

**Standard versus Non-standard IsiZulu: A  
Comparative Study between Urban and Rural  
Learners' Performance and Attitude**

BY

CONSTANCE SAMUKELISIWE (SAMKE)

MAGAGULA

**Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree Master of Arts in the Linguistics  
Programme in the School of Language, Literature and  
Linguistics, University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College),  
Durban**

**Durban, January 2009**

(ii)

### **Abstract**

In this study, standard and non-standard isiZulu varieties are compared and contrasted. While standard isiZulu is proved to be treasured, it is not very well known or spoken among young urban and rural isiZulu speaking learners. The socio-historical development of isiZulu is examined in order to account for the dichotomy between ‘deep’ and ‘urban’ isiZulu. ‘*IsiZulu esijulile*’ [‘deep isiZulu’] and ‘*isiZulu sasedolobheni*’ [‘urban isiZulu’] are terms found useful to describe the differences. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the characteristics of standard and non-standard language in general and standard and non-standard isiZulu in particular are discussed. The empirical section of this thesis is based on a multi-method approach, that is, one hundred rural and urban learners are the participants of this study. This investigation suggests that the dichotomy between urban and rural varieties is not as stark as initially proposed (Mesthrie, 2002).

(ii)

## DECLARATION

I declare that **Standard versus Non-standard IsiZulu: A Comparative Study between Urban and Rural Learners' Performance and Attitude** is my own work and that all sources I have used have been acknowledged by means of references.

---

C.S. MAGAGULA

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to convey my sincere gratitude to the following people who contributed a lot towards the successful completion of this study:

1. God the almighty for His protection and providence throughout this study.
2. My supervisor, Dr S. Rudwick for her commitment and dedication during the supervision of my work. She even sacrificed her Christmas holidays for the sake of my study.
3. Prof. J. Zeller, programme director, School of Language, Literature and Linguistics, University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College), for his support in the completion of this study.
4. Secondary school learners at KwaMakhutha, UMkhumbi, UMlokothwa and Prince Silwane High schools who allowed me to interview them and analyze their essays.
5. My late father, Titus Makhosikhosi Magagula, who sent me to Roman Catholic boarding schools while I was still at primary school. That helped me to gain a better basic education and motivated me to further my education to this point.
6. My mother, Lena, for her moral support

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Abstract	ii
Declaration	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
 <b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Background to the study	1
1.2 Reasons for choosing the topic	3
1.3 Research questions and broader issues to be investigated	7
1.4 Structure of dissertation	8
 <b>CHAPTER 2: HISTORY OF ISIZULU AND ITS DEVELOPMENT INTO A STANDARD LANGUAGE</b>	
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Shakan period	10
2.3 Colonial period	10
2.4 Apartheid period	16
2.5 Post-apartheid period	19
2.6 Conclusion	20
 <b>CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FOUNDATION DEALING WITH STANDARD VERSUS NON-STANDARD LANGUAGE</b>	
3.1 Introduction	22
3.2 Standard language	23
3.2.1 Characteristics of a standard language	24
3.2.2 Standardization process	25
3.2.3 Prescription	26
3.2.4 Limitations of a standard language	27

3.3	Non-standard language	28
3.3.1	Urbanization	28
3.3.2	Social class	29
3.3.3	Gender	29
3.3.4	Age	29
3.4	Standard versus non-standard isiZulu	30
3.5	Lexical borrowing	34
3.5.1	English impact on the isiZulu lexicon	35
3.5.2	Afrikaans influence on the isiZulu lexicon	36
3.6	Language status and attitude	37
3.7	Conclusion	39
<b>CHAPTER 4: DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>		
4.1	Introduction	40
4.2	Selecting speakers	40
	Learner sample	40
4.3	Phases of the research	42
4.3.1	Pilot study	42
4.3.2	Instrumentation	42
4.4	Data analysis	45
4.5	Conclusion	45
<b>CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA</b>		
5.1	Introduction	46
5.2	Analysis and discussion of data collected from learners	46
5.2.1	Lexical items used by learners in their essays	46
5.2.2	Learners' responses to interviews	51
5.3	Conclusion	80
<b>CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>		
		82
		85

## LIST OF TABLES

5.1	Non-standard lexical items used by urban secondary school learners in their essays	49
5.2	Non-standard lexical items used by rural secondary school learners in their essays	49
5.3	Frequency distribution according to gender of the respondents	52
5.4	Frequency distribution according to ages of the respondents	52
5.5	Frequency distribution according to locality of the respondents	53
5.6	Frequency distribution according to mother-tongue of the respondents	53
5.7	Words frequently used by learners in the respondents' schools	54
5.8	The respondents' views about the use of the words ' <i>yamampela</i> ' and ' <i>ngikhonzela</i> '	55
5.9	The respondents' views whether they like or do not like talking 'deep isiZulu	57
5.10	The type of isiZulu frequently used at the respondents' schools	59
5.11	Learners' views about the type of isiZulu used at their homes	60
5.12	Learners' views about the type of isiZulu they prefer to have as the medium of instruction: 'deep' or 'urban' isiZulu	62
5.13	The respondents' views whether 'deep isiZulu' should continue to be learnt in schools	63
5.14	The respondents' perceptions whether 'urban isiZulu' destroys Zulu culture	64
5.15	The respondents' views on whether it is possible or not for 'deep isiZulu' to be kept pure	65
5.16	The respondents' rating of their performance in isiZulu at their schools	67
5.17	The respondents' rating of their proficiency in written isiZulu	68
5.18	Respondents' feelings about the development of the list of new isiZulu words	70
5.19	The language most frequently spoken in the respondents' schools	71
5.20	IsiZulu words for English words provided by the respondents	73
5.21	Borrowed words used by learners when telling a story on how they spent their weekend	76
5.22	The number of learners who selected isiZulu or English to answer interview questions	79

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>Appendix 1:</b> Interviews questions for secondary school learners	96
<b>Appendix 2:</b> Assessment criteria for learners' essays	103
<b>Appendix 3:</b> Learners' responses on open-ended parts of interviews questions	104



## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 3.1:</b> Lexical differences between standard and non-standard isiZulu	33
<b>Figure 3.2:</b> Some English loans in isiZulu accepted for standard isiZulu	36
<b>Figure 3.3:</b> Some Afrikaans loans in isiZulu accepted for standard isiZulu	37

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

In South Africa, it has been proposed by the members of the Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) that indigenous languages such as isiZulu should be used as one of the media of instruction in educational institutions, including universities in South Africa (Webb, Deumert and Lepota, 2005: 156). The promotion of isiZulu as a medium of instruction requires research on the language. Standard isiZulu is referred to by Zulu people as '*isiZulu esijulile*', meaning 'deep' or 'proper' isiZulu and it is the variety which is closest to the one spoken in rural areas of KwaZulu-Natal. All other dialects of isiZulu are frequently seen as 'bad' or 'incorrect' forms of isiZulu by most isiZulu language practitioners, isiZulu scholars and gatekeepers of the standard. Non-standard isiZulu varieties are spoken particularly in urban and township areas and are referred to as '*isiZulu sasedolobheni*', that is, 'urban isiZulu'.

It needs to be mentioned that the standardization of isiZulu was based on the influence of missionaries rather than the typically western emergence of standard languages through urbanization and the prestige accruing from the economic, social and political status of certain groups of speakers (Mesthrie, 2002: 16). This raises the question whether standardization "via the mission presses, sermons and nineteenth-century dictionaries may have taken place too early to be effective as a norm representing black social and political aspirations" (Mesthrie, 2002: 16). Language is not only a formal system of rules governing speech sounds, words, and structures, but also relates closely to the society that uses it. In this thesis, I am concerned mainly with linguistic performance which refers to what speakers 'do' with their language which is affected by factors such as social conditions, place of origin, education, amongst others (Chomsky, 1965). Prescriptive or purist scholars propose that the only variety which would count as 'proper' language is a standard language, that is, the language for formal writing as used in books (Hudson, 1980: 32 and Webb, 2005: 39). Standard forms exclude popular and wide spread forms of

speech which are used daily by members of the speech community in a wide range of communicative domains (Deumert, 2005: 28). The following factors, which applied to isiZulu, correspond most closely with dialectal differences:

*Regional differences:*

Lexical variation is frequently related to geography (Singleton, 2000). As already mentioned, Zulu people in rural KwaZulu-Natal are considered by urban people to speak ‘deeper’ isiZulu (i.e. closer to the standard) than Zulu urbanites. Mesthrie (2002: 204) and Martin (1996: 48) both argue that the standard varieties of African languages are associated with the rural areas, which are no longer centres of prestige. Similarly, Deumert (2005: 28) argues that “the standard forms of African languages are linguistically the closest to the rural varieties, while the non-standard varieties, on the other hand, embody the modernity and relative affluence of the urban centres”. Due to the high exposure to English and Afrikaans, urban varieties of isiZulu include a great amount of lexical borrowing from these languages.

*Social class differences:*

The linguistic reflection of class differences is strongest in the cities and weakest in the rural areas and small towns (Fanaroff and Du Plessis, 1972: 12). In the case of isiZulu, social class differences strongly correlate with regional differences. Mesthrie (2002: 204) rightly points out that upper- to middle-class black society are more likely to live in urban areas, where non-standard urban varieties of African languages are used. ‘Township’ or ‘urban isiZulu’ varieties generally incorporate extensive English lexical borrowings and code-switching. The middle- upper class black society in cities tends not to speak ‘deep isiZulu’ but uses more English borrowing than the lower class.

*Age-group differences:*

Although it has been argued that the youth respects isiZulu greatly as the language of their ancestors, present day township language is the so-called Tsotsitaal, that is, the variety made up of a mixture of isiZulu, English and Afrikaans words which is far removed from the standard (Zungu, 2004: 45). While there are few older people, that is,

50+ years old, who are also Tsotsitaal speakers, it is safe to say that the majority of isiZulu-speakers older than 55 years of age speak a ‘deeper’ variety of isiZulu whereas the younger generations predominantly speak other more ‘modern’ varieties of isiZulu.

It is evident from the above that regional, social, and age factors play an important role in language variation. From this background and perspective a comparative study between urban and rural learners’ performance in standard isiZulu is a worthwhile undertaking. One main objective of my thesis is to interrogate whether what is currently taught as standard isiZulu is ‘alien’ to the learners in urban and rural areas. I will also examine in how far they indeed differ in learning their own mother tongue at school and in their attitudes about the language.

## **1.2 REASONS FOR CHOOSING THE TOPIC**

In light of the fact that isiZulu is not only one of South Africa’s official languages but also the most widely spoken one in the country, there is an obvious need for more systematic linguistic research, both formal and sociolinguistic. Compared to English and Afrikaans, there is still a paucity of linguistic research on isiZulu and its numerous varieties. Language policy makers need to take cognizance of the three afore-mentioned factors, namely regional, social class and age group differences when revising the ‘standard’ of a particular language. This should be done especially by the Department of African languages which runs the two PanSALB – funded projects aimed at developing African languages as media of instruction at tertiary institutions (Webb, Deumert and Lepota, 2005: 156). The first project, facilitated by Prof. Rachele Gauton, concerns the development of African languages as media of instruction at tertiary institutions and the second project, managed by Dr Elisabe Taljard and Prof. Rachele Gauton, is the compilation of standardized terminology of basic chemistry terms in Northern Sotho and isiZulu (Webb, Deumert and Lepota, 2005: 156-157). This thesis ultimately raises some questions regarding a potential re-standardization of isiZulu.

The standard language, being codified and perpetuated by the education system, tends to be regarded by the language conservatives as the only correct variety (Poole, 1999: 111). In other words, 'language' is regarded as a 'static' means of communication. However, every single language in the world is in transition and needs to be developed in order to incorporate terms for new or borrowed technological concepts and material items. Hence, some sociolinguistic scholars, like the team of ten translators led by Prof. Rachel Gauton, are currently concerned with coining new words in the language in order for new concepts or material items to be incorporated into isiZulu (Webb, Deumert and Lepota, 2005: 157).

Many isiZulu scholars find it difficult to accept the increasing usage of English lexical borrowings. From my own experience as an isiZulu speaker, the general attitude among most isiZulu-speakers is a rather prescriptive one. Prescriptivism depends on an ideology which requires that in language use, things should be done in the 'right' and most 'purist' way (Milroy and Milroy, 1985: 1). Many speakers of a language and speakers of isiZulu in particular, have a number of decided opinions about what is correct or incorrect in the language they use. Prescriptivism is an extremely sensitive and even emotive issue for many Zulu people and has for many years found expression. Recently Xala (2006: 9), for instance, complained about the usage of the word '*ukwethula*' [take off from the head or introduce], emphasizing that the word must be used properly according to all the principles of that terminology. He claims that there are people who use the word inappropriately to have the same meaning as the word '*susa*' or '*gudluza*' [remove]. According to him '*ukwethula*' goes together with '*beka*' [put]. He further states that a newly born baby, a guest and a bride could be introduced to the family members or people gathered in order to be part of them. In this case, according to him, the word '*ukwethula*' [unload or introduce] is suitable to be used. Shoyisa (2006: 4) and Madlala (2006: 4) disagree about the usage of the word '*khonzela*' [(pass (my) regards to)]. Madlala argues that it is not properly used in its current form, claiming that it is not appropriate to say '*khonzela*' if you are not sent by somebody to pass regards to the person. According to him, one should say: '*khonza*' [passing regards to]. Shoyisa, in contrast, claims that '*khonzela*' is indeed 'correct' isiZulu. Furthermore, the Zulu King,

Zwelithini Goodwill, has complained about the usage of the word ‘*Yamampela*’ [the real thing] which he says constitutes ‘improper’ usage of the Zulu language, as it should be ‘*Yangempela*’ (Mofokeng, 2005).

In the context of the above concerns, I have in my capacity as an isiZulu educator experienced specific problems arising from the discrepancy between ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’ and ‘*isiZulu sasedolobheni*’ in recent years. ‘Deep’ or ‘proper’ (standard) isiZulu is highly problematic to many of the Zulu learners in secondary schools, in particular those in urban areas. Many learners battle with both ‘deep’ isiZulu grammar and lexicon and perform extraordinarily badly in the subject. In addition, urban learners mix non-standard language with standard language in their spoken usage as well as in their formal written work. The frequent usage of English lexical borrowings combined with certain changes such as prefixal and suffixal interferences are extremely common. Lexical examples of these are: *iclinic* instead of *umtholampilo* [Clinic], *i-Inglishi* instead of *isiNgisi* [English], *igeythi* instead of *isango* [gate], *ipermission* instead of *imvume* [permission], *ilayicensi* instead of *imvume yokushayela* [licence]. Furthermore, there are numerous ‘modern’ isiZulu terms coined by the youths. Koopman (1994) argues that isiZulu-speaking boys and girls have their own collection of isiZulu words, such as *imakhroyayter* [microlight] and *iseksofone* [saxophone]. “The ‘modernizers’ draw on the native word stock of their own language by means of adding prefixes and suffixes to existing words” (Deumert, 2005: 21).

According to the statistics of the Department of Education (2005), 80% of secondary school learners who are mother-tongue isiZulu speakers in KwaZulu-Natal are not performing well in isiZulu. The reason for that is mainly because a high number of lexical items of ‘deep isiZulu’ are completely alien to them. Of course, one needs to acknowledge that various factors are responsible for the poor achievement of some school children. Amongst them are: lack of exposure to ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’, poor motivation of students, the linguistic or cultural mismatch between home and school, the socio-economic situation of the individual and other factors. The detailed examination of these factors is beyond the scope of this work. This thesis interrogates primarily whether

what is currently taught in schools as standard isiZulu is ‘alien’ to the learners and to what extent they actually have to ‘acquire’ their own mother tongue.

The type of isiZulu used in schools is not the variety of isiZulu most learners are accustomed to. As a result of their not fully understanding the lessons, many learners achieve poor results in isiZulu. As has recently been argued, “the common perception that standard varieties are ‘pure’ and other varieties are ‘impure’ or ‘improper’ provides a basis for discrimination which can have serious consequences for learners’ performance in schools, so that the standard language becomes an obstacle to educational development” (Webb, 2005: 39). Many linguists conclude that a negative attitude towards non-standard speech and bilingualism is more decisive in determining school outcomes than actual linguistic differences (Romaine, 1994: 194).

The above discussion raises questions regarding ‘language purity’. It is clear that “as members of a multilingual society we freely borrow from the languages around us, and this is true of all South Africans” (Koopman, 1994: 13). There is no doubt that English and less so Afrikaans, has had a great influence on isiZulu (Koopman, 1994: 32). Deumert (2005: 22) makes reference to Madiba (2001: 74) who recommends borrowing from English and argues that it is a time-honoured strategy due to the lack of indigenous words to express new foreign concepts. This thesis explores, among other things, whether learners in both urban and rural areas welcome lexical borrowings from English and Afrikaans.

Zungu (1995), one of the few isiZulu researchers in the field, focused on isiZulu variation but did not pay much attention to the standard versus non-standard dichotomy. Webb, Deumert and Lepota (2005) looked at the standardization of African languages in South Africa, in general. The current small-scale study will focus on examining how learners perform in ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’ and how they perceive this ‘standard’ variety of the language. Clearly, the scope of this study, and the size of the empirical sample to be used, will be far too small to provide sufficient evidence to justify an informed position from which to propose a re-standardization of isiZulu. However, this small-scale study will

present some preliminary data on learners' performance and perceptions of '*isiZulu esijulile*' in the Zulu community. This should trigger further and more substantial interrogation of the topic. As an isiZulu educator, I am personally interested in finding out how learners perform in standard isiZulu exams and how they perceive the standard form of the language. I will examine whether there are indicators that suggest that the curriculum could be revised to address the needs of secondary school learners more adequately.

### **1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND BROADER ISSUES TO BE INVESTIGATED**

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

- How do isiZulu learners in the rural area of *Nongoma* perform in comparison to (KwaMakhutha) township learners in the *eThekweni* region?
- What are learners' attitudes towards standard ('deep') isiZulu, that is, *isiZulu esijulile*?
- How do learners feel about the lexical development and coining of new isiZulu terminology in order to incorporate new technological concepts?
- Do learners support the use of 'modern' isiZulu terms such as, for instance, the word '*yamampela*'?
- Do learners support lexical borrowings from other languages, e.g. from Afrikaans and English and what implications does this have?
- What further research can contribute to the ongoing endeavour of the revision of the so-called 'standard isiZulu' in order to more adequately address the needs of contemporary Zulu society?

As mentioned before, several isiZulu-speakers have expressed concern about isiZulu becoming more and more 'impure' (Xala, 2006: 9, Madlala, 2006: 4; Mofokeng, 2005). In response to this concern, the current study seeks to examine learners' perceptions of these concerns and to investigate how far lexical rules of '*isiZulu esijulile*' are observed



by isiZulu-speakers (that is, learners) in secondary schools. It will, therefore, examine whether learners do make use of ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’ lexical items or not and whether they also share ‘purist’ concerns. The performance of learners in isiZulu will be investigated in order to find out how proficient learners are in written ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’. This is a crucial question which needs to be addressed in light of the fact that ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’ may be the future variety employed as a medium of instruction at all educational levels (Webb, Deumert and Lepota, 2005: 156).

“Lexical borrowing takes place when two or more different cultural groups and linguistic groups come into contact with each other” (Higa, 1979: 278) and it is thus not surprising that in the multicultural, multilingual *eThekweni* area ‘*isiZulu sasedolobheni*’ contains extensive English borrowing. Although the rural-urban dichotomy in South Africa is frequently referred to in sociolinguistic investigations, there is still paucity of detailed case-studies addressing particular sociolinguistic phenomena, especially those involving indigenous African languages. It is imperative to reach some kind of estimation of current standard isiZulu utility in the educational domain. In the light of the proposed implementation of isiZulu as a medium of instruction at all educational levels, it is pertinent to determine which variety of isiZulu would be the most appropriate to use. Hence, the examination of lexical divergence between ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’ and ‘*isiZulu sasedolobheni*’ is imperative. The study further seeks to explore learners’ attitude towards the ‘standard’ variety and towards lexical borrowings from other languages, so it will also offer some tentative findings regarding the social and cultural status of the current ‘standard’ in isiZulu.

#### **1.4 STRUCTURE OF DISSERTATION**

The dissertation is made up of six chapters. After this introductory chapter, Chapter Two presents the history of isiZulu and its development into a standard language. In Chapter Three, the theoretical backbone of this study, I present a review of literature on standard and non-standard language in relation to isiZulu and examine the dichotomy of prescriptivism versus descriptivism. I relate this literature review to my discussion of the

history of isiZulu and make the distinction between standard and non-standard isiZulu. Subsequently, I discuss theoretical models of linguistic variation and explore lexical borrowings from English and Afrikaans. Chapter Four identifies the research methodology used in the study. A brief explanation of the reasons for the choice of interviews and written texts is presented. I also discuss the method of sampling and analysis. In Chapter Five I present and discuss the data that was gathered for this study. The written data collected from one hundred learner participants will be categorized into common themes. Then, learners' perceptions on and attitudes towards standard isiZulu will be presented. Chapter Six, the last chapter, presents concluding statements on the basis of the findings of the research presented in Chapter Three and in the light of the literature which has been reviewed. Finally some tentative recommendations are made based on the findings.

In the next chapter I will present the history of isiZulu and its development into a standard language. The historical background covers the period from 1816 to the post-apartheid era.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **HISTORY OF ISIZULU AND ITS DEVELOPMENT INTO A STANDARD LANGUAGE**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

People have different opinions about the origin of isiZulu. In this chapter I will look at the history of isiZulu because any analysis of language and language varieties becomes inseparable from the socio-histories which underpinned them (Makoni, Smitherman, Ball and Spears, 2003). I will start off examining the Shakan period and progress into the colonial, apartheid and post-apartheid periods.

#### **2.2 SHAKAN PERIOD**

Historically, the Zulu people belong to the Ntungwa group of people. Zulus were descended from the Ntungwa who were in turn descended from the 'pure' Ngunis and classed as 'Lala' (Postma, 1985: 12). The Zulu nation was born during the reign of Shaka who ruled the Zulu kingdom from 1816 or 1818 to 1828 (Colan, 1988: 6, 7 and Kubeka, 1979: 2). Zulu is King Shaka's surname after the personal name of his grandfather, Zulu, the son of Malandela of the abaNtungwa- Nguni people (Sikhosana, 1997: 8). During his reign, Shaka imposed his own language, isiZulu, on conquered tribes and isiZulu, the language of the Zulus, became a unifying language (Sikhosana, 1997: 8). The conquered person or tribe would not continue to speak their own dialect in front of Shaka (Zungu, 2004: 37). Owing to the Shaka disturbances, isiZulu dialects are found far and wide on the African continent. For example, Ngoni in Nyasaland and Tanganyika, Ndebele in Southern Rhodesia and Transvaal Ndebele all have isiZulu roots.

#### **2.3 COLONIAL PERIOD**

During the colonial period, that is 1830 – 1947, European missionaries did remarkable work in isiZulu. They pioneered its orthography and its development into a standard

language. Inanda is one of the oldest mission stations in KwaZulu-Natal where isiZulu was studied with Rev. Abraham who translated the Bible into isiZulu. During the early nineteenth century there were no alphabets or written isiZulu characters which meant that missionaries began their studies with great difficulty and without reference books (Hance, 1916: 30). In 1836 Dr Wilson and his group came to Natal from Pretoria with a small printing press and started schools for old and young. During that time, Hance (1916: 30) claimed that isiZulu was a pure language, untainted by the languages of other nations who had settled in the area. However, this argument is doubtful since the missionaries who had worked on isiZulu were not isiZulu native speakers. The work of those early missionaries resulted in the publication of grammar leaflets, dictionaries, school cards, part of the Testament, Psalms and hymn books written in isiZulu. Scripture extracts in isiZulu appeared in 1846, having been prepared by the missionary, Newton Adams, (Herbert, 1993: 51). During 1847 J.W. Appleyard, a Wesleyan missionary, contributed a series of articles on South African languages to the *Christian Watchman*, a missionary magazine, in which he attempted a classification of isiZulu and other South African dialects (Doke, 1954: 12). These articles were based on Lewis Grant's paper on isiZulu and other dialects of Southern Africa which he completed in 1847 and which was published in America in 1849. In 1847 Dohne joined the American Board mission in Natal, stationed at Table Mountain. He assisted in translating the Bible into isiZulu and was also asked to prepare a dictionary. His project was sponsored by Sir George Grey and the work was published in 1857 (Herbert, 1993: 50 – 51). Dohne's work deserved praise and approval and must have served as a valuable source for the later isiZulu lexicography. Another two early American missionaries in Natal, James C. Bryant and Lewis Grout, in Natal stand out for their work on the isiZulu language (Herbert, 1993: 46). In 1848 Bryant arranged nouns into twelve classes and his paper was published in 1849 (Herbert, 1993: 47 and Poulos, 1981: 1). Bryant also prepared an elementary arithmetic book in isiZulu (Doke and Cole, 1961: 40 – 41).

In 1850, Hans P.S. Schreuder, Bishop of the Norwegian mission, numbered the noun-class forms 1-13, differentiating singular from plural (9-13) (Herbert, 1993: 49). In the same year a Zulu-English phrase book was published by Rev. C.W. Posselt of the Berlin

Missionary Society, and the Psalms were translated into isiZulu by Bishop Colenso, also appeared in that year (Herbert, 1993: 51). In that same year, J.W. Appleyard produced a book on isiZulu with Natal dialects, classifying the South African dialects under click class and alliteral class. He also classified isiZulu according to eight noun classes, bracketing singular and plural and establishing an order of classes which was used in subsequent grammar books (Doke and Cole, 1961: 38 and Doke, 1954: 12 and 15). That classification differed from Schreuder's classification of thirteen noun classes in that same year (Doke, 1954: 15). In 1851 Bryant prepared an elementary arithmetic book in isiZulu and translated a fourth part of the Psalms into isiZulu. In 1852 Grout wrote a paper on the phonology and orthography of isiZulu dialects in Southern Africa.

In the 1850s the missionary work was exercised over orthography reforms, and the American Zulu Mission had set up a committee on uniform orthography on which Grout served (Herbert, 1993: 48). His essays were an analysis of the fundamental isiZulu sounds with a proposal for an improvement in writing. James Perrin prepared an isiZulu-English dictionary of the Zulus in Natal and it was published in 1855. By 1854 Bishop John William Colenso and Theophilus Shepstone, an official responsible for Native Affairs in Durban, championed for policies which recognized aspects of African customs, procedures and structures of power in a colonial situation (Guy, 2001: 18). Colenso published an isiZulu grammar, Zulu-English dictionary and readers in 1855, 1859, 1860 and 1861 (Guy, 2001: 19 and Herbert, 1993: 51). He also translated the New Testament and parts of the Old Testament into isiZulu and he prepared school readers. Bishop Colenso's elementary isiZulu grammar books appeared in 1859, and were followed by subsequent isiZulu writers. He was therefore the outstanding figure in Zulu literary work at that period. During the 19<sup>th</sup> Century Roman Catholic writers shared a more enlightened approach than the Protestant missionaries in terms of the treatment of isiZulu grammar. By 1855 a dictionary consisting of 6 000 isiZulu words appeared. Dohne's isiZulu Dictionary appeared in 1857. All the words were arranged under the root or stem letter. That dictionary, as Herbert asserts, was still of value to students of isiZulu in 1993. In 1856 Colenso started a school, *Ekukanyeni*, at which he taught nineteen African boys, mostly the sons of Chiefs and Izindunas, at his home at Bishopstowe in Pietermaritzburg

(Brookes and Webb, 1955: 106). The nineteen boys taught by Bishop Colenso increased to thirty-three in 1857 and forty-two in 1859 and he devoted himself to the study of the Zulu language (Brookes and Webb, 1955: 106 and Doke and Cole, 1961: 43). He began to teach isiZulu to his own missionary party on their voyage from England in 1853 – 1854. Less than three months after his second arrival in Natal, he advertised a Zulu-English dictionary for sale in the colonial press as well as a Zulu grammar book and a translation of St. Matthew's Gospel (Brookes and Webb, 1962: 106). In the first seven years of his episcopate he translated the whole New Testament and the books of Genesis, Exodus and 1 and 11 Samuel in the Old Testament. He also published a Zulu liturgy, a tract on the Decalogue and Zulu readers in Geography, Geology, History and Astronomy as well as sundry grammar books and general readers. In 1859 Lewis published a book on isiZulu grammar, dealing mostly with isiZulu standard alphabets. He collected a great number of idiomatic sentences. In 1859 Grout, having read a paper before the American Oriental Society in New York on the phonology and orthography of isiZulu and kindred dialects in Southern Africa in 1852, printed his great work on isiZulu grammar at the mission press (Doke, 1954: 5). A large part of the introduction to this work deals with the Lepsius 'Standard Alphabet' which the mission had at that time decided to adopt. Grout boldly supported this which entailed the introduction of ten new symbols into the isiZulu alphabet.

Moreover, in 1860 and 1861 Colenso's isiZulu literary work which dealt with isiZulu grammar was published (Herbert, 1993: 51). In 1860 he also designed a short word-division which is practically identical to what has been decided on in the latest (1993) orthography settlement as correct for isiZulu. Colenso's orthography too, set the form used as the basis of the 1906 decisions on what is regarded as a correct isiZulu and this book was declared by isiZulu speakers as one of the four best examples of the 'purest' isiZulu. The book was still used in 1940 as an examination 'set book' in isiZulu. In 1861 Colenso's isiZulu-English dictionary of 10 000 isiZulu words was published (Herbert, 1993). Newton Adams completed the translation of the New Testament into isiZulu in 1865 and the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua which were published in 1862 were a direct result of Colenso's (assisted by a catechist, William Ngidi) translation of the book

of Genesis into isiZulu (Brookes and Webb, 1962: 106). “In the Education Act of 1865, English was made the medium of instruction in all first and second class schools” (Hartshorne, 1992: 190). At Springvale Mission Bishop H. Callaway printed two outstanding books: *Nursery Tales, Traditions and Histories of the Zulus in 1866 -1888* and *the Religious System of AmaZulu in 1870* (Doke, 1954: 18).

Furthermore, in 1883 the Inanda mission succeeded in publishing the complete Zulu Bible in which the vocabulary of isiZulu contained more than twice as many words used by peasants of England at the time (Hance, 1916: 30). During his preaching on the subject ‘The Good Shepherd’ Dr Adams had spent much time and effort to get the best and most of his knowledge of isiZulu into that address. IsiZulu was introduced into Natal African schools in 1885 (Hartshorne, 1992: 19). After the Zulu Civil War (1890 – 1920) isiZulu was the dominant language of agriculture, therefore, white farmers had to learn isiZulu because their labourers were Zulus who could only understand instructions in their own language (Lambert and Morrel, 1996). Familiarity with the Zulu language spread through the use of nicknames given to white boys and men by the labourers, through the retention of Zulu place names and through the appropriation of English words into Zulu language (Lambert and Morrel, 1996). A second edition of Lewis' isiZulu work appeared in 1893.

During the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century various orthography settlements in isiZulu culminated in the findings of the Durban Conference of 1907 (Doke, 1954: 15). With the formation of the Union Government Advisory Committee on Bantu Studies and Research, a central orthography Committee was set up to take charge of the question of reforms in various orthographies (Doke, 1954). According to Doke (1954: 18), for many years the best dictionary of Southern Bantu language was A.T. Bryant's isiZulu-English Dictionary of 1905 in which entries are made under the stem and not under the prefixes as is the case in so many other dictionaries. However, in 1954 it went out of print. Entry by stem has obvious advantages in isiZulu and this method had been followed by J.L. Dohne in his isiZulu-Kafir Dictionary which was published in 1857 and that of B.W. Vilakazi and

C.M. Doke which was published in 1948 (Doke, 1954). In 1910 Meinhof wrote a popular book as an introduction to African languages (Herbert, 1993: 90).

In addition to the above work on isiZulu, the language tradition established in the African mission schools in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century continued in the black African schools in 1925 (Webb, 2002: 29). In 1926 C.M. Doke published the phonetics of the Zulu language, a descriptive study developed from Professor Carl Meinhof's 1924 dissertation on the phonetics of the Zulu language. Individual intensive tone-analyses appeared in C.M. Doke's phonetics of the isiZulu language in 1926 (Doke, 1954: 16, 17, 18).

The earliest isiZulu grammatical works had a medieval approach, based upon Latin grammar, and it is only in recent studies that a serious attempt has been made to find a truly isiZulu mode for grammatical work. Doke tried out this new approach in his *Text Book of isiZulu Grammar* in 1927. In 1922 A.R. Kempe and H.K. Leisegang published an isiZulu grammar book which did not meet with the success it really deserved (Doke, 1954: 18). W. Wanger then published a Catholic isiZulu book of terminology in 1927 and he also made a number of extremely speculative attempts to prove the connexion on lexicographical basis, between isiZulu and Sumerian. In Southern Rhodesia after a survey undertaken by C.M. Doke in 1929, an orthography for the Shona language was approved by the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures was adopted by the Government in 1931 (Doke, 1954: 16). These attempts have meant that the search for vernacular terminology has been undertaken in several areas by native educators. A comprehensive list of such terms was agreed upon in Natal for isiZulu and was published in 1939 (Doke, 1954). In Natal the black African child's mother-tongue was catered for by making the study of isiZulu compulsory as a school subject for all "native" children, whether or not their mother-tongue was isiZulu (Webb, 2002: 29).

In 1930 Meinhof's book on African languages which contained illustrative and annotated texts in isiZulu was published (Herbert, 1993: 90). It was not until the publication of the second edition of Doke's *Text book of isiZulu Grammar* in 1931 that two of the four Nguni languages, one of which is isiZulu and the other isiXhosa (excluding isiSwati and



isiNdebele), reverted again to a common class-numbering this time based, as far as possible, upon the order adopted by Meinhof for comparative work (Doke, 1954: 15). Meinhof and other comparative workers separate singulars from plurals, keeping them as close together in order as possible. Later, with the formation of the Inter-University Committee for African Studies, the functions of the Central Orthography Committee were continued, and work was carried out through sub-committees. In 1937 Doke's African linguistic terminology containing mainly a descriptive and critical dictionary of terms used in African linguistics was published. The most detailed isiZulu-English dictionary to date, that of B.W. Vilakazi, was published in 1948. It is a 900 page double-column book (Doke, 1954: 18) and it is still used today as a guideline.

## **2.4 APARTHEID PERIOD**

From the outset of his episcopate, it was clear that Bishop Colenso considered his teaching at his missionary, *Ekukanyeni* school, where he provided an education to African boys, especially the sons of chiefs and izindunas in 1856 to be an important part of his missionary work (Doke and Cole, 1961: 3). The African National Congress (ANC) documents such as the Freedom Charter, the Constitutional Guidelines and the proceedings of the ANC language workshops which were held in Harare, seem to reflect the dilemma which has existed in most of Africa since the 1960's (Doke and Cole, 1961). The dilemma was that there was the need for a language of national unity which was usually English, but at the same time there was the need to free the majority of inhabitants from the languages that were part of earlier imperialist political system by developing African languages (Extra and Maartens, 2004: 33). From the fourth decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century right into the 20<sup>th</sup> Century the indigenous languages began to be studied in increasing numbers. The period commencing in 1830 and continuing through to the 1960's, became a period of intensive monograph study of the indigenous languages, a period in which almost all the research and recording was done by missionaries (Doke and Cole, 1961: 3). However, in 1961 South Africa became a Republic under the leadership of Dr H.F. Verwoed and during and subsequent to his years, the rights of the African language speakers were disregarded (Webb, 2002: 31).

It becomes clear from the above discussion that African languages were initially standardized by missionaries. This in itself had a variety of consequences, three of which are the following:

- Learners began schooling through the medium of mother-tongue.
- There was the recommendation that mother-tongue instruction be extended to eight years.
- IsiZulu became one of the subjects at schools and universities.

The South African government created language committees called 'Language Boards' from the late 1950's to manage the development of the orthography of indigenous languages and to create technical terms (Extra and Maartens, 2004: 29, 30-32). The central Bantu Language Board and its subsidiary committees were established, headed by Afrikaners. In 1977 this Board was replaced by autonomous Language Boards for each of the languages and were handed over to native language speakers (Extra and Maartens, 2004: 32-34). However, these Language Boards still worked indirectly under the auspices of the Publications Control Board with its many machineries of censorship of writing in general. The aims of these Language Boards were, inter alia, to standardize the languages, prescribe books for schools, to work with publishers to accept or reject manuscripts for publication and to make orthographic rules. In 1975 some white schools introduced African languages to their curricula (Extra and Maartens, 2004). African learners in the apartheid years had to begin their schooling through the medium of the mother-tongue (Webb, 2002: 30). The function of mother-tongue education principle in black African education was seen as a way of denying black African children access to English which was the language of prestige and the *lingua franca* of South Africa (Webb, 2002). It is also an international language with wider communication implications than any of the indigenous languages (Webb, 2002).

1975 was the first year in which the public primary school leaving examination, which also governed admission to the secondary school, was to be taken at the end of Standard 5 instead of Standard 6 (Hartshorne, 1992: 201-202). An important fact was that for

Black school learners, the primary school leaving examination had to be written in either English or Afrikaans when they had had only one year's experience of using the dual medium approach, after changing from vernacular medium of instruction at the end of Standard 4. It was this policy that resulted in the 1976 Sowetan Riots. The situation was as follows:

The government decided to maintain the policy of dual-medium instruction from Grade 7 upwards. This meant that the public examination at the end of Grade 7 had to be written in English and Afrikaans instead of in the mother-tongue. When it became clear in 1975 that this policy was to be rigorously enforced, protests erupted. The boycotts, strikes and violence that started in higher primary schools (Grades 5-7) lasted throughout 1975 and spread to secondary schools in May 1976. It took the now infamous Sowetan uprising on 16 June 1976 for the Ministry to capitulate to the demands for a single medium of instruction. Within two years, 96% of African pupils were receiving their secondary schooling through the medium of English. (Extra and Maartens, 2004: 32).

The Bantu Act of 1979, as Extra and Maartens (2004: 32-34) emphasize, finally reduced mother-tongue instruction to the first four years of school only, to be followed by instruction through the medium of English. However, the De Lange Report (1981) which recommended that mother-tongue instruction should take place for the entire 12 years of schooling, was implemented by the Department of Education and Training (DET) in 1982 (Extra and Maartens, 2004). The situation in KwaZulu-Natal was slightly different: the learner's mother-tongue was to be used for the first six years, that is, up to and including Standard 4. This was to be followed by instruction through the medium of English only (Hartshorne, 1992: 193). This policy remained in place until 1985 (Hartshorne, 1992: 193).

Further, Extra and Maartens (2004: 34) state that between 1990 and 1993 the political and constitutional rights of the various African languages as opposed to Afrikaans and English, were negotiated. The need for a *lingua franca*, the choice of the languages to be used as media of instruction and as subjects at schools, and the role of English as a linkage language was also negotiated. The National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) (1992) and the ANC have taken a *laissez-faire* position by making a policy-decision on African languages but ignoring the necessity of formulating attendant

planning strategies through which to implement the policy-decision. Extra and Maartens (2004: 34) even say that Curricula Model for Education in South Africa (CUMSA) proposed that not more than two languages should be compulsory. One of those languages should be the medium of instruction (Extra and Maartens, 2004: 34).

## 2.5 POST-APARTHEID PERIOD

In 1994 the Government of National Unity came to power (the first-ever democratically elected South African government). The 1993 Interim Constitution Clause 3 states:

Afrikaans, English, isiNdebele, Sesotho sa Leboa, Sesotho, siSwati, Xitsonga, Setswana, Tshivenda, isiXhosa and isiZulu shall be the official languages at national level, and conditions shall be created for their development and for the promotion of their equal use and enjoyment.” (The Constitution of the Republic of Africa, 1996: 4–5).

But the curricula for isiZulu were imposed in a top-down fashion and no isiZulu speaking superintendents were employed by the KwaZulu-Natal National Education Department to inspect every subject in every school (Zungu, 2004: 40). According to Zungu (2004) a mother-tongue subject or language advisor was unthinkable. In 1990 was Mr S.S. Nhlumayo appointed as a mother-tongue speaking subject advisor of isiZulu in KwaZulu-Natal and in 1996 three new isiZulu subject advisors were appointed in KwaZulu-Natal. Zungu also says that the situation was aggravated by the shortage of relevant contemporary literature in African languages. According to McDermott (2004: 117) it is still being debated whether indigenous languages like isiZulu should adopt the Afrikaans language movement route and whether the mother-tongue speakers of these languages should take up the fight and commit themselves to the battle for equal rights for their respective languages.

One can conclude that, although historically Afrikaans and English were dominant languages, African language speakers fought against Afrikaans. This led the National Party to install a mainly English system of education from about 1977 onwards. This proves that English was preferred to other languages, even during the apartheid era and serves as an indicator that it might not be easy to change people’s perceptions that

English is the best language and must dominate the country. However, Webb (2002: 91, 103) argues that one of the features of a multilingual language policy must be to reflect the spirit of multilingualism, and English might not be the only language of official use. Governments and legislatures at all levels, state bodies (at provincial levels and local levels of government) and parastatal boards and commissions must employ any additional language other than English in official functions and state employees will have to promote the use of those languages. The democratization of the country implies the transformation of the state administration into an institution in which Bantu languages will have one of the dominant roles. Interestingly, since 2002, some schools in Soweto and Diepkloof have re-installed isiZulu as a language of instruction in the first three years after a decade long English only policy (Lafon, 2005: 136). However, Zungu (2004: 39–40) argues that although isiZulu now has the same official status as Afrikaans or English in terms of the Constitution, it is not functioning effectively as an official language, due to the fact that it is not sufficiently represented in education, industry or government.

Taking the above facts into consideration, one can conclude that from colonial times until today's democratic era, indigenous languages, that is, African languages such as isiZulu, have never been socio-politically valued, treasured or considered important. This was largely because of the people who were and who are in power. It is only recently that the democratic rulers have begun proposing that African languages be promoted and treated equally.

## **2.6 CONCLUSION**

This chapter has focused on the socio-historical development of isiZulu which served as a platform from which to reflect on the standard versus non-standard varieties in the educational setting. It laid the foundation for standard and non-standard isiZulu to be discussed in the next chapter. King Shaka and the missionaries such as Lewis Grant, James Bryant, Lewis Grout and John William Colenso were the pioneers of the written form of isiZulu. They contributed a lot to its development and to its present status. At the level of the village school and the missionaries' evangelizing and pastoral work, many

missionaries began to feel the need to be able to communicate in African languages. It must be remembered that in nearly all the African languages, the existence of Bible translations, grammars, dictionaries and the first school text books in the nineteenth century was thanks to the efforts of European missionaries or of their successors.

It had also been highlighted in this chapter that schooling in South Africa has revolved around the relative positions and status of English, Afrikaans and the African languages. The decisions on African languages policies have seldom been taken by those who use African languages in their everyday life. Ironically, when policy decisions were taken about languages, the users of those languages were not consulted. Nor were the broader community considered. The decisions were taken for and not by those most closely involved. Only since the late 1970s, after the 1976 Sowetan Riots, have African voices had any influence on the decisions taken about the languages in their schooling system.

In the next chapter I will present a review of literature of standard and non-standard language in relation to isiZulu. The literature in the next chapter outlines the theoretical framework upon which I have based this study.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THEORETICAL FOUNDATION DEALING WITH STANDARD VERSUS NON-STANDARD LANGUAGE

#### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to review some selected literature on standard and non-standard isiZulu. IsiZulu speakers do not seem to be using the same variety of isiZulu as taught in schools. While there is always a difference between spoken and written language usage – the dichotomy between common spoken isiZulu and standard isiZulu as taught in schools, is more profound. Ndlovu (2005: 4), an Inanda resident, complained that pure isiZulu is disappearing. According to him isiZulu ‘impurism’ is caused inter alia by the radio station uKhozi FM. He also blames Zulu leaders and Zulu people in high positions for ignoring the disappearance of ‘pure’ isiZulu. He even quoted words which are commonly used by Zulus that are not ‘pure’ isiZulu but are taken from other languages such as isiXhosa. He mentioned words such as ‘*umongo*’ [gist] instead of ‘*umnyombo*’; ‘*iphepethwe*’ [wiped off] instead of ‘*ipheshethwe*’; ‘*isabise*’ [intimidated] instead of ‘*usatshiswe*’ and ‘*ligibelwe*’ [being ridden] instead of ‘*ligitshelwe*’.

Nevertheless, one of the most important facts about language is that it is continuously changing. Everyone knows that languages have changed throughout the course of history. It is easy to see from a distance in time that there are differences between the isiZulu used in the era of Shaka Zulu and present-day isiZulu, but it can also be shown from close at hand that language is continuing to change in the present just as it did in the past. Old varieties are changing and new varieties are springing up. Pronunciations are changing, new words and word forms are being adopted and old ones adapted to new uses. Sometimes change is fast, and sometimes it is slow, and at any given time some linguistic structures are changing while others remain stable. Indeed, change seems to be inherent in the nature of language and there is no such thing as stable human language. It is also true that at any given time a language is variable. Languages are never uniform entities. They vary geographically and socially, and according to the situational contexts in which

they are used, hence languages or dialects are variable and in a state of change (Milroy, 1992: 1).

However, all languages are important for the knowledge that they embody as expressions of life experiences and for the people who speak them. They are vehicles for storing and repeating a society's knowledge as well as purveyors of culture (Makoni, Smitherman, Ball and Spears, 2003: 86). This means that people should have sufficient knowledge of their language and be concerned that it is developed. In my professional life, I am aware of how problematic standard isiZulu is to the learners in secondary schools.

### **3.2 STANDARD LANGUAGE**

South Africa has eleven official languages, each of which has its own lexicon and grammar. The status of the standard variety of a language is usually provided by the education system (Jahr and Janicki, 1995: 30). This view is endorsed by Mackey and Ornstein (1979: 337) when they argue that standard language is learned largely through formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes. It is the prestige that is associated with more standardized varieties that sets a standard language apart (Poole, 1999: 111, 112 and Hudson, 1980: 32). However, standard forms of any language are social constructs, that is, they are created by the dominant community members in the society in which the language is used (Wilson and Henry, 1998: 5 and Webb and Sure, 2000: 18.). According to Poole (1999), a standard language is linguistically just another dialect. Its origins are usually as humble as those other dialects. However, socially and politically it has been elevated, put on a pedestal as the supreme variety. The standard form of a language is based on the speech of the educated elite. The development of a standard is influenced by a great variety of complex factors. Mobility and the professions are some factors which tend to further the usage or non-usage of the standard language. Such factors tend to affect urban areas rather than rural areas. The standard language is promoted above all others and counts as a 'proper' language, in isiZulu, '*ulimi lwangempela*' or '*isiZulu esijulile*', and all other dialects are 'bad' forms of the language (Stockwell, 2002: 5). Yet, according to Romaine (1994: 84), standard



languages are created by conscious and deliberate planning in society in order to remove variation and establish only one linguistic system to serve as the uniform one for a group. However, standard isiZulu was created by the ‘chance’ actions of the missionaries. Hudson (1980: 33), Stockwell (2002: 14) and Milroy and Milroy (1985: 27) state that the notion of ‘standard language’ will have passed through four stages in the process of standardization, namely: selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance. The standard language is the one used in dictionaries, grammar books and hand books and these documents are regarded as authorities on ‘correct’ usage of the language.

### **3.2.1 Characteristics of a standard language**

Poole (1999: 111) identifies the following characteristics of a standard language:

- It has been selected from among the varieties of the language.
- It has been codified and it is suitable for use as an official language and written and teaching medium.
- It has been accepted by the influential members of the community.
- As it is codified, it serves as a literary language as it is perpetuated by the education system.
- It tends to be used by conservative community members.
- It can be used as a yardstick for assessing a person’s correctness.

From the above characteristics of a standard language, it becomes clear that the standard language, which before was just a dialect (that is, a non-standard variety), constitutes the linguistic repertoire of the community where it is used. It has been accepted by that community as a superordinate variety, irrespective of the vernaculars which individuals may use at home.

### 3.2.2 Standardization process

Language standardization is the process by which an authoritative language body, such as a government-appointed body, prescribes how a language should be written: that is, its orthography, how its sounds should be pronounced, how its words should be spelt, which words are acceptable in formal situations and what the appropriate grammatical constructions of the language are (Webb and Sure, 2000: 18). Standardization often establishes itself in urban centres and then spreads from them into the surrounding areas (Poole, 1999: 112). According to Stockwell (2002: 5), Milroy and Milroy (1999: 1-3) and Hudson (1980: 33) a standard language should have passed through the following four stages in the process of standardization:

- (a) **Selection.** A particular variety is selected above others as the one to be developed into a standard language. It may be an existing variety, such as the one used in an important political or commercial centre, but it could be a blend of various varieties. The choice is a matter of great social and political importance as the chosen variety necessarily gains prestige and so the people who already speak it, share in this prestige.
- (b) **Codification.** Some agency such as an academy must have written dictionaries and grammar books to 'fix' and regulate the variety. Therefore the variety is largely codified through the education system and standardization depends on the existence of a written form of a language (Romaine, 1994: 84, 86).
- (c) **Elaboration of function.** The variety must increase in terms of the functions and range of uses of the code. It must be used in all the functions associated with central government and with writing, for example, in parliament and law courts, in bureaucratic educational and scientific documents of all kinds, and of course in various forms of literature. Therefore, technical words should be added to the variety and it is also necessary to develop new conventions for using existing forms in formulating examination questions and how to write formal letters. However, this is not the case for isiZulu which is still undeveloped and lacks technical terms.
- (d) **Acceptance.** The variety should be accepted by the relevant population at large as the variety that the community regard as the 'standard' form. Once this has happened, the

standard language serves as a strong unifying force for a state as a symbol of its independence of other states and a marker of its difference from other states. However, in South Africa there is one national language, namely English.

### 3.2.3 Prescription

Prescription depends on an ideology or set of beliefs that in language use, things shall be done in the 'right' way (Milroy and Milroy, 1999: 1). 'Prescriptivism', therefore, is any approach which attempts to lay down the rules of correctness in terms of how a particular language should be used (Crystal, 1985). Prescriptive grammarians and language purists usually consider the dialect used for literature or printed documents and the one taught in the schools as the only 'correct' form of a language (Fromkin and Rodman, 1988: 260-263). However, the purist approach to language is questioned in this thesis, in particular because a multilingual society such as the one found in South Africa, is characterized by enormous ethnic, cultural and linguistic mixing which makes 'pure' forms of any language a sheer impossibility. Different language speakers come into contact with and influence each others' languages. As a result of this contact, they develop different language varieties. Changes in a language can be said to fall into two areas, namely a general realignment to reflect aspects of social and technological evolution and a local realignment in contact with other languages (Stockwell, 2002: 53). There are varieties which differ from standard isiZulu in terms of lexicon but they remain intelligible (Maphumulo, 2005: 82). The language variety has evolved lexically with the entry of borrowed words and phonically with the new sounds such as *eklubini* [in the club] and *rayithi* [right] (Lafon, 2005: 133). All these forms of innovative terms are still intelligible to isiZulu speakers. However, the flip side of the coin is that even if we accept that all varieties are linguistically 'equal' we still have to address the issue of standardization. You understand a term but you still know that in certain situations it is not the appropriate term. There needs to be a linguistic awareness about situationally appropriate linguistic behaviour and lexical choice. This should, however, not be done along the traditional divide of 'rural' and 'urban' isiZulu.

### 3.2.4 Limitations of a standard language

Language is a much more complex phenomenon than such things as table manners (Milroy and Milroy, 1999: 1-2). Therefore, the process of language standardization involves the suppression of optional variability in language and as a consequence, non-standard varieties can be observed to permit more variability than standard ones. According to Hudson (1980: 114) “speech is social, the rules or skills for using it are for the most part learned from others, in just the same way that linguistic items are learned”.

In modern day urban South Africa new linguistic boundaries are being set up and there seem to be the growing conflict between urban and rural varieties of the same language (Webb, 2002: 73). As a result “the standard dialects inhibit many of the low-level, variable processes of phonetic conditioning that characterize spoken language and that underlie regular phonological change” (Chambers, 1995: 232). Moreover, the democratization process in South Africa has presented language planners with a considerable challenge, namely the fact that many speakers of the major languages are alienated in varying degrees from the standard varieties, so that the latter are instruments of elitism and discrimination (Webb, 2002: 92). One can say that standardization is an idea in the mind rather than a reality (Siachitema, 1986: 202). This argument is due to the fact that linguistics is regarded by linguists as a descriptive discipline rather than a prescriptive one (Milroy and Milroy, 1985: 5 and Milroy and Milroy, 1999: 4). Prescription is therefore not a central part of the linguistic discipline (Milroy and Milroy, 1999: 4, 6). One may agree with Milroy and Milroy (1999) who stress that there is no such thing as good or bad, correct or incorrect, grammatical or ungrammatical language usage. It has been argued that purist notions of language ignore language variation and militate against the view that language is situated socially (Bex, 1996: 71). The expression of new meaning requires the introduction of new grammatical forms, new lexical items and new ways of linking sentences (Bex, 1996: 72). I argue, together with descriptivist scholars such as Crystal (1985), Fromkin and Rodman (1988), Chambers, Trudgill and Chilling-Estes (2004) and Milroy and Milroy (1999) (to mention but a few) that one dialect is neither better nor worse than another, nor poorer nor more or less

‘correct’. As long as it exhibits systematic linguistic properties, it is simply different. Any judgments, therefore, as to the superiority or inferiority of a particular dialect are merely social judgments, not linguistic ones (Crystal, 1985).

### **3.3 NON-STANDARD LANGUAGE**

A non-standard or dialect refers to a language associated with a regionally, or socially defined group of people (Makoni et al., 2003: 84). According to Wilson and Henry (1998: 14) differences found in a non-standard language variety have equivalents within the standard grammar. This means that non-standard variants are embedded within structurally equivalent grammars: standard and non-standard varieties are therefore merely dialects of the same language. The non-standard isiZulu variety, even if grammatically different or innovative, is still intelligible to isiZulu speakers. Linguistic diversity not only endures, but prevails. However, non-standard accents and other forms of linguistic diversity would be counter-productive in a society with a great deal of mobility (Chambers, 1995: 212, 230). On one hand, every language is flexible enough to admit new elements to enhance its efficiency (Webb and Sure, 2000: 66) and on the other hand its speakers often resist the newly formed terms. City non-standard varieties are a result of social developments such as industrialization, urbanization, geography, age, gender/sex, register, mode, tenor, style, diglossia and social class (education, occupation and income). One of these examples for isiZulu is *isiTsotsi* [Tsotsitaal].

#### **3.3.1 Urbanization**

Urbanites do not have adequate opportunities to always use native languages spoken in their original rural homes (Webb and Sure, 2000: 89). This situation applies to isiZulu speakers both in townships and urban areas. IsiZulu in urban areas shares the linguistic scene with other languages such as English and Afrikaans. This argument is supported by Poole (1999: 113) when he claims that city-dwellers may speak a language differently compared to those who live in the surrounding rural areas. As a result city-dwellers develop their own variety which is then regarded as the ‘urban variety’, that is, for

isiZulu '*ulimi lwasedolobheni*'. It is very difficult in urban areas to easily draw lines on the map, that is, isoglosses, to separate one form and speech community from another. This is due to migration and industrialization which tend to mix family origins (Stockwell, 2002: 6).

### **3.3.2 Social class**

Social classes have certain varieties of speech which they use. The middle-upper class black African society tends to use more English borrowing than the lower class. This may be because in their everyday lives they come into contact with more English.

### **3.3.3 Gender**

There is a connection between patterns of social stratification and gender (Romaine, 1994: 79). Women tend to use higher-status variants more frequently than men. Women of each social class group use the more standard variants more often than men of equal status (Romaine, 1994: 79). Many studies have shown that women generally use forms which are more closely to those of the standard language than do men of the same social background and age (Poole, 1999: 113). However, from my experience in the case of isiZulu, women tend to use more English borrowing than men. This is due to the fact that women want to be regarded as urban and fashionable more than men do.

### **3.3.4 Age**

The youngest speakers of a language (between the ages of 7 and 16) in Sweden, for instance, use more standard forms than the young adults between the ages of 16 and 20 (Romaine, 1994: 80). 78% of adults use standard language compared to only 15.7% of young adults (Romaine, 1994: 81). Young township men aged 25 and below use Tsotsitaal, that is, in isiZulu '*isiTsotsi*', when they are gathered together because they are influenced by 'township fever' and peer pressure which causes them to speak Tsotsitaal and 'urban' varieties of their language (Zungu, 1995: 29).

I will now look at the standard and non-standard isiZulu in order to determine how far it meets the above discussed characteristics of a standard and non-standard language.

### 3.4 STANDARD ISIZULU VERSUS NON-STANDARD ISIZULU

It has been said in Chapter One that standard isiZulu is the dialect which is normally used in printed books and newspapers. It is the dialect used in the education system and it is the dialect found in dictionaries such as *'Isichazamazwi'* [Words Explainer] (Nyembezi, 1992), *'Inqolobane'* [Thatched house for keeping food such as mealies and pumpkins] (Nyembezi, 1956), -a book explaining isiZulu words, idiomatic expressions, culture and customs and grammar as well as books such as *'Injula nokujiya kwesiZulu'* [Depth and Beauty of IsiZulu] (Shange, 1953), *'Izikhali Zabafundi Nabaqeqeshi'* [Learners' and Educators' Weapons] (Nkosi and Msomi, 1992) and *'izinwadi zohlelo'* [language books]. According to Mathonsi (1994: 7) standard isiZulu refers to the official language of the Zulu nation as supported by the isiZulu Language Board and employed by isiZulu writers. In other words it is *'isiZulu esijulile'* ['deep isiZulu']. There is a broad perception that standard isiZulu reflects the variety spoken in rural Zululand, which forms the basis of school isiZulu and refers to the traditional culture in terms of idioms and cultural contents (Lafon, 2005: 134). That is why non-standard isiZulu is referred to as *'isiZulu esintengayo'* [weak isiZulu] and it is regarded as *'isiZulu sasedolobheni'* ['urban isiZulu']. Non-standard varieties are used by urbanites who tend to be weak in 'deep isiZulu' because their language is influenced by the multicultural and multilingual societies in which they grow up. Urbanites do not know 'deep isiZulu' because of the influence of multicultural and multilingual societies. It is isiZulu gatekeepers who believe that there is a 'right' way of using isiZulu, although they themselves do not necessarily use the 'correct' forms in their own speech. Newspapers, on one hand, promote a consciousness of the standard and on the other hand maintain their position, that is, there is the use of non-standard varieties in newspapers.

The standardization of isiZulu has been in progress for many centuries as has been discussed in Chapter Two. The process of isiZulu normalization can trace a gradual

progression towards uniformity in written isiZulu. IsiZulu that was initially spoken in rural Northern KwaZulu-Natal areas was selected and codified as the standard for all isiZulu speakers, irrespective of their origin (Lafon, 2005: 134). This form of isiZulu is the basis of school isiZulu. People such as early missionaries, namely Bryant and Bishop Colenso, early writers namely Doke and Nyembezi have written isiZulu dictionaries and grammar books which serve as the sources of prescriptions. However, those available isiZulu dictionaries often lack proper lexicographical planning (Prinsloo, 1998: 239). This results in Webb and Sure's (2000: 46) argument that the African languages such as isiZulu are far less standardized, codified and technicalized than European languages such as English and Afrikaans. It must be remembered that during and since the colonial period isiZulu has not been used in legal or administrative functions. English rather than isiZulu was used and was the predominant language of learning until today. Only Christian missionaries used indigenous languages such as isiZulu for the spread of the gospel (Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998).

Recent proposals like that of the Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, reflect consciousness of the need for indigenous languages such as isiZulu to be used to a greater extent of functions, and elaboration of functions involves elaboration of vocabulary. IsiZulu gatekeepers such as Xala (2006) and Mofekeng (2005) have also complained about the 'incorrect' usage of the language. These complaints are symptoms of the movement towards establishing isiZulu rather than English as one of the media of instruction in South Africa. We know that isiZulu is a first language or mother-tongue of the Zulus and English is the language of education and power as well as an instrument of social mobility and international status. This point is endorsed by Webb (2002: 91) when he argues that there seems to be a degree of language-internal conflict, particularly in the sense that the standard varieties of indigenous languages such as isiZulu do not seem to be generally accepted and used in formal contexts.

I have mentioned in Section 3.2 that the chief linguistic characteristic of standardization is the suppression of linguistic variation at all levels of language in pronunciation, spelling and lexicon. This is aimed at preventing or inhibiting linguistic change. It must



be borne in mind that a speaker may use different synonymous lexical items depending on his or her style of communication. Speech registers used by isiZulu speakers are the ‘*hlonipha*’ language, that is, language of respect and ‘*isiTsotsi*’ [Tsotsitaal] is used by teenagers living in urban areas. Marked differences seem to exist between the lexicons of social groups within a specific speech community. In the case of isiZulu, a clear distinction can be made between the lexicons of speakers living in more traditional rural environments and those living in urban areas. These differences probably result from contact with speakers of other languages in urban areas as well as extensive contact with the Western culture and its concepts. The lexical difference between standard isiZulu, that is, ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’ and ‘*isiTsotsi*’ are so marked that a person who is not a member of the youth feels left out when a conversation between members using either one is going on. Nevertheless, one might, for instance, be able to say that ‘urban isiZulu’, ‘deep isiZulu’ and Tsotsitaal are related varieties of the same language. By building a tree structure on top of these varieties, one can show that ‘rural isiZulu’ is lexically and structurally most closely related to ‘urban isiZulu’. Hence, the varieties of isiZulu can be categorized along a dialect continuum which ranges from the very ‘deep’ isiZulu variety to the urban mixed code Tsotsitaal.

Standard isiZulu uses lexical items such as:

- *isikhahlamezi*                    [fax]
- *ingculazi*                        [Aids]

The above-mentioned words are not frequently used by isiZulu speakers. Instead, non-standard varieties indicated below are more commonly used by isiZulu speakers, regardless of the fact that non-standard dialects have less prestige than standard language constructions as mentioned before (Trudgill, 1994: 5). Non-standard isiZulu uses lexical items such as:

- *ifax*                                [fax]
- *i-Aids*                                [Aids]

The above are English lexical borrowings which deviate from standard isiZulu but are commonly used by isiZulu speakers and are intelligible and communicative.

It must be considered that a language belongs to all of those that belong to the same linguistic group, that is, all are equal in regard to its norm. It then becomes axiomatic that standard isiZulu should be owned by all those recognized as isiZulu first language speakers, regardless of their area or origin, their life experience and their attitudes (Lafon, 2005: 134). It must be borne in mind that users of isiZulu as the first language are not all from Zulu parents, which is particularly true in urban areas. Standard language must provide a unified means of communication and must bridge equality between all isiZulu speakers. It must be taken into consideration that (from my experience) the majority of South Africans converse in isiZulu and a few in other languages.

There are lexical differences between standard and non-standard isiZulu as shown below:

**Figure 3.1: Lexical differences between standard non-standad isiZulu**

Standard	Non-standard
<i>Kunezingane ezingama-40 eMkhumbi.</i> [There are 40 learners at UMkhumbi.]	<i>Kunezingane ezingu-40 eMkhumbi.</i> [There are 40 learners at UMkhumbi.]
<i>UCele ubamba iqhaza elikhulu ekuthuthukiseni umphakathi.</i> [Cele plays a vital role in the development of the community.]	<i>UCele udlala indima enkulu ekuthuthukeseni umphakathi.</i> [Cele plays a vital role in the development of the community.]
<i>Ngifunda isiNgisi.</i> [I'm learning English]	<i>Ngifunda i-English.</i> [I'm learning English].
<i>Siya emshadweni kaZanele KwaMakhutha mhla ziyi-16.</i> [We are going to Zanele's wedding at KwaMakhutha on the 16 <sup>th</sup> ].	<i>Siya emshadweni kaZanele KaMakhutha ngomhlaka 16.</i> [We are going to Zanele's wedding at KwaMakhutha on the 16 <sup>th</sup> ].
<i>UNana uhlanza izingubo.</i> [Nana is washing clothes.]	<i>UNana uwasha izingubo.</i> [Nana is washing clothes.]
<i>UNeli uphendula umakhalekhwikhwini.</i>	<i>UNeli uphendula icell.</i> [Neli is answering

[Neli is answering the cellphone].	the cellphone]
Ngeke <b>ngikwazi</b> ukupheka. [I won't be able to cook.]	<i>Ngeke ngikhone</i> ukupheka. [I won't be able to cook.]
<i>Ngiyaqonda</i> . [I understand.]	<i>Ngiya-understanda</i> . [I understand]
<i>Mhlawumbe</i> [perhaps]	<i>Mhlasimbe</i> [perhaps]
<i>Ubaba usebenzisa ifosholo</i> . [My father is using a spade.]	<i>Ubaba usebenzisa isipade</i> . [My father is using a spade.]

A person who speaks isiZulu perfectly and effectively might not be employed because he or she is not using 'isiZulu esijulile' [the standard isiZulu]. He or she may, for instance, be refused employment to be an isiZulu educator on the grounds of 'isiZulu sasedolobheni' [non-standard varieties] alone. However linguists, as mentioned previously, argue that linguistics is a descriptive discipline and not a prescriptive one. Linguists describe language in all its aspects, but do not prescribe rules of correctness (Aitchison, 1978: 13).

IsiZulu standardization favours rural people who speak 'isiZulu esijulile' [deep isiZulu]. As a result, the standard dialects inhibit many of the low-level, variable processes of phonetic conditioning that characterize spoken language and that underlie regular phonological change (Chambers, 1995: 230, 232). Other languages, such as English and Afrikaans interfere with standard isiZulu which lead to non-standard varieties. This necessitates an examination of lexical borrowing in the next section.

### 3.5 LEXICAL BORROWING

Lexical borrowing is defined as the introduction of words and idiomatic phrases from one language into another which are integrated into the grammatical system of the borrowing language (Winford, 2003: 30–31 and Postma, 1985: 9). ). As a result of language contact borrowed words have been introduced into isiZulu. Therefore, the lexical expansion occurs through the creation of new words and the gradual development of scientific and special vocabulary as new concepts became quite general and very common (Mutaka,

2000). Lexical expansion becomes necessary to bridge the gap between the existing lexicon and rapid social, economic and scientific progress. Two major factors motivate borrowing: prestige and necessity. In the case of prestige, the donor enjoys a higher social status than the borrowing language (Mutaka, 2000). Some isiZulu words are borrowed from other languages, such as English, Afrikaans and Tsotsitaal. IsiZulu has grown and expanded due to education (Vilakazi, 1962: 133). It has also taken new concepts from English and Afrikaans (Vilakazi, 1962: 133). These languages have supplied numerous loans to isiZulu as discussed below.

### **3.5.1 English impact on the isiZulu lexicon**

Through British colonization, in the nineteenth Century, English became the administrative language of large parts of Africa. The number of extraterritorial English speakers means that the language no longer belongs to any one nation, and that one must speak not of 'English' per se but of 'Englishes' (Stockwell, 2002: 19). It is not unusual for newly independent post-colonial countries to choose a *lingua franca* which is highly developed and ex-colonial (Fardon and Furniss, 1994: 104). In the 1930s and 1940s it was proposed within the liberation movement that English should be *lingua franca* as it would cut across ethnic divisions. This stand was taken by the ANC in opposition to the state which supported the development of African languages for the purpose of its programme to divide and rule.

English has become so important that it is now the language of international communication, science and technology, business and trade (Wardhaugh, 2002: 58). English is easily acquired through formal education because it is the most widespread medium of instruction. In township schools where isiZulu is the first language, English is the second additional language, and all other subjects, such as Physical Science, Mathematics, Business Economics, Economics, Travel and Tourism, Biology, and History are taught in English. Therefore, borrowing from English comes from growing exposure to it via subjects' instruction, radio, newspapers, television and other forms of mass media.

Some of the borrowed words from English as identified by Townshed (1996) and Nyembezi (1957) appear below:

**Figure 3.2: Some English loans in isiZulu accepted for standard isiZulu**

<b>IsiZulu</b>	<b>English</b>
<i>Amabreadrolls</i>	Breadrolls
<i>Amasaladi</i>	Salads
<i>ICurriculumu</i>	Curriculum
<i>Ikhekhe</i>	Cake
<i>Imaki</i>	Mug
<i>Ikokoloshe</i>	Cocroach
<i>Ikhofi</i>	Coffee
<i>Ibhakede</i>	Bucket
<i>Ikhishi</i>	Kitchen
<i>Iphepha</i>	Paper
<i>Uletisi</i>	Lettuce
<i>Ukhololo</i>	Collar

### 3.5.2 Afrikaans influence on the isiZulu lexicon

Kruger and Zegeye (2001: 17-23) emphasize that during the colonial period, the Dutch as well as the British pursued policies that promoted the learning and status of their respective languages by the conquered peoples. Kruger and Zegeye (2001) also claim that the main product of Dutch colonial rule in South Africa was the emergence of the creolized form of Dutch, which was known as Afrikaans. Kruger and Zegeye (2001) further say that English and Afrikaans were declared official languages of the territory in 1909 and 1925 respectively. Moreover, Afrikaans is taught as the second language in schools. The above factors led to Afrikaans loans in isiZulu, as a result of language contact with Afrikaans, and some of the following words have been introduced into isiZulu:

**Figure 3.3: Some of Afrikaans loans in isiZulu accepted in standard isiZulu**

<b>IsiZulu</b>	<b>Afrikaans</b>	<b>English</b>
<i>Itafula</i>	Tafel	Table
<i>Isitofu</i>	Stoof	Stove
<i>Ibhotela</i>	Boter	Butter
<i>Ikati</i>	Kat	Cat
<i>Utamatisi</i>	Tamaties	Tomatoes
<i>Udokotela</i>	Dokter	Doctor
Isitini	Steen	Brick
<i>Ummese</i>	Mes	Knife
<i>Ibhayisiskobho</i>	Bioskoop	Cinema
<i>Isikole</i>	Skool	School
<i>Imoto</i>	Motor	Motor-car
<i>Iketela</i>	Ketel	Kettle

The above interference of other languages in isiZulu is mainly due to the lack of isiZulu terminology for those words.

### **3.6 LANGUAGE STATUS AND ATTITUDES**

Maake (1994: 111) points out that many Africans in South Africa have a negative attitude towards their indigenous languages such as isiZulu. Africans believe that these languages enforce the divisions between ethnic or tribal groups and that certain languages belong to certain political enclaves. According to Maake (1994: 111-112) this view grossly neglects the complexity of language variation.

Some dialects of a language are considered more 'beautiful' than others, some languages are widely held to be more 'logical' than others. Many people regard '*isiZulu esijulile*' as superior to '*isiZulu sasedolobheni*' and they also regard English as a superior language to both forms of isiZulu (Milroy and Milroy, 1985: 12-16). According to Milroy and Milroy (1999: 13) at the level of language system, arguments that one language or dialect

is linguistically superior to another are generally not sustainable. Kubeka (1979: 83) claims that in Central Zululand (such as Nongoma, Empangeni) isiZulu is referred to as 'Queen's Zulu language'. It might be due to the fact that a Queen is the wife of a King and women are known to use more standard variants than men (Romaine, 1994: 79). In contrast to Kubeka's idea, I would say Central Zululand isiZulu is referred to as 'King's Zulu language' because a king is an important figure among the Zulus and isiZulu originated from the King's surname, Zulu, as discussed in Chapter Two. When one refers to 'standard Zulu' what is meant is the central Zululand dialect which appears to be the basis for schools or literary isiZulu. The Zululand isiZulu is taken as 'deep isiZulu'. Kubeka (1979: 83) states that the stamp of inferiority is branded onto local dialects in remote areas, such as the Johannesburg dialect, the Transkei dialect and other urban dialects. These dialects are referred to by isiZulu gatekeepers as '*isiZulu esintengayo*' [weak isiZulu] or '*isiZulu sasedolobheni*' ['urban isiZulu'].

However, urban children often reject the prescribed reading material and the standard isiZulu in which books are written (Zungu, 2004: 40). The Johannesburg dialect and other 'urban isiZulu' dialects are considered by youngsters as fashionable and most African youngsters imitate these dialects in order for them to sound fashionable. As a result, many African learners and students do not even understand the variety of isiZulu that they are being taught in schools. Pressure, as Zungu (2004) claims, came from parents who demanded that their children be taught through the medium of English from the outset.

Furthermore, African languages remained languages of low status (Kriger and Zegaye, 2001: 20-21). This, as Kriger and Zegaye (2001) state, was due to the fact that these languages were deliberately underdeveloped, especially in the economic sphere. There are also frequent claims that English is a gateway to the world because it is a prestige language and has international status (McDermott, 2004: 110). The above arguments indicate that Africans are holding onto and have pride in something, that is, '*isiZulu esijulile*'. However, it will be shown in this study that '*isiZulu esijulile*' is no longer their culture and is now strange to them. This pride in '*isiZulu esijulile*' is due to the fact that

there are differences regarding language attitudes between the races (Webb, 2002: 82). Such attitudes are due to linguistic colonization and the historical denial of a basic right: the right to use one's mother tongue in the course of one's day-to-day existence (McDermott, 2004: 111). It seems that people are willing to pay lip-service to correctness and prestige variants, but at the same time they continue to speak the variety current in their own speech communities (Milroy and Milroy, 1999: 16). The attitude people have towards the language might lead to language variation.

### **3.7 CONCLUSION**

In this chapter I have emphasized that standard ideology encourages prescription in a language dedicated to the principle that there must be one, and only one, correct way of using a linguistic item. In contrast to this, it was highlighted that many people still resort to the non-standard variety depending on the situation and social contexts. Therefore, it was evident that standard language is never complete because a language is the property of the communities that use it, and it must function effectively at that level in a manner that fulfils the needs of the users. The focus was on standard and non-standard isiZulu. Many isiZulu mother-tongue speakers are never introduced to any of the standard isiZulu lexical items. It became clear that isiZulu needs to be re-standardized because its functions are still limited and there is a need to include the new non-standard varieties in the standardization process for the sake of isiZulu development and technology. The emphasis was that non-standard varieties are due to a number of loan words into isiZulu and language status. It was noted that isiZulu, the main language of KwaZulu-Natal, has been considerably influenced by other languages spoken in South Africa, notably Afrikaans and English. This can be seen in the first place from the large number of loan words now in use. Therefore, I suggest that English lexical items have to be accepted for standard isiZulu.

In the next chapter I will discuss the methods used in this study. The chapter starts off with a discussion of the sampling procedures. The discussion of the two instruments, text analysis and interviews will follow.



## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter outlines and discusses the methodology and the two data collection methods which were employed in this research. It starts off with the discussion of the sampling procedures. The pilot and text analysis phases are presented. The latter part of the chapter discusses the interview phase and the way the data was analyzed.

#### **4.2 SELECTING SPEAKERS**

To ensure the validity of the study I considered a number of sampling factors which would impact on the study. One of these was representativeness. Leedy (1974: 152) maintains that the most important requirement for a sample is ‘representativeness’, which depends on a number of important factors. One of these factors, according to Leedy, is randomization. Bearing in mind Leedy’s view, I proceeded to draw up my learners sample population making use of randomization of the sample which ensured that every member of the population had an equal chance of being selected.

##### **Learner Sample**

The interviews were conducted in four schools, two rural and two township schools. The schools were selected using judgment sampling, that is, measuring pre-selected schools according to a number of criteria. The schools were chosen because isiZulu was taught as the first language in these schools. The learners attending these schools were also isiZulu mother-tongue speakers. The rural schools were Nongoma schools in the Zululand region while the township schools were KwaMakhutha schools in the *eThekwin*i region. The names of the schools are not given but only numbers were assigned to them, namely T1, T2 (township schools), R3 and R4 (rural schools). Preference was given to these schools because 99% of learners are isiZulu speakers. My position in this research was an

‘insider’ one as I am an isiZulu speaker and also educator. During my research I was the Head of Department of Languages at one of the selected schools and at the time was also engaged in part-time post-graduate studies. Through my professional experience I am familiar with both the spoken and the taught isiZulu in a secondary school environment.

The lists of learners were obtained from the school principals. Two grades, namely, grades 10 and 12 were selected. The lists of the same grade of each region were combined into one list. There are two factors which led me to choose grades 10 and 12: accessibility and their relevance and appropriateness to the context of the study.

Learners in grades 10 and 12 proved to be easily accessible, more mature and better able to understand isiZulu and English than grades 8 and 9 learners. To facilitate understanding by the respondents, Sidaki (1987: 82) believes that the language, vocabulary and sentence structure used must be simple and should relate to the respondents’ current level of information so that they can respond easily.

A stratified random sample was then used. Simple random sampling, one of probability sampling, is a procedure according to which a sample of particular elements is drawn from the population in such a way that each of the samples that can be drawn from the population has the same probability of being drawn. In other words, it is a process of sample selection in which the units are selected individually and directly by means of a random process in such a way that each unit has the same probability of being selected as any other unit in the population when the draw takes place. I adopted stratified random sampling because it allowed me to ascertain that the sample was evenly balanced in the classes that were presented (Zungu, 1995: 2). Learners in each grade were divided into two strata (groups), that is, one stratum for boys and the second for girls. I then used systematic sampling, one of the probability sampling, which is generally quick and easy and often a much more convenient method of sampling. The basic principle in systematic sampling is that the elements of the sample are drawn systematically from a complete list of the elements of the population. As a result, each list of learners was then arranged alphabetically. Each learner was assigned a number starting with 1. I wanted 25 boys and

25 girls from each stratum. Eventually systematic random sampling from the strata was used. The sample of 100 learners, that is, 50 from each region was required. The population size was divided by the sample size. Every 9<sup>th</sup> boy and 9<sup>th</sup> girl was selected from rural schools whereas every 10<sup>th</sup> girl and 10<sup>th</sup> boy was selected from urban schools. I then analyzed the texts of the respondents and interviewed them after I had obtained permission from the circuit superintendents and from school principals to conduct interviews in the schools under their control. Permission was asked by means of written letters explaining the nature and the purpose of the research. Thereafter interview sessions with secondary school learners were arranged.

### **4.3 PHASES OF THE RESEARCH**

The empirical research phases lasted for almost 8 months. The study was conducted in 4 consecutive phases, that is:

Phase 1: Pilot study to measure feasibility of the study

Phase II: Text analysis (research instrument)

Phase III: Interviews (research instrument)

Phase IV: Analysis of data

#### **4.3.1 Pilot study**

I undertook a pilot study in order to find out whether the questions were understood, and whether the questions would elicit the information needed. The outcome of the pilot study showed that structured individual interviews were a more successful method of retrieving information than focus group interviews because focus group interviews might cause participants to influence each other in answering the questions.

#### **4.3.2 Instrumentation**

Two instruments were used to gather the subjective sociolinguistic data: text analysis and interviews. The structured interview format used in this research project allowed

participants to speak in their own voice and enabled the researcher to elicit subjective data. As already mentioned, the sample of learner participants of the study was drawn from four different secondary schools. Two schools were rural schools in the Nongoma circuit in the Vryheid district and the other two schools were KwaMakhutha township schools in the *eThekweni* region. These secondary schools included learners from grades 10 and 12 ranging from 15 to 23 years old.

**(a) Text Analysis**

50 rural and 50 urban secondary learners' essays (compositions), that is, creative work made up of long and short pieces, were examined with the aim of detecting how proficient learners were in written standard isiZulu. The learners had to write essays of no less than a page on '*Umdlalo Webhola*' [Soccer] and a letter to a friend telling him/her about his/her December 2006 results. Twenty five scripts per school were examined. Assessing learners' essays allowed me to identify common problems and mistakes among mother tongue speakers of isiZulu. At the same time, I could compare and contrast the linguistic variety of isiZulu employed by both rural and urban learners. It was also possible to highlight particular areas of linguistic difficulties for the learners based on comparisons with the standard variety (Adolphs, 2006: 31). This allowed me to determine the learners' level of proficiency in written standard isiZulu in order to offer a brief comparative description of actual language (that is, isiZulu) in use. It is necessary to look at the written language because people's writing can also show how their language and their social world shape each other (Johnstone, 2000: 121). Indeed, some sociolinguistic studies are based on large numbers of written scripts, consisting of hundreds of texts (Johnstone, 2000: 122).

Sociolinguistic research necessarily starts from a corpus and adopts a non-normative attitude (Nelde, 1983: 298). Corpora provide a more realistic foundation for the study of a language and are useful for comparing regional varieties of a language (Aijmer and Alenberg, 1991: 2). The text analyses were used as an initial approach to lay the foundation for the interviews. Essentially, they complemented the interviews which would be conducted with 25 learners from each school.

## **(b) Interviews**

The interviews were conducted by me personally. The interviews were conducted over two months during the afternoons. Thirty minutes were spent with each interviewee. The structured interviews took the format of one-on-one tape recorded conversational interviews. Individual interviews, unlike focus group interviews, reduce the influence participants are able to have on each other which can lead to problems such as preventing individuals from giving their own view but giving the group view instead. The interviewees were able to select the language they would prefer to use for the interviews, either isiZulu or English or both isiZulu and English (refer to Appendix 1). The isiZulu data was translated into English for the purpose of this research. Note-taking was also done while the interview was in progress. In the interviews the learners were asked open-ended questions. The interviews measured learners' attitudes towards standard isiZulu and explored the type of isiZulu preferred by learners who speak isiZulu.

I employed structured interviews as they enabled the research questions to be explored in depth by going beyond factual matters to seek views and explanations (Nandraj, 2003: 73). Structured interviews reduced the risk of a bias on my part and it increased the reliability of the data (Mitchell and Jolley, 2004: 200). This was due to the fact that in structured interviews the interviewer has both the specific objectives in mind and a list of questions prepared beforehand whilst unstructured interviews are open-ended, loose and questions develop spontaneously in the course of the interviews. Furthermore, the informal nature of the interviews encouraged extensive and well-informed responses. I was able to ask a question and allow an interviewee to respond to it. It was possible to obtain more truths and details. I had the opportunity to follow up any statements which the participants made by seeking clarification. This would, for instance, not be possible had I used a questionnaire where I would have received responses to specific statements sometimes without the necessary reflection. It was also possible for me to create a relaxed atmosphere during the interviews. Open-ended questions asked in the interviews allowed learners to express themselves more freely than if closed-ended questions had been used. With closed-ended questions only, I might not have realized that the

respondent was making uninformed responses. Asking open-ended questions, therefore, allowed me to discover that respondents with similar responses often have different opinions (Mitchell and Jolley, 2004: 199).

#### **4.4 DATA ANALYSIS**

Finally, after exiting the site, the data collected from learners' essays and structured interviews were transcribed, translated and analyzed. Non-standard varieties used by learners in their compositions were listed in tables according to both rural and urban learners' responses. During interviews open-ended questions consisting of both closed-ended and open-ended parts were asked. Responses to the closed-ended sections of the interviews were collated manually. The frequencies and percentages were calculated and presented in tables. The open-ended sections of the interviews generated a variety of responses. The tape-recorded interviews were first transcribed verbatim by hand. I tried to keep my own interpretations of data to the minimum and to let the voices of my respondents tell the story of their perceptions. I grouped learners' common responses into one theme and I only discussed the most common responses due to the various answers given by each respondent for each item. However, I did present data as they were presented to me by the informants as Vakalisa (1995: 122) suggests.

#### **4.5 CONCLUSION**

In this chapter the methods and criteria for data analysis have been discussed, the advantages of using individual interviews as a research tool were given and the way respondents were selected was also discussed. Finally, the phases for the research were presented. I employed two methods for data collection. These include text analysis and structured interviews. Each of these methods has advantages and disadvantages. By making use of these two methods, I ensured that the weaknesses of one are counter-balanced by the strengths of the other.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to present, analyze and discuss the data that has been collected from the secondary school learners.

#### 5.2 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA COLLECTED FROM LEARNERS

##### 5.2.1 Lexical items used by learners in their essays

There were many lexical adoptives which were found in the essays of the secondary school learners whose standard language usage I was researching. The specific words appear in the tables below. Those words were picked out from the 100 learners' essays (50 rural and 50 urban). Some of the 'deep isiZulu' words were obtained from Zulu Dictionaries, namely *Inqolobane* (Nyembezi, 1956) and *Isichazamazwi* (Nkosi and Msomi, 1992).

**Table 5.1: Non-standard lexical items used by urban secondary learners in their essays**

<b>Non-lexical items used by learners</b>	<b>English words</b>	<b>Standard 'deep isiZulu' words</b>
<i>Esefresh</i>	Being fresh	<i>Engakakhathali</i>
<i>Ihalf time</i>	Half time	<i>Ingxenyeye yesikhathi</i>
<i>Amamminute</i>	Minutes	<i>Imizuzu</i>
<i>Igroup discussion</i>	Group discussion	<i>Ingxoxo yamaqembu</i>
<i>Ngicrossnighthe</i>	To cross night	<i>Ngingalali kuze kuse</i>
<i>Iwinter</i>	Winter	<i>Ubusika</i>
<i>Amaklas</i>	Classes	<i>Igumbi lokufundela</i>

<i>Amalessons</i>	Lessons	<i>Izifundo</i>
<i>Idirection</i>	Direction	<i>Umgudu</i>
<i>Idraw</i>	Draw	<i>Ukulingana</i>
<i>UJuni</i>	June	<i>UNhlolanja</i>
<i>UDesemba</i>	December	<i>UZibandlela</i>
<i>Amaholide</i>	Holidays	<i>Izinhlakhefu</i>
<i>Ibreak</i>	Break	<i>Inhlakhefu</i>
<i>iDictionary</i>	Dictionary	<i>Isichazimazwi</i>
<i>Ilibrary</i>	Library	<i>Umtapo wolwazi</i>
<i>Imagazine</i>	Magazine	<i>Iphephabhukhu</i>
<i>Inyuziphepa</i>	Newspaper	<i>Iphephandaba</i>
<i>Ama-exercise</i>	Exercise books	<i>Amabhuku okubhalela</i>
<i>Ipeni</i>	Pen	<i>Usiba lokuloba</i>
<i>Ipencila</i>	Lead pencil	<i>Umsizi</i>
<i>i-order</i>	Order	<i>Ukuqoqeka</i>
<i>Itoilethi</i>	Toilet	<i>Indlu yangasese</i>
<i>Ngilate</i>	Being late	<i>Emva kwesikhathi</i>
<i>Icup</i>	Cup (trophy)	<i>Inkomishi</i>
<i>Iwall</i>	Wall	<i>Udonga</i>
<i>Obugreen</i>	Green	<i>Obuluhlaza</i>
<i>Oyellow</i>	Yellow	<i>Ophuzu</i>
<i>Aba-under 23</i>	Under 23	<i>Abangaphansi kwama-23</i>
<i>Oblue</i>	Blue	<i>Oyisibhakabhaka</i>
<i>Amashorts</i>	Shorts	<i>Isikhindi</i>
<i>Amasponsors</i>	Sponsors	<i>Abaxhasi</i>
<i>Itechnology</i>	Technology	<i>Ezobuchwepheshe</i>
<i>Amafinal</i>	Finals	<i>Amanqamu</i>
<i>Iground</i>	Playground	<i>Inkundla yebhola</i>
<i>Ureferee</i>	Referee	<i>Unompempe</i>
<i>Amagoal</i>	Goals	<i>Amanqaku</i>



<i>Ipenalty</i>	Penalty	<i>Inhlawulo</i>
<i>Ugoalkhipha</i>	Goalkeeper	<i>Unozinti</i>
<i>Ecenta</i>	In the Centre	<i>Phakathi nenkundla</i>
<i>Amadifenda</i>	Defenders	<i>Abavimbi</i>
<i>Ifirst aid</i>	First aid	<i>Usizo lokuqala</i>
<i>Iscore</i>	Score	<i>Umklomela</i>
<i>Amathimu</i>	Teams	<i>Amaqembu</i>
<i>Amafouls</i>	Fouls	<i>Amaphutha</i>
<i>Isoccer</i>	Soccer	<i>Ibhola likanobhutshuzwayo</i>
<i>Iyellow card</i>	Yellow card	<i>Ikhadi eliphuzu</i>
<i>Ired card</i>	Red card	<i>Ikhadi elibomvu</i>
<i>Ukapteni</i>	Captain	<i>Umphathi webhola</i>
<i>Amaclub</i>	Clubs	<i>Amaqembu</i>
<i>Itrofi</i>	Trophy	<i>Inkomishi</i>
<i>Amacolours</i>	Colours	<i>Imibala</i>
<i>iMaths</i>	Maths	<i>iziBalo</i>
<i>i-Afrikaans</i>	Afrikaans	<i>isiBhunu</i>
<i>i-Economics</i>	Economics	<i>EzoMnotho</i>
<i>INatural Science</i>	Natural Science	<i>EzeMvelo</i>
<i>iGeography</i>	Geography	<i>eZezwe</i>
<i>Angicope</i>	I do not cope	<i>Angimelani</i>
<i>Ngitadisa</i>	studying	<i>Ngizilolongela ukuhlola</i>
<i>Uhomework</i>	Homework	<i>Umsebenzi wasekhaya</i>
<i>Sipanishwe</i>	Being punished	<i>Sijeziswe</i>
<i>Ngibe early</i>	Being early	<i>Ngifike ngesikhathi</i>
<i>Angikhoni</i>	Cannot cope	<i>Angikwazi</i>
<i>Ngindezwa (isiXhosa)</i>	Not understanding	<i>Ngingezwa</i>
<i>Amaproblems</i>	Problems	<i>Izinkinga</i>
<i>Isigele</i>	School	<i>Isikole</i>
<i>Amaquestions</i>	Questions	<i>Imibuzo</i>

<i>Ukunyamezela</i>	Endure	<i>Ukubekwezela</i>
<i>Ucoashi</i>	Coach	<i>Umqeqeshi</i>
<i>Imeneja</i>	Manager	<i>Umphathi</i>
<i>Idladla</i>	Home	<i>Ikhaya</i>

**Table 5.2: Non-standard lexical items used by rural secondary learners in their essays**

<b>Non-lexical items used by learners</b>	<b>English words</b>	<b>Standard ‘deep isiZulu’</b>
<i>Agasti</i>	August	<i>UNcwaba</i>
<i>Ifaneli</i>	Final	<i>Ukuphela konyaka</i>
<i>Ngaziphasa</i>	I <b>passed</b> them	<i>Ngaziphumelela</i>
<i>Ngaphansi kuka-80</i>	Less than 80	<i>Ngaphansi kwama-80</i>
<i>Iklasi</i>	Class	<i>Igumbi lokufundela</i>
<i>Amaholidi</i>	Holidays	<i>Inhlabakhefu</i>
<i>Othisha</i>	Teachers	<i>Abafundisi</i>
<i>Ngo-2-1</i>	Two-1	<i>Ama-2 kweli-1</i>
<i>Amasokisi</i>	Socks	<i>Amakawosi</i>
<i>Ka-2007</i>	Of 2007	<i>Wezi-2007</i>
<i>Iwini</i>	Win	<i>Ukunqoba</i>
<i>Zingakakori</i>	Have not yet scored	<i>Zingakalifaki</i>
<i>Ukhoji</i>	Coach	<i>Umqeqeshi</i>
<i>Bajimile</i>	Have gymned	<i>Bazilolongile</i>
<i>Uwani</i>	One	<i>Elilodwa</i>
<i>Amaphenalthi</i>	Penalties	<i>Izizezo</i>
<i>Ngifeyile</i>	To fail	<i>Ngingaphumeleli</i>
<i>Iviki</i>	Week	<i>Isonto</i>
<i>Igoli</i>	Goal	<i>Inqaku</i>
<i>Liluze</i>	To lose	<i>Lihlulwe</i>
<i>Iprimary</i>	Primary school	<i>Isikole samabanga aphantsi</i>

<i>Isecondary</i>	Secondary school	<i>Isikole samabanga aphakeme</i>
<i>Omisi</i>	Mistresses	<i>Othishelakazi</i>
<i>IMaths</i>	Maths	<i>IziBalo</i>
<i>IBusiness studies</i>	Business Studies	<i>Izifundo zomnotho</i>
<i>I-Englishi</i>	English	<i>isiNgisi</i>
<i>IBiology</i>	Biology	<i>EzeMvelo</i>
<i>IPhysical Science</i>	Physical Science	<i>ISayensi</i>
<i>I-LO</i>	Life Orientation	<i>EZempilo</i>
<i>Iwinile</i>	Won	<i>Inqobile</i>
<i>Istadium</i>	Stadium	<i>Inkundla yebhola</i>
<i>uNovember</i>	November	<i>KuLwezi</i>
<i>Amatekisi</i>	Taxis	<i>Amakhumbi</i>
<i>Isenta</i>	Centre	<i>Phakathi nendawo</i>
<i>Kwi-eighteen</i>	At eighteen	<i>Kwele-18</i>
<i>Ibhentshi</i>	Bench	<i>Isiqgiki</i>
<i>uSeptember</i>	September	<i>KuMandulo</i>
<i>IHSS</i>	Human Social Sciences	<i>EzoMlando</i>
<i>Amagoli</i>	Goals	<i>Amanqaku</i>
<i>Ulayini</i>	Line	<i>Umugqa</i>
<i>I-Afrikaans</i>	Afrikaans	<i>IsiBhunu</i>
<i>I-Arts and Culture</i>	Arts and Culture	<i>EzoBuciko naMasiko</i>
<i>Imijezi</i>	Jerseys	<i>Imifaniswano yebhola</i>
<i>Uhhafu</i>	Half	<i>Ingxenye</i>
<i>Ideal</i>	Deal	<i>Isivumelwano</i>
<i>Ukujoyina</i>	To join	<i>Ukuba ilunga</i>
<i>Amathimu</i>	Teams	<i>Amaqembu</i>
<i>Ukusaphotha</i>	To support	<i>Ukusekela</i>
<i>UMatikuletshe</i>	Matriculation	<i>Ibanga le-12</i>
<i>Ilambu</i>	Lamb	<i>Isibani</i>

<i>Indishi</i>	Dish	<i>Isitsha</i>
<i>Isikimu</i>	Scheme	<i>Iqembu</i>
<i>Ithalente</i>	Talent	<i>Isiphiwo</i>

The list of adoptive words above which were used by both rural and urban learners gives an indication of the influence that languages have on each other. There were in total about 100 lexical borrowings used by learners. There are also words without isiZulu equivalents, which have been excluded from the lists, which learners used such as '*iphepha*' [paper] and '*ibhola*' [ball]. It is really confusing that on one hand loan words from English and Afrikaans are rejected as inappropriate for standard isiZulu, whereas on the other hand we find many Afrikaans and English borrowings without isiZulu equivalents accepted in standard isiZulu (cf. figures 3.2 and 3.3). Some responses show common words used by both rural and urban secondary learners. This is due to the fact that they learn standard isiZulu irrespective of which language an individual uses. The source languages, such as Afrikaans and English, are subjects and English is also used as the medium of instruction. The above words have adapted the borrowed items to the phonological and morphological patterns. As a result of language contact, the above words have been introduced into isiZulu. There are words which have shown replacement and deletion of certain consonants and vowels. Some have back formations (that is, when a speaker of a language is faced with a new term, wrongly perceives some morphological structure and then by regular morphological rules, derives another term), for example, '*ukutadisha*', and have used prefixes and suffixes of certain isiZulu classes. Others have developed new isiZulu compound nouns and near compound nouns, for example, '*unyuziphepa*', '*ugoalkhipha*'.

### 5.2.2 Learners' responses to interviews

#### Section B: General information about the respondents

This section presents the biological data of respondents, locality of respondents' schools and the mother-tongue of respondents.

Question one identified the gender of the respondents. The variations are indicated in the table below.

**Table 5.3: Frequency distribution according to gender of the respondents**

Respondents	Females	Males	Total	Percentages
Rural	25	25	50	50%
Urban	25	25	50	50%
Total	50	50	100	100%
Percentages	50%	50%	100%	100%

Table 5.3 above shows that of 100 (100%) respondents 50 (50%) were rural and 50 (50%) were urban respondents. There is an equal number of rural and urban learners because that was my aim and the way sampling was done helped to fulfill that purpose. However, the information came mostly from Grade 10 learners because more than half of the total respondents, that is, 54% were Grade 10 secondary learners.

Item 2 required respondents to indicate their ages. See table below:

**Table 5.4: Frequency distribution according to ages of the respondents**

Respondents	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	Total	%
Grade 10	2	18	15	09	06	02	00	01	00	01	54	54%
Grade 12	00	00	02	14	09	09	09	01	02	00	46	46%
Total	02	18	17	23	15	11	09	02	02	01	100	100%
Percentages	2%	18%	17%	23%	15%	11%	9%	2%	2%	1%	100%	100%

Table 5.4 above shows that the highest percentage of respondents is 17 years old followed by 15 years. This is probably due to the fact that the number of Grade 12 learners is almost the same as that of Grade 10 learners. Most of the grade 12 learners are 17 years old and most of the grade 10 learners are 15 years.

Item 3 asked about the locality of the respondent's school. The learners' responses are shown in the table below:

**Table 5.5: Frequency distribution according to locality of the respondent's school**

Respondents	Rural	Township / Urban	Total	Percentages
Females	25	25	50	50%
Males	25	25	50	50%
Total	50	50	100	100%
Percentages	50%	50%	100%	100%

Item 4 measured for the mother-tongue of the respondents. The respondents responded as indicated in the table below:

**Table 5.6: Frequency distribution according to mother-tongue of respondents**

Respondents	IsiZulu	English	Afrikaans	Total	Percentages
Females	50	00	00	50	50%
Males	50	00	00	50	50%
Total	100	00	00	100	100%
Percentages	100%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Table 5.6 depicts that all respondents' (100 / 100%) mother-tongue is isiZulu. This is probably due to the fact that learners attending the schools are coming from Zulu townships and rural areas.

### **Section B: Analysis and interpretation of learners' data**

This section analyses and interprets data from learners in response to the interview questions on standard versus non-standard isiZulu. It can be remembered that all questions were open-ended. However, each question had a closed-ended part and an open-ended part. The closed-ended parts are summarized in the tables below and the open-ended are grouped into themes and only the most common responses are presented for discussion because the open questions in this section produced a large number of different responses.

Item 1 in the interview questionnaire (cf. Appendix 1) seeks to find out which words are often used as an informal code. The responses of the closed-ended part of this question are summarised below in Table 5.7.

**Key: UZ (Urban IsiZulu), DZ (Deep IsiZulu), F (Females) and M (Males)**

**Table 5.7: Words frequently used by learners in the respondents' schools**

Item	Urban Schools			Rural Schools			Grand Total
	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
1. ' <i>Ngikhonzela umama</i> '. (UZ) [I'm passing regards to my mother.]	24	21	45	21	16	37	82 (82%)
	01	04	05	04	09	13	18 (18%)
2. ' <i>Ngizocula ingoma yamampela</i> '. (UZ) [I'll sing the real song.]	12	16	28	04	01	05	33 (33%)
	13	09	22	21	24	45	67 (67%)
3. ' <i>Ubaba udlala indima enkulu emphakathini wakithi</i> '. (UZ) [My father is playing an important role in our community.]	10	14	24	09	06	15	39 (39%)
	15	11	26	16	19	35	61 (61%)
4. ' <i>Ukuhlola kuqala ngomhlaka 10</i> '. (UZ) [The examination starts on the 10 <sup>th</sup> .]	25	24	49	21	24	45	94 (94%)
	00	01	01	04	01	05	06 (6%)
5. ' <i>Mhlasimpe ngizophasa ngoJuni</i> '. (UZ) [Perhaps I'll pass in June.]	22	22	44	17	16	33	77 (77%)
	03	03	06	08	09	17	23 (23%)

The majority of learners (both rural and township learners) seem to frequently use 'urban isiZulu' lexicons. The response indicates that 82% of learners use '*ngikhonzela*' instead of '*ngikhonza*' (37 /74% rural and 45 /90% urban learners). However, there are only 33% who use the word '*yamampela*,' 28 township learners (56%) and only 5 rural learners (10%). These responses are selected because of Madlala's (2006) and King Goodwill's concerns about the usage of these words (cf. 1.2). That means that Madlala's and the King's concerns are invalidated since the youth do infrequently make use of these words.

The word seems to be mostly used by township learners. It is probably due to the fact that township youth have more access than rural youth to media such as television where the term is commonly used.

Question 2 aimed to examine the feelings of learners about the use of the words ‘yamampela’ and ‘ngikhonzela’ (cf. Appendix 1). The responses of the closed-ended part are reflected in Table 5.8 below.

**Table 5.8: The respondents’ views about the use of the words ‘yamampela’ and ‘ngikhonzela’**

Location of Respondents’ Schools	Respondents	Grade	Happy	Sad	Have no problem	Total	
Urban	Females	10	03	07	03	13	
		Females	12	03	05	04	12
		Males	10	05	05	02	12
		Males	12	06	06	01	13
Total			17 (34%)	23 (46%)	11 (22%)	50	
Rural	Females	10	04	07	04	15	
		Females	12	03	04	03	10
		Males	10	01	08	05	14
		Males	12	04	07	00	11
Total			12 (24%)	26 (52%)	12 (24%)	50 (100%)	
Grand Total			29 (29%)	49 (49%)	23 (23%)	100 (100%)	

Table 5.8 shows that 49 (49%), 23 township (46%) and 26 rural (52%), are sad about the use of the words ‘yamampela’ and ‘ngikhonzela’, whereas only 29 / 29% (17 / 34% township and 12 / 24% rural) were happy about the use of those words. Judging from the response of the majority, it appears that learners are not happy about the use of those words. This response confirms King Zwelithini’s (cf. chapter 1) concern that people are generally against the use of the word ‘yamampela’. This also endorses Zungu’s (1995: 9) argument when he argues that the employment of non-standard varieties of a language is regarded as ‘corrupt’ and ‘impure’ linguistic behaviour.



In the open-ended section, respondents were asked to give reasons for their answers. This part of item generated numerous responses from 100 respondents. All similar responses were grouped together.

On one hand, the most commonly cited reasons for learners who were happy and who did not have a problem with the use of '*yamampela*' and '*ngikhonzela*' are as follows: (1) Those words such as '*yamampela*' and '*ngikhonzela*' are frequently used by youth and new generations (used by the right people at the right time) and the youth is used to these words and the use of them shows freedom of speech, (2) '*Yamampela*' and '*Ngikhonzela*' means one and the same thing as '*yangempela*' and '*ngikhonza*', the only difference is that they are pronounced and written differently and (3) the words bring about style to teens.

On the other hand the most commonly cited reasons for the learners who were sad about the use of the words '*yamampela*' and '*ngikhonzela*' are summarized as follows: (1) The use of '*yamampela*' breaks and misuses isiZulu language instead of using 'proper isiZulu' and it makes the language cheap and disrespected especially in KwaZulu-Natal province; (2) The use of '*yamampela*' symbolises the use of Tsotsitaal or isiXhosa instead of 'pure' isiZulu in KwaZulu-Natal and (3) these words, namely, '*yamampela and ngikhonzela*', are impurifying isiZulu which our forefathers used to speak and those words are regarded as slang in isiZulu. Other reasons cited by the respondents are not included in the discussion as each of these reasons was cited infrequently, that is, not more than once or twice (refer to appendix 3 for a complete list of reasons).

The reasons given by learners who revealed that they were happy and had no problem with the use of the words '*yamampela*' and '*ngikhonzela*' (both rural and urban learners) endorse the idea of Ngubane (1991: 11). Ngubane argues critically that if two persons understand each other then they speak the same language. Non-standard dialects are grammatically different from standard language such as isiZulu but are not defective in any way (Trudgill, 1994: 5). Non-standard varieties are in no way inferior to the standard languages. They co-exist with standard languages and are employed by various speakers

of all walks of life (Zungu, 1995: 2). Language varies regionally, according to social grouping of speakers and in the speech of individuals according to the situational contexts in which they find themselves from time to time (Milroy and Milroy, 1999: 47). Patterns of language are complex (Maake, 1994: 111-112).

The reasons given by learners who are sad about the use of the words ‘*yamampela*’ and ‘*ngikhonzela*’ support the view of Zungu (1995: 9, 29). Zungu argues that the employment of non-standard varieties of a language is regarded as corrupt and impure linguistic behaviour. She further states that young men aged approximately 21 and below use Tsotsitaal because they are under the pressure of township fever and peer pressure. The 2% of respondents who claimed that isiZulu has been mixed and impurified with slang support Kubeka (1979: 229). Kubeka argues that new speech is loosening the ‘conservative’ roots of isiZulu and opening the way for an uprising for change because it uses linguistic material at its disposal and is primarily characterized by a fair sprinkling of slang.

In Item 3 learners were asked to indicate whether they like talking ‘deep’ isiZulu or not. That response is reflected in Table 5.9 below:

**Table 5.9: The respondents’ view whether they like or do not like talking ‘deep’ isiZulu**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Yes	No	Total
Urban	Females	10	06	07	13
	Females	12	04	08	12
	Males	10	04	08	12
	Males	12	06	07	13
Total			20 (40%)	30 (60%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	10	05	15
	Females	12	03	07	10
	Males	10	07	07	14
	Males	12	05	06	11
Total			25 (50%)	25 (50%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			45 (45%)	55 (55%)	100 (100%)

Judging by the data in Table 5.9, it is evident that a slight majority of respondents (55 which is 55%), made up of 25 rural (50%) and 30 township (60%) dwellers, do not want to use ‘deep isiZulu’ lexicons compared to 45 (45%) who like to talk ‘deep isiZulu’, made up of 25 rural (60%) and only 20 township learners (40%). However, the number of rural secondary learners who like talking ‘deep isiZulu’ is almost equal to rural secondary learners who do not like talking ‘deep isiZulu’. This implies that more than half of learners especially township learners do not like ‘deep isiZulu’ whereas about 40% of township learners like ‘deep isiZulu’. This is in line with Mesthrie’s (2002: 204) argument that the standard varieties of African languages are associated with the rural areas compared to urban people who speak non-standard urban varieties of African languages.

In the open-ended section the most commonly cited reasons for not liking to use ‘deep isiZulu’ are summarised as follows: (1) Deep isiZulu is difficult, complicated and confusing because it is no longer used especially by new generations because of many changes hence there are many failures in isiZulu in secondary schools, (2) when one talks ‘deep isiZulu’ one is mocked at, looked down upon and taken as coming from ‘deep’ rural areas and one is sometimes called by nasty names such as ‘farm Julia’ or ‘*inyoni*’ and young people lack exposure to ‘deep isiZulu’ (look at appendix 3 for details).

The responses above endorse Zungu (1995: 22) who claims that sometimes a standard variety takes a round about way by means of a lexicalized sentence in expressing something which can be said in one word in another language variety. She also argues that non-standard varieties may be used if their vocabulary is more expressive than standard equivalents or if standard sounds old fashioned from a speaker’s point of view. In my opinion, returning to the statistics presented in Table 4.7, I would say both rural and urban learners are no longer interested in ‘deep isiZulu’ due to technological changes and lack of exposure to it as they have emphasized in their responses.

Question 4 seeks to require the type of isiZulu (‘deep’ or ‘urban’ isiZulu) frequently used by learners in their schools (cf. Appendix 1). The responses appear in Table 5.10 below:

**Table 5.10: The type of isiZulu frequently used at the respondents' schools**

Location of the School	Respondents	Grade	'Deep' IsiZulu	'Urban' IsiZulu	Total
Urban	Females	10	01	12	13
	Females	12	00	12	12
	Males	10	00	12	12
	Males	12	01	12	13
Total			02 (4%)	48 (96%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	02	13	15
	Females	12	02	08	10
	Males	10	01	13	14
	Males	12	02	09	11
Total			07 (14%)	43 (86%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			09 (9%)	91 (91%)	100 (100%)

Table 5.10 above shows that almost all respondents (91 / 91%), that is, 48 township learners (96%) and 43 rural learners (86%), stressed that 'urban isiZulu' is frequently used at their schools. This data supports the theory that 'urban isiZulu' is used in many secondary schools, and even in rural secondary schools. This negates Mesthrie's (2002: 204) idea that rural people speak 'deeper' varieties than urban 'modern' people.

Learners were also required to give reasons for the particular type of isiZulu used in their schools. This item generated the greatest number of differing responses from 100 respondents. The responses of respondents were synthesized into themes. The following common reasons were given by respondents who claimed to talk 'urban isiZulu' at their schools: (1) Many learners (about 90% of urban learners) were born and grew up in the township where 'urban isiZulu' is used, (2) many of the Zulus are working in urban areas which leads to isiZulu being mixed with foreign languages and (3) English is the medium of instruction in all secondary schools in KwaZulu-Natal which leads to English loan words appearing in isiZulu.

The responses of the majority respondents above endorse Kubeka's (1979: 229) argument that the advent of industrialization has prompted the influx of settled communities from rural areas into towns in quest for employment. He says that townships and squatter settlements have mushroomed around towns and cities with the result that a new urban

and sophisticated society has developed resulting in an urbanized form of speech, in isiZulu, '*isidolobha*', being cultivated. Standard language is an idea in the mind rather than a reality (Siachitema, 1986: 22).

In Question 5 learners were asked to indicate which type of isiZulu they used at home either 'deep' or 'urban' isiZulu. The responses of the closed-ended section are reflected on Table 5.11 below:

**Table 5.11: Learners' perception about the type of isiZulu used in their homes 'deep' or 'urban' isiZulu**

Location of the School	Respondents	Grade	'Deep' isiZulu	'Urban' IsiZulu	Total
Urban	Females	10	00	13	13
	Females	12	01	11	12
	Males	10	01	11	12
	Males	12	01	12	13
Total			03 (6%)	47 (94%)	50 (50%)
Rural	Females	10	07	08	15
	Females	12	04	06	10
	Males	10	08	06	14
	Males	12	05	06	11
Total			24 (48%)	26 (52%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			22 (27%)	73 (73%)	100 (100%)

The total score indicates that 73 (73%) of respondents, that is, 47 township respondents (94%) and 26 rural respondents (52%) use 'urban isiZulu' at home. Only 27 (27%) use 'deep' isiZulu. However, the number of rural learners who use 'urban isiZulu' is almost the same as those who use 'deep isiZulu' at home. This endorses Martin's (1996: 48) argument that there are different patterns of language use between rural and urban Zulu learners. This can be due to the fact that rural people, especially parents do not have access to media such as newspapers and televisions. Most of the parents are also illiterate and they do not have much contact with different racial groups. This has perhaps ensured that their language has not been influenced by other languages.

The wide array of reasons given in the open-ended section were grouped into themes and appear in Appendix 3. Only the reasons given by learners who claimed to talk 'urban isiZulu', who seemed to be the majority, are summarized as follows: (1) Urban isiZulu is more understandable, easier and preferable to 'deep isiZulu' because 'deep isiZulu' is only taught at schools, (2) Zulus now stay and work near people of different racial groups in urban areas who influence one another, (3) Young generations and their parents are now attending multiracial schools which results in a lack of knowledge of 'deep isiZulu' and (4) most Zulus are now educated and they know different languages such as Afrikaans and English which have an influence on isiZulu.

The responses above support the idea of Cluver (1991) cited by Fardon and Furniss (1994: 10). Cluver argues that the previous government limited the use of African languages to be used within the African family and the school. There is always the dominant variety for each community (Zungu, 1995: 21). According to Zungu (1995: 7) the choice of a non-standard variety depends upon the speaker and his audience. This implies that the standard isiZulu learnt at school is not the learners' home language which makes it difficult for parents to help their children with homework and assignments, yet parents have an important role to play in their children's education in order to prevent the lack of identity and loss of culture.

Item 6 required the respondents to give the type of isiZulu ('urban' or 'deep' isiZulu) they prefer to have as the medium of instruction in schools. The responses to the closed-ended part of this question appear in Table 5.12 below:

**Table 5.12: Learners' view about the type of isiZulu they prefer to have as the medium of instruction : 'urban' or 'deep' isiZulu**

Location of the School	Respondents	Grade	'Deep' IsiZulu	'Urban' IsiZulu	Total
Urban	Females	10	03	10	13
	Females	12	03	09	12
	Males	10	03	09	12
	Males	12	04	09	13
Total			13 (26%)	37 (74%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	05	10	15
	Females	12	04	06	10
	Males	10	10	04	14
	Males	12	07	04	11
Total			26 (52%)	24 (48%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			39 (39%)	61 (61%)	100 (100%)

Table 5.12 reveals that 61 respondents (61%), that is, 37 township (74%) and 24 rural respondents (48%), prefer 'urban isiZulu' other than 'deep isiZulu' to be the medium of instruction. However, more than half (26 / 52%) of rural learners prefer 'deep isiZulu' to be the medium of instruction.

The learners' common reasons for selecting 'urban isiZulu' to be medium of instruction are summarized as follows: (1) By using 'urban isiZulu' as medium of instruction, everything might be clearer to learners and will make it easier for them to be able to answer examination questions because learners grew up using that type of isiZulu, and (2) it is very difficult to understand subjects such as history in 'deep isiZulu'.

The responses above contradict the argument of Wardhaugh (2002: 190). Wardhaugh argues that people tend to resist new language words usages and try to constrain language variation. This is not in keeping with the evolution of language in new urban cultures. However, the responses indicate that learners do have 'a love and hate relationship' with English.

In Item 7 the respondents were required to give their views on whether it is necessary or not for ‘deep isiZulu’ continue to be learnt in schools. The summary of the closed-ended part appears in the table below.

**Table 5.13: The respondents’ views whether ‘deep’ isiZulu should continue to be learnt in schools or not**

Location of the School	Respondents	Grade	Yes	No	Total
Urban	Females	10	09	04	13
	Females	12	11	01	12
	Males	10	06	06	12
	Males	12	09	04	13
Total			35 (70%)	15 (30%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	13	02	15
	Females	12	06	04	10
	Males	10	11	03	14
	Males	12	09	02	11
Total			39 (78%)	11 (22%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			74 (74%)	26 (26%)	100 (100%)

It is evident from the data in Table 5.13 above that an acceptable number of respondents, that is, 74 /74% (37 / 70% township and 39 / 78% rural), felt that ‘deep isiZulu’ should continue to be learnt in schools, whereas 11 (22%), stated that ‘deep isiZulu’ should not continue to be learnt in schools. This means that Kubeka (1979: 228) was right when he stressed that people aspire to master what is regarded as ‘proper Zulu’ (standard Zulu), instead of sticking to their local dialects. It is evident from the type of isiZulu learners claimed to be using both at home and at school, that it is not a standard isiZulu.

The learners’ common reasons for not wanting ‘deep isiZulu’ to continue to be learnt at schools follow: (1) ‘Deep isiZulu’ is more difficult than ‘urban isiZulu’ which results in high failure rates in secondary school, (2) ‘deep isiZulu’ is no longer used: even at iNkandla, people are speaking ‘urban isiZulu’, (3) learners are from places such as Lesotho where ‘deep isiZulu’ is not known and (4) talking ‘deep isiZulu’ might prevent



learners from knowing other languages and those languages might be left undeveloped in isiZulu speakers' areas.

In Question 8 the respondents were asked to give their opinions on whether 'urban isiZulu' destroys the Zulu culture or not. The closed-ended part responses are reflected in Table 5.14 below.

**Table 5.14: The respondents' perception on whether 'urban isiZulu' destroys the Zulu culture**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Yes	No	Total
Urban	Females	10	10	03	13
	Females	12	10	02	12
	Males	10	08	04	12
	Males	12	12	01	13
Total			40 (80%)	10 (20%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	11	04	15
	Females	12	06	04	15
	Males	10	12	02	14
	Males	12	09	02	11
Total			38 (76%)	12 (24%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			78 (78%)	22 (22%)	100 (100%)

The total score indicates that 78 (78%) of the respondents, that is, 40 (80%) township and 38 (76%) rural learners, think that 'urban isiZulu' destroys the Zulu culture. These responses support what is emphasized by Webb and Sure (2000: 68) who stress that human language is culture-bound. This view concurs with what Ngubane (1991: 18) states. Ngubane states that cultural habitats are widely reflected in the language and its system, that is, language may be conditioned by cultural conditions.

The most common reasons given by learners for their perception that 'urban isiZulu' is destroying the Zulu culture are presented as follows: (1) 'Urban isiZulu' causes Zulus to adopt cultures and customs of people from which isiZulu borrows words, especially as there are now people who are buying houses in urban areas and tend not to believe in slaughtering for ancestors, (2) people who tend to use isiZulu borrowed words tend to adopt foreign cultures and forget their Zulu culture and (3) if 'urban isiZulu', which

learners consider stylish, is used, the youth lose respect for their parents and other older people.

It is evident from the data above that the majority of the learners have the belief that changes in isiZulu are a threat to their cultural identity. This is supported by Kamwangamalu (2000: 126) when he states that there are Africans who, having been educated through the medium of foreign languages, shun their mother tongues and behave like Europeans. That is, European languages have become an integral part of their lives and those languages have become part of the new cultural environment. However, people can identify with cultural group without speaking its language (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 125).

In Item 9 the respondents were required to indicate whether it is possible or not for ‘deep isiZulu’ to be kept ‘pure’. The summary of the closed-ended part of this item appears in Table 5.15 below.

**Table 5.15: The respondents’ view whether it is possible or not for ‘deep isiZulu’ to be kept ‘pure’**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Yes	No	Total
Urban	Females	10	04	09	13
	Females	12	05	07	12
	Males	10	03	09	12
	Males	12	05	08	13
Total			17 (34%)	33 (66%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	08	07	15
	Females	12	04	06	10
	Males	10	07	07	14
	Males	12	06	05	11
Total			25 (50%)	25 (50%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			42 (42%)	58 (58%)	100 (100%)

Table 5.15 shows that 58 (58%) respondents, that is, 33 (66%) township and 25 (50%) rural learners, stated that it is not possible for ‘deep isiZulu’ to be kept ‘pure’. 42% of the respondents maintained that ‘deep’ isiZulu can be kept ‘pure’. This view concurs with

Zungu's (1995: 7) idea that the purist view of a standard language is challengeable and that no man has control over language.

Learners' common reasons for arguing whether 'deep isiZulu' cannot be kept 'pure' and free from the influence of other languages are as follows: (1) IsiZulu is in contact with other languages which means that isiZulu borrows words and many of those words cannot be translated into 'deep isiZulu', (2) English is the medium of instruction in all secondary schools and Africans now tend to use many English borrowed words in isiZulu and (3) African learners are now attending multiracial schools where a lot of 'urban isiZulu' is used.

The reasons given by most of the respondents confirm Ngubane's (1991: 17) view. Ngubane states that it is not easy to have clear-cut boundaries because people move from one area to another, for instance, when a member of one dialect community marries a member of another group. These responses also support what has been revealed by Webb and Sure (2000: 60-61) who claim that human languages have neither fixed forms nor an internal control that is resistant to usage. According to Webb and Sure (2000) language variation comes about through contact between different languages. Such contact leads to borrowing of words. Language is a living entity and it is exposed to concepts, ideas and cultural aspects of neighbouring language community (Ngubane, 1991: 20).

Languages are never uniform entities, they can be observed to vary geographically and socially and according to the situational contexts in which they are used, hence languages or dialects are variable and in a state of change (Milroy, 1992: 1). The data also endorses Stockwell's (2002) position when he states that one must not speak of English but of 'Englishes'. The obtained data also support Kriger and Zegeye (2001: 17-23) who argue that traders used to be Afrikaners and Africans interacted with them because they were their bosses. From my experience, Afrikaans and English are taught as the second languages in schools and English is the medium of instruction. This situation leads to Afrikaans and English loans in isiZulu. This implies that the lexical rules of standard

isiZulu are broken because of the influence of other languages. The results of this situation make it clear that keeping ‘deep isiZulu’ ‘pure’ is impossible.

In Item 10 the respondents were required to rate the performance in isiZulu at their schools. The rating appears in Table 5.16 below.

**Table 5.16: The respondents’ rating of the performance in isiZulu at their schools**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Bad	Total
Urban	Females	10	01	01	07	03	01	13
	Females	12	00	05	04	02	01	12
	Males	10	00	02	05	04	01	12
	Males	12	00	06	06	00	01	13
Total			01 (2%)	14 (28%)	22 (44%)	09 (18%)	4 (8%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	00	00	03	07	05	15
	Females	12	00	02	05	02	01	10
	Males	10	01	01	02	03	07	14
	Males	12	00	00	07	04	00	11
Total			01 (2%)	03 (6%)	17 (34%)	16 (34%)	13 (26%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			02 (2%)	17 (17%)	39 (39%)	25 (25%)	17 (17%)	100 (100%)

Table 5.16 reveals that 39 (39%) of the respondents, that is 22 township (44%) and 17 rural (34%), rated their proficiency in isiZulu as good, whereas only 2 (2%) are excellent in isiZulu. There were 17 (17%) who were performing badly in isiZulu. This implies that learners, both rural and urban, are not very good in standard isiZulu. This response endorses what the learners’ essays indicated. Both rural and urban learners used almost an equal number of borrowed words in their essays. However, there were more rural learners among those who did not use borrowed words when telling a story which might perhaps be because rural learners know ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’ [‘deep isiZulu’] better than urban learners.

The learners’ reasons for giving a bad rating to the isiZulu performance in their schools are as follows: (1) Only few learners did well in 2006 June examinations, most learners obtained less than 40% and 22% passing marks, (2) learners do not understand the ‘deep

isiZulu' which is taught to them and (3) most learners come from urban areas and they consider 'deep isiZulu' to be unimportant.

In Question 11, learners were asked to rate their proficiency in written isiZulu. The rating appears in Table 5.17 below.

**Table 5.17: The respondents' rating of their proficiency in written isiZulu**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Excellent	Good	Mediocre	Satisfactory	Bad	Total
Urban	Females	10	02	10	00	01	00	13
	Females	12	03	07	00	02	00	12
	Males	10	03	04	01	04	00	12
	Males	12	03	09	00	01	00	13
Total			11 (22%)	30 (60%)	01 (2%)	08 (16%)	00 (0%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	01	06	00	05	03	15
	Females	12	01	07	01	01	00	10
	Males	10	01	06	01	06	00	14
	Males	12	01	05	01	04	00	11
Total			04 (8%)	24 (48%)	03 (6%)	16 (32%)	03 (6%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			15 (15%)	54 (54%)	04 (4%)	24 (24%)	03 (3%)	100 (100%)

The table above reveals that more than half of the respondents, that is, 54 (54%) rated themselves good in written isiZulu, whereas only 3 (3%) rated themselves bad. That response is in contrast with what the responses in Item 10 above revealed. It can be recalled that in Item 10 learners based their proficiency in isiZulu on their actual performance in June. According to the responses to Item 10, only a few learners did well in the 2006 June Examination. Most learners obtained 40% and less than 22% marks in isiZulu. The response in this item might probably be what learners think they are. It is surprising that learners from the rural schools are the ones amongst whom we get bad performers, that is, 3 (3%) in standard isiZulu. This negates the idea of Mesthrie (2002: 204) who claims that the standard varieties of African languages are associated with rural communities. At the end of every year when matriculation results are issued, I always compare rural and urban schools' performance in standard isiZulu. I have discovered that the schools which have good isiZulu Matric results are those schools which are regarded

as generally good performing schools, such as UMlokothwa High School at Nongoma and Mariannhill High School in Pinetown, both in rural and urban areas.

In Item 12, the respondents were asked to give their views on what they think can improve the isiZulu performance in secondary schools. Those common points were grouped into themes as follows: (1) Learners must have a love for isiZulu, (2) 'urban isiZulu' should be taught instead of 'deep isiZulu' and (3) educators must themselves improve their knowledge of 'deep isiZulu'.

The majority of respondents think that an increase in both learners' and educators' dedication to learning 'deep isiZulu' can improve the isiZulu results. That means that secondary educators in the selected schools also do not know 'deep isiZulu'. This endorses Jahr and Janicki's (1995: 30) who argue that it is one of the tasks of the school to teach the learners to look after the beauty and purity of the mother-tongue and it is a task of the school to have the learners express themselves clearly, correctly and esthetically both in speech and in writing. According to Makoni, et al. (2003: 85-86) African languages are poor because Africans do not want to enrich them by not wanting to use them in fields such as education.

In Item 13, the respondents were asked to express their feelings about the development of new words in isiZulu to incorporate new technological terms. The summary of the responses appears in Table 5.18 below.

**Table 5.18: The respondents' feeling about the development of the list of new isiZulu words**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Happy	Sad	No Problem	Total
Urban	Females	10	04	07	02	13
	Females	12	06	04	02	12
	Males	10	05	07	00	12
	Males	12	06	07	00	13
Total			21 (42%)	25 (50%)	04 (8%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	07	07	01	15
	Females	12	05	04	01	10
	Males	10	06	06	02	14
	Males	12	07	04	00	11
Total			25 (50%)	21 (42%)	04 (8%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			46 (46%)	46 (46%)	8 (8%)	100 (100%)

It is interesting to note that the same number of respondents, that is, 46 (46%), revealed out that they were happy or sad about the development of new words in isiZulu. Only 8 (8%) were indifferent. However, it is surprising to note that more rural learners, that is, 25 (50%), were happy about the development of the list of new isiZulu words compared to 21 township learners (42%) who were happy and 25 (50%) who were sad. Social and technological evolution and innovation in language and a local realignment in contact with other languages (this involves borrowing and copying) is necessary (Stockwell, 2002: 53). Languages are characterized by high degrees of variation (Singleton, 2000). The lexicon has been shaped by deliberate attempts to impose notions of bettering society (Ibid).

The most frequent reasons given by learners who were happy and who do not have a problem with the development of the list of new isiZulu words are as follows: (1) It shows that isiZulu is becoming rich in terminology because Zulus also need to know new isiZulu technological terms, (2) words such as '*icomputer*' and '*icell*' borrowed from other languages are common and as a result they can be understood by anyone from whom Zulus would love to seek help and (3) everything is changing nowadays and learners' isiZulu vocabulary is broadening.

The use of borrowed words in isiZulu as stipulated by learners confirms the view of Kubeka (1979: 230) who states that isiZulu is not properly equipped as a vehicle for imparting technological concepts. Therefore Zulu terms are coined with foreign technical terms in order to be suitable to be used in the teaching of technical subjects. The obtained data further endorses Kubeka's (1979: 228) argument that economics is contributing to rapid progress towards homogeneity in Zulu speech. That means that it is hard for 'deep isiZulu' to be developed to be in par with economy. This results in the incorporation of many loan words into isiZulu.

Question 14 seeks to find out which language is often used as an informal code. The responses of the closed-ended part of this question are summarized below in Table 5.19.

**Key: DZ = 'Deep' isiZulu, UZ = 'Urban' isiZulu, E = English, T = Tsotsitaal**

**Table 5.19: The language most frequently spoken in the respondents' schools**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	DZ	UZ	E	E and UZ	T	T and UZ	Total
Urban	Females	10	00	13	00	00	00	00	13
	Females	12	00	11	01	00	00	00	12
	Males	10	01	09	02	00	00	00	12
	Males	12	03	07	03	00	00	00	13
Total			04 (8%)	40 (80%)	06 (12%)	00	00	00	50 (50%)
Rural	Females	10	04	11	00	00	00	00	15
	Females	12	01	05	02	01	01	00	10
	Males	10	02	09	01	00	02	00	14
	Males	12	01	08	01	00	00	01	11
Total			08 (16%)	33 (66%)	04 (8%)	01 (2%)	03 (6%)	01 (2%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			12 (12%)	73 (73%)	10 (10%)	01 (1%)	3 (3%)	01 (1%)	100 (100%)

The majority of learners (73 / 73%), that is, 40 township learners (80%) and 33 rural learners (66%), pointed out that 'urban isiZulu' is frequently spoken by them in their schools. This suggests that 'urban isiZulu' is the language most frequently spoken by learners in the schools. This is true as far as I know in the schools I researched and due to



the fact that most learners in those schools have been exposed to 'urban' life. Learners from rural schools are exposed to 'urban' life through their fathers and brothers who work in urban industries.

In the open-ended parts, respondents were asked to give reasons for their answers. This part of the item generated numerous responses from 100 respondents. All similar responses were grouped together to form one theme. The most frequent reasons for each group who claim that 'urban isiZulu' is frequently spoken in their schools are (1) 'Urban isiZulu' is the township language because many educators and learners are urban Zulus, therefore it is easy to understand and communicate with each other, (2) 'urban isiZulu' is easier and better than other languages if one is with other racial groups and (3) many people at the schools like 'urban isiZulu' because it is easy and it has become mother-tongue of learners.

The majority of respondents appear to make the point that the school is dominated by Zulus and 'urban' mother-tongue speakers compared to only 12 (12% ) respondents made up of 4 township (8%) and 8 rural (16%) respondents who claimed to speak 'deep isiZulu'. Webb (2002: 68) endorses this obtained data of the majority respondents. Webb referred to 1996 statistics which indicated that the vast majority in KwaZulu-Natal speak isiZulu as their mother-tongue. That corresponds to what I found in those researched schools. There was, for instance, only one Sesotho speaker among the staff members in my school. That staff member originated from KwaZulu-Natal and moved to Qwaqwa. However, the obtained data indicates that the frequently spoken isiZulu is not standard isiZulu but 'urban isiZulu'.

Despite the fact that English is the medium of instruction, only 10 respondents (10%) indicated that English is frequently spoken in the schools. Some respondents stated that English is an international language, therefore, knowing it would make it easy for people to interact with anyone anywhere in the world. This finding is supports McDermott (2004: 110) and Webb (2002: 83) who maintain that English is a gate-way to the world for all and a prestige language. This might be why English has such an influence on

isiZulu lexicon, which results in learners adapting ‘urban isiZulu’. Very few respondents (rural) selected ‘*isiTsotsi*’ as the frequently spoken language in the schools.

In Item 15, the respondents were provided with English words and they were asked to give the commonly used isiZulu words for those English words provided. The summary of the responses appear in Table 5.20 below.

**Key: EW = English word, ZW =isiZulu word used**

**Table 5.20 IsiZulu words for English words provided by the respondents**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Understand (EW) Qonda (ZW)	Understand (EW) Verstana (ZW)	Understand (EW) Understanda (ZW)	Understand (EW) Ngiyayifica (ZW)
Urban	Females	10	13	00	00	00
	Females	12	12	00	00	00
	Males	10	11	00	01	00
	Males	12	12	00	01	00
Total			48 (96%)	00 (0%)	02 (4%)	00 (0%)
Rural	Females	10	11	00	04	00
	Females	12	07	00	03	00
	Males	10	08	02	03	01
	Males	12	09	00	02	00
Total			35 (70%)	02 (4%)	12 (24%)	01 (2%)
Grand Total			83 (83%)	02 (2%)	14 (14%)	01 (1%)

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	English (EW) isiNgisi (ZW)	English (EW) uJoji (ZW)	English (EW) E-Englishi(ZW)
Urban	Females	10	12	00	01
	Females	12	12	00	00
	Males	10	09	00	03
	Males	12	12	01	00
Rural	Females	10	10	03	02
	Females	12	08	00	02
	Males	10	13	01	00
	Males	12	08	02	01
Total			39 (78%)	06 (12%)	05 (10%)
Grand Total			84 (84%)	7 (7%)	9 (9%)

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Book (EW) Incwadi (ZW)	Book (EW) Ibhuku (ZW)	Salt (EW) Usawoti (ZW)	Salt (EW) Iswayi (ZW)	Radio (EW) Iradio (ZW)
Urban	Females	10	13	00	13	00	08
	Females	12	11	01	12	00	09
	Males	10	10	02	12	00	10
	Males	12	11	02	13	00	11
Total			45 (90%)	5 (10%)	50 (100%)	00 (0%)	12 (24%)
Rural	Females	10	14	01	08	07	07
	Females	12	10	00	07	03	05
	Males	10	14	00	09	05	07
	Males	12	11	00	03	08	04
Total			49 (78%)	01 (2%)	27 (54%)	23 (46%)	23 (46%)
Grand Total			94 (94%)	6 (6%)	77 (77%)	23 (23%)	61 (61%)

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Radio (EW) Igongo (ZW)	Radio (EW) Umsakazo (ZW)	Father (EW) Ubaba (ZW)	Father (EW) Ithayima (ZW)
Urban	Females	10	00	05	12	01
	Females	12	00	03	12	00
	Males	10	00	02	12	00
	Males	12	00	02	12	00
Total			00 (0%)	12 (24%)	49 (98%)	01 (2%)
Rural	Females	10	00	08	13	02
	Females	12	00	05	08	02
	Males	10	00	07	10	04
	Males	12	01	06	08	03
Total			01 (1%)	26 (52%)	39 (78%)	11 (22%)
Grand Total			01 (1%)	38 (38%)	88 (88%)	12 (12%)

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Let us go (EW) Asihambe (ZW)	Let us go (EW) Asivaye (ZW)	Let us go (EW) Asimashe (ZW)	Let us go (EW) Asiqhume (ZW)	It is okay (EW) Kulungile (ZW)
Urban	Females	10	12	01	00	00	12
	Females	12	12	00	00	00	12
	Males	10	12	00	00	00	06
	Males	12	12	01	00	00	11
Total			48 (96%)	02 (4%)	00 (0%)	00 (0%)	35 (70%)
Rural	Females	10	13	02	00	00	07
	Females	12	09	01	00	00	03
	Males	10	07	03	02	02	05
	Males	12	10	00	01	00	05
Total			39 (78%)	06 (12%)	03 (6%)	02 (4%)	20 (40%)
Grand Total			87 (87%)	08 (8%)	03 (3%)	02 (2%)	55 (55%)

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	It is okay (EW) Sure (ZW)	It is okay (EW) Kuright (ZW)	It is okay (EW) Kugrand (ZW)	It is okay (EW) Kumoja (ZW)	Come here (EW) Woza la (ZW)
Urban	Females	10	00	01	00	00	13
	Females	12	00	00	00	00	12
	Males	10	00	02	00	01	12
	Males	12	00	02	00	00	13
Total			00 (0%)	05 (10%)	00 (0%)	01 (2%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	00	06	00	02	14
	Females	12	00	07	00	00	08
	Males	10	00	04	02	03	03
	Males	12	01	02	00	00	08
Total			01 (2%)	19 (38%)	02 (4%)	05 (10%)	33 (66%)
Grand Total			01 (1%)	24 (24%)	2 (2%)	06 (6%)	83 (83%)

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	Come here (EW) Shayisa (ZW)	Come here (EW) Zwakala la (ZW)	Come here (EW) Moja (ZW)
Urban	Females	10	00	00	00
	Females	12	00	00	00
	Males	10	00	00	00
	Males	12	00	00	00
Total			00 (0%)	00 (0%)	00 (0%)
Rural	Females	10	00	01	00
	Females	12	01	01	00
	Males	10	05	06	00
	Males	12	02	01	00
Total			08 (16%)	09 (18%)	00 (0%)
Grand Total			08 (8%)	09 (9%)	00 (0%)

Table 5.20 above indicates that the majority of respondents seem to use words such as *'usawoti'* [salt] (township = 100% and rural = 54%) and *'iradio'* [radio] (61% -township = 76% and rural 46%) which are considered to be 'urban isiZulu' (non-standard). Only a few use words such as *'umsakazo'* [radio] (38%), *'iswayi'* [salt] (mostly rural learners) which are regarded as 'deep isiZulu' words. This obtained information concurs with responses in Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 where learners seemed to give positive feeling about 'urban isiZulu' compared to 'deep isiZulu'. Township and rural respondents appear to have similar responses in so far as the indication of positive feeling about 'urban isiZulu' is concerned.

There are learners who seemed to be using Tsotsitaal words instead of ‘deep isiZulu’ words. It is surprising that those Tsotsitaal words are mostly used by learners from rural schools. Those words are ‘*ithayima*’ [father], ‘*ujoji*’ [English], ‘*igongo*’ [radio], ‘*kugrand*’ [it is okay], or ‘*kumoja*’, ‘*shayisa*’ or ‘*zwakala la*’ [come here]. This is probably due to the fact that the fathers and brothers (who are dropouts from schools) of rural learners I researched are mostly working in Johannesburg where Tsotsitaal is frequently spoken.

Item 16 aimed at finding out which borrowed isiZulu words learners would use in their paragraph when telling a short story. The summary of the responses appears in Table 5.21 below according to the rank order of frequency (total frequencies = 141).

**Key: EW = English word from which isiZulu word is borrowed, AW = Afrikaans word from which isiZulu word is borrowed, DZW = ‘deep’ isiZulu word, BWUBL = Afrikaans and English-lexical borrowed words used by learners in their story, GT = Grand Total, F = Females, M = Males and T = Total**

**Table 5.21: Borrowed words used by learners when telling a story on how they spend their weekend**

EW	AW	DZW	BWUBL	URBAN			RURAL			GT
				F	M	T	F	M	T	
			No borrowed words	7	3	10	10	11	21	31 22%
I do washing		<i>Ngihlanza izingubo</i>	<i>Ngiwasha iwashing</i>	3	2	5	3	7	10	15 10.6%
T.V.		<i>Umabonakude</i>	<i>iT.V.</i>	2	0	2	2	8	10	12 8.5%
Movies		<i>Izithombe</i>	<i>Amamovie</i>	1	4	5	0	1	1	6 4.2%
Clean		<i>Hlanza</i>	<i>Ngicleana</i>	3	1	4	1	0	1	5 3.5%
Homework		<i>Umsebenzi wasekhaya</i>	<i>Uhomework</i>				2	1	3	3 2.1%
Radio		<i>Umsakazo</i>	<i>Iradio</i>				1	2	3	3 2.1%
My sister’s		<i>Kadadewethu</i>	<i>Kasisi</i>	1	1	2	0	0	0	2 1.4%

At 10h00 or 11h30		<i>Ngehora le-10</i>	<i>Ngo-10</i>	1	1	2	0	0	-	2	1.4%
In the soccer playground		<i>Enkundleni yebhola</i>	<i>Egroundini</i>	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	1.4%
In the library		<i>Emtatsheni wolwazi</i>	<i>eLibrary</i>	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	1.4%
	Bioskoop	<i>Isithombe</i>	<i>Ibhayiskobho</i>	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	1.4%
Weekends		<i>Izimpelasonto</i>	<i>Amaweekends</i>	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1%
On Sunday		<i>ngeSonto</i>	<i>ngeSunday</i>	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1.4%
	In die kamer	<i>Egunjini lokulala</i>	<i>Ekamereni</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
Dining room		<i>Igumbi lokudlela</i>	<i>Edining room</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
What we have planned		<i>Esikuhlelile</i>	<i>Esesikuplanile</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
To gym		<i>Ngiyozivocavoca</i>	<i>Ngiyojima</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
At the beach		<i>OLwandle</i>	<i>eBeach</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
In the cinema		<i>Ezithombeni</i>	<i>Ecinema</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
In town		<i>Edolobheni</i>	<i>Etown</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
Film		<i>Isithombe</i>	<i>Ifilimu</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
To attend		<i>Ngiyofunda</i>	<i>Ngiyo-attenda</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.7%
In the class		<i>Egunjini lokufundela</i>	<i>Eclasini</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.7%
To relax hair		<i>Ngiyolula izinwele</i>	<i>Ngiyorelaxer</i>	0	0	-	1	0	1	1	0.7%
In the kitchen		<i>Exhibeni</i>	<i>Ekitcheni</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.7%
For the week		<i>Isono</i>	<i>For iviki</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1%
In order to pass it		<i>Ngiphumelele kuso</i>	<i>Ngisiphase</i>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.7%
Party		<i>Umcimbi</i>	<i>Iparty</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.7%
And then		<i>Bese</i>	<i>And then</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.7%
Tests		<i>Izivivinyo</i>	<i>Amatest</i>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	

										0.7%
September tests		<i>Izivivinyo zikaLwezi</i>	<i>Amatest kaSeptember</i>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1 0.7%
Maths		<i>iziBalo</i>	<i>iMaths</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1 0.7%
	Afrikaans	<i>isiBhunu</i>	<i>i-Afrikaans</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1 0.7%
Poems		<i>Izinkondlo</i>	<i>Amapoem</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1 0.7%
Seventeen years		<i>Eyishumi nesikhombisa</i>	<i>Ewuseventeen</i>	0	0	0	1	0	1	1 0.7%
Exams		<i>Ukuhlola</i>	<i>Ama-exam</i>	0	0	0	0	1	1	1 0.7%

The Table above shows that only 22% of respondents did not use borrowed words in their story telling. The majority of respondents, that is 78%, (rural and urban) used borrowed words as indicated in the table above. However, urban township learners used more lexical borrowings in their stories than rural learners. The main reason would be higher degree of contact with English for learners in around Durban compared to those in Nongoma. In addition to the lexical items displayed in the table above, learners used numerous other English-lexical borrowings which have no equivalent in isiZulu such as ‘*ehostel*’ [in the hostel] and ‘*amanovels*’ [novels]. This implies that there is no way of avoiding borrowed words in isiZulu by the modern society. Koopman (1998) is correct when he argues that Zulu is still adapting to new situations and in so doing, continues to be a language taking on a new life. This is vividly displayed in learners’ essays which creatively employ a varied isiZulu lexicon.

Item 17 asked learners to give reasons for selecting either isiZulu or English for answering their interview questions. Interview questions were provided both in isiZulu and English (cf. Appendix 1). The number of learners who selected either isiZulu or English in answering the interviews questions is reflected in Table 5.22 below.

**Table 5.22: The number of learners who selected isiZulu or English to answer interview questions**

Location of the school	Respondents	Grade	IsiZulu	English	Total
Urban	Females	10	05	08	13
	Females	12	09	03	12
	Males	10	07	05	12
	Males	12	04	09	13
Total			25 (50%)	25 (50%)	50 (100%)
Rural	Females	10	09	06	15
	Females	12	03	07	10
	Males	10	08	06	14
	Males	12	04	07	11
Total			24 (48%)	26 (52%)	50 (100%)
Grand Total			49 (49%)	51 (51%)	100 (100%)

It is interesting to notice from Table 5.22 above that there was an almost equal number of respondents who selected English, that is 51 (51%) made up of 50% township and 52% rural and 49 (49%) made up of 50% township and 48% rural, selected isiZulu. This implies that about half of the learners probably see a difference between English and isiZulu, but they may prefer English in an educational setting and for answering an interview questionnaire. More than half of rural learners selected English. Those who answered in isiZulu mixed English words and isiZulu words such as '*ngisi-understanda kangcono*' [I understand it better] and '*I-English iright*'. On the other hand those who answered in English were doing well.

Learners who chose isiZulu to answer the interview questions gave the common reasons as follows (cf. appendix 3 for other reasons): (1) IsiZulu is the learners' mother-tongue and is known and understood better than English, (2) many learners are Zulus and live in rural areas and (3) one does speak English but there is a time when one runs out of English words because one is not an English speaker.

Learners who selected English to answer interview questions gave the reasons as follows (cf. Appendix 3 for other reasons): (1) Learners want to master English and experience no problems when they come out of schools especially because English is the language of



communication internationally, (2) English is easier and more understandable than isiZulu, therefore answering in English might improve one's English day by day and (3) learners like English because it is the language of interaction with non-isiZulu speakers.

There are responses above which support what was discovered by Martin (1996: 55) in his research. Martin found that children in the rural schools are motivated to learn English because their parents depended on them for English literary skills. English has acquired such prestige that people are regarded as civilized, developed and successful only if they know some English, regardless of the real degree of their literacy and numeracy (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 114). English is used as an instrumental motivation (used for individual gain) and as integrative motivation (wish to use or learn language in order to be accepted in the community) (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 120).

### **5.3 CONCLUSION**

The responses in this chapter suggest that both rural and urban secondary school learners use 'urban isiZulu' more frequently than 'deep isiZulu' both in the school setting and in their homes. But rural learners seem to speak 'deep isiZulu' more frequently at their homes. There are also no longer many differences between the isiZulu used by rural learners and that one used by the urban ones. While 'deep isiZulu' is neither very well known nor spoken very often among young isiZulu-speaking learners, this research suggests that it is still treasured by the youth. 78% of learners (80% urban and 76% rural learners) would love 'deep isiZulu' to continue to be taught in schools and they think that 'urban isiZulu' destroys the Zulu culture. However, the majority of learners in responding to most of the interview questions, revealed that they use non-standard varieties more frequently. It can be remembered that in all KwaZulu-Natal secondary schools, English is the medium of instruction. Both rural and urban learners borrow English words and use them in isiZulu by using isiZulu prefixes and suffixes. The fact that learners do not use 'deep isiZulu' implies that the teaching of 'deep isiZulu' in schools is problematic because it is no longer used among the youth. The question which arises is how it is

possible for stakeholders such as dominant community members to come to some consensus regarding which type of isiZulu can be taught effectively to learners.

In the light of these findings, I would say that policy designers should take into account the influence of 'urban isiZulu' when promoting isiZulu as the medium of instruction at tertiary institutions and at schools and should incorporate an acceptance of English lexical borrowings.

In the next chapter I will conclude my study. I will also offer recommendations emanating from the findings.

## CHAPTER SIX

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is the final chapter which concludes the study. Recommendations based on the findings are also offered.

The findings in this research have shown that ‘urban isiZulu’ is a preferred choice among learners. 82% (74% urban and 90% rural learners) stated that they did make use of the word ‘*ngikhonzela*’ [pass regards to]. Madlala (2006), an isiZulu purist complained about its usage, claiming that ‘*ngikhonza*’ [pass regards to] should be used instead which would be the ‘deep’ version of the word. Beside the word ‘*ngikhonzela*’ (cf. 1.2), 33% of learners (56% urban and 10% rural learners) revealed that they did make use of the word ‘*yamampela*’ [the real thing] which King Goodwill, an isiZulu gatekeeper, has complained about (cf. 1.2). The learners use these words which are regarded as non-standard isiZulu by isiZulu gatekeepers. That means that learners who were participants in the study do not share the purists’ concerns. Furthermore, 55% of learners (60% urban and 50% rural learners) showed that they do not like talking ‘deep isiZulu’ and 91% (96% urban and 86% rural learners) claimed to use ‘urban isiZulu’ in their schools. 77% (94% urban and 52% rural learners) use ‘urban isiZulu’ at home. That is the main reason why 61% of learners (74% urban and 48% rural learners) would prefer ‘urban isiZulu’ to be the medium of instruction. The above data was also evident in the learners’ essays which employed about 100 English-lexical borrowings, and it was also proved by 78% learners (80% urban and 76% rural learners) who could not tell their story without lexical borrowings, which fall out of the ‘deep isiZulu’ or ‘*isiZulu esijulile*’. The urban-rural dichotomy is not as stark as previously assumed. It is noteworthy, however, that less than 50% of rural learners prefer ‘urban isiZulu’ to be the medium of instruction (cf. Table 5.12).

The above findings show that there are differences between the language varieties that secondary school learners use and the standard variety that is imposed upon them in the education system. The data suggests that both ‘urban isiZulu’ and ‘deep isiZulu’ should

be encouraged in the education system. The data warrants that the 'urban isiZulu' used by learners should be incorporated and acknowledged as one of the choices in language planning processes. The above findings also present me with many challenges which makes it necessary to give some recommendations.

Being an isiZulu scholar, I advocate that 'standard' isiZulu be revised; taking into consideration the non-standard lexical terms or commonly used English-lexical borrowings. These non-standard varieties must be accepted as having a useful role to play in the communities they are used. I am suggesting this idea because English-lexical borrowings are well known compared to the not so well known standard isiZulu ('deep isiZulu'). This is on a par with innovation in the country and the modernization of technology. Those newly developed lexical terms need to be incorporated into standard isiZulu in order to develop them into more acceptable terms of usage. That is, a bi-dialectal approach (equal recognition of standard and non-standard language varieties) should be adopted. IsiZulu development calls for an investigation which must be undertaken to collect more isiZulu non-standard lexical terms which are commonly known and used, in order to incorporate them as standard language equivalents. That will create space for knowledge about isiZulu varieties. This might motivate isiZulu speakers to do research on isiZulu and to publish papers and articles on different aspects of isiZulu varieties. Therefore, the attitude towards the use of standard language might probably change. A plan for codification and standardization of lexical development must be created. I also recommend that the study of language varieties be introduced during the professional training of educators in universities and technikons, in order for educators to acquaint themselves with principles whereby the use of non-standard varieties is accommodated. The main reason is that educators need to be made aware of the importance and role of non-standard language varieties.

I further suggest that the newly developed terms be incorporated into the dictionaries which need to be developed by mother-tongue speakers of isiZulu. Prinsloo (1998: 49) states that although dictionaries may be readily available for most of these languages, lexicographers agree that they lack proper lexicographic planning. According to Prinsloo

(1998) it is better either to improve on existing dictionaries by incorporating English lexical borrowings or to compile dictionaries for lexical items for which no dictionaries have as yet been published. The incorporation of non-standard into standard language is supported by Fromkin and Rodman (1988: 261) when they state that “one dialect is neither better nor worse than another, nor purer nor more corrupt; it is simply different.” They argue that any judgments about the superiority or inferiority of a particular dialect are based on social judgments, not linguistic ones. So the English-lexical borrowings are appropriate in isiZulu.

Moreover, I suggest that IsiZulu purists be exposed to the findings revealed by isiZulu researchers pertaining to isiZulu variation and that further research be done on isiZulu lexical items. IsiZulu researchers should not be from KwaZulu-Natal only, but from the whole South Africa since isiZulu is spoken throughout the country. Standard isiZulu is taught nationally and examination papers are set nationally. IsiZulu speakers must have access to that research. The change might cause tremendous resistance. Therefore, the change needs proper planning, involvement, co-operation and effective communication. The involvement of isiZulu stakeholders such as community members might enhance and facilitate the revision of the isiZulu policy within the country.

Furthermore I advocate that isiZulu educators’ job interviews be conducted in ‘urban isiZulu’ as well, in order to change the attitudes of learners towards isiZulu and the situation might be improved.

The above recommendations are offered because the study has found a number of reasons of the use of non-standard isiZulu varieties by young isiZulu speakers. Some of those causes are linked to social and contextual factors such as the township lives, education, age, modernization and exposure to multiculturalism and multilingualism. The language is socially embedded (Makoni, et al., 2003: 11). The newly standardized isiZulu variety will then be implemented in educational institutions such as the schools and in the community at large.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adolphs, S. 2006. *Introducing Electronic Text Analysis: A Practical Guide for Language and Literary Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Aijmer, R. & Alenber, B. (eds.). 1991. *English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik*. London and New York: Longman.

Aitchison, J. 1978. *Linguistics*. Sevenoaks: Kents, Hodder and Stoughton.

Bex, T. 1996. *Variety in Written English*. London and New York: Routledge.

Brookes, E.H. & Webb, C.C.B. 1962. *A History of Natal*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Chambers, J.K. 1995. *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and its Social Significance*. Cambridge and Oxford: Blackwell.

Chambers, J.K., Trudgill, P. & Chilling-Estes, N. 2004. *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Colan, D. 1988. *Construction and Reconstruction of Zulu History*. Unpublished thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy; submitted to the Senate of the Hebrew University. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Cole, D. 1993. Doke's Classification of Bantu Languages. In Herbert, R.K., *Foundations in Southern African Linguistics*. University of the Witwatersrand (Johannesburg): The Witwatersrand University Press.

Cooper, P. & De V Cluver, A.D. 1990. Sociolinguistics. *In Study Guide 2 for LNG 100-S: Language Use*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Crystal, D. 1985. *What is Linguistics?* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd.

De V Cluver, A.D. 1990. *Sociolinguistics: Study Guide 2 for LNG 100-S (Language in use)*. Pretoria: UNISA (Department of Linguistics).

Department of Education. 2005. *Matric Results Statistics*. Unpublished isiZulu Maric results analysis. Durban: IsiZulu Subject Advisors.

Deumert, A. 2005. The Standard –Reflections on Post-colonial Standard Languages, with Special Attention to South Africa. In V. Webb, Deumert, A & Lepota, B., *The Standardisation of African Languages in South African Languages in South Africa*. University of Pretoria: PanSALB.

Driven, R. 1990. Contact and Conflict Linguistics in Southern Africa. In K. Chick (ed.), *Searching for Relevance: Contextual Issues in Applied Linguistics in Southern Africa*. Durban: South African Applied Linguistics Association.

Doke, C.M. 1954. *The Southern Bantu Languages*. London, New York and Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Doke, C.M. & Cole, D.T. 1961. *Contributions to the History of Bantu Linguistics*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Extra, G. & Maartens, J. 2004. *Multilingualism in a Multicultural Context: Case Studies on South Africa and Western Europe*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Fanaroff, D. & du Plessis, P.G. 1972. *South African English Dialect: A Literature Survey: Republic of South Africa: Second Report*. Pretoria: South African Human Sciences Research Council.

Fardon, R. & Furniss, G. 1994. *African Languages, Development and the State*. London and New York: Routledge.

Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. 1988. *An Introduction to Language*. London: Helt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gumede, R.B. 1996. *National Lexicalization and Usage of Some Zulu Terms*. Unpublished B.A. (Hons) dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. KwaDlangezwa: University of Zululand.

Guy, J. 2001. *The View Across the River*. Claremont: David Phillip Publishers.

Hance, G.R. 1916. *The Zulu Yesterday and To-day: Twenty-nine Years in South Africa*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co.

Hartshorne, K. 1992. *Crisis and Challenge: Black education 1910-1990*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Herbert, R.K. (ed.). 1993. *Foundations in Southern African Linguistics*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Higa, M. 1979. Sociolinguistic Aspects of Word-borrowing. In W.F. Mackey & Ornstein, J. (eds.), *Sociolinguistic Studies in Language Contact: Methods and Cases*. New York: Mouton Publishers.

Hudson, R.A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jahr, E.H. & Janicki, K. 1995. The Function of the Standard Variety: A Contrastive Study of Norwegian and Polish. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 113(1995), pp. 25-44. New York: Mouton de Guyter.



Johnstone, B. 2000. *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kamwangamalu, N.M. 2000. Language in Contact. In V. Webb & Sure, K., *African Voices: An Introduction to the Languages and Linguistics of Africa*. Oxford: University Press.

Kauffman, L. (ed.) 1988. *Webster's Dictionary*. Maryland: Harbor House.

Koopman, A. 1994. *Lexical Adoptives in Zulu*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Zulu. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.

Koopman, A. 1998. Another Look at Zulu Compound Nouns: In F.A.C. Nkabinde, *Some Issues in African Linguistics*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Kotey, P.F.A. 1999. *New Dimension in African Linguistics and Languages*. Trenton: Africa World Press.

Kruger, R. & Zegeye, A. (eds.). 2001. *Culture in the New South Africa after Apartheid*, Vol. 2: 15-23. Cape Town: Khwela Books and SA History Online.

Kubeka, I.S. 1979. *A Preliminary Survey of Zulu Dialects in Natal and Zululand*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts. Durban: University of Natal.

Lafon, M. 2005. The Future of IsiZulu Lies in Gauteng. In V. Webb, Deumert, A. & Lepota, B. (eds.), *The Standardisation of African languages in South Africa*. University of Pretoria: PanSALB.

Lambert, J. & Morrel, R. 1996. Domination and Subordination in Natal 1890-1920. In R. Morrel (ed.), *Political Economy and Identities in KwaZulu-Natal: Historical and Social Perspective*. University of Natal (Durban): Indicator Press.

Leedy, P.D. 1974. *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Lippi-Green, R. 1997. *English with an Accent: Languages, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London and New York: Routledge.

Maake, N.P. 1994. Dismantling the Tower of Babel: In Search of a New Language Policy for a Post-Apartheid South Africa. In R. Fardon & Furniss, G., *African Languages, Development and the State*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mackey, W.F & Ornstein, J. 1979. *Sociolinguistic Studies in Language Contact: Methods and Cases*. New York: Mouton Publishers.

Madiba, M. 2001. Towards a Model for Terminology Modernization in the African Languages of South Africa. *Language Matters*, 32, pp. 53-57.

Madlala, B.E. 2006. Ningavumi Ukudukiswa Ngabanye Abantu. *Ilanga*, 3-5 April, final edition.

Makoni, S., Smitherman, G., Ball, A.F & Spears, A.K. 2003. *Black Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Maphumulo, M.A. 2005. IsiZulu. In V. Webb, Deumert, A. & Lepota, B. (eds.), *The Standardisation of African Languages in South Africa*. University of Pretoria: PanSALB.

Martin, D. 1996. *Zulu is the Talk Lovely: Investigating Perceptions of Being Bilingual in Zulu/ English Speaking Children in South Africa*. Durban (University of Natal): Education Policy Unit.

Mathonsi, N.N. 1994. *The Effects of a Multilingual situation on Zulu Syntax and Semantics in the Greater Durban Area*. Unpublished thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in the Department of Zulu Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities. Durban: University of Natal.

Mazrui, A.A. & Mazrui, A.M. 1998. *The Power of Babel: Language and Governance in the African Experience*. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

McDermott, L. 2004. The Case of English in South Africa. *In Language in Education: An International Journal*, Vol. 18: 3(2004). pp. 105-118.

Mesthrie, R. 2002. South Africa: A Sociolinguistic Overview. In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Language in South Africa*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milroy, J. 1992. *Linguistic Variation and Change: On the Historical Socio? Linguistics of English*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Company.

Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. 1985. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription*. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. 1999. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardization*. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mitchel, M. & Jolley, J. 2004. *Research Design Explained*. Australia: Wadsworth.

Mofokeng, L. 2005. Zulu King Gets TV Slogan Trashed. *Sunday Times*, 6 February, late & final edition.

Morrell, R. (ed.). 1996. *Political Economy and Identities in KwaZulu-Natal: Historical and Social Perspectives*. University of Natal (Durban): Indicator Press.

Mulder, J.C. 1989. *Statistical Techniques in Education*. Pretoria: Sigina Press .

Mutaka, N.N. 2000. *An Introduction to African Linguistics*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

Nandraj, S. 2003. *Gender Imbalances in Positions of Leadership at Schools*. Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for Masters Degree in Education in the School of Educational Studies. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Ndlovu, E. 2005. *IsiZulu Sangempela. Ilanga, 6 – 8 October, Final edition*.

Nelde, P.H. (ed.) 1983. *Theory, Methods and Models of Contact Linguistics*. Bonn: Ferd.

Ngubane, S.E. 1991. *A Survey of Nothern Zululand Dialects in the Ngwavuma District*. Unpublished M.A. thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Zulu Language and Literature. Durban: University of Natal.

Nhlapho, J. 1945. *Nguni and Sotho*. Cape Town: African Bookman.

Nhlumayo, V.B. 1999. *Uphenyo Ngolimi Lwesigodi Isizansi Olukhulunywa Ngabantu Basezansi Nogu Lolwandke LaKwaZulu-Natal Nomthelela Walo Lubafundi Bebanga Leshumi*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts. Durban: University of Durban-Westville.

Nkosi, N.R. & Msomi, G.N. 1992. *Izikhali Zabaqeqeshi Nabafundi*. Pietermaritzburg: Reach Out Publishers.

Nyembezi, C.L.S. 1956. *Uhlelo LwesiZulu [Zulu Grammar]*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter & Shooter (Pty) Ltd.

Nyembezi, S. 1957. *Learn Zulu*. Pietermaritzburg: Reach Out Publishers.

Nyembezi, S. 1992. *Isichazamazwi Sanamuhla Nangomuso*. Pietermaritzburg: Reach Out Publishers.

Penalosa, F. 1981. *Introduction to the Sociology of Language*. London: Newbury House Publishers.

Poole, S.C. 1999. *An Introduction to Linguistics*. New York: Palgrave.

Postma, O.C. 1985. *Early Nguni History: The Linguistic Evidence and its Correlation with Archaeology and Oral Tradition*. University of California: University Microfilms.

Poulos, G. 1981. *Issues in Zulu Relativization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

Prinsloo, D.J. 1998. Dictionaries for African Languages: The Road Ahead. In F.A.C. Nkabinde, *Some Issues in African Linguistics*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Reader, D.H. 1966. *Zulu Tribe in Transition: The Makhanya of Southern Natal*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Richards, L. 1999. *Using Nvivo in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.

Romaine, S. 1992. *Language, Education and Development*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Romaine, S. 1994. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Rubagumya, C.M. 1994. *Teaching and Researching Language in African Classrooms*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Shange, O.L. 1953. *Injula Nokujiya KwesiZulu*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.

Shoyisa, S. 2006. YisiZulu Esiqondile Lesi, *Ilanga*, 6-8 March, late final edition.

Siachitema, A.K. 1986. Attitude Towards the Case of English in Three Neighbourhoods of Lusaka. In *Language in Education in Africa: Seminar Proceedings*, No. 26: 202. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Sidaki, G.M.P. 1987. *Teaching of Language: Special Reference to Spoken and Written Language in KwaZulu Junior Secondary Schools*. Unpublished M.A. thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in the subject didactics at the University of Zululand. KwaDlangezwa: University of Zululand.

Sikhosana, B.R. 1997. *A Brief Oral History of Zulu Clans through Izibongo and Izithakazelo*. Unpublished research project in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the M.A. degree in the Department of Orality and Literacy Studies. Durban: University of Natal.

Silverman, D. 1985. *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology: Describing the Social World*. England: Gower Publishing Company Ltd.

Singleton, D. 2000. *Language and the Lexicon: An Introduction*. London: Arnold.

Stockwell, P. 2002. *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

The Constitution Assembly. 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa: Act 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Thomas, G. 1991. *Linguistic Purism*. London and New York: Longman.

Townshed, J.B. 1996. *The Zulu: Practical Handy Easy Zulu*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.

Trudgill, P. 1994. *Dialects*. London and New York: Routledge.

University of South Africa. 2003. *Focus Group Interviewing*. Pretoria: Institute for Adult Basic Education and Training.

Vakalisa, N.C.G. 1995. *African Science, Teachers' Perceptions of How Inservice Education Influences Classroom teaching: A Case Study*. Unpublished D.A. dissertation presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of the Ohio State University. Ohio State: Ohio State University.

Vilakazi, A. 1962. *Transformations: A study of the Dynamics of Social Change*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Walizer, M.H. & Wiener, P.L. 1978. *Research Methods and Analysis: Searching for Relationships*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Wardhaugh, R. 2002. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Webb, V. 2002. *Language in South Africa*. Philadelphia: Hohn Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Webb, V. 2005. The Role of Language Standardisation in the Effective Functioning of Communities in Public Life in South Africa. In V. Webb, Deumert, A. & Lepota, B.

(eds.), *The Standardisation of African Languages in South Africa*. University of Pretoria: PanSALB.

Webb, V., Deumert, A. and Lepota, B. (eds.). 2005. *The Standardisation of African Languages in South Africa*. University of Pretoria: PanSALB.

Webb, V. & Sure, K. 2000. *African Voices: An Introduction to the Languages and Linguistics of Africa*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Willemsse, H. 1991. *A Position Paper on Language Policy in a New South Africa: New Observations*, 83: 6-8. New York: Routledge.

Wilson, J. & Henry, A. 1998. Parameter Setting Within a Socially Realistic Linguistics. In W. Bright (ed.), *Language in Society*, Vol. 27: 1(1998). pp.1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Woods, D. 1985. *Language Standards and their Codification, Process and Application*. Exeter: University of Exeter.

Xala, N. 2006. Asingafuhleli Uma Sithi Siyethula. *Umafrika*, 3-9 March, final & late edition.

Zungu, P.J.N. 1995. *Language Variation in Zulu*. Unpublished D.A. thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Literature and Philosophy in the Department of Zulu. Durban: University of Durban-Westville.

Zungu, P.J.N. 2004. The Status of Zulu in KwaZulu-Natal. *Language and Education: An International Journal*, Vol.18: 3(2004). pp. 37-48.



## APPENDIX 1

### INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS

I am a Masters student at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and I am doing research on standard versus non-standard isiZulu. You have been randomly selected from the township and rural secondary schools in Umlazi and Vryheid districts. The data I collect will be purely for research purposes. Your responses to the interview questions will contribute to the success of this research. Your responses will be kept confidential and you are not required to give your name. Thank you for your commitment.

*Ngingumfundi weMasters eNyuvesi yaKwaZulu-Natal, ngenza uphenyo ngesiZulu esijulile naleso esikhulunywayo. Ukhethwe ngokulingana ezikoleni zasedolobheni nezasemaphandleni ezingaphansi kwamadistrithi amabili, uMlazi kanye neFilidi. Ulwazi engiluqoqayo luqondene nezinjongo zophenyo kuphela. Izimpendulo zakho ziyogcinwa ziyimfihlo futhi igama lakho alidingakali. Ngiyabonga ngokuzinikela kwakho.*

### ENGLISH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (SAMKE)

#### STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDING QUESTIONS

Grade of the respondent:

#### SECTION A

- Sex of the respondent

Female	
Male	

- Age of the respondent

- Locality of the respondent's school

Rural	
Urban	
Semi-urban / Suburban	
Township	

- Place of the respondent's school

Nongoma	
KwaMakhutha	

## 5. Mother-tongue of the respondent

IsiZulu	
English	
Afrikaans	
Other (specify).....	

## SECTION B

1. Let us study **the underlined words** in the two columns in the table below. Say which words you frequently use in your school.

SPOKEN ISIZULU	PUT A CROSS (X)	“DEEP ISIZULU”	PUT A CROSS (X)
“ <u>Ngikhonzela umama</u> ”. [I’m passing regards to my mother]		“ <u>Ngikhonza kumama</u> ”. [I’m passing regards to my mother.]	
“ <u>Ngizocula ingoma yamampela</u> ”. [I’ll sing the real song.]		“ <u>Ngizocula ingoma yangempela</u> ”. [I’ll sing the real song.]	
“ <u>Ubaba udlala indima enkulu emphakathini wakithi</u> ”. [My father is playing an important role in our community.]		“ <u>Ubaba ubambe iqhaza elikhulu emphakathini wakithi</u> ”. [My father is playing an important role in our community.]	
“ <u>Ukuhlola kuqala mhlaka 10</u> ”. [The examination starts on the 10 <sup>th</sup> .]		“ <u>Ukuhlola kuqala mhla ziyi-10</u> ”. [The examination starts on the 10 <sup>th</sup> .]	
“ <u>Mhlasimpe /Mhlampe ngizophasa ngoJuni</u> ”. [Perhaps I’ll pass in June.]		“ <u>Mhlawumbe ngizophumelela ngoJuni</u> ”. [Perhaps I’ll pass in June.]	

2. How do you feel about the use of “yamampela” [the real thing] instead of “yangempela” (the real thing) and “ngikhonzela” [pass my regards to] instead of “ngikhonza” [pass my regards to]? Give reasons for your answer.
3. What do you understand is isiZulu *esijulile*?
4. Do you like talking 'deep isiZulu'?
- Yes or  No

Give reasons for your answer.

5. What type of isiZulu is frequently used by learners in your school? Is it 'deep isiZulu' or 'urban isiZulu'? Give reasons for your answer.
6. Do you use 'deep isiZulu' or 'urban isiZulu' at home? Give reasons for your answer.
7. If you are required to choose the type of isiZulu that must be your medium of instruction. Do you prefer 'urban isiZulu' or 'deep isiZulu'? Give reasons for your answer.
8. In your opinion, is it necessary for 'deep isiZulu' to be continued to be learnt in schools?  
 Yes or  No
- Give reasons for you answer.
9. Do you think the use of 'urban is Zulu' destroys the Zulu culture? Give reasons for your answer.
10. Is it possible for 'deep is Zulu' to be kept “pure”, that is, to protect it from the influence of other languages? Give reasons for your answer?
11. How is the performance in isiZulu at your school? Please explain by referring to the June isiZulu results.
12. How do you rate your proficiency in written isiZulu?  
 Excellent  Good  Mediocre  Satisfactory  Bad
13. What do you think can improve isiZulu performance in secondary schools?
14. How do you feel about the development of the list of new words of isiZulu to incorporate new technological terms? Give reasons for your answer.
15. Which language is frequently used in your school? Give reasons for your answer.
16. Orally provide me with the frequently used isiZulu words for the following English words:

English words	IsiZulu words (frequently used)
Understand	
English	
Book	
Salt	
Radio	

Father	
--------	--

17. Will you please tell a short story of about five to eight sentences in isiZulu how you spend your weekend.
18. Why did you select English to answer the interview questions?

**Thank you very much for responding to the interview questions.**

**APPENDIX 1****ISIZULU INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (SAMKE)****UHLA LWEMIBUZO ELEKELELAYO KUNGXOXO EHLELELWE**

Ibanga lomphenduli:

**ISIQEPHU A**

## 1. Ubulili bomphenduli

Isifazane	
isilisa	

## 2. Iminyaka kamphenduli

## 3. Indawo yesikole somphenduli

Emaphandleni	
Edolobheni	
Emngceleni	
Elokishini	

## 4. Igama lendawo yesikole somphenduli

Nongoma	
KwaMakhutha	

## 5. Ulimi lwebele lomphenduli

IsiZulu	
IsiNgisi	
IsiBhunu	
Olunye (lusho).....	

**ISIQEPHU B**

1. Asibheke amagama adwetshelwe asebhokisini elingezansi. Yisho ukuthi yimaphi amagama ajwayelwe ukusetshenziswa ngabafundi esikoleni sakho?

ISIZULU ESIKHULUNYWAYO	BEKA ISIPHAMBANO (X)	ISIZULU ESIJULILE	BEKA ISIPHAMBANO (X)
<u>Ngikhonzela</u> umama.		<u>Ngikhonza</u> kumama.	
Ngizocula ingoma <u>yamampela</u> .		Ngizocula ingoma <u>yangempela</u> .	
Ubaba <u>udlala indima</u> enkulu emphakathini wakithi.		Ubaba <u>ubambe iqhaza</u> elikhulu <u>emphakathini</u> wakithi.	
Ukuhlola kuqala ngomhlaka 10.		Ukuhlola kuqala <u>mhla ziyi-</u> <u>10</u> .	
<u>Mhlasimpe</u> / <u>Mhlampe</u> <u>ngizophasa</u> ngoJuni.		<u>Mhlawumbe</u> ngizophumelela ngoJuni.	

2. Uphatheka kanjani ngokusetshenziswa kwegama “yamampela” esikhundleni sokuthi “yangempela” kanye negama “ngikhonzela” esikhundleni sokuthi “ngikhonza”? Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
3. Wazi ukuthi siyini ‘isiZulu esijulile’?
4. Uyakuthanda ukukhuluma ‘isiZulu esijulile’?  
Yebo noma Cha  
  
Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
5. Hlobo luni lwesiZulu elisetshenziswa izingane esikoleni sakho? 'isiZulu esijulile' noma 'isiZulu sasedolobheni'? Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
6. Usebenzisa 'isiZulu esijulile' noma 'isiZulu sasedolobheni' ekhaya? Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
7. Ekengithi ucelwa ukuba ukhethhe uhlobo lwesiZulu esingasetshenziswa ekufundiseni. Ukhetha 'isiZulu sasedolobheni', noma 'isiZulu esijulile'. Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
8. Ucabanga ukuthi kubalulekile ukuthi 'isiZulu esijulile' sifundwe ezikoleni?  
Yebo noma Cha  
  
Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
9. Ucabanga ukuthi ukusetshenziswa kwesiZulu 'sasedolobheni' kuyalibulala yini isiko lamaZulu? Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
10. Kungenzeka yini ukuthi 'isiZulu esijulile' sihlale siyiso, sivikeleke emtheleleni wezinye izilimi? Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.

11. Abafundi besikole sakho benza kanjani esifundweni sesiZulu? Chaza ubhekise emiphumelweni yesiZulu yangoJuni.
12. Uzikala kanjani ekwazini kwakho isiZulu (ekubhaleni nasekukhulumeni)?  
 Sihle kakhulu     Sihle     Siyanelisa nje     Simbi
13. Ucabanga ukuthi yini engenza imiphumela yesiZulu ibe ngcono?
14. Uphatheka kanjani ngokukhula kohla lwamagama esiZulu ukuze kufakekwe amagama amasha etheknoloji? Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
15. Yiluphi ulimi olusetshenziswa kakhulu esikoleni sakho uma kuxoxwa nje? Nikeza izizathu zempendulo yakho.
16. Nikeza amagama esiZulu ajwayelwe ukusetshenziswa kulana esiNgisi:

Amagama esiNgisi	Amagama esiZulu ajwayelwe ukusetshenziswa
Understand	
English	
Book	
Salt	
Radio	
Father	

17. Ngicela uxoxe indaba emfishane (imigqa emi-5 kuya kweyisi-8) ngesiZulu ngokuthi uyichitha kanjani impelasonto yakho.
18. Yingani ukhethe ukuphendula imibuzo ngolimi lwesiZulu engxoxweni yethu?

**Ngiyabonga kakhulu ngezimpendulo zakho.**

## APPENDIX 2

### ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR LEARNERS' ESSAYS

The key questions are as follows:

1. What are the non-standard lexical items employed by rural and urban secondary learners in Nongoma and Durban (KwaMakhutha) in their essays?
2. Are there any common non-standard lexical items used by both rural and urban learners in their essays?
3. Do rural and urban secondary school learners use any modern isiZulu terms in their essays?
4. Do rural and urban secondary school learners use words borrowed from other languages, that is, Afrikaans and English?
5. In how far are rules of isiZulu *esijulile* (standard isiZulu) observed by rural and township learners in their writing?



### APPENDIX 3 LEARNERS' RESPONSES ON OPEN-ENDED PARTS OF THE INTERVIEWS QUESTIONS

#### Learners' reasons for being happy about the use of the words '*yamampela*' and '*ngikhonzela*'

Reason	Urban schools			Rural schools			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- It is easy to understand and pronounce those words such as ' <i>yamampela</i> ' and ' <i>ngikhonzela</i> '. It is also the language frequently and mostly used for youth or new generations and it means one and same thing as ' <i>yangempela</i> ' and ' <i>ngikhonza</i> '. Therefore, we are used to and it is used by the right people at the right place and it causes one to be accepted among other young people. It shows freedom of speech.	5	11	16	4	5	9	25
- People use different pronunciations for different words meaning one and the same thing.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- Rural children are getting pressure from children who are staying in townships who influence rural children.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- The use of those words is an attempt to accommodate people who cannot speak isiZulu but trying to.	-	-	-	1	-	1	01
- When one uses words such as ' <i>ngikhonza</i> ' and ' <i>yangempela</i> ', which are believed by isiZulu purists to be 'deep' isiZulu, one is regarded as coming from rural areas and inferior.	1	0	1	0	0	0	01

Learners' reasons for being sad about the use of the words '*yamampela*' and '*ngikhonzela*'

Reason	Urban schools			Rural schools			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- The use of the words such as ' <i>yamampela</i> ' breaks and misuses isiZulu language instead of using 'proper' isiZulu words. Being a Zulu speaker one must be proud of that and is supposed to use isiZulu the way it is supposed to and pronounced in the best way it should. This will lead to the disappearance of isiZulu and will not be known by youth. This is due to the fact that according to Zulus the use of those words does not promote the use of their language and it does not make sense instead it makes the language cheap and disrespected especially in KZN province. Therefore, those words must be changed and corrected because those people who are using them seem not to be 'proper' Zulus.	11	9	20	10	13	23	43
- The use of those words symbolises the use of Tsotsitaal or Xhosa in isiZulu grammar in KwaZulu-Natal	0	4	4	0	0	0	04
- Those words do not sound right because the 'real' isiZulu forefathers used to speak has been impurified and mixed with slang such as the word ' <i>yamampela</i> '. It is obvious that Zulus will end up leaving their culture and be ruled by foreign people.	1	1	2	0	0	0	02
-							

**Learners' reasons for having no problem about the use of the words 'yamampela' and 'ngikhonzela'**

Reason	Urban schools			Rural schools			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- It is the language that learners as youth are used to speak when they are a group- grew up that word being used. It has the same meaning as 'yangempela'. The use of the word brings about style to teens.	0	1	1	4	5	9	10
- It is the way one wants to express him / her because people are coming from different places. They are also used to that type of isiZulu especially township dwellers. However, both words still mean one and the same thing. That is, any person can understand what one wants to say.	7	2	9	0	0	0	09
- "As long as we understand what is said because people talk isiZulu in different ways".	0	0	0	2	0	2	02
- "Everyone seems to speak this way, so am I".	0	1	1	0	0	0	01

**Learners' reasons for liking to use 'deep' isiZulu**

Reason	Urban schools			Rural schools			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Speaking 'deep' isiZulu does help one to know more about it and be able to understand some of the words or Zulu things. IsiZulu is the mother tongue which enables one to know it and one's origin especially because IsiZulu tests and examination papers are set in deep isiZulu. One needs to be proud of it. It even sounds good when one talk with an adult in the community. One also connects well	12	7	19	5	4	9	28

with Zululand people who seem to talk 'proper' isiZulu.							
- "We are the true Zulus and many of us grew up in rural areas. "Our parents are also using 'deep' isiZulu at home". We are proud of our language no matter where we are even if we are regarded as backwards and old fashioned. It was spoken by our ancestors. That's why we believe that 'proper' isiZulu must be used and spoken correctly.	7	6	13	1	1	2	15
- It promotes love and culture of the language and reminds one of one/s origin.	0	3	3	0	0	0	03
- When one talks 'deep' isiZulu one is talking only isiZulu not mixing it with borrowed words. It shows that one is a real Zulu.	0	2	2	0	0	0	02
- 'Deep' isiZulu gives one dignity and the sense to know that one is a 'real' Zulu and gives one a sense of that one knows one's background.	0	0	0	1	0	0	01
- It is exact and precise compared to 'urban' isiZulu.	0	0	0	0	1	1	01
One shows other racial groups that one loves one's mother-tongue and those who do not know isiZulu end up loving it.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01

#### Leaners' reasons for not liking to use 'deep' isiZulu

Reason	Urban schools			Rural schools			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- 'Deep' isiZulu is difficult, complicated, confusing especially words with clicks although isiZulu is the mother-tongue. This is due to the fact that it is no longer used especially by new generations and many old people no longer know and understand 'deep' isiZulu.	15	8	23	9	9	18	41

It is because things have changed hence there are many failures in secondary schools.							
- When one talks 'deep' isiZulu, one is sometimes mocked at, be looked down upon and taken as a person coming from 'deep' rural areas, uneducated and outdated. One is sometimes called by nasty names such as 'farm boy' or 'farm Julia' or 'inyoni' [bird]. 'Deep' is suitable to be used by older people. "As teenagers, 'deep' isiZulu changes our beings because for us youth it is fashionable to be from the urban area".	0	5	5	2	1	3	08
- "We do not stay with our people who talk different languages to hear us as well, 'urban' isiZulu is better."	0	1	1	0	1	1	02
- The generation of today cannot understand and interested in 'deep' isiZulu and lack enough exposure to it. Many schools are used to English as the medium of instruction and many places use it. Simple isiZulu is okay to be used so that one can be understandable.	0	1	1	1	2	3	04

**Learners' reasons for talking 'deep' isiZulu at school**

Reason	Urban			Rural			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- We know it as our mother-tongue and being from rural schools. We are also proud of it and being Zulus we do not want people to take us as	0	0	0	4	1	5	05

criminals.”							
- Educators taught it at schools in higher grade in order for learners to know ‘proper’ isiZulu and be able to write it.	1	1	2	0	1	1	03
- “We are staying at a farm and we use ‘proper’ words such as ‘liyana’ [it is raining] instead of ‘liyanetha’ [it is raining], a word used by urban people.	0	0	0	0	1	1	01

#### Learners’ reasons for talking ‘urban’ isiZulu at school

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- “Many of us (about 90% of learners) were born and grew up in the township where urban isiZulu is used. It is, therefore, the easier type of isiZulu than ‘deep’ isiZulu. We are used to and like it and it is the easy way to communicate and connect with each other and other people because it mixes isiZulu words with words of other languages such as English and Afrikaans.”	22	18	40	2	2	4	44
- It is due to the influence of the surrounding different people’s languages. Learners’ interact with people who talk different languages and there are learners who are not Zulus and all those languages have an influence on isiZulu and learners end up mixing isiZulu with words from those languages. Many of the Zulus are also working in urban areas.	0	3	3	6	7	13	16
- Almost all subjects are taught in English, although isiZulu is the learners’ first language. Thus learners usually use English. That’s why ‘deep’ isiZulu is unusual, as a result English is mixed with isiZulu in order to teach themselves	-	-	-	6	5	11	11

English which the medium of communication.							
- “We want to be fashioned because ‘urban’ isiZulu is believed to be fashionable and stylish. We are youngsters and it is nice to talk what we know. We are therefore imitating urban people because we want to be taken as urban people not rural people because when one talks ‘deep’ isiZulu, one is mocked at and looked down upon by urban people.”	0	0	0	4	9	13	13
- “We like to mix isiZulu with isiTsotsi but not the one of stealing.”	0	2	2	0	1	1	03
- Learners like and enjoy ‘urban’ isiZulu and they do not take notice of ‘deep’ isiZulu.	2	0	2	1	0	1	03
- Many learners now attend at multiracial school and they influence learners in township and rural schools because x-model C learners are taken as people who know and more fashionable which leads to them being imitated by township and rural school learners.	-	1	1	1	-	1	02
- “We want to know other languages as well so that when we are with urban people we do not encounter any problem.”	0	0	0	1	0	1	01

#### Learners’ reasons for talking ‘deep’ isiZulu at home

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- “We are in front of our parents who are proudly Zulus and staying at the farm who grew up talking it. If we use ‘urban’ isiZulu they are going to say we are not showing respect.”	0	0	0	10	9	19	19
- “We talk ‘deep’ isiZulu only with our parents because parents want	1	1	2	-	1	1	03

us to talk with them using isiZulu. They want us to know isiZulu and Zulu things. However when talking with friends we do not use it.”							
- “My parents emphasise that if you know your background, then you definitely know where you are going to. Therefore they teach us to speak deep isiZulu. As a result we are encouraged to talk ‘deep’ isiZulu.	0	1	1	1	1	2	03
- “Our parents are not educated and cannot talk ‘urban’ isiZulu. Thus we use isiZulu in order to have open communication with them and they cannot say we do not respect and we gossip them.”	0	0	0	0	1	0	01
- “I like to know everything about ‘deep’ isiZulu because my parents think that ‘urban’ isiZulu is Tsotsitaal which they hate.”	0	0	0	0	1	1	01

#### Learners’ reasons for talking ‘urban’ isiZulu at home

Reason	Urban			Rural			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- “‘Urban’ isiZulu is more understandable, easier and preferable to ‘deep’ isiZulu hence we connect well with each other. This is due to the fact that many of us and some of our parents grew up in townships where ‘deep’ isiZulu is not used. ‘Deep’ isiZulu is only taught at schools. Some people at home do not know ‘deep’ isiZulu.	23	20	43	4	2	6	49
- “We Zulus now stay and work near the people of different racial group in urban areas who influence us.”	0	1	1	4	5	9	10
- “We mix isiZulu with English because our young sisters are attending the multiracial schools. Thus they cannot understand ‘deep’ isiZulu.	0	0	0	2	2	4	04
- “Most of the members of our families are educated and they know	0	0	0	3	3	6	06



other languages which have an influence on isiZulu. Thus they mix isiZulu with English and no one is interested in 'deep' isiZulu anymore". This leads to English borrowing in IsiZulu which make use of isiZulu prefixes and suffixes.							
- There are learners who stay with parents who like English and who are not Zulus. As a result they influence isiZulu with other languages.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- Almost all subjects are taught in English. Thus learners usually use English.	1	0	1	0	0	0	01
- "I did not learn isiZulu in primary schools and my mother did not learn isiZulu at school".	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- "We are in the civilised residence.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01

**Learners' reasons for choosing 'deep' isiZulu to be the medium of instruction**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- "It is the type of isiZulu we do not understand. Therefore, we must learn it because it is the 'proper' isiZulu Zulus must have deep knowledge of and be proud of in order to learn more of their things and origin. It is due to the fact that isiZulu was sucked by the Zulus from their mothers' breasts."	6	5	11	0	3	3	14
- "'Deep' isiZulu is helpful and straightforward whereas urban isiZulu leads one to be lost.	0	0	0	2	3	5	05
- "We grew up knowing 'pure' isiZulu because it is our language and we like it.	0	0	0	3	1	4	04
- "It is the 'real' isiZulu and it is the type of isiZulu we are supposed to speak as our mother-tongue and it was spoken by our ancestors hence it is our culture. If one learns	0	0	0	3	3	6	06

‘improper’ isiZulu one will not be able to answer isiZulu tests and examinations question papers and any isiZulu questions because English words are not allowed in answering those question papers.							
- In order to develop the level of African people and their Zululanguage.	0	0	0	1	2	3	03
- “We are in the area of Zulu people and they are proud of isiZulu. It is also better than mixing it with English.	0	0	0	0	3	3	03
- “‘Deep’ isiZulu is common to us who are in township places. It is easy for us to understand but difficult for others.”	0	2	2	0	0	0	02
- ‘Urban’ isiZulu is not respectable compared to ‘deep’ isiZulu.	0	0	0	0	1	1	01
- “Some of the people especially in rural areas are unable to read and speak English. For their sake, we need to be treated equally and give attention to those unable”.	0	0	0	0	1	1	01

**Learners’ reasons for selecting ‘urban isiZulu to be the medium of instruction**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- “‘Urban’ isiZulu is nowadays the type of isiZulu usually used because we grew up talking it. Thus using this type of isiZulu in teaching everything will be clearer to us than being taught in ‘deep’ isiZulu. We will be able to answer examination questions easily. This type of isiZulu is also understandable by people of other cultural backgrounds and it makes it easy to communicate with people who are not good	19	18	37	15	8	23	60

in isiZulu. This is due to the fact that there are some English words and words from other languages used in this type of isiZulu. It also enables us to know other languages as well.”							
- “I cannot understand subjects such as history in ‘deep’ isiZulu.”	0	0	0	1	0	1	01

**Learners’ reasons for emphasizing that ‘deep’ isiZulu should be continued to be learnt at schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- “We have to know our mother-tongue first because we are born by Zulus and we are Africans. Thus it is important to know one’s mother-tongue first before knowing any other language. This is due to the fact that through ‘deep’ isiZulu, Zulus can learn better about their traditions, customs, culture and origins and ‘proper’ writing isiZulu skills. This ‘deep’ isiZulu is the backbone of the Zulu nation and should not be forgotten but be maintained instead. It has got the truth in it, for example, folklore.	4	7	11	3	9	12	23
- “We want to learn it in order to know and understand and write ‘deep’ isiZulu words and expressions properly especially learners who grew up in townships. This is important because isiZulu is our mother-tongue and we learn culture in it.	13	6	19	0	0	0	19
- ‘Deep’ isiZulu teaches youth to have knowledge of their true language and many isiZulu things such as being able to do research on ‘proper’ isiZulu and Zulus and Zulu traditions, customs, culture and their origin. Thus by being learnt it will be maintained not disappears but continues to exist as	0	0	0	7	6	13	13

the mother-tongue of the Zulus.							
- It is important to develop and promote isiZulu which is one of the indigenous languages and it leads one to be encouraged to love Zulu things because every language is important to its people and to young generation as well.	0	0	0	4	3	7	07
- It is the building up language and it was used by our ancestors and it is helpful to know the origin of the language and how ancestors used to speak or connect. As a result it gives Black Africans dignity and background.	2	2	4	0	0	0	04
- “We are used to it and it is easily understood by many people and learners.”	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
- “‘Deep’ isiZulu helps us to know how to respect.”	0	0	0	2	0	2	02
- It connects Africans very well.	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
- It develops one in certain talents.	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
- “It helps us to connect well with those in rural area	1	0	1	0	0	-	1
- It enables Zulus to keep their culture and Zulu tribe.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01

**Learners’ reasons for claiming that isiZulu should not be continued to be learnt at schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- ‘Deep’ isiZulu is more difficult to be understood and spelt causing high failure rate than ‘urban’ isiZulu which most people can speak because many learners grew up in townships and do not understand it. By learning ‘urban’ isiZulu it will be easy to understand questions as it is difficult to understand questions asked in ‘deep’ isiZulu and this leads to many isiZulu failures. IsiZulu pass rate will be improved and educators will be better understood.	5	8	13	6	3	9	22
- ‘Deep’ isiZulu is not helping and it is no longer spoken even iNkandla	0	1	1	0	1	1	02

people are speaking 'urban' isiZulu. It seems as if one is old fashioned when one talk 'deep' isiZulu.							
- Some learners are from places such as Lesotho where 'deep' isiZulu is not known.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- "We'll not get used to talking other languages and they will be left undeveloped in our areas."	-	-	-	-	1	1	01

#### Learners' reasons for perceiving 'urban' isiZulu to be destructive in the Zulu culture

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- 'Urban' isiZulu includes other languages such as Tsotsitaal and English. Those who deeply believe in customs think that 'urban' isiZulu changes people's minds and they loose their culture, origin and identity. They end up adopting other people's culture especially whites resulting in them buying houses in urban areas and no longer believing in slaughtering for ancestors.	10	9	19	11	11	22	41
- People who mix isiZulu with other languages end up not knowing isiZulu and stick to and adopt those other languages and foreign culture and forget Zulu culture which results in words such as 'isipoon' [spoon] instead of 'ukhezo'.	6	8	14	0	0	0	14
- If 'urban' isiZulu, which learners consider stylish, is used youth lose respect for their parents and other people because they think that they are better than their parents and sometimes become involved in criminal matters.	0	0	0	2	7	9	09
- "Some of our traditions require 'deep' isiZulu. If we forget our	0	2	2	1	3	4	06

language it will not be easy to talk with our ancestors and we will not understand our culture.”							
- Learners sometimes talk isiTsotsi with adults unnecessarily when speaking ‘urban’ isiZulu which leads them to lose respect for adults.	3	0	3	1	0	1	4
- Nowadays English seems to be burying other languages and cultures such as isiZulu and Zulu culture. Eventually isiZulu where isiZulu culture is embedded will die.	1	0	1	0	0	0	01
- “Young ones know nothing about English; one finds them mixing it with isiZulu.”	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- The language is no longer as it should be and this frustrates the elders, since they believe that the language should be kept ‘pure’.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- “IsiZulu which was used by our forefathers had been influenced by slang languages which will result in the destruction of culture.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01

**Learners’ reasons for perceiving ‘urban’ isiZulu not to be destructive in the Zulu culture**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- The way one speaks does not define who one is. People nowadays know how to promote culture and connect with ancestors through ‘urban’ isiZulu. Ancestors understand one even if one informs them about a party. “We are still practicing our customs and following our culture while talking ‘urban’ isiZulu. On the other hand ‘urban’ isiZulu is developing isiZulu	0	0	0	8	3	11	11

because culture is not about speaking, but it about believes in norms and values.							
- The use of 'urban' isiZulu has got nothing to do with culture. Culture can be maintained through the use of any type of isiZulu. Urban isiZulu only teach one to talk with and be understood by white people. We still follow our culture even if we talk 'urban' isiZulu. Culture is culture and language is language.	5	4	9	0	0	0	09
- "Urban' isiZulu only helps us to learn more things from 'urban' words especially we rural people."	0	0	0		1	1	01
- Zulu culture is already destroyed by new generations not by the type of language spoken.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01

**Learners' reasons for claiming that 'deep' isiZulu can be kept 'pure'**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- If caution is taken that isiZulu is learnt regularly and properly at school and at home where parents discourage the adoption of 'urban' isiZulu but encourage the use of 'deep' isiZulu.	0	0	0	4	8	12	12
- Zulu People must talk 'deep' isiZulu regularly and must have love for it, their language, and ignore other people's things and languages. It is their responsibility to protect it from being impurified.	4	3	7	3	2	7	12
- "Deep' isiZulu is good and it is important for us young generation to know and learn isiZulu so that we cannot lose our culture because 'deep' isiZulu enables	4	0	4	0	0	0	04

one to maintain one's culture.”							
- “If we go on learning ‘deep’ isiZulu at schools especially as we do not use it outside the school can be helpful.	1	2	3	0	0	0	03
- If Africans can do like whites who do not mix English with isiZulu. English is kept ‘pure’ from isiZulu influence.	0	1	1	0	1	1	02
- If the community can take people who mix isiZulu with other languages as tsotsis	0	0	0	2	0	2	02
- If we lose ‘deep’ isiZulu, it will mean that we have lost ourselves (identities)	0	0	0	0	1	1	01
- If ‘deep’ isiZulu can be used in the media such as TVs and radios.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- ‘Deep’ isiZulu is unique and has got its own words which are defined in different ways.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- Keeping isiZulu ‘pure’ will lead Zulus to know their own things and be able to mention them in their own mother-tongue.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- “When we practice it, other people who neglect it will love it.”	0	0	0	0	1	1	01
- The non- isiZulu speakers can even be able to learn isiZulu.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- There are isiZulu educators and the people in the community who know isiZulu and Zulu culture who can convey it to youth.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01

**Learners’ reasons for arguing that ‘deep’ isiZulu cannot be kept pure**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- People are used to other languages and interested in learning them. This is due to the fact that isiZulu is in contact with other languages which lead to borrowed words into isiZulu that cannot be translated into ‘deep’ isiZulu.	6	5	11	10	6	16	27



Many people also think that isiZulu is not that important anymore.							
- There is now English which is learnt too much because it is the medium of instruction in secondary schools. Africans are trying to speak English hence they like to mix isiZulu with 'George' [English].	3	3	6	0	0	0	06
- 'Deep' isiZulu come into contact with English, the commonly spoken language in urban areas, which leads to English borrowed words into isiZulu and most learners like English.	3	2	5	0	0	0	05
- 'Urban' isiZulu is usually used because most African learners are learning in urban schools and some of them are taught by whites. That leads them to mix isiZulu with other languages. Those learners in turn influence us who are attending township schools. There are also words which are not found in isiZulu but only words of other languages are used such as 'itafula'. In township languages are mixed and this cannot be avoided as different languages come into contact.	3	1	4	0	0	0	04
- It is difficult for one to speak without mixing isiZulu with any other language because people interact and they are coming from different racial group.	0	3	3	0	0	0	03
- "Nowadays it is English which is important for us to get a job. Thus it has a great influence on isiZulu. English is frequently used and it does influence isiZulu. One cannot finish isiZulu sentence without using	0	0	0	0	3	3	03

an English word.							
- People from different racial groups claim to know isiZulu and they have great influence on isiZulu because they come with words from their languages which become isiZulu borrowed words.	0	0	0	1	2	2	02
- It is written nowhere that isiZulu will be the only subject but it was developed with other subjects as well and there is no language which cannot be influenced by other languages.	0	0	0	1	1	2	02
- IsiZulu can be influenced by Tsotsitaal because most people nowadays love Tsotsitaal.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- "Life is now influenced by urban living from life style to language."	1	0	1	0	0	0	01
- 'Urban' isiZulu, which is commonly used in urban areas, is already not 'pure' isiZulu. Therefore, isiZulu is already impurified	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- People are not proud of isiZulu.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- IsiZulu is available with the inclusion of other languages in the school curriculum.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01

**Learners' reasons for rating isiZulu performance excellent at their schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- IsiZulu is done as first language at secondary schools and many learners are trying their best to understand it.	1	0	1	0	1	1	02

**Learners' reasons for rating isiZulu performance very good at their schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- There were learners who got more than 80% and 60% in June examinations. This means that symbol A's were achieved and only a few who had bad results.	6	8	14	3	0	3	17

**Learners' reasons for rating isiZulu performance good at their schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Most learners passed isiZulu in June examinations (got 60 – 70%) although the pass percentage has dropped. There are learners who improved and there were few who failed (got less than 40%) because of English words they usually used.	11	11	22	8	9	17	39

**Learners' reasons for rating isiZulu performance satisfactory at their schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Most learners got 40% and there were few learners who got below 40%. There were those who usually pass in standard grade not in higher grade.	2	2	4	8	7	15	19
- The number of learners who passed is equal to the number of learners who failed in June.	3	2	5	0	0	0	05
- There were learners who failed in June examinations. It is probably due to the use of 'deep' isiZulu in questioning.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01

**Learners' reasons for rating isiZulu performance bad at their schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Only few learners did well in June 2006. Most learners got less than 40% and 22%.	2	1	3	4	6	10	13
- Learners do not understand 'deep' isiZulu especially because educators teach 'deep' isiZulu yet they know 'urban' isiZulu.	-	1	1	1	-	1	02
- Most of the learners are coming from urban areas and they do not care because they consider isiZulu as unimportant.	0	0	0	1	1	2	02

**Learners' ideas about what can improve the performance of isiZulu in Secondary schools**

Idea	Urban			Rural			Grand Total
	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
- Learners must dedicate themselves to learning isiZulu and they must not take it as an easy subject. They must also consult and listen to educators for words they do not understand, giving themselves enough time for studying isiZulu, having love for it because educators are teaching it very well.	11	5	16	3	3	6	22
- 'Urban' isiZulu should be taught instead of 'deep' isiZulu. Learners must be allowed to write isiZulu the way they speak and understand it (the deepness of the language must be dropped).	5	6	11	1	1	2	13
- Highly qualified and educated isiZulu educators, who are experienced in and know 'deep' isiZulu must be appointed and increased to teach isiZulu in Secondary		3	3	5	3	8	11

schools.							
- Educators must first improve themselves and must have a new strategy to be used to motivate learners and make learners aware that isiZulu is their mother-tongue, therefore it must be respected. Appropriate teaching approaches must be promoted, more tests to be written.	1		1	3	6	9	10
- There should be the 'deep' isiZulu vocabulary books, dictionaries and material which learners should read and get to know more isiZulu words and avoid using English words and talking 'urban' usiZulu and do more oral work.	1	1	2	5	1	6	8
- Educators and learners must be changed to be more dedicated to teaching and learning – care should be taken in both learning and teaching.				2	3	5	5
- Learners must be encouraged to love and know their home language (isiZulu) and be proud to be Zulu speakers by practicing it regularly.	1	4	5				5
- Educators must have enough time with learners, listening to learners' questions using 'deep' isiZulu books in order to challenge isiZulu learners.	3	1	4				4
- Learners must help each other in the learning of 'deep' isiZulu and co-operate with educators especially in learning verbs, proverbs and expressions.				1	3	4	4
- In KZN province isiZulu must be used in all subjects (being medium of instruction) and many isiZulu books must be made available.		1	1	1	1	2	3
- There should be more open areas for people to learn	2	1	3				3

isiZulu.							
- Novels should not be learnt but only poetry because novels are long and hard to understand.	-	2	2				2
- It has to be learnt and promoted at home as well.				1		1	1
- Learners' learning and listening skills must be developed.					1	1	1
- Forms of speech must be taken out when exams are written because they are the cause of many failures.	0	0	0	1		1	1
- Taking out isiZulu proverbs and expressions because they are very hard and no longer used.	0	0	0	1		1	1
- An improvement is within an individual.	0	0	0	1		1	1
- Educators must use both urban and deep isiZulu when teaching because there are learners who understand 'urban' isiZulu very well.					1	1	1
- The schools must network.					1	1	1
- The school should organize more cultural activities in order to instill love for isiZulu.					1	1	1
- There should be days when learners must speak only 'deep' isiZulu and in other days other languages.		1	1				1
- There must be more fun as well as practical way to learn isiZulu.	1		1				1

**Learners' reasons for feeling sad about the development of the list of new isiZulu words**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Those incorporated words such as 'ifax' 'iDVD' 'icell' and 'icomputer' are not real isiZulu words but borrowed one especially from English because isiZulu does not have all the names that are in other languages. As a result they are	8	10	18	9	9	18	36

put as they are from other languages and they become meaning less for us Zulus. We will end up not having 'real' isiZulu words. This will cause the coming generation to know nothing about 'deep' isiZulu.							
- The newly incorporate words make no sense and they have no good explanation instead they make harder for us to understand isiZulu.	2	3	5	0	0	0	05
- "Our Zulu cultures are left behind."	0	0	0	1	1	2	02
- There are people who think that isiZulu is unimportant and put it aside by substituting some of 'deep' isiZulu words with borrowed words.	1	0	1	0	0	0	01
- These borrowed words come from English.	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- "Replacing of words will confuse us just like the changed names of the provinces and other areas."	0	0	0	1	0	1	01

**Learners' reasons for feeling happy about the development of the list of new isiZulu words**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- "It shows that our language is developing and growing by those new terms. The development of a language is common and people learn from it because Zulus also need to know new things in their language, thus people's knowledge is broadening and Zulu nation is developing in a high rate.	10	9	19	5	11	16	35
- Words borrowed from other languages such as ' <i>icomputer</i> ', ' <i>icell</i> ' with which we are familiar can be understood by anyone and make us to get help from others.	0	0	0	4	2	6	06
- 'Deep' isiZulu is very difficult; those new words make isiZulu to be	0	2	2	1	0	1	3

easy for everyone even for non-isiZulu speakers.							
- It makes us aware that our language is recognized and it will not fall away.	0	0	0	2	0	2	02

**Learners' reasons for having no problem about the development of the list of new isiZulu words**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- It is like anything, everything is changing nowadays and learners' isiZulu vocabulary is broadening.	4	0	4	0	0	0	04
- Those newly developed isiZulu words have got no problem to me and they are words from other languages. As long as it makes sense.	0	0	0	2	2	4	04

**Learners' reasons for considering 'deep' isiZulu to be the most spoken language in the schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Learners are 'real' Zulus who grew up talking it and 'deep' isiZulu is their mother-tongue and they are brought up by it.	0	0	0	5	2	7	07
- "We are at the township and we are all Zulu speakers. English is only used during teaching and learning not during informal conversations."	0	4	4	0	0	0	04
- It is the good habit so that we can correct each other.	0	0	0	0	1	1	01

**Learners' reasons for claiming 'urban' isiZulu to be frequently spoken in the school**



Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- It is the language of township people (all learners and educators are urban Zulus and learning and teaching in townships) and isiZulu is the mother-tongue of everybody in the school and all are isiZulu speakers. Therefore it is easy to understand and communicate with each other.	23	15	38	0	0	0	38
- It is easier and better than other languages if one is with other racial groups.	0	0	0	4	7	11	11
- Many people at our school like this type of isiZulu and understand it well because it is easy and has become the mother-tongue of learners.	0	0	0	2	7	9	09
- "We are not good either in English or 'deep' isiZulu."	0	0	0	5	1	6	06
- At school youth communicate among themselves. There is no adult.	0	0	0	3	0	3	03
- "Most English words are not understood by learners in our school hence people in our school are scared of English."	1	1	2	0	0	0	02
- "At school we mostly learn English and we also like it. Therefore, we end up mixing it with isiZulu.	0	0	0	2	0	2	02
- "We have made ourselves whites."	0	0	0	0	1	1	01
- "We are different people coming from different places."	0	0	0	0	1	1	01

**Learners' reasons for considering English to be the frequently spoken language in the schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- IsiZulu is only used during isiZulu periods. All other subjects are taught in English because it is the medium of instruction. During school hours, English is frequently used.	0	3	3	2	2	4	07
- “The principal forces us to speak English in order to give us practice and promote English because it is an international means of communication.”	1	2	3	0	0	0	03

**Learners’ reasons for perceiving English and ‘urban’ isiZulu to be frequently spoken language in the schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- English is the medium of instruction. When we are in our dormitories and during isiZulu period we use ‘urban’ isiZulu.		0	0	1	0	1	01

**Learners’ reasons for thinking that isiTsotsi is the most frequently spoken language in the schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Most learners use words such as ‘moja’, ‘howzit’ because isiTsotsi makes one feel great.	0	0	0	1	2	3	03

**Learners’ reasons for pointing out that isiTsotsi and ‘urban’ isiZulu are the most frequently spoken languages in the schools**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- Learners want to understand each other better.	0	0	0	0	1	1	01

**Learners’ reasons for choosing to answer the interviews questions in isiZulu**

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- “IsiZulu is our mother-tongue and the language we understand and know better than English. We are also proud of it and we wanted to	13	9	22	0	0	0	22

give more correct answers than we would give when using English.							
- “We know isiZulu better than English and other language.”	0	0	0	9	10	19	19
- “We are Zulus and live in rural areas and we sucked isiZulu from our mothers’ breasts and we want to know it”	0	0	0	2	2	4	04
- One does speak English but there is a time when one runs out of English words because one is not an English speaker. But in isiZulu one does not run short of words.	1	1	2	0	0	0	02
- “I can explain whatever I think of in isiZulu especially as I’m speaking the ‘non-deep’ isiZulu. As a result I’m able to put in English words as well.”	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- IsiZulu let one to speak the truth and it does not mislead one.	0	0	0	1	0	1	01

#### Learners’ reasons for selecting English in answering the interview questions

Reason	Urban respondents			Rural respondents			Grand Total
	Females	Males	Total	Females	Males	Total	
- “We love English and we like to improve it and learn it more from other people so that it can be easy to understand it and be masters of it when we finish our matriculation. This is due to the fact that English is the language of communication internationally. In tertiary we will also be compelled to learn English. We try also to practise it for our future interviews in order o make it perfect and be multilingual.”	3	4	7	6	10	16	23
- “We understand English easily because it is easier and more enjoyable than isiZulu. Therefore we	7	7	14	4	2	6	20

wanted to understand well before giving an answer. It is also the way of learning more about English. We are trying to improve English everyday because we find English interesting and easy to use after long periods of learning in English.							
- "We like English and English is the language of interaction with non-isiZulu speakers. We also want to impress non-isiZulu speakers."	0	2	2	0	0	0	02
- English has got some collective words which are short and simple.	0	0	0	2	0	2	02
- "I like to be different from other Zulu speakers because they like talking isiZulu all the time."	0	1	1	0	0	0	01
- "English is not our mother tongue. Therefore, we are proving the point that Zulus in townships schools use other languages as well."	1	0	1	0	0	0	01
- "I wanted to check how advanced my English is. I also wanted to be corrected if there are mistakes."	0	0	0	1	0	1	01
- "I am used to English because most languages are taught in English."	0	0	0	0	1	1	01