interests for greater effectiveness. It trains learners to meet up with the communicative roles in the right way in the real world contexts outside the classroom. Moreover, it is the backbone of LSP through the process of copious vocabulary development in the various disciplines, which is incorporated into the language component. To achieve this feat, CBLT necessitates collaborative teaching of every course by both content teachers, linguists and language teachers who work as a team to evolve the needed vocabulary in each field. No language develops without being used as the sole medium of instruction in all disciplines. Consequently, no nation develops without raising the status of her indigenous language(s) to that of medium/media of instruction at all levels of her educational system and for use at all social settings. Communicative methods, like, CBLT are trending in different parts of the world. In Africa, for instance, South Africa has been able to develop 11 of their indigenous languages as L2 to the extent that some of them, e.g., Swahili has developed up to computer-assisted language learning (CALL) (Kouame, 2002; Ndimande-Hlongwa, Mazibuko & Gordon, 2010).

In the Nigerian language teaching terrain, it is very obvious that Nigerian languages are still being taught mostly with traditional methods like grammar-translation and direct method. Grammar-translation method (GTM) is well known for grooming beginners because it allows the use of learners' L1 for explanation, questioning, etc. It teaches literacy skills of reading and writing and also uses contrastive analysis and translation techniques. Translation has grown into a discipline of its own right and is a very powerful tool for vocabulary and language development and in solving communication problems, e.g., bridging communication gaps between two or more languages. Various types of translation are highly utilised in all disciplines. In cross-religious practices, it has been a major pillar, e.g., translating the Bible into various world languages. For these and other advantages, GTM is still being used in many parts of the world today (Larsen-Freeman, 2008; Trinder, 2012). However, GTM principles and techniques are not very much in tune with modern trends: in the classroom, the teacher is the sole authority and initiator of all interactions; not much of student-teacher and student-student interaction; learners' feelings are not really considered; and, learners are said to have no voice; nor, are they effectively prepared for TL communication. Coming to the first oral-based language teaching method, the direct method (DM), its advantages include that it is said to be natural, conversational and direct because TL is the sole medium of instruction; it uses techniques like mime, gestures, imitation of correct TL pronunciation, dictation, etc. Nevertheless, it completely abhors use of learners' L1; like GTM, it does not recognise learners' feelings. Moreover, it is said to produce parrotlike speakers because learners do not comprehend much of what they say, and they fall short of the communicative roles outside the classroom. As such, it is also out of tune in current times. In comparing GTM and DM with CBLT, it is obvious that CBLT is more suited for developing Nigerian languages from LGP to LSP, which delivers the required results.

The negative attitude of the Nigerian government and their agencies towards Nigerian languages, is a big disappointment and so disheartening that positive-minded people no longer look up to them nor wait for them for the 'right policy' before undertaking meaningful developmental projects, linguistic or otherwise. For instance, it is well known that many people both Nigerians and non-Nigerians are individually and collectively doing a lot to develop Nigerian languages, like, Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba, which are being taught as L2 and/or FL within and outside Nigeria: in USA, China, etc. Most of these programmes never waited for the right government language policy, etc., to be put in place. Otherwise, they would never have taken off till date. The fact that a Nigerian language is already being successfully taught and learnt as L2 in several Nigerian tertiary institutions, is a further litmus test that waiting for 'right government policy' may be counter developmental. In terms of obstacles, no matter the type, the vision of establishing all Nigerian languages, particularly the major three for a start, as GS L1/L2 in the educational system is realisable. Positive attitude has already been established in this initiative and would be sustained because in the case of Igbo, many other tertiary institutions, e.g., Imo State University, are cuing in into the Igbo GS project. Similarly, with regard to vocabulary, a lot is already being done. Many scholars in different disciplines have privately started evolving Igbo terms in their own areas. Some organisations, like *Otu Sɔwakwa Igbo*, meaning, 'Please, start and keep speaking Igbo' (a pan-Igbo group that advocates the use of Igbo and founded by Prof. Peter Ejiofor), have been doing a lot. The church, for instance, the Catholic Church in Owerri Ecclesiastical Province, led by Archbishop Anthony John Valentine Chiedozie Obinna has been holding *Nkuzi*

Odenigbo ‘Odenigbo Lecture’ every first Saturday of September, and celebrated its Silver Jubilee in September, 2019.

These lectures, that last for about two hours, are delivered strictly in Igbo by erudite scholars from various disciplines of life, including, medicine, pharmacy, engineering, philosophy, theology, language and linguistics, culture, etc. What it takes to succeed in any good endeavour is having the radical leadership to take the right initiatives, shunning all distractions and detractors and boldly stepping towards the right directions, leaving dissidents behind. Usually, what ever problems that raise their heads at any point in time to clog the wheel of progress of such ventures are rightly addressed as they crop up. Such has been the right spirit in the success story of Odenigbo Lectures and the Igbo GS programme, which are making great waves currently with high prospects. It could be desirable to further strengthen the GS advocacy with a show of positive attitude, what more from Nigerian youth. Under this premise, a brief report is given below of a study showcasing positive attitude towards Nigerian languages by her government and people.

A report of positive attitude towards Nigerian languages: Igbo for General Studies

Nwankwere (in press) outlined various procedures that could be used to establish Nigerian languages as GS courses in Nigeria’s educational system through various needs based systems. However, Nwankwere (2019a) is an extensive study of the Basic Igbo (Igbo GS/L2) course of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka (UNIZIK) as an example of all Igbo GS courses in Nigerian tertiary institutions. The study investigated the first set of Igbo GS/L2 class consisting of 768 non-Igbo indigenous undergraduate regular students of UNIZIK from the 14 faculties in the university (School of General Studies, Non-Igbo Report, 2016). The learners did the Igbo GS/L2 course in the 2015/2016 academic session. These non-Igbo undergraduate learners of Igbo GS/L2 identified the needs they have for the Igbo language. The table below is a brief summary of Nwankwere’s (2019a) findings showcasing the stunning views expressed by the students which exhibit openness and positive attitude towards Nigeria’s indigenous languages like Igbo.

Table of excerpts of identified items of need for Igbo

SN	Items of need	SA	% SA	A	% A	D	% D	SD	% SD	TR	% TR	N R	%	TP	T%
1.	Because my country wants me to learn Igbo (as in National Policy on Education)	27	13.5	58	29	82	41	18	9	185	92.5	15	7.5	200	100
2.	Because my university wants me to learn and speak Igbo	72	36	89	44.5	28	14	5	2.5	194	97	6	3	200	100
3.	Because Igbo is one of the major Nigerian languages	73	36.5	68	34	41	20.5	6	3	188	94	12	6	200	100
4.	Because of cross-cultural relationships in Nigeria (NPE)	56	28	71	35.5	48	24	15	7.5	190	95	10	5	200	100
5.	To interact with Igbo people who abound everywhere in Nigeria and elsewhere	53	26.5	81	40.5	47	23.5	14	7	195	97.5	5	2.5	200	100

6.	To use Igbo with Igbo friends/people at school, in offices, etc.	53	26.5	81	40.5	47	23.5	5	2.5	186	93	14	7	200	100
7.	So I can also speak to Igbo people in Igbo in the villages and towns around	61	30.5	83	41.5	38	19	6	3	188	94	12	6	200	100
8.	To learn about Igbo people and understand them in a better way	56	28	78	39	46	23	10	5	190	95	10	5	200	100
9.	Because I enjoy learning Igbo to use it	42	21	66	33	63	31.5	15	7.5	186	93	14	7	200	100
10.	I wld like to learn some of my departmental, specialist courses in Igbo	10	5	32	16	104	52	40	20	186	93	14	7	200	100
11.	So I can sing and understand worship songs and 'choruses' in Igbo	49	24.5	78	39	56	28	7	3.5	190	95	10	5	200	100
12.	So I can understand films, TV, radio programmes in Igbo	34	17	85	42.5	61	30.5	10	5	190	95	10	5	200	100
13.	So I can read in Igbo, esp. books for Igbo GS/L2 and the Igbo GS/L2 exams.	54	27	76	38	51	25.5	5	2.5	186	93	14	7	200	100
14.	So I can write in Igbo, especially during Igbo GS/L2 lectures; and to Igbo friends	47	23.5	77	38.5	52	26	9	4.5	185	92.5	15	7.5	200	100
15.	So I can understand books written in Igbo, especially for Igbo GS/L2 and its exams.	50	25	80	40	47	23.5	8	4	185	92.5	15	7.5	200	100
16.	Learning vocab of dif Igbo contexts: e.g., using photo telling technique	56	28	86	43	40	20	8	4	190	95	10	5	200	100
17.	Pair work in/out of class: dialogues; reporting events seen/heard, etc.	36	18	78	39	52	26	20	10	186	93	14	7	200	100
18.	Listening to recordd, live radio/TV programs (esp, in Igbo) in/out of class, imitating	48	24	68	34	66	33	10	5	192	96	8	4	200	100
19.	Doing series of exercises in-class: language games role plays, etc., in Igbo	35	17.5	60	30	65	32.5	28	14	188	94	12	6	200	100
20.	Actively participating in developing relevant Igbo materials for class use	35	17.5	69	39.5	58	29	22	11	184	92	16	8	200	100
21.	I would like the Igbo GS/L2 to be expanded up to year two only	12	6	28	14	98	49	50	25	188	94	12	6	200	100
22.	I would like the Igbo GS/L2 to be extended up to year three only	4	2	21	10.5	110	55	55	27.5	190	95	10	5	200	100
23.	I would like Igbo GS extended up to final year and in my discipline	6	3	25	12.5	104	52	55	27.5	190	95	10	5	200	100
24.	Learning frm specialists discussing their dif areas in Igbo in/out of class	35	17.5	74	37	58	29	18	9	185	92.5	15	7.5	200	100
25.	I would like to write my final year project report in Igbo and English	6	3	29	14.5	104	52	51	25.5	190	95	10	5	200	100

26.	Attending traditional ceremonies & interacting (especially in Igbo)	42	21	76	38	50	25	18	9	186	93	14	7	200	100
27.	Attending dif functions by/for young people and interacting (esp in Igbo)	39	19.5	68	34	65	32.5	18	9	190	95	10	5	200	100
28.	So I can establish a good business in Igbo land and use Igbo profusely	29	14.5	50	25	82	41	25	12.5	186	93	14	7	200	100
29.	So I can marry an Igbo person & interact well in Igbo wt my spouse/kids	29	14.5	52	26	80	40	24	12	185	92.5	15	7.5	200	100
30.	So I can interact well in Igbo with my in-laws, associates, etc.	29	14.5	62	31	77	38.5	18	9	186	93	14	7	200	100
31.	*So I can get a good job after graduation: Igbo L2 teacher in Nigeria, USA, China, etc.	20	10	40	20	94	47	35	17.5	189	94.5	11	5.5	200	100
32.	*That I can be an artist, e.g., in Nollywood, AIT, etc., and act parts using Igbo	16	8	40	20	105	52.5	26	13	187	93.5	13	6.5	200	100
33.	*So I can get a better media job, be able to present shows, etc., in Igbo	15	7.5	45	22.5	98	49	31	15.5	189	94.5	11	5.5	200	100
34.	*So I can be an Igbo/English translator, lexicographer, etc., in my discipline	21	10.5	42	21	110	55	18	9	191	95.5	9	4.5	200	100
35.	*So I can be a writer and publisher, etc., of Igbo L2 materials in my discipline	13	6.5	41	20.5	100	50	31	15.5	185	92.5	15	7.5	200	100

(Curled from Nwankwere, 2019)

From the above table, showing excerpts from the quantitative results, in which the percentage of students who chose SA (strongly agree) and A (agree) are added up, about 50-70% of the non-Igbo students (items 1-4) are highly aware of NPE's language provisions and are happy to learn Igbo. Again, 50-70% of them (nos. 5-9) display integrative motivation about their learning Igbo; while over 50% of them (nos. 11-12; 26-27) want to attend social functions and to enjoy while learning Igbo. On the instrumental level, socially (nos. 28-30), not less than 40% of the learners want to settle down in Igbo land to work and even marry Igbo people and interact in Igbo with all Igbo associates. In terms of employment, in order to be Igbo L2 teachers (no. 31, 30%), movie actors (no. 32, 28%) and media practitioners (no. 33, 30%); as well as translators and interpreters (no. 34, 31%), writers and publishers (no. 35, 27%), and so on, in their own disciplines, 50-70% of them indicate interest in using modern techniques (e.g., items 13-20) to learn the basic skills and Igbo grammar to attain proficiency in Igbo. Most importantly, not less than 12% and up to 50% of these non-Igbo learners are very much interested in using Igbo from IGP to ISP as indicated in nos. 20-25. In fact, they freely and openly expressed themselves very well in ways that exhibit positive attitude, as is openly showcased in the qualitative data.

From the qualitative results, the students buttressed their stand made known through their choices in the closed section, and even mentioned areas that escaped the notice of the researcher. For instance, in terms of the course books used in Igbo GS, they identified the importance of texts for the non-Igbo learners which are not different from those for the

mainstream class (the Igbo GS L1 class for Igbo indigenes). For the benefit of non-Igbo students, they requested for profuse explanations in English, bilingual texts or incorporating translated versions of the texts in use. For the medium of teaching Igbo GS, while some non-Igbo students accepted the mixed code in Igbo and English (partial immersion) for lectures in the Igbo GS/L2 class and their end of semester examinations, others were comfortable with the Igbo medium used in examinations for both Igbo and non-Igbo students, and even suggested the use of only Igbo for classroom teaching (full immersion).

Furthermore, the non-Igbo students stated the need to implement and enforce NPE's language provisions from the lowest level of education to the highest. They recognised the importance of developing, through the GS programme, Nigerian languages like Igbo to full potentials from LGP to LSP like other world languages. As such, they expressed the need for more time, extra-mural classes, and so on, to enable learners learn and use the language effectively. They openly stressed their preferred ways of learning Igbo as using modern technology and language teaching techniques that incorporate enjoyment and/or entertainment, visits and attendance to cultural or traditional places and events, etc., and learning the vocabulary of these different Igbo contexts. So, they identified their need to perform communicative roles effectively in the real world outside the classroom. While condemning the poor attitude of some Igbo native speakers towards them, they commended the institution for giving them the opportunity to learn Igbo and suggested that other Nigerian languages should be established as GS/L1 and GS/L2 courses in the educational system. Some students further identified the need for content teaching, for instance, using Igbo partly in their disciplines for 2 years or more and writing their final year projects in Igbo and English. The foregoing clearly expresses the need to teach and learn Nigerian languages not just as general courses (GS) but fully as languages of schooling on both counts as is applicable for English, and of course other developed languages. A brief look is taken below into Nigeria's NPE and the L2 provisions therein.

The second language (L2) provisions of Nigeria's National Policy on Education

The FRN (2004), in its NPE provides for language of immediate community to be medium of instruction in school from pre-primary to primary three. Then, the FRN (2004), in its NPE and *Constitution* (FRN, 1999) chose Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba from about 450 distinct indigenous languages (Agbedo, 2007) to be taught in schools and used as regional and national official languages. The FRN's NPE provides some language clauses (NPE, 2004 edition: 10, Section 1, Para 10a; 12, Section 2: Para 14c; 15-16, Section 4: Para 19b and 19e; 19: Section 5, Para 24a, Group Av) in favour of teaching and learning each of Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba as L2 to school children in Nigeria from primary one to junior secondary levels of education (see *NPE*, 2004: 10, Section 1, Para 10a). These language provisions make it imperative for every educational institution in Nigeria, federal, state or private to teach at least one of Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba to their pupils as stated. As noted in Nwankwere (2019a), the expectation is that every child who passes through the primary and secondary educational levels in Nigeria should have some level of competence and performance in at least one of Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba, in addition to the child's first language (L1) and the language of his or her immediate community and English. This policy on the surface level implies heavy linguistic awareness in recognition and support of the multilingual nature of the nation.

According to Nwankwere (2019a), following from these official linguistic mandates, the teaching and learning of indigenous languages as L2 is expected to be blooming right from the pre-primary level of education to the junior secondary level and flowing into the senior secondary level, where L2 was only mentioned in passing (NPE, 2004: 21, 22, Section 5, 25c, Group Aiii and Group Cxvi), and then optimistically to the tertiary level that was never mentioned in the NPE. Unfortunately, due to negative attitudes towards indigenous languages, only very little implementation is reported in favour of the government schools. Whereas the private schools adamantly ignore the implementation of this all important provision. The poor implementation of NPE's language provisions at the lower levels, and their exclusion at the tertiary level is believed to have caused untold harm to national development, and is a clear indication of negative attitudes towards indigenous languages.

According to Nwadike (2004) cited in Olaoye (2013: 748), language "is the key to the heart of the people. If we lose the key, we lose the people. If we treasure the key and keep it safe, it will unlock the door to wealth or affluence, thus bringing about national development." Relegating indigenous languages has led to Nigeria's efforts at technological development being conceptualised and carried out in foreign languages, particularly English. This situation is a very limiting scenario that easily results in Nigeria's technological advancement being referred to as copy technology since foreign languages, like English, are the media of researches and discoveries, documentations, etc. Thus making such efforts exotic and lacking in originality so to say. This situation is contrary to what is obtainable in the case of some current well-to-do countries, e.g. China, which was formerly rated as a third world and an under-developed country along side Nigeria. Before or in addition to seeking knowledge of English currently, these former third world countries first of all made absolute use of their individual indigenous languages in looking inwards in their search for technological and economic advancement. All their efforts in research, their interpretations, discoveries, documentations, etc., were first made in their respective indigenous languages. This strategy among others strengthened and safeguarded their findings and exploits, etc., making them indigenous.

The strategy forced the world super powers like Europe and America, when they were attracted and developed interest to come into the picture, not only to learn these languages but to establish their own heavy weight industries in these countries. Lack of this manner of indigenusness and forth-rightness on the Nigerian government side has led to brain drain and robbed Nigeria of high level science and technological and economic advancement, because ground-breaking discoveries by Nigeria's gifted children are majorly made abroad and are ascribed to foreigners in whose languages they are formulated, interpreted, documented, etc. One good example of the scourge of brain drain to Nigeria and economic dwarfing, discussed in Nwankwere (2019bi and ii) is about the American-based Prof. Ekekwe, the founder of modern highly digitalised companies like Zenvus (Precision Agtech) for the most modern world class agricultural practices; Medcera (Health Tech) for the most ultra-modern and technology-based healthcare delivery system; and Fasmicro Group for modern macroeconomics and allied practices. All these world class systems would have been Nigerian-based all things being equal.

Negative attitudes towards indigenous languages

The negative attitudes meted against Nigerian languages can be said to emanate from and be propagated by the government and people of Nigeria themselves, and several authors have commented on the counter or anti developmental effects of this situation of things. On the side of the government, it has been noted that Nigeria has no language policy, whereas the language provisions as showcased in her NPE is a farce. Ogbonna (2010) enlists various criticisms against the government's NPE which represent official negative attitude towards Nigerian languages. Some of these criticisms against the government include that the policy being subtractive does not guarantee proficiency in either Nigerian languages or English; neither is the policy committed to the use of Nigerian languages in education. A pointer to this view is that the government failed to put in place measures to implement and/or enforce the use of mother tongue or language of the immediate environment as medium of instruction, particularly in privately owned schools, which were initially being patronised by only elite parents who preferred English. Today, such schools are being embraced by both the elite and non elite alike.

Adding his voice to this argument, Owolabi (2013) enlists several points on what he calls 'official attitude towards the use of African languages in the development process'. Owolabi identifies these negative attitudes of the government to include: the use of English by legislators in addressing their constituencies; likening the use/role of language in development to the use of English or French, the so-called languages of wider communication; using these foreign languages in training the youth in various fields of life; as well as using foreign languages in all official settings like the courts, hospitals, banks, governance and politicking, etc.

On the part of the citizens, modern parents, beginning with the elite class, loathe indigenous languages in preference to all foreign ones, English in particular. Nwankwere (2019bi and ii) decry this negative attitude. These parents abhor their children being spoken to what more being taught in/with indigenous languages (see also Nwankwere, Mmadike and Eme, 2017 on this issue). Such parents see everything foreign as original and worthy of acquisition and emulation, while taking indigenous languages and other things as nothing but fake, imitation, of poor quality, too local and never to be appreciated, admired, associated with nor owned.

Okunade (2010: 105-105), speaking in favour of developing more indigenous languages due to the natural multilingual status of the nation, agrees with the criticisms and states,

The unfortunate thing about these provisions in the NPE and the nation's constitution is that they are not being implemented adequately and added to this is the fact that the issue of a Nigerian child learning his language in addition to one of the three major ones (Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba) is just mere policy statement. Most Nigerian children cannot learn or learn in their languages because such languages have not been developed.

All these views and more showcase the negative attitudes meted against indigenous languages by Nigerian government and indigenes or citizens themselves. Worst of all, it has led to Nigerian children being denied the right to multilingualism or plurilingualism, a natural endowment, which incidentally is in vogue in modern times. This ugly scenario of negative

attitudes against indigenous languages caused a linguistic gap for the youth contrary to official projection on paper. As well, the trend has retarded the optimal growth and development of Nigerian languages in particular and that of the entire nation in general. As it stands, it cannot be said that Nigeria is close to realise her vision 20: 2020 in terms of being one of the top 20 global economies by the year 2020, even in the area of indigenous language promotion. Rather, contrary to projections, a worst case scenario is being experienced. This language need situation prompted the researcher to embark on this study. Following from the foregoing, it becomes necessary for the nation to fashion out reorientation programmes geared towards positive attitudes of Nigerian government and people towards the teaching, learning and use of indigenous languages, particularly beginning with the three indigenous languages already provided for in the country. Sequel to this need, it is therefore ripe for the nation to amend the language provisions of NPE and design a proper language policy, as well as provide course curricula contents for the teaching of indigenous languages as general courses, especially at the tertiary level of education, as is already the case of the Igbo language in a number of tertiary institutions in Igbo land.

Conclusion

Currently, monolingualism is no more in vogue. Ogbonna (2010) observes that in current times, irrespective of the fact that most of the developed countries are monolingual, they encourage their citizens to acquire skills in foreign languages (also, see Piri, 2001 and 2002 on this issue and the situation in Europe). These monolingual countries also go to any length, including heavy funding, to entice foreigners to learn their languages. This is true of America to the extent that the Public Affairs Section of the United States Embassy in Abuja, earlier in 2019 called for applications from young lecturers of English in Nigerian universities, who are also proficient in Nigerian languages, like Hausa and Yoruba, to be engaged in their Foreign Language Teaching Assistant (FLTA) programme, to teach in some American universities, colleges and schools while receiving training in teaching techniques. The reason they said is to foster intercultural relationships. If a world power like America would go to any length to encourage her citizens to be multilingual, what more Nigeria that is naturally endowed! This paper calls on the government, in their efforts to encourage Nigerian youth to imbibe foreign languages, to toe the line of encouraging the youth to be multilingual, particularly, in at least two indigenous languages in addition to the foreign languages. The paper thus agrees with Arohunmolase (2006: 130) as quoted below:

The Federal Government in Nigeria's policy on the teaching and learning of Yoruba L2 in Colleges of Education is to see that people in Nigeria live in unity and harmony as one indivisible, indissoluble, democratic, and sovereign nationals founded on the principles of freedom, equality, and justice with other ethnic groups.

The paper posits that this is the right spirit not just for Yoruba, but for all Nigerian languages. The paper further notes that this type of laudable declaration in the right direction, if imbibed by all Nigerians with the right frame of mind, will breed peace and promote national cohesion. Where there is peace, there is cohesion which implies unity and which breeds positive attitude and effective optimal linguistic and economic development.

This paper concludes with a statement that there are great economic benefits flowing into any and every country from language development. Again, by not developing her indigenous languages, Nigeria is experiencing colossal losses to the tune of billions in hard currency that should be harnessed and channelled to vital areas of national development. As a follow up to a notice of the British Council's release of the timetable of Professional and Linguistic Assessment Board (PLAB) examinations in Nigeria, the following post that was forwarded to the Nnamdi Azikiwe University Staff Community 2 Whatsapp wall on 30th November, 2019, by a staff named JudeKennedy, confirms the situation of things, which is a worrisome truth and a source of grave concern and serious food for thought for our great country and her rulers. This is just United Kingdom alone! What about America and other countries like France and their French, China and their Chinese, Germany and their German, etc., which are getting very hot and popular currently in many Nigerian educational and other organisations? The post is reproduced here to buttress the reason why world powers go to any length to 'sell' their languages, and why they suppress unwise countries like Nigeria from developing theirs. The post goes this way:

The UK makes 9 billion pounds annually from visa globally. It's a money spinning business. They make billions from other exams like IELTS, Cambridge etc. I once asked a British Council officer how much they rake out from Nigeria daily and she just laughed. You don't need IMF or World bank to milk the 3rd world. Just offer scholarships and employment opportunities. Let's assume 1000 apply every day and pay up to 300 to 500 pounds {sic}. That's about 50k {sic} pounds daily. You offer maybe 10 scholarships of 10 thousand pounds. The mathematics 50,000 x 240 days give {sic} you 12 million pounds. You give a scholarship of 100,000 pounds. Profit margin 11,900,000 pounds. Profit is close to 12,000 percent. What better business can this {sic} be? Charles Adisa

Recommendations

A few recommendations are made here.

- There is need for Nigerian government and people to establish at least Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba as GS/L1 and GS/L2 courses in all Nigerian schools, especially, tertiary institutions. This will serve as the foundation for developing indigenous languages for schooling in the country.
- The already established GS courses, i.e., Igbo GS, should be more learner-centred. This entails inculcating the needs of the learners in the programme by carrying out needs analyses on the courses as is required in the case of UNIZIK's Igbo GS/L2. Most importantly, there is need to implement the results and recommendations of needs analysis studies already carried out (for instance, Nwankwere, 2019a) and future ones.
- The existing Igbo GS courses still use the traditional approach to language teaching. Even the students identified the need to incorporate modern approaches of L2 pedagogy.
- The government, educational institutions and other insider stakeholders should be aware of the need and their responsibilities to design new GS courses and redesign old ones through officially sponsored learner-centred, needs-based indigenous general language courses. This step entails engaging applied linguists versed in the field of needs analysis and current language pedagogy to adopt standard practices in designing appropriate courses, textbooks and supplementary materials which will guarantee the production of all round learner effectiveness.

- The government, educational institutions and other insider stakeholders should be aware of the need and their responsibilities to employ needed staff and embark on training and retraining of staff in the appropriate L2 approaches for greater effectiveness. This need implies introducing learner-centredness backed by needs analysis processes in teacher education.
- vi, In like manner, government should provide adequate and modern infrastructure suitable for current L2 pedagogies to account for learner needs.
- In order for Nigerian languages as GS/L1 and GS/L2 to develop, they must move from LGP to LSP, which heavily depends on their being subjected to content-based teaching and learning leading to genre-based language teaching, which is exactly what the Council of Europe terms 'language(s) in other subjects'.
- All these imply the need for proper language policy in Nigeria.

References

- Agbedo, C. U. (2002). Normadic education in Igboland: A case for Igbo for specific purposes. *Nigerian Journal of Contemporary Language & Communication Studies*, 1(1), 127-140.
- Arohunmolase, Oyewole. (2006). Globalization and the problems and prospects of teaching and learning of Yoruba as a second language (L2) in colleges of education in Nigeria. In F. A. Olaoba & M. A. Pemberton (Eds.) (129-132). *Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Council of Europe Portal (n.d.). Languages of schooling – Council of Europe. Accessed on 27th November, 2019. Retrieved from: <https://www.coe.int> > language-policy.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*. Lagos: Government Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National policy on education*. Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Garrido, M. F. & Fortanet, G. I. (2010). Needs analysis in CLIL context: A transfer from ESP. *CLIL perspectives from the field*, Art. 23.
- Kouame, G. N. (2002). *The application of some second language teaching/learning principles in multimedia language design: A case study of a multimedia approach to an undergraduate course in Swahili*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2008). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP
- Long, M. (2005). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis. In M. H. Long (Ed.). *Second language needs analysis*, (pp. 19-76). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marsh, D. (1994). Bilingual education and content and language integrated learning. Paris: International Association for Cross-cultural Communication, Language Teaching in the Member States of the European Union (Lingua), University of Sorbonne.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL. Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Ndimande-Hlongwa, N., Mazibuko, G. & Gordon, M. (2010). The teaching and learning of isiZulu as a second language for professional purposes at the University of KwaZulu-Natal: A response to professional needs. *Alternation* 17(1), 138-164. Retrieved from IsiZulu-Ndimande-Hlongwa = alternation.ukzn.ac.za/docs/17.1/07%20Ndi%20FIN.pdf. Accessed on 13th February, 2014.

Nwankwere, A.U.N., Mmadike, B.I. & Eme, C.A. (2017). Safeguarding the Igbo language through teaching Igbo children in diaspora: Language maintenance perspective. In *Ogirishi – A New Journal of African Studies, 2017 Edition*: 166-186 Print and Online. Retrieved from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/og/article/download>. Accessed: 10-10-2017.

Nwankwere, A.U.N. (2019a). Needs analysis of undergraduate Basic Igbo in Nigerian tertiary institutions using Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria as example. A Ph.D thesis submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Nwankwere, A. U. N. (2019bi). Nnwogharị akụkọndụ ndị Igbo site n’aka ndị ntorobịa na asụsụ Igbo, a public lecture delivered at the 3rd Igboekulie national and state recognition/award for excellence in Igbo language to deserving students, teachers and schools as adjudged by WAEC, held at Girls’ Secondary School, Owerri, Imo State, on 23rd November, 2019.

Nwankwere, A. U. N. (2019bii). Changing the Igbo narrative through the Igbo language and the Youth, the English version of a public lecture delivered at the 3rd Igboekulie national and state recognition/award for excellence in Igbo language to deserving students, teachers and schools as adjudged by WAEC, held at Girls’ Secondary School, Owerri, Imo State, on 23rd November, 2019.

Nwankwere, A.U.N. (in press). Need for indigenous languages as General Courses in Nigeria’s educational system. In B.M. Mbah, C.U. Agbedo, C.O. Okeke, G.T. Okeke & C.C. Ezebube (Eds.): *Semantics and the Study of Languages, Linguistics, Literature and Culture. Ûgò Gbuzuo: A Festschrift in Honour of Prof. Gabriella Ihuarũgo Nwaozuzu*.

Ogbonna, S. O. (2010). Towards a maintenance-oriented bilingual education policy for Nigeria. O. Ndimele (Ed.) *Language policy, planning and management in Nigeria: A festschrift for Ben O. Elugbe* (361-372). Port Harcourt: M & J Grand Orbit Communication Ltd.

Okunade, S. K. (2010). Developing more indigenous Nigerian languages for sustainable development. O. Ndimele (Ed.) *Language policy, planning and management in Nigeria: A festschrift for Ben O. Elugbe* (103-110). Port Harcourt: M & J Grand Orbit Communication Ltd.

Ola-Busari, J. O. (2014). The state of English language teaching and learning in Nigeria and Namibia: Implications for national development. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Studies*, 3(4), 218-249.

Olaoye, A. A. (2013). Towards Vision 20-2020: The role of language and literature in national development. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 5: 748-753.

Owolabi, K. (2013). Using Africa’s indigenous languages as tools for sustainable development: A pragmatic approach. In O. Ndimele, M. Ahmad & H. M. Yakasai (Eds.) *Language, literature and culture in a multilingual society: A festschrift for Abubakar Rasheed* (5-32). Port Harcourt, Nigeria: M & J Grand Orbit Communications Ltd. & Emhai Press.

Piri, R. (2001). *Foreign language teaching policy in Finland: National and international context*. Finland: Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä.

Piri, R. (2002). *Teaching and learning less widely spoken languages in other countries*. Helsinki: The Ministry of Education.

Sasidharan, P. (2012). A needs based approach to teaching and learning of English for engineering purposes. Ph.D Thesis, National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, Orissa, India.

School of General Studies. (2016). SGS, non-Igbo report, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Accessed: 21st October, 2016. Retrieved from http://localhost/sgs_nau/nonigboreport.php.

Trinder, R. (Ed.) (2012). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. New Castle: Nyx Academics LLC.

UNESCO (2003). *Education in a multilingual world – UNESCO Education Position Paper*. Paris: UNESCO

West Virginia Department of Education (2013-2014). *WVABE Instructor Handbook*. West Virginia. Office of Adult Education and Workforce Development. Retrieved from [wvde.state.wv.us/abe/file-cabinet/Handbook//section 14.doc](http://wvde.state.wv.us/abe/file-cabinet/Handbook//section%2014.doc). Accessed 22nd May, 2014.