STANDARD IN SETSWANA IN BOTSWANA

by

BOKANG ITUMELENG NFILA

*Submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the
Master of Arts in African Languages
with specialisation in Setswana*

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

SUPERVISORS: PROF. V. N. WEBB

MS R. M. RAMAGOSHI

PRETORIA

MAY 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4   CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5   CHAPTER FIVE: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

6 CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I thank God Almighty for giving me strength, power, wisdom and knowledge throughout this study.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Vic Webb, for his excellent guidance and advice that enabled me to complete this study. My thanks also go to my co-supervisor, Refilwe Morongwa Ramagoshi, for the dedication and academic guidance she offered throughout this study.

I would also like to extend my sincere appreciation to my colleagues, Abby Tshinki and Rachel Malambane, for their support and encouragement during the study. Mphidi Hamilton, from the library department, also deserves a word of thanks for helping with the necessary material whenever it was needed. I do appreciate his help.

A special word of thanks and deepest gratitude is extended to Moocha Phepisi for the love and tender care he gave to my children Reuben, Theophilus and their little sister Melba. With him, they never felt the absence of their mother.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for the support they gave me during my study. They also gave support to my children, especially Reuben, who had to write his Junior Certificate as well as Cambridge Examination during the absence of his mother.

God bless you all.

SUMMARY

Standard languages have become a very important instrument of communication in most multilingual countries. Botswana is one of the Southern African countries that have a number of languages, hence the need for a standard language was chosen. Setswana consists of a number of dialects but none of these dialects has been used as a basis for standard Setswana; instead, dialects have been combined to form a standard variety. The aim of this study is to investigate and discuss the problems regarding the state of standard Setswana in Botswana, and the processes followed in standardising Setswana in Botswana.

A questionnaire was used as an instrument for data collection. Eight schools from different educational levels, namely primary schools, junior secondary schools, senior secondary schools and colleges of education were chosen for the study. The study was limited to Setswana teachers and to the National Setswana Language Council (NSLC) members. Two different questionnaires were designed for these respondents.

The study has revealed that although standard Setswana exists in Botswana, the variety is not well known by most of the Batswana and they do not use it. Batswana do not seem to take standard Setswana seriously, as they think it does not benefit them economically. However, the study indicates that most Setswana teachers value the standard variety and would like other Batswana to take it seriously and regard it as an important communicative tool. The study found that one of the problems that hinders the progress of implementing standard Setswana in schools is the lack of suitable material. The National Setswana Language Council faces the same problem.

Another problem identified during the research is that some respondents cannot differentiate between standard Setswana as a variety of Setswana and Setswana as a language. This indicates that the Batswana were never made aware of the

standard variety nor of its importance; hence, it is not adequately known and used in high public functions.

The study also analysed the National Setswana Language Council, the body responsible for Setswana language issues in Botswana. The Council deals with the whole process of language standardisation, as well as the accuracy and proficiency of language use. However, the study revealed that of the four stages in the process of standardization; (selection, elaboration, codification and acceptance), the Council seems to have succeeded with selection and a part of codification. The orthography has been standardised but not yet published. Other stages, such as acceptance and elaboration, need to be revisited.

The study consists of six chapters. Chapter One outlines the purpose of the study as well as the problem statement. The sociolinguistic profile of Botswana and the Setswana language profile are also discussed. Chapter Two presents the theoretical framework, while Chapter Three discusses the historical background of the Setswana-speakers, the history of Setswana and the development of standard Setswana by the missionaries. Methods and techniques of data collection are dealt with in Chapter Four, while Chapter Five presents data analysis and interpretation. Summary, findings, conclusion and recommendations are presented in Chapter Six.

SAMEVATTING

Standaardtale het die belangrikste kommunikasie-instrumente geword in die meeste veeltalige lande. Botswana is een van die Suid-Afrikanse lande wat verskeie tale het, dus is hier gemaak vir die gebruik van 'n standaardtaal nodig. Setswana bestaan uit 'n aantal dialekte. Nie een van hierdie dialekte is egter as die basis vir Standaardsetswana gebruik nie. Die standaardvariëteit is gevorm uit meer as een van die dialekte. Die doel van hierdie studie is om die probleme rondom die gebruik van Standaardsetswana in Botswana na te vors en te bespreek. 'n Verdere doel met die studie is om die proses van standaardisering van Setswana in Botswana te ondersoek.

Vraelyste is gebruik vir data-insameling. Agt skole met verskillende opvoedkundige vlakke is met die oog op die studie gekies, nl. laerskole, junior sekondêre skole en opvoedkundige kolleges. Die studie is beperk tot Setswana-onderwysers en tot lede van die National Setswana Language Council (NSLC). Twee verskillende vraelyste is vir hierdie respondente opgestel.

Die studie het aan die lig gebring dat, alhoewel Standaardsetswana in Botswana bestaan, hierdie variëteit nie goed bekend is by die meeste van die Batswana nie en dat die meeste van hulle dit nie gebruik nie. Die Batswana neem nie Standaardsetswana ernstig op nie, aangesien hulle van mening is dat dit geen ekonomiese voordele vir hulle inhou nie. Aan die ander kant is bevind dat die meeste Setswana-onderwysers hierdie standaardvariëteit hoog ag en sou wou sien dat die ander Batswana dit ernstig opneem en as 'n belangrike kommunikatiewe instrument beskou. Met behulp van hierdie studie is gevind dat die probleem wat verhinder dat daar gevorder word met die implementering van Standaardsetswana in skole die tekort aan gepaste leerstof in hierdie variëteit is. Die National Setswana Language Council ervaar ook hierdie selfde probleem.

Nog 'n probleem wat deur die studie geïdentifiseer is, is dat sommige respondente nie kan onderskei tussen Standaardsetswana as 'n variëteit van Setswana en Setswana as 'n taal nie. Dit dui daarop dat die Batswana nooit bewus gemaak is van hierdie

standaardvariëteit en die belangrikheid daarvan nie en dat dit daarom nie na wense gebruik word in hoë- openbare funksies nie.

In die studie is 'n analise gemaak van die lidmaatskapprofiel van die National Setswana Language Council, die liggaam verantwoordelik vir Setswana-taalsake in Botswana. Die Raad hanteer die proses van taalstandaardisering asook van die korrekte en die vlot gebruik van die taal. Die studie het egter aan die lig gebring dat ten opsigte van die vier fases, nl. seleksie, uitbreiding, kodifisering en aanvaarding, die Raad nog net seleksie en gedeeltelike kodifisering afgehandel het. Wat laasgenoemde aspek betref, nl. kodifisering, is slegs die ortografie afgehandel, hoewel nog nie gepubliseer nie. Daar sal weer aandag aan uitbreiding en aanvaarding gegee moet word.

Die studie bestaan uit ses hoofstukke. In hoofstuk een word die studiedoelwit en die probleemstelling uiteengesit. In dieselfde hoofstuk word die sosiolinguistiese profiel van Botswana en van die Setswana-taal ook bespreek. Hoofstuk twee stel die teoretiese raamwerk aan die orde, terwyl hoofstuk drie die historiese agtergrond van die Setswana-sprekers uiteensit, asook die geskiedenis van Setswana en die ontwikkeling van Standaardsetswana deur die sendelinge. In hoofstuk vier word aandag gegee aan metodes en tegnieke van data-insameling, terwyl hoofstuk vyf die analise van data asook die interpretasie daarvan aanbied. Die samevatting, bevindings, gevolgtrekking en aanbevelings word in hoofstuk ses gegee.

KEY WORDS

Acceptance

Codification

Elaboration

Language

Norms

Registers

Selection

Standard language

Standardisation

Styles

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1   INTRODUCTION

This study aims to investigate standard Setswana in Botswana and to discuss the emerging problems regarding this standard variety. Issues such as standardisation of Setswana, acceptance of standard Setswana as well as the Batswana's perception of the standard Setswana will be discussed.

1.2   SOCIOLINGUISTIC PROFILE OF BOTSWANA

Botswana is a large country measuring approximately 582 000 square kilometres. According to the 1991 census, the population has reached the 1.5 million mark. The population density is quite low with relatively dispersed patterns of settlement. The population was widely scattered in remote rural areas due to the lack of employment in those areas. The number of people in urban areas is currently growing as they migrate to towns to seek employment in the industrial sector.

Botswana is a multilingual country. Batibo (1997:22) points out that more than thirty languages are spoken in Botswana, among which more than ten are of Bantu origin. The languages in Botswana include Setswana, Ikalanga, Setswapong, Sebirwa, Thimbukushu, Otjiherero, Shiyeyi, Sesarwa and Icisubiya. A survey conducted by Batibo, Mathangwane and Mosaka (quoted by Molosiwa, Ratsoma and Tsonope, in Legere, 1996:129) indicates that these languages can be grouped into three language families:

- Bantu, spoken by 97% of the population;
- the Indo-European language family, spoken by (0.2%);
- the Khoisan language family, spoken by 2.8% of the population.

The Indo-European language family includes English and Afrikaans. The number of mother tongue speakers of these languages is small as indicated by the percentages above. Geographically, the Afrikaans-speaking people are mostly found in Ghantsi, a remote area in the Kalahari, and along the southern border of Botswana.

The Khoisan language family is utilised by the people of the desert. These people are the Bushmen and the Hottentots. They are referred to as the Basarwa and their language as Sesarwa. There are very few mother tongue speakers of this language.

According to Batibo, Mathangwane and Mosaka (1996 quoted by Molosiwa, Ratsoma & Tsonope, in Legere, 1996:129) the Bantu language family encompasses approximately 97% of the population of Botswana. Of this percentage, the Setswana-speaking people make up the highest portion. Maho (1998:52) states that, *"about 80% of all the inhabitants of Botswana... use Setswana as their mother tongue"*. Bantu languages such as Ikalanga, Sebirwa, Setswapong, Shiyeyi, Thimbukushu, Otjiherero and Icisubiya constitute a smaller percentage of the Bantu family.

1.3   SETSWANA LANGUAGE PROFILE

Setswana is constitutionally accepted as a national language. Due to its dominance, Setswana has been developed and used as a symbol of unity. It functions as a symbol of the nation and is a means of unification of the people of Botswana. Setswana is used in formal gatherings such as public meetings,

political rallies, sermons, as well as in the media (for example, radio and television, news bulletins).

Setswana is also used as an official language. During the colonial era, the official language of administration was English (Janson and Tsonope, 1991:74), which remained the country's official language after independence. It has been used in all official contexts. Parliament sessions were conducted in English until 1988 when a decision to use Setswana in conducting official business was taken (Molosiwa, Ratsoma and Tsonope, in Legere, 1996:100) and it was later used in both the National Assembly and the House of Chiefs. The *National Development Plan 6* (1985:8) states that, "the official languages are Setswana and English". Some of the official documents that were once written only in English are now written in both English and Setswana. For instance, Omang (national identity) forms, passport forms and bank forms are written in both languages.

Setswana should be used as a medium of instruction in the first two years of primary education (*The Revised National Policy on Education*, 1994:59). During these two years, English is to be taught as a subject. Setswana is then taken as a compulsory subject from the third year of primary education up to the end of secondary education, while English becomes the medium of instruction. Setswana can be taken as an optional subject at university level. School materials such as textbooks and literature books are written in both English and Setswana.

Setswana comprises a number of dialects. These include Sengwato, Sekgatla, Sengwaketse, Setawana, Sekwena, Selete, Serolong and Setlokwa. The first five of these dialects are regarded as the major Setswana dialects and the last three as minor. This is probably due to the origin, size and power vested in the major dialects. Setswana is the most prestigious Bantu language in Botswana as it is used in courts, the parliament, schools and other formal institutions. Other Bantu languages are used during daily communication with friends and families.

1.4   SETSWANA AS A STANDARD LANGUAGE

Setswana was the first among the Bantu languages in Botswana to acquire a written form. According to Janson and Tsonope (1991:107), the first important missionary among the Batswana was Robert Moffat of the London Missionary Society, who arrived in Kudumane in 1821. They also emphasise that a very important aspect of his work was his use of Setswana both orally and in written form. Mogapi (1998) as well as Janson and Tsonope (1991) maintain that, after Moffat, other missionaries (such as Archbell and Casilis) also produced some publications in Setswana but in different dialects. According to Mogapi (1998:9), Moffat and Casilis had different opinions about the language. Casilis believed that the language of the Basotho was Setswana. Sesotho was considered a dialect of Setswana. As a result of various perceptions of the speech forms of the hosting dialects, the missionaries used different orthographies. Thus Moffat used Setlhaping and Archbell used Serolong. Moloto (1964) explains that the missionaries' task of converting spoken Setswana into a written language was not easy. They had to learn to speak Setswana before they could attempt to write it. Eventually, the missionaries based the Setswana orthography on that of their mother tongue (Malimabe, 1990). The indigenous African languages did not have established writing systems and, being illiterate, the majority of Africans could not help the missionaries. Consequently, each missionary used an orthography that was influenced by his linguistic background and the orthography of his mother tongue (Prah, 1998:168). The history of Setswana orthography will be discussed in detail in Chapter Three of this study.

Setswana has many dialects. However, unlike in South Africa, where Sehurutshe has been selected as the basis for standard Setswana (Malimabe, 1990), standard Setswana of Botswana is not based on any of the major dialects. It does not reflect the phonology of any specific dialect. Janson and Tsonope (1991:106) state that:

The decision on orthography of 1981 is an official
declaration of a written standard for Setswana. ... it
is not based upon the pronunciation of any of the major
dialects, but rather represents a compromise between them.

The above compromise can usually be observed in lexical variations. Thus, where dialects differ lexically, the lexical items common to most of the dialects are taken as standard. The following examples can be quoted:

Table 1.1   Dialectal lexical variations

Sengwato	Sekgatla	Sekwena	Sengwaketse	Standard Setswana	English
mmidi	mmopo	mmidi	mmidi	mmidi	maize
thoro	kuane	hutshe	hutshe	hutshe	hat
lekoma	lebotana	lekotswana	lebotana	lebotana	wall
thupa	mpa	thupa	thupa	thupa	cane

From examples presented in Table 1.1 above, it can be seen that words that appear in standard Setswana are those that appear in other major dialects. This is how dialects compromise to form standard Setswana.

The dialects of Setswana display phonological variations in some cases. These variations allow one to identify whether the speaker comes from the southern or northern regions of Botswana. The following are examples where the northern dialects such as Sengwato and Setawana employ the inter-dental explosives [t] and [th], while the southern dialects employ the lateral explosives [tl] and [tlh]. The southern regional dialects include Sekwena, Sengwaketse and Sekgatla.

Table 1.2: Dialectal phonological variations

Northern dialects	Southern dialects	English
dithako	ditlhako	(shoes)
sethare	setlhare	(tree)
letalo	letlalo	(leather)
tetse	tletse	(full)

Another phonetic variation that can be observed is the use of the voiceless glottal fricative /h/ in the northern dialects, while the southern dialects employ the labiodental fricative /f/ (phonetically [Φ]). The following are examples:

Table 1.3   The use of glottal fricative /h/ and labiodental fricative /f/

Northern dialects	Southern dialects	English
lehihi	lefifi	darkness
lehatshe la rona	lefatshe la rona	our country
lehuha	lefufa	jealousy

Morphologically dialectal variations are also found in Setswana. In Sengwaketse, for instance, it is a common phenomenon to omit noun prefixes. For example:

- *"kgomo tsa me di timetse"* instead of *"dikgomo tsa me di timetse"* (my cattle went astray)

- *"nku tsotlhe di bolailwe ke ditau"* instead of *"dinku tsotlhe di bolailwe ke ditau"*

  (all sheep have been killed by lions).

"di" in both *dikgomo* and *dinku* is the plural noun prefix. The omission of *"di"* by the Bangwaketse is not common in other dialects. Standard Setswana recommends the use of the plural noun prefixes.

Other morphological variations are as follows:

Table 1.4   Dialectal morphological variations

Sengwato	Sekgatla	Sengwaketse	English
ha	ge	fa	if
ke	ke	kye	I
lona	lona	nyena	you (in plural)

From the examples, it can be seen that there is no one dialect that dominates the others. Because of this, standardisation of Setswana becomes a difficult task (Mogapi, 1998:25). The number of dialects makes it even harder to choose one dialect as a basis for standard Setswana as most of them have common linguistic features. Secondly, if one particular dialect is chosen, people might complain and question the criteria used for selecting that dialect. Therefore, one common variety was thought of, whereby a number of dialects compromise to form a standard variety. The linguistic items that are common to the majority of dialects form features of standard Setswana.

1.5   PROBLEM STATEMENT

A number of problems are encountered with regard to the selected standard variety of Setswana. The study done by Janson and Tsonope (1991) will be used as a basis for this study to highlight problems encountered in standard Setswana. Firstly, it has been observed that standard Setswana does not meet the required specifications. Standard Setswana should be taught as a subject in all schools throughout Botswana, but it seems that in some parts of the country standard Setswana as a school subject is not taken seriously. The report by the permanent secretary in the Ministry of Education, as cited by Molosiwa, Ratsoma and Tsonope (Legere, 1996) states that in some places, Setswana is not even recognised as a language, let alone a subject. In some schools, instead of teaching Setswana where it appears in the timetable, a different subject such as

mathematics, science or English will be conducted. Baral (1991) has observed a similar situation, especially in the regions where Setswana is not used as a mother tongue. He perceives that the majority of students do not speak Setswana at all. In such cases, teachers do not have a choice but to teach in the language of that area. This means that the knowledge and usage of standard Setswana by both pupils and teachers is not adequate.

Molosiwa, Ratsoma and Tsonope (in Legere, 1996:119), report on a study that assesses the status of Setswana and ascertains the teachers' attitudes towards the teaching of Setswana as compared to other subjects. This study reveals that the majority of teachers do not like Setswana and have problems with the approach to the teaching of the language. Some teachers feel that Setswana is a subject they would not advise their learners to master. This is an indication of a negative attitude towards Setswana as a subject among teachers. It should be noted that it is through the teaching of Setswana that standard Setswana can be improved and interest in the language can be created in both teachers and learners. Schools should be regarded as the most appropriate domains to promote the use of standard Setswana. It can therefore be assumed that, because standard Setswana is not thoroughly taught in schools, this language variety is not adequately known to most of the Batswana.

Another observation is that standard Setswana is not adequately used in the media, especially on the radio. It is desirable that what is written should be read and pronounced exactly the way it is written. In most cases, listeners can tell whether the presenter is a Mongwato, Mokgatla or Mongwaketse from the way he or she pronounces some words. This means that, instead of reading standard Setswana, the reader converts it to his or her own dialect. This poses a question as to whether standard language should only be seen in writing or whether it should also be heard by listeners. In newspapers, the use of standard Setswana is limited. Janson and Tsonope (1991:84) have observed that most publications are printed in English and not in Setswana. In some papers, the Setswana content is

unsatisfactory when compared to what the same papers offer in English. It should be noted that it is through the use of standard Setswana in newspapers and magazines that standard Setswana can be read and learnt by the public (if they do not learn it at school).

Apart from the newspapers, books written in Setswana by Batswana are very few. Peter and Tabane (1982 in Janson and Tsonope 1991:83) provide a list of all known works in Setswana including dictionaries, grammars, short stories and poems. The list indicates that the number of books in Setswana does not exceed one thousand. Most of them are published in South Africa. At colleges, the majority of the literature books prescribed for students are from South Africa. Only a few titles are from Botswana.

Most of the Batswana show no interest in standard Setswana. This standard variety does not seem to be accepted, which leads it not fulfilling the role of being a government language, since it is not used (to the required standard). It is this lack of interest in Setswana by Batswana that has prompted the researcher to undertake this study, taking into consideration the standardisation of Setswana and its establishment in the entire community.

People seem to be uncertain about the nature of standard Setswana. Some people do not believe that it is a common language developed from all Setswana dialects. Janson and Tsonope (1991:108) explain that, "*some people maintained that the language used was standardised and mainly based on the Setlokwa and Sekgatla*". On the other hand, one of the respondents specified that standard Setswana is the language spoken in the region stretching between Kanye, Molepolole and Barolong areas. (Janson & Tsonope, 1991). These places are in the Ngwaketse and Kweneng regions in the south.

From the above paragraph it is clear that people have different opinions about standard Setswana. People have to be made aware of the nature of standard

Setswana. The lack of acceptance may, in future lead, to language conflict erupting because people of different vernaculars regard their dialects as being the most important. The notion of standard language and how standardisation occurs should both be clarified to the language users to prevent confusion.

The problems discussed above lead to the formulation of the following sub-questions:

- Why is standard Setswana not adequately known by most people?
- What can be done to make sure that the use of standard Setswana is promoted?
- What measures can be taken to ensure the uniformity of standard Setswana in all formal domains?
- Why is standard Setswana not being accepted by all Batswana?
- What can be done to make sure that standard Setswana is accepted?
- Are there enough teaching materials in schools in standard Setswana?

1.6   SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study will be limited to exploring the history of standard Setswana in Botswana, considering that Setswana comprises a number of dialects. The study will also concern itself with the standardisation of Setswana in Botswana and the problems encountered with the standard form.

1.7   RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data will be collected from various people exposed to standard Setswana. These include teachers, lecturers, and members of the National Setswana Language Council.

A structured questionnaire on standard Setswana will be constructed and distributed to teachers in different institutional levels such as primary schools, junior secondary schools and colleges of education.

1.8   STUDY DESIGN

Chapter One serves as an introduction to this study. It provides a brief sociolinguistic profile of Botswana as well as a brief Setswana profile. The problem statement and the purpose of the study are described in this chapter. The theoretical framework of the study is presented in Chapter Two, while Chapter Three deals with the history of Setswana as well as its standardisation. In Chapter Four, the method followed in the study will be described. The description of data analysis and interpretation will be presented in Chapter Five, while Chapter Six focuses on linking the research findings with the problems discussed in Chapter One. Summary of the research, conclusion as well as recommendations will also be presented in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1   INTRODUCTION

In Chapter One the linguistic variety which is regarded as standard Setswana was discussed. In this chapter, the focal point will be the standard language as well as the processes of language standardisation.

It is assumed that since the introduction of unified states and central governments, the notion of standard language has also become an important subject. Governments need a common language to communicate with the society in multilingual and dialectally diverse communities. Trudgill (1987:160) points out that, in multi-national communities, disputes can often arise as to which language is to be used. Because of such a situation, there is a clear need for a single variety that is known by the community at large and that can be used in high public functions. This requires a standard language that does not give anybody an unfair advantage. According to Crowley (1989:95), this variety could also act as a unifying force and a way of encouraging people to unite around a set of particular values.

Linguistic concepts like *language, standard language* and *standardisation,* which have a bearing on this study, need to be defined and discussed in some detail.

2.2   LANGUAGE

The focal point to be discussed in this chapter concerns standard language, which is one of the varieties of a language. Thus it is important to define and discuss the concept *language.*

Trudgill (1975:1), Appel and Muysken (1987:11), and Edwards (1988:16) define *language* as a tool for communicating information as well as establishing relationships with other people. Language is also regarded as a means of transmitting cultural norms and the values of various groups from one generation to another. From the statements made by these authors, it can be assumed that a language is a multi-purpose phenomenon as it fulfils various important social functions.

Authors such as Chambers and Trudgill (1998:3) and Wardhaugh (1988:315) point out that a language exists as a collection of related varieties and that each variety has a role to play in the society. These language varieties include *standard language*, *dialect* (non-standard variety), *register* and *style*.

2.3   STANDARD LANGUAGE

Holmes (1992:83) and Crystal (1985:325), regard the standard language as a prestigious variety. Holmes also emphasises that the standard variety is one that has been written and codified, while Crystal sees it as the variety that unifies communities by breaking the barriers that might linguistically exist within the society. Crystal (1985:325) further points out that this variety is:

> *... an institutionalised norm which can be used in the*
> *mass media, in teaching the language to foreigners,*
> *and so on.*

Garvin and Mathiot (1968) (in Calteaux, 1996:36), Byron (1976:11), and Crowley (1991:195) argue that even though written and codified, a standard variety can also exist as a spoken form. This is true as the standard language is heard on the radio and on television. It is used in parliamentary discussions, in conducting interviews as well as teaching in schools. Webb and Kembo-Sure (2000:28) also emphasise this point by saying that this variety is accepted by

13

various groups in the community as the appropriate form of speaking and writing in high level public contexts.

Looking at the given definitions, it is clear that there are important features that constitute the essential characteristics of a standard language. Firstly, the norms of a standard language must be described. Usually, an authoritative language body agrees on the bases that should be considered when deciding on the norms of a standard language; what is agreed upon as a norm is then spread across and accepted by the whole community of speakers.

Secondly, the standard language is accepted and used in high public functions like schools, courts and in formal contexts across group boundaries. This means that the standard variety is used in all formal functions, irrespective of the region or the institution. Generally, the variety has an official status.

The grammar of the standard variety has been codified; that is, its lexical items, pronunciation, spelling and orthography have been agreed upon and accepted by the society. The orthography appears in dictionaries and grammar books. Government documents and all school material are written in this variety.

The standard variety can be used as a spoken variety in cases where people, especially the educated elite, use it as their vernacular. Joseph (1981:9) observes that not everyone is able to use this variety because one usually acquires it through the process of studying. Thus, one has to go to school to acquire it.

It can be said that a standard language is a codified variety of a language used in high public functions. The variety is taught in schools as a subject, and it is used to teach other subjects. It is also a communicative tool between the government and the society. The variety is normalised and accepted by the community.

2.4 STANDARDISATION

Having looked at the concept of *standard language* and its features, the following discussion focuses on *standardisation*.

Byron (1976:1), Coulmas (1997:82) and Joseph (1981:9) are of the opinion that standardisation is a process of converting one variety into a standard by fixing and regulating its spelling, grammar and vocabulary. Webb and Kembo-Sure (2000:18) define standardisation as:

> ... *the process by which an authoritative language body...*
> *prescribes how a language should be written ..., how its*
> *sounds should be pronounced , how its words should be spelt,*
> *which words should be accepted in formal situations and what*
> *the appropriate grammatical constructions of the language are.*

According to Romaine (1994:84):

> *Standardisation is not an inherent, but rather an*
> *acquired or deliberately and artificially imposed*
> *characteristic. Standard languages do not arise via*
> *a natural course of linguistic evolution or suddenly*
> *spring into existence. They are created by conscious*
> *and deliberate planning.*

Ferguson, cited by Hoffman (1991:207), points out that the standard language usually emerges gradually. Whereas Romaine and Ferguson see standardisation as a deliberate creation, Crystal (1985:286) has a different opinion as he regards standardisation to be:

... a natural development of a standard language in

a community or an attempt by a community to improve

a dialect as a standard.

Even though Crystal does not see standardisation as the product of a deliberate intervention, but rather as a natural development of a variety, he agrees that it is an attempt to "improve" a certain language variety to a standard level, thus, normalising its grammar, spelling as well as orthography. It may be argued that an "improvement" of an existing language variety changes that particular variety from being "natural" to being a deliberate intervention. Where a dialect is improved, the linguistic features of that variety need to be prescribed. The variety needs to borrow words from other languages and assimilate them, and new words need to be coined. This is because some of the terminology may not exist in that particular variety, especially with the new technological inventions. In this sense the variety is not a natural but an artificial development.

Standardisation is therEfore a process by which a dialect changes in status, function and form to become a standard. The process deals with linguistic aspects such as morphology (form and structure of words), phonology (sounds of a language), syntax (sentence structure) and spelling.

Standard languages are the products of the process of standardisation. They are regarded as a planned creation because their development process can be traced.

2.4.1 Stages in the standardisation process

The standardisation of a language follows certain stages. Some authors, such as Appel and Muysken (1987:50) and Fasold (1987:251), speak of the initial fact-finding that comes prior to the other stages of standardisation. A considerable amount of background information needs to be available before any step can be taken. For example, according to Appel and Muysken (1987:50), an audit of the

number of mother-tongue speakers as well as second language speakers of the varieties needs to be considered. Other things to be taken into account include the social distribution, the sociolinguistic status, and the existence of written forms as well as the elaborateness of vocabulary.

Theorists who explored the process of standardisation agree that the stages involved in standardising a language variety include *selection, elaboration of functions, codification* and *acceptance*. However, those same theorists have different opinions on how these stages should be ordered. This will be shown after the discussion of each stage below.

2.4.1.1   Selection

At this stage, the aim is to select a language variety that will be developed as the standard language. Selection can be done in various ways. For example, one dialect may be selected from a number of related dialects of the same language, and developed into a standard, as in the case with Sehurutshe in South Africa (Malimabe, 1990). Another way is to construct a variety by "combining" features of a number of related dialects of the same language to form one variety (Msimang in Prah, 1998:165).

Problems may be encountered with both the composite way and the single dialect way. Wardhaugh (1988:31) observes that, *"selection may prove difficult, because choosing one vernacular as a norm means favouring those who speak that variety"*. A composite of dialects may also be regarded as favouring some dialect features and marginalising others, and those speakers who feel disadvantaged may complain. Members of the strongest dialect community may also object to learning and using features from other dialect communities. The issue of language standardisation can be controversial and sensitive. The authoritative language body must try to be fair, but its decisions might not please everyone.

It is this researcher's opinion that, even though both options could function well, a composite of dialects seems to be preferable as it considers the majority of the language speakers, while a single dialect seems to neglect other dialects. It is also necessary for the language authorities to communicate with and to consult the public on the choices of words made from different dialects during standardisation, so as to keep people aware and involved in the standardisation process.

2.4.1.2   Elaboration of functions

After the variety has been selected, its functions must be expanded. This means that the variety is developed and prepared for use in various formal domains and all functions associated with the government. These functions include usage in parliament, courts of law, education and in literature (Hudson, 1980:32; Wardhaugh, 1992:30). In the elaboration stage, the acceptance of the standard variety is also promoted.

Romaine (1994) and Haugen (1990) point out that the elaboration stage leads to the maximal variation in function. This implies that the standard variety should have a wider range of uses in comparison to other varieties of the same language. The functions must meet the needs of the community at large (Haugen, 1990:249).

2.4.1.3   Codification

According to Leith (in Bolton and Crystal, 1987:312), codification is concerned with the fixing of grammar and dictionaries by recommending certain linguistic aspects to be regarded as standard and stigmatising others. Codification refers to the describing of features in normative grammar. The codification stage involves a number of issues. Firstly, norms are determined during this stage. Crystal

(1980:243) describes the concept *norm* as *"a standard practice in speech or writing"*. Elaborating on this aspect, Bartsch (1982:62) defines a norm as:

> *A prescription that has been accepted and internalised*
> *by the society as a standard by itself, guiding one's own*
> *behaviour as wrong or right.*

According to Webb (1999:18), norms can be defined as:

> *...practical guidelines for appropriate linguistic behaviour.*
> *They are context-sensitive rules for language use and*
> *provide a cultural definition of desired behaviour.*

From these definitions it can be said that norms guide the society in performing certain functions in an appropriate and desired manner; in this instance, they are guidelines on the spelling of words and their pronunciation.

The community learns the standard variety in school and uses it in high public functions such as parliament, the media and all institutions associated with the government. This stage, according to Haugen (1990:249), is characterised by accepting minimal variation in form. Thus, the lexical items to be used in the standard variety are those that have been agreed upon. Some of these lexical items are borrowed from other languages, while others are new words coined during the codification stage.

Two types of norms can be distinguished, namely formal and informal. The informal norms generally arise spontaneously. They exist naturally within a speech community and constitute unmonitored social practice in the society (Bartsch, 1982:62). The informal norms apply to a spoken language and are passed on from the older generation to the younger generation. The informal type of norm contains some expectation about social behaviour (ibid: 61), thus, what

the society regards as being good behaviour. For instance, children know appropriate ways of greeting elderly people as well as their contemporaries and this is the behaviour that is expected of them.

The formal norms on the other hand, can be said to be externally determined. Language authorities develop these norms for the standard variety of a language. Norms of this nature are created for a purpose. Bartsch (1985:62) points out that these norms are consciously developed and are obligatory to a certain degree. This type of norm is not static; what is regarded as a norm today may not be a norm tomorrow.

2.4.1.3.1   Norm determination

In deciding on the norms of a standard language, certain criteria are often considered. Not all the bases for deciding on the norm apply effectively in all situations. Authors such as Bartsch (1985:26) and Webb (1999:19-20) discuss and give examples of such bases that can be considered:

- *Authority*: The language is used by leading authors, such as dictionary makers and some professional people, such as university professors. Webb (1999:19) argues that this basis may be invalid as these professionals and professors can, at times, be ignorant of the nature of the language usage in the speech communities at large.

- *Historical basis*: The norm is based on the language of earlier periods, and on the assumption that the correct meaning of a word is its older one. For instance, the meaning of the word *history* is *"investigation"* as this was the meaning of *"historia"* in Greek. The word *"nice"* means *"fastidious"* as this was what the word meant during Shakespearean time (Crystal, 1985:63). This basis seems to ignore the fact that the language changes in a variety of ways that are linked to different places and time periods.

- *Another language*: The norm is based on another language as if it is a variety of that particular language, for example, the attempt to treat English as Latin (Crystal, 1985:63). This basis is not valid, because the prescription for one language cannot be based on the forms and elements of another language.

- *Purity*: The norm implies that the variety does not contain borrowed words from other languages. This basis is also invalid, as there is no such phenomenon as a *pure* language. There is no language that has not borrowed some words from other languages (Appel and Muysken, 1987:164). Each living language contains loaned elements, especially lexical items, from other languages.

- *Democracy*: This basis takes the *majority* speakers of the language into consideration. This implies finding some sort of *average*, which cannot be implemented in practice (Webb, 1999:20).

- *Aristocracy*: This approach considers the language variety spoken by a "prestigious" group, as the basis for norm determination. In this case prestige is usually defined in terms of political and economic power as well as education. The basis is not valid, as it does not lead to equity and equal opportunity for all people.

- *Literacy*: A variety can be seen as a basis if it appears in the writings of great authors. However, Webb (1999:20) argues that, "*such language use is very restricted*".

- *Geography*: The variety is sometimes considered to be appropriate because it is spoken in a particular location. The basis is not valid because the geographical dimension focuses on the language usage and ideas of a small number of people within a small area.

As already stated, the authoritative language body can use one or more of these criteria to determine the norm. However, Edwards (1988:252) points out that government authorities initially make language plans and then language planners work at their request. This confirms that the factor of power is usually the one that is adhered to. It is the opinion of this researcher that the democratic basis can be appropriate as it considers the majority of the speakers of a language. The language planners need to consider the opinions of the people as well as their participation when determining norms.

2.4.1.4   Acceptance

The selected variety needs to be accepted by the community at large, so that it can serve as a communicative tool across different groups (Hudson, 1980:32). According to Kamwangamalu (Prah, 1998:195), acceptance entails an agreement that has been achieved with regards to words that can be used or left out. The co-operation and involvement of the society is essential.

A problem that might be encountered at this stage is that people may not agree with the selected form for some reason. For instance, where a single variety has been selected, people may think that their vernaculars are being "despised" and not seen as important. They may also think that certain dialects have been marginalised where a composite of dialects has been used.

To avoid conflict, this researcher believes that the authoritative language body must consist of speakers from all dialect communities and must be encouraged to publish the terminology discussed at this forum. For example, the Setswana Language Board of South Africa has a list of representatives from different departments. The list, as cited from the undated *Constitution of Setswana Language Board*, consists of persons from the following domains:

- Media (that is, radio and television newsreaders and translators)
- Bible translators (Pastors)
- Teachers
- Lecturers from both colleges and universities
- Writers
- Lay people.

Such a selection basis helps to provide a broad representation of the community. As a contribution, each representative presents a list of lexical terms in his or her sphere of specialisation. The list is then presented to the board members and discussed and a decision is taken on how words should be written and pronounced.

As already stated in section 2.2.1, authors' opinions on the order of the standardisation stages differ. For instance, Hudson (1980), Appel and Muysken (1987) and Haugen (1966a) (cited by Wardhaugh, 1992:30) are of the opinion that the stages of standardisation should be ordered as selection, acceptance, codification and elaboration of functions. Their reason for this order is that the community should accept the selected variety and agree on some kind of model to provide a norm before the variety can be codified and its functions described. Selection and acceptance stages are societal in nature, while codification and elaboration deal with the language itself (Edwards, 1988:88).

Milroy and Milroy (1985), Edwards (1988) and Haugen (1990) have observed that the order of the stages as stated above is not fixed. In practice, the acceptance stage may be the last. A particular government or its language planners may determine the order of stages. According to Milroy and Milroy (1985:27) and Haugen (1990:252), if the variety is selected, codified, elaborated and then taken to the public for acceptance, it will be regarded as being imposed on the community.

In a democratic situation, the people's participation and consultation should always be considered. The speakers should contribute to issues dealing with language as these issues also concern them. This implies that the authoritative language body should work as a representative of the public, consulting them on a continual basis. It is a sound practice to test whether the public accepts or rejects the selected variety before codification can be done.

The process of standardisation is a complex one. Firstly, the choice of a variety that will be elevated to the standard level is not an easy task. The criteria used to select the norm should be suitable to persuade the public to accept the chosen variety. Secondly, in the case of unifying dialects of the same language into a standard variety, problems may be encountered because the upper-class group from the strongest dialect may refuse to learn and use other dialect features.

Standardisation should be planned in a way that does not marginalise other dialects. If it does, speakers of those dialects whose features are left out are likely to object against the selected variety. This can be avoided by giving the public adequate representation in the language body that determines the standard norm. The public will be informed about and involved in language matters. Language planners need to monitor the degree of acceptance of the standard variety and make sure that books on the standard variety are available for public use. It is also the task of the authoritative bodies to sensitise the public to the use of the standard language. In other words, campaigns need to be conducted to make the public aware of the developments and changes made in the standard variety (as in the case of newly coined words as well as borrowed words). To carry on with these procedures, language planners need time and resources in the form of funding and manpower.

2.5 LANGUAGE VARIETIES AND STANDARD LANGUAGE

In section 2.1 it is stated that a *language* comprises a number of diverse varieties including dialects, style, registers as well as the standard variety. Herbert (1992:3) adds to this by saying that each language label presents a range of varieties. It is necessary to distiguish the standard variety from the other types and to look at the role of this standard variety within a language.

2.5.1 Style

Authors such as Crystal (1980:337), Wardhaugh (1988:48, 1993:142), and Romaine (1994:84) discuss the concept of *style*. According to them, *style* can be defined as different ways of speaking adopted by speakers in different situations. The situation or circumstance in which the speaker finds him or herself governs his or her way of speaking (Wardhaugh, 1988: 48); the variety is then described as situational.

Romaine (1994:84) points out that *"the most common influence and product is the degree of formality"*. This implies that the choice of language to be used by the speaker is determined by the situation. The speaker will use formal language in formal situations, and informal language in informal situations. For instance, the way a principal at a school addresses or speaks to the teachers in a staff meeting will differ from the way he/she would speak to them at home or in an informal conversation. The situation in which the language is used allows the use of certain words and prohibits the use of others. As the situation becomes more formal, the speaker's behaviour and the use of words also become formal.

2.5.2 Register

Biber (1995:1), Wardhaugh (1988:48) and Calteaux (1996:34) define *register* as a set of vocabulary items associated with different occupations. This implies that the activity of the speaker determines his/her choice of words at that particular

time. For instance, the vocabulary used by a medical doctor at the hospital will differ from the vocabulary used by the bank manager at the bank. Registers are not necessarily dependent on the speakers, but on the activity for which the language is being used. For example, one can be a bank manager and also be a cricket player. The vocabulary one uses while engaging in these activities will differ. McArthur (1992:852) and Asher (1994:5116) point out that, in contrast with dialect, register is related to the use of language and not the user.

2.5.3 Dialect

A dialect is one of the varieties of a language distinguished from other varieties in terms of specific groups to which the speakers belong. Brook (1979:13) defines *dialect* as:

> *... a sub-division of a language that is used by*
> *a group of speakers who have some non-linguistic*
> *characteristics in common.*

According to Francis (1983:1) (Lodge, 1993:23), dialects are relatively similar to each other and have minor divergences. This author points out that dialects are used by groups smaller than the total community of speakers.

A dialect can be described as a set of linguistic forms associated with different social groups. Dialects can be regional or social. Regional dialects are distinguished by the areas in which that particular language variety is spoken. Social dialects are associated with people belonging to different social backgrounds such as social class, age, gender, occupation, religion as well as cultural background.

2.5.4 Standard language

It was pointedout in section 2.1 that the standard language is one of the varieties of a language. It is contained within a particular language in much the same way as dialects, registers and styles. The distinction between the standard language and other language varieties is that standard language is consciously created and developed for a purpose. The language authorities have described its functions. It can be concluded that in a dialectally rich community, when one is at home, one uses or speaks a dialect, but when one moves into a formal domain (such as a classroom), one switches to the standard variety. This variety is also subject to internal variations. Different terminology that refers to the same objects can be used in different formal domains. For example, in schools terms such as *hall* and *kitchen* will be used, while in the universities terms such as *auditorium* and *refectory* may be used.

The standard language can be formal or informal. Usually, the standard variety is written and this is one of the differences observed between the standard language and a dialect. In the formal standard, the choice of appropriate words is considered, for example, in application letters and formal interviews. The informal standard can be observed in situations such as informal letters.

Each language variety has a special role to play in society, and each variety is appropriate to a particular context. The standard variety is appropriate to high public functions whereas non-standard varieties are appropriate to informal situations.

2.6 CONFLICT BETWEEN STANDARD LANGUAGE AND NON-STANDARD LANGUAGES

Conflict between language varieties may occur as a result of the attitudes that the language users have towards non-standard varieties. Language varieties that did

not go through the process of standardisation are referred to as non-standard, and they do not have the same status as the standard dialect. According to some authors who deal with this topic, some people regard non-standard varieties as being "wrong", while standard varieties are perceived as "correct". For example, Tarren (1986:1886 in Janicki in Jahr 1993:105) states that:

> *When we move on... we hit upon the conflict situations*
> *in which speakers of the standard variety of a language*
> *come into contact with those of a non-standard variety*
> *of a language. With reference to that type of situation*
> *... many speakers of a standard variety believe that their*
> *variety is... better than non-standard variety.*

This is an invalid perception as there is no wrong or bad language, but only an appropriate language (Appel and Muysken, 1987:164; Webb, 1999:20). That implies that each language variety is appropriate in its functional context. However, it is clear that the standard language speakers often have a negative attitude towards non-standard varieties. Non-standard dialects are regarded as something that needs to be eradicated. Christian and Wolfram (1979:1) also observe negative attitudes towards non-standard dialects:

> *Non-standard dialects are often thought to be an unsystematic*
> *or incomplete version of the standard one. Speakers of these*
> *dialects are sometimes mistakenly judged to have cognitive*
> *handicaps, to be less intelligent or to have slower language*
> *development.*

It can be concluded that the standard language users regard themselves as being formally educated and, therefore superior, while the non-standard dialect speakers are regarded as uneducated and therefore inferior. This notion is incorrect as the non-standard dialect speakers value their dialects and regard

them as important. It is through their dialects that they express their cultural identity.

Bartsch (1985:40) points out that the creation of the standard dialect may cause the non-standard dialects to lose some of the functions they have been performing before the existence of the standard variety. For instance, standard varieties are regarded as new creations and, before their existence, public gatherings were conducted in non-standard varieties. Currently, public gatherings are conducted in standard varieties, even in the traditional courts: court clerks are present to take notes of the discussion. Non-standard dialects are no longer utilised to fulfil their old functions, nor are they being used in new situations that result from standardisation.

It can be argued that the development of the standard language depends largely on non-standard varieties (as well as on borrowing of foreign words from other languages); hence, non-standard varieties are important. However, it can also be assumed that, in the long run, some of the language varieties may disappear as a result of the power of the standard language (Trudgill, 1975; Mutasa, 1996). As more people become educated and are encouraged by governments to use standard varieties, non-standard varieties may decline in usage.

2.7   CONCLUSION

It was pointed out in this chapter that standard language is a product of the process of standardisation. This process has certain stages such as selection, acceptance, codification and the elaboration of functions. The process is carried out in order to normalise the selected variety. The task is performed by an authoritative language body. However, it is essential that the participation and consultation of the public be considered to avoid complaints from the language speakers. For the standard variety to be regarded as a norm, it should be accepted and adopted by the society. It is also important for governments that adopt the

use of standard languages to develop and cultivate these varieties to make them more useful for various communicative needs.

Furthermore, a language exists in a number of different varieties, namely dialects, styles, registers and the standard variety. All these varieties are appropriate in their particular contexts. The standard variety plays an important role as it is used in all high public functions across all social groups. It is through the use of the standard variety that the society can assess its behaviour concerning the use of language in formal domains.

Having looked at the notion of standard language, how the variety is standardised as well as the stages it has to follow, it is the aim of this study to explore the standard in Setswana in Botswana. The selection of the standard variety, be it single or a composite, its acceptance by the society, the elaboration of its functions as well as the people's proficiency in the language variety will be discussed.

CHAPTER THREE

HISTORY OF SETSWANA

3.1   INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the history of standard Setswana, taking into account the origin of the Batswana, the linguistic classification of Setswana dialects as well as the history of Setswana orthography in Botswana.

As a preliminary to the task of studying standard language in Botswana, it is considered necessary to look briefly at the history of the Batswana and their distribution into various groups as they are found in different regions in southern Africa, especially Botswana, South Africa and Namibia. The important factor, as will be observed from the discussion, is that the distribution of the Setswana dialects is connected to the large migrations and secessions of different groups.

3.2   HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Authors such as Andersson and Janson (1997), Janson and Tsonope (1991), Tlou and Campbell (1984), Schapera (1952,1953), Schapera and Comaroff (1991, Sillery (1965) and Young (1966) have studied the history of the Batswana. The brief overview of the history of Setswana provided in this chapter is based on the works of these authors.

While some sources regard the Great Lakes of East Africa as the origin of the Bantu-speaking people, others go beyond this region. Fred and Ellenberger (1912:xix) believe that some of the Bantu-speaking people came from Egypt more than two thousand years ago. According to Fred and Ellenburger, the Bafokeng must have crossed the great desert, while the ancestors of the Barolong would appear to have left the region of the Great Lakes at about the end of the

10th Century. Janson and Tsonope (1991:23) state that the Bantu-speaking people may originally have inhabited Cameroon, which is in the northern part of the Great Lakes region. They spread along different routes, starting eastwards and then southwards along the eastern coast of Africa. Most authors seem to agree that Batswana originated from the Great Lakes of East Africa. This is probably the region where the Sotho-Tswana group broke away from other Bantu-speaking groups, migrating to southern Africa. Malan (1980:6) states that:

> After the emerging of these people in the vicinity of the
> Great Lakes in East Africa, a southerly migration was
> caused by the conflicting interests having arisen mainly
> from over-population and the over-exploitation of
> natural resources.

He further says that:

> Over a long period various groups embarked on the
> southerly movement and started populating different
> parts of central and southern Africa.

Sillery (1965:21) points out that:

> All that we can say with tolerable assurance is that
> at the time of the Bantu migration into southern
> Africa, a group of people called Sotho, allied by ties
> of language and by similarities in social organisation,
> penetrated as far as the Vaal river and beyond, and spread
> across southern Africa from Kalahari to what is now eastern
> Transvaal, forming a belt across that part of the continent.

32

From the above quotations, it would seem that Batswana came from the Great Lakes, belonging to one cluster known as the Sotho group. However, today they are regarded as different Sotho-Tswana groups, probably because of the linguistic differences between these languages. These groups have relatively small differences as far as linguistic aspects and customs are concerned.

According to Sillery (1965:22), the Sotho-Tswana group is said to have come to southern Africa in three different waves. The first group comprised the ancestors of the Kgalagadi, who settled in Bechuanaland (Botswana), and drove away the Khoe, who were the first inhabitants of the region. It is after this group that the Kalahari Desert was named.

The second wave consisted of the people from whom the Rolong and their offshoots (such as Tlhaping) have descended. The group spread into the former southwestern Transvaal and southern Bechuanaland (Sillery, 1965:22).

The third wave is said to have been the greatest wave of the Sotho-Tswana migration. The group comprises the people who developed into the Tswana tribes that exist today. They settled in the former Western Transvaal. This group was united under a single chief before breaking into many tribes. It is believed that the Batswana had already occupied the eastern and southern parts of Africa by about AD 1600. By the 18th century, the existing clusters became subdivided into various groups (Schapera, 1952:8).

Having mentioned the Khoe, a brief history of this group will be given. Not much is known about the origin of the Khoe. According to Schapera (Young, 1966:32), the Khoe are certainly the oldest to inhabit the southern region of Africa, and originally came from the Great Lakes of East Africa, possibly as far as Ethiopia. Schapera believes that they were driven away from this region by more powerful tribes.

According to Tlou and Campbell (1984:22), different groups of people living in Africa south of the Sahara today once formed a single group of people. They probably resembled the Khoe more than the Bantu-speaking people did. It is believed that the Khoe-type of skeletons found in some parts of eastern and southern Africa, seem older than the skeletons of the Bantu-speaking people. The results from the comparison of these skeletons are evidence that the Khoe probably occupied some parts of Africa earlier than the Bantu-speaking people. Other traces of the Khoe are the paintings of people and animals that are found throughout eastern and southern Africa, for instance, the paintings found in the Tsodilo Hills in Northwest Botswana.

It can therefore be assumed that the Khoe were the first inhabitants of southern regions of Africa. It is not possible to tell how long the Khoe lived in their present area.

3.3   THE ORIGION OF THE BATSWANA

The Tswana group is said to have probably been united under a single chief and may probably have spoken the same "language". According to Schapera (1953:15), this is because the group settled as a united body, and as time went by, it broke up into separate clusters. Schapera (1952:8) states that:

> *The chiefs of most modern Tswana tribes claim to be*
> *descended from a certain Malope, who ruled very long*
> *ago in the south western Transvaal. He is said to have*
> *been the father or near ancestor of Mohurutshe, Kwena,*
> *Ngwato and Ngwaketse, who were respectively the direct*
> *ancestors of the chiefs now ruling the tribes of those names.*

The death of Malope seems to have given birth to a split in the tribe, owing to a dispute between Mohurutshe and Kwena about the succession to the

34

chieftainship. According to Tlou and Campbell (1984:23), Mohurutshe, who was from the first house of Malope, was a woman, and Kwena was from the junior house. Some people did not want to be ruled by a woman, and the tribe split because of this. Some supported Mohurutshe while others supported Kwena. Those following Mohurutshe became known as Bahurutshe and those following Kwena were called Bakwena. Schapera (1952:9) points out that all other groups respected and regarded the Bahurutshe as their seniors as most of the Batswana groups broke from the Hurutshe group.

Ngwato and Ngwaketse were the younger brothers of Kwena and remained under his rule, but they were heads of different wards of the tribe. According to Tlou and Campbell (1984:60) "*the Kwena group split and one section moved and occupied the area now known as Lesotho, and surrounding areas of South Africa*". The other section of the Kwena, led by Mogopa, occupied the area around the confluence of the Marico and Crocodile rivers. Another group broke from Mogopa and was led by his brother Kgabo. That group settled in the area presently known as Molepolole in Botswana. The Bakwena of Mogopa are said to be the Tswana tribe occupying Pretoria and Rustenburg areas of the former Transvaal. From this group, there are also some offshoots such as Phalane and Fokeng (ibid).

Ngwato and Ngwaketse remained under the leadership of Kgabo, and with him they crossed into the present day Botswana, settleing in the Kgatla reserve (Schapera, 1952:9). Sillery (1965:22-23) confirms:

> *Early in the eighteenth century a group of people belonging*
> *to one of these divisions, the Kwena of Mogopa, offshoots*
> *of the Hurutshe tribe, crossed the Limpopo westwards under*
> *a leader named Kgabo and ultimately settled in the Dithejwana*
> *hills.*

It was from this group that Ngwato and Ngwaketse broke away. Ngwaketse broke away first, and became a separate tribe under Makaba, who became the first chief of the Bangwaketse. According to Sillery (1965:22), this group settled at Lobatse. Ngwato also broke away from Kwena, and the group was under the leadership of Mathiba. The group moved north and settled on the Shoshong hills. Here too the tribe split. Schapera (1952:9) states that Kgama, who was the elder son of Mathiba, maintained that his father was unduly partial to another son, Tawana. Conflict erupted between the two brothers and, ultimately, Tawana seceded with his followers, including his father. They migrated to the northwest beyond the Botletle River in the Ngamiland region of Botswana. Kgama became the chief of the Bangwato, while Tawana became the chief of the Batawana. The Bangwato tribe currently occupies the central area of Botswana, and the Batawana are in Ngamiland in the northwest.

Up to this point, it can be seen that the section that seceded from Mohurutshe, under the leadership of Kwena, had become divided into at least five separate tribes. These are Mogopa-Kwena, Kwena of Molepolole, Ngwaketse, Ngwato and Tawana.

The Hurutshe also broke up. Mohurutshe is said to have had two sons and each of them led a group. One group settled in Ootse, west of the Marico River. The other group remained in the Western Transvaal, where they joined the Gananwa tribe. The third group moved from Ootse further north of Botswana and settled in the Francistown area, where they lived with the Kalanga group. The group is currently known as Bakhurutshe.

The group that remained in the southwestern Transvaal also broke up into many groups. Some of them are presently found in the Zeerust area. One section of this group is the Tlharo under the leadership of Motlhware. Other groups that also deserve to be mentioned are Bahurutshe-boo-Manyana in Botswana, and the Bahurutshe boo-Mohubibu, currently found in Mmankgodi. The former is

36

commonly regarded as the senior branch of all the Bahurutshe (Schapera, 1952:10).

The Kgatla tribe is also said to be the offshoot of the Hurutshe tribe under the leadership of Malekeleke. This tribe was divided. Mogale led one group, while Thabane led the other. Mogale's group settled in Hammanskraal, north of Pretoria. The group under Thabane moved to the north.

Mogale's group also became divided as a result of chieftainship disputes between Kgafela and his sister Mosetlha. Tlou and Campbell (1984:67) state that, *"Some Bakgatla followed the daughter, Mosetlha, while others followed the son, Kgafela"*. Because of this, the tribe split and each group regarded itself as a separate tribe. Each group became known after its leader, that is, Bakgatla-ba ga-Kgafela and Bakgatla-ba ga-Mosetlha. The Kgafela group also split and one section became known as the Bakgatla-ba ga-Mmanaana. This group did not get its name after its leader, but historically speaking, they left the village at night, leaving behind a red-and-white cow ("kgomo e naana" in Setswana) tied to a tree. The tribe was then named after that cow (ibid).

In most cases, the names of the tribes found in Botswana today are derived from the names of the leaders. This also applies to the language spoken by the tribe. In some cases, even the region occupied by that tribe is known by that name. For instance, the followers of Tawana are called Batawana, speaking Setawana and found in Goo-Tawana.

So far, nothing has been said about the Batswana in Namibia. It seems that only a small number of the Batswana migrated to Namibia from Botswana and South Africa. Malan (1980:8) states that:

They are quite distinct from the members of the

south western Bantu group, and originate from

the neighbouring Botswana as well as parts of the

northern Cape Province. Their numbers are relatively

low.

The Tswana group found in Namibia seems to be a combination of different tribes such as Batlharo, Batlhaping and Bakgalagadi. Not much is known about this group.

3.4 SETSWANA DIALECTS

It may be appropriate to say that dialects emerge through time as a result of splitting from a single variety. From the above discussion, it is clear that various groups of Tswana split from the single group led from the beginning by Malope; this resulted in the creation of various dialects (Schapera, 1952:8).

Because of the geographical demarcations and political developments between South Africa and Botswana, the present Setswana dialects in the two countries are different. Janson and Tsonope (1991:46) have observed that when groups of people become geographically and politically separated they may also develop differences in their form of speech. In this regard Downes (1998:19) states that, *"geographical separation is a causal factor in the differences between dialects".* According to him, such differences can be brought about by the linguistic boundaries that tend to coincide with major physical features (for example, rivers and mountains) that separate one community from another. In the case of Botswana, physical features such as the ones mentioned above are not commonly used as dialectal boundaries, even though they exist in those areas. Dialectal differences are identified according to regions, as in the case with Sengwato in the north and Sengwaketse in the south. It can therefore be said that geographical separation produces linguistic divergence. In most cases, differences are found

38

mainly in phonology and in the lexicon. Morphology and syntax are much less affected (Janson and Tsonope, 1991:46).

In Botswana, there are many dialects as can be deduced from the splitting of different Tswana groups. Each group has its own dialect. The Setswana dialects that can be identified in Botswana are Sekgatla, Sengwato, Sekwena, Setawana, Sengwaketse, Serolong, Selete and Setlokwa. These are regarded as the principal dialects. Nonetheless, according to Sillery (1965:22), they have a common ancestor. Cole (1955:xvi-xviii) divides the Tswana dialects into four divisions: the central division, the northern division, the southern division and the eastern division. It should be kept in mind that these divisions were made long before the present political boundaries between Botswana and South Africa were created.

When looking at the present linguistic situation in Botswana, Setswana dialects can be separated into the northern division and the southern division. The southern division consists of those dialects that employ the lateral explosives [tl] and [tlh]. The dialects found here include Sengwaketse, Sekgatla, Setlokwa, Selete, Serolong and Sekwena.

The northern division consists of those dialects that use the inter-dental explosive [t] and the aspirated *t* [th]. These dialects are Sengwato, Setawana and part of Sekwena. Janson and Tsonope (1991:46) observe that people of the northern Kweneng do not generally use the lateral release. The above-mentioned aspects are the most salient features of dialectal differences that can be identified. Apart from these phonological differences, lexical differences can also be identified in the Setswana dialects. For instance, Bakgatla would refer to *maize* as *mmopo*, while other dialects use *mmidi*. Bangwato and Bakwena would refer to an uncastrated goat as *phoko* while Bangwaketse and Bakgatla use *phorogotlho*.

Because of these variations, it is clear that there are significant differences between the forms of language spoken in different regions that need to be taken into account when standardising the language.

As will be shown in the following discussion, early works of written Setswana were based on the dialects not spoken in present day Botswana. The writings were based on Setlhaping and Serolong. These dialects are spoken in South Africa and only a small number of the Barolong is found in Botswana today. According to Cole (1955:xvi):

> *The Tlhaping tribe has its main settlements in the*
> *Taung, Vryburg and Barkley West districts of the Cape*
> *Province, but extends southwards to the Orange River*
> *and eastwards into the neighbouring districts of the*
> *Transvaal and Orange Free State.*

Nothing is said about the Batlhaping in Botswana today. With regard to the Barolong, Cole (1955) explains that they were situated mainly in Mafikeng, Lotlhakane and Polfontein, southeast of Mafikeng as well as Thaba Nchu in the Orange Free State.

It can be noted that the present Setswana speakers of Botswana arrived in the country as one group of the Kwena tribe and started splitting up later on. It could be appropriate to talk of Sekwena as the basis of standard Setswana but that is not the case. Standard Setswana is believed to be a compromise between all Setswana dialects (Janson and Tsonope, 1991). The reasons for this could be political because, even though the Batswana presently utilise various dialects, they are united under one government and need one common language variety. They identify themselves as the Setswana-speaking Batswana and not according to their dialects.

It can also be concluded from the discussion that most Setswana dialects obtained their names from the leaders of the various groups. For instance, the Bahurutshe were named after their leader Mohurutshe, and so was the dialect Sehurutshe. The Bakwena were named after their leader Kwena, and so was their dialect Sekwena. To a certain extent, the areas where groups settled were named after the leaders, for example, Goo-Tawana, Ga-Mma-Ngwato, Ga-Ngwaketse, and so on.

The origin of the names Setswana and Botswana is uncertain. Nothing definite is known, except that there are many speculations about the origin. According to Schapera (1953:9), the name has been interpreted in many different ways. Some of the meanings are as follows:

- "the little offshoots" (from *–tswa*, "to come out, to come from")
- "the separatists", or "secedes" (from *–tswaana*, to separate from one another)
- "those that are alike" (from *tshwana*, "to be alike").

Schapera and Comaroff (1991:3) state that none of the above derivations are accepted, as they are fruitless speculations.

3.5   THE SETSWANA ORTHOGRAPHY

The first people to transform Setswana into a written form were the missionaries from different societies. This conversion, according to Janson and Tsonope (1991:57), was not an easy task, since *Setswana* was not their mother tongue.

A number of authors such as Cole (1955), Moloto (1964), Janson and Tsonope (1991) and Andersson and Janson (1997) investigated the history of written Setswana. According to them the history of written Setswana can be traced as far back as 1806. This is the time when Heinrich Lichtenstein, German by birth,

contributed his vocabulary dictionary, *Upon the language of Beetjuans*. He produced a list of about 270 Setswana words and phrases (Cole, 1955:xxiii). Examples taken from this source are:

sseaakja	>	seatla (hand)
mochohru	>	mogodu (stomach)
bussecho	>	bosigo (night)
kammuhscho	>	ka moso (tomorrow)

In 1815, John Campbell also wrote a dictionary, *Bootchuana words*. He included words such as:

chebbey	>	tsebe (ear)
loonowho	>	lonao (foot)

William Burchell added his *Sichuana language* in 1824; this publication contained over a hundred words and phrases. For example:

ncha	>	ntša (dog)
nuenjanni	>	nonyane (bird)
mosarri o mungklje	>	mosadi yo montle (a beautiful woman)
ka ki uklwi Sichuana	>	ga ke utlwe Setswana (I do not understand Setswana)

From these works, three different variants for the same sound can be distinguished. The present sound [-tsw-] is spelt [-tj-], [-tch-] and [-ch-].

Another missionary whose contribution was important was Robert Moffat, who arrived and lived among the Batswana around 1816. He stayed with the Batlhaping in Kuruman in the northwestern Cape. In 1824, Moffat started a school with the Batlhaping. He needed to use Setswana in his teaching work and

based the orthography on his mother tongue. Robert Moffat aimed to translate the Bible into Setswana. He coined the term *Sechuana* as opposed to *Sichuana* by Burchell. It must be noted that the missionaries were from different denominations; this contributed to the use of different writing systems and resulted in different types of orthographies. Consequently, many problems were encountered at a later stage in the development of Setswana orthography.

In his study, Moloto (1964:3) observes that Moffat adopted English sounds for use in Setswana. For instance, "she" is used in the name "Moshe" which is Moses in English. Additionally, Moffat used /r/ instead of /d/ to procede /i/ and /u/:

Morimo > Modimo   (God)

rumela > dumela   (believe)

Moffat also employed the /y/ sound instead of the /j/ sound and the close vowel /u/ instead of the open vowel /o/:

ka yenu > ka jeno   (today)

In 1838 a Wesleyan missionary, James Archbell, published the first grammar book, *A grammar of the Bechuana language*. He introduced the following:

Mo- in Mochuana (which is noun class 1)

Bu- in Buchuana   (land of the Tswana)

Be- in Bechuana   (plural of Mochuana)

James Archbell worked among the Barolong and decided to use their dialect.

In 1841 Eugene Casalis from the Paris Evangelical Mission published his *Etudes sur la langue Sechuana* which contained grammar and French translations of southern Sotho praise poems, songs, proverbs and folklore, using Setswana

orthography. Thus he wrote in southern Sotho while employing the Setswana structures that had been developed by Moffat (Cole, 1955:xxiii-xxv).

Casalis was stationed at Thaba Bosiu in Lesotho and had contacts with different groups of the Batswana such as Rolong, Tlhaping and Kwena. This led to confusion of Setswana with Sesotho. With regard to this, Janson and Tsonope (1991:38) noted:

> *What is remarkable is that Casalis evidently*
> *was of the opinion that the language of the*
> *Basotho was Setswana; or at least thought so*
> *in his earlier years. ...From his text, it is evident*
> *that he regarded Setswana to be the language*
> *of the Basotho as well as several groups that are*
> *generally included among speakers of that language.*

Because Casalis was not familiar with either Setswana or Sesotho, he could not find the differences between them. He regarded Sesotho as a dialect of Setswana. Eventually, upon noting the linguistic differences between the two, he realised that Setswana and Sesotho are different languages as did the other missionaries. Setswana and Sesotho were just similar to such an extent that someone who is not familiar with the two languages would not notice the differences. Evidence shows that Casalis did not introduce anything new; instead, he used the orthography that was already available and produced publications in Setswana. It is at this point that the three languages of Sesotho, Sepedi and Setswana came to be seen as different languages.

David Livingstone also made his contribution to Setswana studies by producing *An analysis of the language of the Bechuanas* in 1858. His work contained most of Archbell and Casalis' works. Livingstone, according to Cole (1955:xxiv), recognised the error of forcing Bantu languages into the grammatical mould of

European languages. He realised that the familiar grammar that were used were not appropriate for the Bantu languages. This is not surprising, since most Europeans used the phonological systems of their mother tongue as the background for dealing with Bantu languages. Up to that point, there had been no writing systems for the Bantu languages.

John Brown of the London Missionary Society published the first Setswana dictionary entitled *Lokoalo loa mahuku a Secuana le Seeneles*, in 1876. This was a bilingual dictionary that included an introduction to Setswana grammar as well as kinship terms. Its second edition was published in 1895 and it was reprinted several times afterwards (Cole, 1955:xxiv-xxv).

From the above discussion of studies of the Setswana language, it is clear that there was no single systematic way of spelling words. Each missionary spelt words in accordance with his own abilities, using his language and the dialects around him. The same words were spelt differently by different missionaries. The sounds that were used were spelt differently from the spellings commonly used today. This is an indication that the orthography applicable to European languages is not always suitable to Bantu languages. It can be noted that in most Bantu languages the sound of any letter will always be the same and will be pronounced in the same way in various situations. In European languages, however, some letters have different pronunciations. For instance: in English, *ph* and *f* are often pronounced in the same way as demonstrated by words, p̲hase [feiz], f̲ace [feis], p̲hone [foun], f̲ate [feit] and f̲ame [feim]. All the underlined letters are pronounced with the /f/ sound. In Bantu languages, *phone* and *phase* would be pronounced with an aspirated /p/ while *face, fate* and *fame* would be pronounced with the /f/ sound.

The problem of orthography gave birth to a conference on the spelling system held in Johannesburg in South Africa in 1910.

3.5.1 The 1910 Orthography

The conference was held in Johannesburg in 1910 with the intention of resolving the problem of the orthography of Setswana. It was initiated by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The aim was to set up spelling rules that were to be adhered to by the missionaries and other writers. The rules were based on the Setlhaping dialect, but variations from other dialects were allowed (Janson and Tsonope, 1991:62). These are some of the spellings that, according to Moloto (1964:9), were agreed upon:

- The use of accent marks, for example opé (nobody)
- The use of the accent mark on the semi-open front and back vowels ó and é, as opposed to the circumflex (that is, ô and ê)
- The velar nasal symbol to be ñ
- The conjunction ha (if)
- The employment of the voiced alveolar explosive d as opposed to r as in dihile, which replaced rihile of 1881
- The use of both o and w as labial semi-vowels as in oa and gagwe
- The use of e as the palatal semi-vowel, as in raea and eo
- The use of diha in place of the existing dira
- The use of y in place of the existing j as in boyaloa yoa (bojalwa jwa)
- The use of ch in chologa and in sechwancho (the 1881 Testament used secuanco)

Not all the denominations and writers put the 1910 orthography into practice. The number of orthographies in use for various dialects of Setswana continued to increase (Mogapi, 1998:27). As early as 1928, there was a proposal to develop a common orthography for the three Bantu languages, namely Setswana, Sesotho and Sepedi. The three languages were seen to be similar to each other, probably because they are mutually intelligible. The Central Orthography Committee was

46

established with the aim of attempting to evolve a uniform orthography that would serve all the languages. This did not materialise due to the linguistic differences between Setswana, Sesotho and Sepedi. The three languages differ in various phonetic details, grammar and vocabulary. For instance, unlike Sesotho, Setswana has no click sound such as /c/ and /q/. It uses the velar fricative [x] instead of the aspirate /h/, for example: Setswana's "*bogadi*" (lobola) is the equivalent to Sesotho's "*bohadi*". As orthography continued to be a problem, the Setswana committee met several times in 1929 and 1930 with the aim of developing it, but failed.

Around 1930, the Institute of African Languages and Cultures of the Transvaal Sotho sub-committee under Lestrade produced the *Practical Orthography of African Languages*, which outlined the principles of orthography. With regard to Setswana, they prescribed the following to be used (examples taken from Moloto, 1964:16):

- x for g of the present day   (as in kgakala)
- ŋ for ng of the present day   (as in nokeng)

They also recommended that divisions should be made in words such as the following:

- bare for present ba re   (they say)
- ekile for present e kile   (it once happened)
- kefa for present ke fa   (and then)
- No diacritic marks to be used
- fa instead of ha   (if)

The existence of diaphonemes was to be recognised and allowed as in the instance of /f/ and /h/. In some dialects the labiodental fricative /f/ was used instead of the voiceless glottal fricative /h/ used in other Setswana dialects.

The *Practical Orthography of African Languages* became known as the Central Orthography. It could not bring the problem of orthography to an end. In November 1930 representatives of the Department of Education in Botswana (then Bechuanaland), Cape Povince, Orange Free State and Transvaal held a meeting on the Setswana orthography. They agreed on using the writing system referred to as the Mafikeng Orthography, which was different from the 1930 Central Orthography. The same committee met again in 1931 in Bloemfontein in South Africa, and devised another orthography, which differed from both the Central and Mafikeng orthographies.

3.5.2 The 1937 Orthography

In April 1937 the November 1930/31 committee and the Institute of African Languages Committee met. Among other things, the conference addressed the Setswana orthography that was used in both Botswana and South Africa, and argued that some symbols had to be excluded from the orthography. Some of the symbols that were to become redundant are as follows (examples taken from Moloto 1964:18):

ps as in mpsa	(dog)	psh as in mpsha	(new)
pš as in mpša	(dog)	pšh as in mpšha	(new)
py as in mpya	(dog)	phy as in mphya	(new)

This implied that where the following sounds alternate because of dialectal variations, only one sound should be used in writing; that is, for ps, pš, py and tš, only tš should be used. For sounds like [psh, pšh, phy] and [tšh], only tšh should be used. Other alternatives were also recommended in the 1937 orthography:

ts and tš as in tšola	(undress)
tsh and tšh as in tšhoga	(frightened)
t and tl as in tlala	(hunger)

th and **tlh** as in **tlhala**   (divorce)

A decade later, the unification of the orthographies was initiated by the Transvaal Education Department; this led to the Somerset House Conference in February 1947, during which a number of changes were agreed upon. At this conference some permanent committee members were elected. For instance, the Sotho Language Committee (Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho and Tswana) consisted of Education Inspectors and Ministers of Religion, assisted by university professors. The first issue of *Sotho Terminology and Orthography No.1* was eventually published in 1957. In this publication, the following sounds are recommended for use in Setswana:

fricatives   >   (fs, fs, fy)
ejected affricates   >   (ps, pš, py)
aspirated affricates >   (psh, pšh)

It was also agreed that the diacritic marks (^) should not be used except where there is likely to be confusion; for example:

golola   (release)
gôlôla   (make biltong)
noka   (river)
nôka   (hip)

Thus diacritic marks are conditionally provided in the 1957 orthography.

3.5.3   Tswana Language Committee (1960)

In 1960, the Sotho Language Committee was divided into three sectors: for Setswana, Northern Sotho and Southern Sotho. The underlying aim was to have a separate sub-committee for each of the languages. Two years later, each committee produced its terminology and orthography. The Setswana sounds were

similar to the 1957 orthography. The sounds that were regarded as variants were recognised in other dialects. The orthography that was produced in 1937 and reviewed in 1957 continued to be adhered to both in Botswana and South Africa. This orthography was revised by the South African Language Committee and was published in 1980 (Janson and Tsonope, 1991:77).

After independence, Botswana's government established a national language board. In 1977, a Setswana Language Panel was formed with the aim of furthering primary education in Setswana. The main concern was that Botswana depended on books produced in South Africa, and there was a need to have locally produced material. Botswana felt the need to establish a formally independent orthography for the country. Consequently, the Setswana Language Committee was established under the Ministry of Education. Its main task was to revise the Setswana orthography booklet that was published in 1981 and that is still being used today.

3.5.4   Lexical standardisation

Standardising the lexicon of a language is not an easy task since the vocabulary is the most open-ended aspect of a language (Crystal 1985 in Bolton & Crystal, 1985). It is the most dynamic part of standardisation, because new words (loan words) are incorporated daily through borrowing. Authors such as Moloto (1964), Janson and Tsonope (1991), Andersson and Janson (1997) and Mogapi (1998) explored the standardisation of Setswana. Nothing was mentioned in these sources about lexical standardisation. It is this researcher's observation that, because standard Setswana is a combination of all Setswana dialects, its lexicon is produced from the vocabularies of different dialects through a compromise process. In a case where dialects differ lexically, the lexical items common to the majority of dialects are taken as standard. For example:

Table 3.1   Lexical variations

Sengwato	Sekgatla	Sekwena	Sengwake tse	Standard Setswana	English
mmidi	mmopo	mmidi	mmidi	mmidi	maize
thoro	kuane	mutshe	hutshe	hutshe	hat
thupa	mpa	thupa	thupa	thupa	cane
lekoma	lebotana	lekotswana	lebotana	lebotana	wall

It is an aim of this study to discover whether there are any specific criteria used for the standardising of the Setswana lexicon.

3.5.5 Morphological standardisation

The morphological standardisation of Setswana can be observed in the noun classification that is effected by prefixes of nouns. Prefixes also distinguish between the singular and plural forms. For example:

<p style="text-align:center">"<u>mo</u>simane"   (boy)   and   "<u>ba</u>simane"   (boys)</p>

The singular prefix is "mo-", while the plural prefix is "ba-". There are a number of noun classes with different prefixes. Below is a simplified list of Setswana noun classes as well as examples of nouns (examples taken from Janson and Tsonope, 1991:29; Andersson and Janson 1997:34; Mogapi, 1998:70-87).

Table 3.2   Setswana noun classes

Class	Prefix	Example	Meaning
1	mo-	motho	man
2	ba-	batho	men
3	mo-	morafe	state
4	me-	merafe	states
5	le-	lefoko	word
6	ma-	mafoko	words
7	se-	selo	thing
8	di-	dilo	things
9	n-	nko	nose
10	di-	dinko	noses
11	lo-	lonao	foot
14	bo-	boboko	brain
15	go-	go tsamaya	to walk
16	fa-	fatshe	down
17	go-	godimo	up
18	mo-	morago	behind/back

3.5.6 Syntax

The various dialects of Setswana do not differ when it comes to syntax. The word order is the same as in standard Setswana. Words and phrases are combined in a way that produces a meaningful sentence. Le Roux (1999:3) observes that the combination of linguistic aspects, such as words and phrases, is controlled by a system of rules. In Setswana, these rules seem to function in the same manner in all varieties of the language. The proper arrangement of linguistic units is observed. The word order can follow the subject-verb-object (direct or indirect object) formular, as can be seen in the example below:

Mosetsana o apaya dijo.   (A girl cooks food.)

This sentence is structured as follows:

Mosetsana	>	subject
o	>	subjectival concord
apaya	>	verb
dijo	>	direct object

A sentence can be structured into phrases that reflect the functions of the words or units that form a sentence. For example:

Ngwana yo montle o ne a lwala.   (A beautiful child was ill.)

This sentence may be structured into a noun phrase and a verb phrase, that is,"*ngwana yo montle*" is a noun phrase and "*o ne a lwala*" is a verb phrase. A noun phrase can be divided into a noun "*ngwana*" and an adjective "*yo montle*". The verb phrase can also be divided into an auxiliary verb "*o ne*" and the main verb "*a lwala*".

3.6   DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SETSWANA AND SEPEDI

Setswana and Sepedi have different orthographies because of the linguistic differences between the two languages. The major differences are found in their morphology and phonology.

3.6.1   Phonological variations

There are salient sound differences between standard Setswana and Sepedi. For instance, where standard Setswana uses the affricative [tlh], Sepedi uses the fricative [hl]:

Setswana	Sepedi	English
tlhano	hlano	(five)
tlhatswa	hlatšwa	(wash)
tlhogo	hlogo	(head)
tlhopha	hlopha	(select/elect)

Where Setswana uses the fricative [s], Sepedi uses [š]:

Setswana	Sepedi	English
mosimane	mošimane	(boy)
lesika	lešika	(next of kin)
setse	šetše	(remain)

Where Setswana uses the semi-vowel [y], Sepedi uses the two vowels [ea]:

Setswana	Sepedi	English
apaya	apea	(cook)
raya	rea	(tell)

3.6.2 Morphological variations

Setswana and Sepedi can also be distinguished by morphological differences:

Setswana	Sepedi	English
kwala	ngwala	(write)
botsa	botšiša	(ask)
bua	bolela	(speak)

54

| tsala | mogwera | (friend) |
| didimala | homola | (keep quiet) |

Setswana and Sepedi are from the same language family; therefore, they are interrelated to a certain extent. The relationship is illustrated by similarities found between the two languages. For instance, the two languages use the same vowels, consonants as well as semi-vowels.

Vowels:

[a] e.g. aba	(give away)
[e] e.g. lema	(plough)
[ê] e.g. rêma	(chop)
[i] e.g. ila	(hate)
[o] e.g. motho	(person)
[ô] e.g. ôma	(dry)
[u] e.g. utlwa	(hear)

Semi-vowels: [w] e.g. wena (you)   [y] e.g. ya (go)

wela (fell)   bolaya (kill)

3.7 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICAN SETSWANA AND SETSWANA OF BOTSWANA

Although not many differences are identifiable between the Setswana orthographies of South Africa and Botswana, it is easy to make a distinction regarding the spoken form. According to Janson and Tsonope (1991:113), South African Setswana is more influenced by Sesotho as well as other languages of South Africa. The main influence can be observed in the vocabulary. South African Setswana contains more loan words from English than Botswana variety.

For example:

Botswana	South Africa	English
Tautona	Poresitente	(president)
seka-lediri	kopulatifi	(copulative)
tlhotomo	helikopetara	(helicopter)
gatisa	tereika/aena	(to iron)

Other differences can be gleaned from everyday conversations; for instance, in Botswana, "Good morning/afternoon is "Dumela mma/rra" while in South Africa one would just say "Agee!".

It may be assumed that in South Africa, the number of languages which are not mutually intelligible to Setswana play a major role in making difference between Setswana usage in the two countries. In Botswana, most languages that are in contact with the standard Setswana are those that are mutually intelligible to it, such as Setswapong, Sebirwa, and the Setswana dialects. Languages such as Sekalaka, Seyeyi, Sembukushu and others that are not mutually intelligible to Setswana are spoken in the northern part of the country and their influence is not significant on standard Setswana.

3.8 CONCLUSION

Having looked at the history of the Batswana, it can be concluded that, although the Batswana belong to different dialect groups, they share the same linguistic ancestors. They need one common language that can be used to unite and bind them together as a society. This variety is standard Setswana. The Batswana may belong to different dialectal groups, but they are united under a single government. As stated by Hoffman (1991:23), standard language can be used as a communicative tool between the government and its people. Therefore standard

Setswana should be r
tool for communicating information and as a means of establishing and maintaining relationships, peace and stability between the government and the people of Botswana.

It can also be noted from the discussion that the standardisation of Setswana began as early as 1806, when Heinrich Litchtenstein transformed it into a written form. From that time, a number of missionaries and Europeans wrote in Setswana, using different spellings. A number of changes have been made, especially in the orthography of standard Setswana. For instance, the name Botswana was written in different spellings before it reached its current spelling. It is also noted from the discussion that different bases of selecting the norms have been used, such as single dialect and a composite of dialects. Different committees have been involved in standardising Setswana.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the first chapter, the purpose of this study as well as the problem statement were discussed. To collect the data needed to resolve the research problem, certain methods and techniques will be used. These are described and discussed in this chapter.

4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The concept "research design" is defined by Guy et al. (1987:92) as " *the plan of procedure for data collection and analysis that are undertaken to evaluate a particular theoretical perspective*". According to Marshall and Rossman (1989) (Rubin and Rubin, 1995:42), a research design entails "*planning what you are going to ask, whom you are going to ask and why*". This can be seen as a formal way of data collection. This study combines quantitative and qualitative methods. It uses a quantitative method since the data collected via the questionnaire is to be presented numerically. The questionnaire, designed for the National Setswana Language Council, is an open-ended type of questionnaire and is qualitative in nature.

4.3 SAMPLING

Information was collected from eight schools in Botswana. The northern and southern regions were considered in order to cover a large area. From the selected schools, only teachers teaching Setswana were sampled, as they are presumed to be acquainted with the use of the standard variety. Due to fact that in primary schools, all teachers teach all subjects, only the teachers handling

standard five, six and seven classes were engaged in the study. In addition, all Setswana teachers in the selected secondary schools and colleges of education were selected.

Two schools were chosen from each educational category, that is, two primary schools, two junior community secondary schools, two senior secondary schools and two colleges of education. The following schools were targeted:

Table 4.1   Schools, towns and regions of practice

Schools	Town/Village	Region
1. Masa Primary school	Gaborone	southern
2. New-Town Primary	Serowe	northern
3.Mosele-Wapula Junior	Gaborone	southern
4. Kgatadimo Junior	Kgagodi	northern
5. Lotsane Senior	Palapye	northern
6. Swaneng Senior	Serowe	northern
7. Lobatse college	Lobatse	southern
8. Serowe college	Serowe	northern

4.4   INSTRUMENTATION

A questionnaire was the main instrument of data collection. Berdie and Anderson (1974:11) define this measuring instrument as "*a device for securing answers to questions by using a form which the respondent fills in himself*". The self-administered questionnaire was chosen because of its advantages. Firstly, in this study, a number of institutions are involved. These are situated long distances away from one another. But, as stated by Berdie and Anderson, the questionnaire allows one to cover a large geographical area. Secondly, questionnaires save time and money. Mason and Bramble (1989:308) and Oppenheim (1974:33) have

59

observed that this instrument can be used to collect information from a large sample at a low cost.

The questionnaire also has disadvantages. For instance, authors such as Oppenheim (1972:33) and Berdie and Anderson (1974:20) point out that the largest disadvantage of the questionnaire is that it usually produces poor response rates. This results in the original sample being non-representative. These authors also point out that with this instrument, the desired respondent who has no interest in the questionnaire, may pass the form to someone he or she thinks is more interested. When this takes place, an unintended population is being included in the study.

4.4.1 Questionnaire for teachers and lecturers

The questionnaire for teachers has three sections (Cf. Appendix 1) Section A determines the personal profile of the respondent and includes the following:

- Gender
- Age
- Citizenship
- Region/District of birth
- Language/Dialect
- Training/Qualification
- Years of experience
- Post of responsibility held

Sections B and C of the questionnaire have closed-ended questions (Cf. Appendix 1). Section B contains questions with Yes/No answers. The respondents are requested to tick the answer that they see as most appropriate. Contingency questions were also catered for in this section.

Section C contains questions in which the respondents are requested to choose and tick the response or an alternative that best describes his/her opinions. Examples of these alternative responses are as follows:

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral/Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

Questions from the whole questionnaire have been categorised into the following four groups:

Group 1: *Questions and statements on the importance of standard Setswana in the curriculum*

Questions:

- Should standard Setswana be used in the school curriculum?
- Is there any need to write Setswana schoolbooks in standard Setswana?
- Should standard Setswana be compulsory in schools?
- Is there any need for training teachers in standard Setswana in order to teach Setswana?

Statements:

- When marking, teachers penalise students who do not use standard Setswana.
- There are enough teaching materials such as teachers' guides, dictionaries and syllabi for standard Setswana, to assist teachers in the teaching of standard

Setswana.

- Teachers and learners do not have any difficulties concerning the use of standard Setswana.

Group 2:   *Questions and statements on standard Setswana in the media and on public billboards*

Questions:

- Is it important to use standard Setswana in newspapers, radio and television?
- Is it necessary to write public notices in standard Setswana?

Statements:

- Standard Setswana is used in the media, e.g. Radio Botswana.

Group 3:   *Questions and statements on the knowledge of standard Setswana*

Questions:

- Is there any difference between the Setswana used in schools (standard Setswana) and the Setswana used at home (dialects)?
- Apart from standard Setswana being taught in schools, is there any function of standard Setswana that you know?

Statements:

- Standard Setswana is not well known by most of the Batswana in Botswana.

- The use of standard Setswana is important for communication between the government of Botswana and its people.

Group 4: *Questions and statements on the general feelings of the respondents about standard Setswana*

Questions:

- Would it bother you if there were no standard Setswana?
- Can standard Setswana be used to preserve our cultural identity?
- Is there any need to use standard Setswana beyond the level of reading and writing, that is, should it be observed in speaking?

Statements:

- The service of the Setswana Education Officer is necessary to promote the teaching of standard Setswana.
- Most students are reluctant to use standard Setswana as it is not recognised in the work enviroment.
- Setswana teachers put little effort into the teaching of standard Setswana.

4.4.2 *Questionnaire for the National Setswana Language Council*

The questionnaire for the members of the Setswana Language Council Committee was designed in the form of open-ended questions (Cf. Appendix 2). The purpose of these questions was to give the respondents the freedom to express their own views. The 14 questions asked in the questionnaire intended to elicit information regarding the following:

- Membership of the National Setswana Language Council

- The main tasks of the Council

- Political influence (if any) in the Council

- Criteria used in standardising Setswana

- Processes followed in standardising Setswana

- Problems encountered by the Council with regard to standard Setswana

- People's knowledge of standard Setswana.

4.5   DATA COLLECTION

The Director of Teaching Service Management and the National Setswana Language Council gave the researcher permission to conduct research in the selected schools in Botswana (as listed in Table 4.1), and to collect data from the National Setswana Language Council members. The researcher distributed the questionnaire to the schools and was warmly welcomed by the Principals and Headteachers. In each school, the questionnaire was given to the Setswana Head of Department, who was to distribute the copies to other Setswana teachers. Teachers were given two weeks to complete the questionnaire. In each institution, the reseacher and the Head of Department agreed upon the date for the collection of questionnaire copies.

The researcher also presented the questionnaire to the National Setswana Language Council. A warm welcome was received from the Council secretary who was then given copies of the questionnaire and promised to distribute them to other Council members. The copies were to be collected after two weeks.

4.5.1 *Problems encountered with data collection*

It was discovered that only a small number of teachers in the targeted schools teach Setswana. A minimum of four and a maximum of eight Setswana teachers were found in secondary schools and colleges of education. In some schools,

copies of the questionnaire were not completed on the agreed dates, forcing follow-ups on the part of the researcher.

There was a delay with the National Setswana Language Council questionnaire, as it had to be sent to various areas in which members of the Council could be reached. According to the Council secretary, some members could not be contacted since their contact addresses were not reliable. The secretary produced an interview transcription that he believed contained the information needed for the questionnaire. Despite this pamphlet, the secretary was requested to send a completed questionnaire to the researcher, as some of the questions were not fully answered by the pamphlet.

4.6   CONCLUSION

It is clear that, even though the secretary did not mention it directly, the National Setswana Language Council is not an active body. The pamphlet obtained from the secretary states that the Council does not meet regularly.

As already stated, the information collected from teachers is presented and analysed using a quantitative method and thus the responses are presented by percentages. The information is then interpreted to elicit the respondents' opinions with regard to standard Setswana.

CHAPTER FIVE

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1   INTRODUCTION

In Chapter Four, the methods and techniques used in the data collection, analysis and interpretation were described. This chapter focuses on the actual analysis of the data and its interpretation.

The questionnaire was used as an instrument for data collection. The questionnaire for Setswana teachers was designed to elicit their opinions of standard Setswana. One hundred and twenty copies of the questionnaire were sent to eight schools listed in Table 4.1 in Chapter Four. From the total of 120 copies, only 40 copies were received completed. Seventy-two copies were returned blank, while eight copies were not received by the researcher. In sending 120 copies to schools, the researcher had hoped to get responses from as many Setswana teachers as possible. It was later discovered that there is a serious shortage of Setswana teachers in schools and that only a quarter of the total copies sent was received and completed. Because the study was limited to Setswana teachers, those who do not teach Setswana could not complete the questionnaire. This means that if a follow-up study is conducted in future, a wider population should be considered. The study should include teachers of other subjects, the number of schools to be targeted by the study should be higher and people outside the teaching profession should be included. However, the collected data does allow the researcher to arrive at some insights. Therefore, it will be analysed and interpreted.

5.2 FIRST PART OF THE TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE FOR: PERSONAL PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS (ITEMS 1-10)

The first section of the questionnaire (items 1-10) (Cf. Appendix 1) sought to determine the personal profile of the respondents. The respondents were Setswana teachers from different educational levels such as primary schools, junior secondary schools, senior secondary schools and colleges of education. The respondents were from different regions of the country and were all citizens of Botswana.

From the target population, only 15% of the respondents were males while 85% were females. It can be assumed that the reason for the low percentage of males was that, unlike women, males do not opt to teach Setswana. A high percentage of respondents (85%) were Setswana-speaking, while 11% were from other language groups such as Sengologa, Ikalanga and Setswapong. Four percent of the respondents did not state their regions of origin. The qualifications of the respondents differed. Thirty-nine percent hold either a BA or B Ed. degree, 29% have a certificate in primary education, while 15% hold a diploma in either primary or secondary education. Seventeen percent have a Masters degree and none of the respondents have a doctorate. Because of the low number of Setswana teachers in schools, as discussed above, the respondents are not adequately representative of the different educational levels. They are, however, indicative of the Setswana teachers.

5.3 SECOND PART OF THE TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE: QUESTIONS

Sections B and C consist of questions that are categorised into four groups. Each group comprised items in the form of statements and questions. Analyses of the items are based on each group's responses to the statements and questions. Some

of the items that share responses have been combined, but were classified in different categories. Items do not follow a specific order.

5.3.1 Group 1: Responses to the questions and statements on the importance of standard Setswana in the curriculum: (Items 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 22 & 42, 41 and 43).

<u>Item 11</u>

Should standard Setswana be taught in the school curriculum?

Table 5.1   **The need to teach standard Setswana in schools**

Yes	No
39	1
97.5%	2.5%

The respondents emphasised the teaching of standard Setswana; this is due to the fact that though Setswana is taught as a subject in schools, it is not taken seriously. As stated by Janson and Tsonope (1991:75), standard Setswana has a weak position in the curriculum. A citation from the National Commission on Education of 1977 by Molosiwa, Ratsoma and Tsonope (1996:101) states that although Setswana as a subject was examined in the Primary School Leaving Examination, the grade was not included in the aggregate score. This means that learners did not need standard Setswana in order to pass their examination, and whether the learners pass standard Setswana or not, they can still be selected for further studies. As a result, Setswana as a subject was neglected by most of the learners.

Items 12 and 13.

Should Setswana books used in schools be written in standard Setswana? Give two reasons to support your answer.

Table 5.2   The importance of writing school books in standard Setswana

Yes	No
39	1
97.5%	2.5%

Some of the reasons given by the respondents are as follows:

- To ensure uniformity and avoid confusion in the use of language (there are many Setswana dialects).
- A common language is needed for use in writing, reading as well as in oral work in schools.
- Since reading is known to expand a person's vocabulary, learners can learn the language better when they read it from books.

From the above reasons, it can be concluded that the respondents are aware of standard Setswana and its importance in the school curriculum. This might be because the respondents are Setswana teachers, who feel that they need to be positive about the use of standard Setswana.

Item14 and 15

Should standard Setswana be compulsory in schools? Give two reasons to support your answer.

Table 5.3   Standard Setswana to be compulsory in schools

Yes	No
34	6
85%	15%

The respondents indicated that making standard Setswana compulsory is a way of spreading it, making it acceptable and enabling learners to know it and use it. The results also indicate that to have a compulsory standard language will pave the way for unity of the Botswana nation. Additionally, uniform usage of the language in high functions (education, courts and media) across different groups will be promoted. However, 15% of the teachers responded negatively; they believe that having standard Setswana as a compulsory subject is analogous to forcing people to learn what they do not want to learn.

Item 18.

Is there a need for training teachers in standard Setswana in order for them to teach Setswana?

Table 5.4   The importance of training teachers in standard Setswana

Yes	No
36	3
92.3%	7.7%

It is crucial to produce competent teachers and to equip them with the necessary skills to teach the standard variety of Setswana. The nation needs teachers who can handle and implement the Setswana syllabus successfully. Fasold (1987:252) observes that governments use educational systems to implement standard languages. This is the same in Botswana, since standard Setswana is taught in schools. Table 5.4 indicates that the majority of the respondents (92.3%) believe that it is necessary to train teachers in order for them to teach the standard variety successfully.

Item 41

When marking, teachers penalise students who do not use standard Setswana.

Table 5.5   **Penalty on students who do not use standard Setswana**

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
8	18	3	9	2
20%	45%	7.5%	22.5%	5%

It is interesting to find that teachers do not have the same opinion when marking students' work. Sixty-five percent of the respondents believe that students are penalised for not using standard Setswana; at the same time, a fairly high percentage of 35% disagree with this statement. It can be assumed that there are no marking schemes or guidelines that are used by all Setswana teachers with regard to learners' command of the standard language. It may also be assumed that teachers are unsure of the norms; thus, they might not be sure of what is to be regarded as standard and what is not. Another reason may be that there are no restrictions as far as the standard Setswana usage is concerned, that is, the use of dialects in schools is not prohibited.

Items 22 and 42

There are enough learning and teaching materials such as learners' textbooks, teachers' guides, dictionaries as well as syllabi to assist learners and teachers in the learning and teaching of standard Setswana.

Table 5.6   **Learning and teaching materials in schools**

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
4	6	2	16	12
10%	15%	5%	40%	30%

The responses indicate that most of the respondents (75%) believe that there is a shortage of material and resources on standard Setswana that can be used by both the learners and the teachers. Lack of material in schools seems to be a serious problem. This issue was first discussed by the 1977 National Commission on Education, which recommended that material in Setswana be developed (Baral, 1991:7). It has been a long time since the serious lack of material was experienced- according to Table 5.6, the lack of material still persists. The reality is that resources such as teachers' guides and dictionaries are not sufficient for most of the schools. Material such as flip charts, wall charts and workbooks were never designed for standard Setswana. In primary schools, there are no teachers' guides for any components of the Setswana syllabus - except for the grammar, where only one book is used. The book, Kgomotso Mogapi's *Thuta-Puo ya Setswana*, is mostly used in upper classes (standards 5-7). Lower classes, (standards 1-4), do not have grammar resources in standard Setswana.

The Setswana syllabus for primary schools not only contains grammar topics, but also has a list of topics that include terms that need to be agreed upon by the Language Board. For instance, where the topic aims at enabling the learners to use scientific and mathematical concepts such as *shapes*, *capacity*, *weight* and *weighing*, *sharing*, measurement of *length* and *weather*, terms have to be agreed upon. In the syllabus, all these concepts are written in English and the teacher is expected to use standard Setswana terminology. Teachers end up using these English terms, as there are no equivalent standard Setswana words. There is a need for teachers' guides where these terms are compiled in standard Setswana.

Item 43

Teachers and learners do not have any difficulties concerning the use of standard Setswana.

Table 5.7   Teachers and learners have no difficulty concerning the use of standard Setswana

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
-	3	4	20	13
-	7.5%	10%	50%	32.5%

It is surprising that 92.5% of the respondents believe that Setswana-speakers have difficulties with standard Setswana. A number of factors may contribute to learners having difficulties with the use of standard Setswana. One reason might be that Batswana regard Setswana as the language they speak every day and see no need to study it. Hence, they do not take it seriously and fail to see the importance of learning standard Setswana that holds no perceived future benefits for them.

From the analysis of the questions and statements about the role of standard Setswana in the school curriculum, it can be concluded that the standard variety is regarded as an important tool to be used in the Setswana curriculum. Setswana teachers believe that, through the use of standard Setswana, learners can identify themselves as members of one nation using one common language variety. According to the respondents, using different dialects can confuse learners. A common variety will, therefore, avoid the discrimination against any of the dialects. It is appropriate to make standard Setswana compulsory in schools.

It is the opinion of this researcher that the teaching of standard Setswana should incorporate the use of meaningful activities enabling the learners to master this language. For instance, learners could be involved in activities such as writing

essays and articles in standard Setswana that could later be published in school magazines. Learners might be encouraged to translate English articles into standard Setswana. They could also be urged to participate in national competitions in standard Setswana. All these activities might create an interest in standard Setswana among learners. Teachers, through panels, could write and produce material that could, in the end, be used in schools. The government could also encourage these teachers by offering, as an incentive, prizes to those who produce materials. It is necessary for the government to train skilled and competent teachers, who can teach standard Setswana successfully, that is, teachers who know the variety and who are able to use it fluently.

5.3.2 Group 2: The use of standard Setswana in the media and on public billboards: (Items 19, 20 and 36)

Item 19.

Is it important to use standard Setswana in newspapers, on radio and on television?

Table 5. 8   The use of standard Setswana in newspapers and on radio

Yes	No
35	5
87.5%	12.5%

Standard Setswana should be used in newspapers and on radio so that this variety can be accessible to the public.

Item 20.

Is it necessary to write public notices in standard Setswana?

Table 5.9   Standard Setswana in public notices

Yes	No
37	3
92.5%	7.5%

The current practice employs English on most public notices; clearly, people think it is time that standard Setswana were used in public notices.

Item 36.

Standard Setswana is used in the media, e.g. Radio Botswana.

Table 5.10   Standard Setswana in the media

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
6	18	5	8	3
15%	45%	12.5%	20%	7.5%

It can be seen in Table 5.8 that 87.5% of the respondents believe it is necessary to use standard Setswana in the media, but in Table 5.10, 60% of the respondents believe that standard Setswana is already used in the media. The percentage has dropped from 87.5% to 60%. The 27.5% discrepancy is an indication that some of the respondents believe that standard Setswana ought to be used in the media, but it is not. Even though the majority believes that standard Setswana was used in the media, a fairly high percentage (40%) of the respondents feels differently. It can be assumed that the positive responses emanate from the fact that, as stated in Item 43, some people cannot differentiate between standard Setswana as a variety and Setswana as a language. As long as the language Setswana is used, people think standard Setswana is being used.

5.3.3 Group 3: The responses for questions and statements on the respondents' knowledge of standard Setswana: (Items 26 & 27, 28 & 29, 32 and 33 & 37)

<u>Items 26 and 27</u>

Is there any difference between the language taught in schools (standard language) and the language used at home (dialects)? If yes, how do they differ?

Table 5.11   The distinction between the standard variety and dialects

Yes	No
34	3
91.9%	8.1%

The differences listed by the respondents include the following:

- Standard Setswana is nationally used, while dialects are regional and are identified according to tribes.
- Standard Setswana is a composite of aspects from different dialects, that is, it contains components of different dialects.
- Standard Setswana is written in books, while dialects are not written and do not have a set orthography.
- Dialects are known within a certain group of people.

The differences provided by the respondents concur with the discussion in Chapter Two concerning the concepts of *standard language* and *dialect.* The respondents believe that dialects are used within a certain group of people in a certain region, whereas the standard language is used nationwide. The respondents listed general differences between dialects and standard language, because the question was not specific on the standard Setswana and Setswana dialects. It can be assumed that the respondents could have given the same responses as the differences given also apply to Setswana. Some of the

differences that can be distinguished between standard Setswana and the Setswana dialects deal with linguistic aspects. For example, as stated in Chapter One, where dialects such as Sengwato and Setawana employ the inter-dental explosives [t] and [th], standard Setswana uses lateral explosives [tl] and [tlh].

Item 28 and 29

Apart from standard Setswana being taught in schools, are there other functions of standard Setswana that you know? If yes, state them.

Table 5.12 **Various functions of the standard Setswana**

Yes	No
15	23
39.5%	60.5%

Whereas the majority of the respondents indicate that they are aware of the existence of standard Setswana, a fairly high percentage (60.5%) have no knowledge of the functions of standard Setswana. The functions of standard Setswana as given by some of the respondentsare listed below:

- It is needed to communicate with other Batswana who are not Setswana speakers, for example Bakalaka, Bakgalagadi and Basubiya.
- It should be taught to foreigners who work or serve in Botswana
- It is used in the media, public gatherings, parliamentary discussions, workshops, seminars and interviews in different institutions.

From the results, it can be deduced that teachers are still unclear about standard Setswana, and do not seem to know the role of this variety. Teachers should know the importance as well as the role of standard Setswana. Knowing the functions of this variety will enable teachers to teach it to their learners purposefully. The authorities responsible for the establishment of standard

language must make sure that teachers are trained to teach and implement standard Setswana. If teachers lack adequate knowledge of standard Setswana or are taking the variety for granted, the learners will not know standard Setswana as well.

Item 32

Standard Setswana is not known to most of the Batswana.

Table 5.13   Batswana's lack of knowledge of standard Setswana

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
14	21	1	2	1
35.9%	53.8%	2.6%	5.1%	2.6%

The Batswana need to be educated so that they know what standard Setswana is and how to use it. A language campaign needs to be carried out by the language board to make sure that people understand this language variety, accept it and utilise it.

Items 33 and 37

The use of standard Setswana is important for the government of Botswana and its people.

Table 5.14   The importance of standard Setswana

Strong agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
24	15	-	1	-
60%	37.5%	-	2.5%	-

Standard Setswana needs to be seen as an important tool for the communication of information between the government and the public. As stated by Nyati-

Ramahobo (1995:32), in teaching standard Setswana, skills needed on and off the job market must be provided. The society needs people such as radio announcers, nurses, lawyers, court interpreters and a generally literate society that can read road signs, health messages and commercial messages written in standard Setswana. Standard Setswana ought to be used as a medium of oral communication between workers and clients in all professions. Letters from the central government and the local government to the public, need to be written in standard Setswana. There is, therefore, a need to develop effective communication skills in standard Setswana.

From the above-mentioned findings on the knowledge of standard Setswana, it can be concluded that, even though teachers know that standard Setswana exists, they admit that most Batswana do not know it. This implies that the language authorities should make sure that the society is made aware of this language variety as well as the importance of using it.

It can also be assumed that teachers do not know the purpose of having this standard variety, as they do not know its functions. They are the ones who must educate the public about where and how standard Setswana should be used. The stage of elaboration of functions in the process of standardisation still has to be completed by the National Setswana Language Council. As stated in Chapter Two of this study, after codification there should be an expansion of functions. Should this stage take place in the standardisation of Setswana, teacher, learners and people in different formal domains will know about and use standard Setswana. This calls for the National Setswana Language Council to revisit the standardisation process of Setswana, working together with teachers so that the acquisition of the standard language can be successful. The success of this variety should be seen through its use in different formal domains, such as schools and courts of law.

5.3.4 Group 4: Responses to questions and statements on the respondents'
opinions about standard Setswana (Items 16 & 17, 21, 23 & 24, 25, 30 & 31,
34, 35, 38, 39 and 40)

Item 16&17

Is there any need to use standard Setswana beyond the level of reading and
writing, that is, should it be observed in speaking? Give two reasons.

Table 5.15   Standard Setswana in a spoken form

Yes	No
25	11
67.6%	32.4%

A higher percentage (67.5%) of the respondents feel that standard Setswana
should be used even in speaking. The following are some of the reasons given by
the respondents:

- In public addresses, standard Setswana becomes crucial.
- Dramas and debates should be performed in standard Setswana.
- To reinforce the level of understanding, that is, to make people more
  competent in the use of this variety, standard Setswana should not only be in
  a written form, but should also be spoken.

Public addresses, dramas, debates and interviews in different institutions are in
most cases attended by people from different dialect communities. This gives rise
to the need to use the standard variety. 32.4% of the respondents, who are against
the idea of standard Setswana in a spoken form, argue that the spoken variety
will always contain words that are not found in the standard variety. It is possible
for one to mix the standard variety with dialectical aspects whenever addressing
the public.

Item 21

Do you ever encourage your learners to use standard Setswana?

Table 5.16   Learners' encouragement on the use of standard Setswana

Yes	No
36	4
90%	10%

The results indicate that most Setswana teachers (90%) value standard Setswana and would like other people to know it and use it. The remaining 10% of the respondents indicate that there are some Setswana teachers who are not concerned about their students' use of standard Setswana. This implies that not all Setswana teachers encourage learners to use the standard variety. Learners need to be made aware of when and where to use this standard variety in future.

Items 23 & 24

Would it bother you if there were no standard Setswana? Give two reasons.

Table 5.17   The respondents' concern about standard Setswana

Yes	No
30	8
76.9%	23.1%

A fairly high percentage (76.9%) of the respondents expressed their appreciation of standard Setswana by indicating that they would be bothered if the standard variety did not exist. This shows that people value standard Setswana and would be pleased to see it come into wider use. The reasons given by the respondents are as follows:

- There would be no variety to be used at national level.
- Material and resources such as syllabi would be written

in different dialects.

- Teachers would be forced to know all Setswana dialects in order for them to handle children from different cultures.

- There would be no standard orthography to be used in the writing of books and articles.

- The nation would be divided, as there would be no common variety to bind them.

From the above, it can be deduced that the standard variety could be an important tool used by people from different linguistic backgrounds in different communities. Although the majority of the respondents support the existence of standard Setswana, the percentage of those who would not be bothered by the non-existence of standard Setswana is fairly high (23.1%). They explained their views as follows:

- There is not much difference between standard Setswana and other Setswana dialects. Therefore, without standard Setswana, communication will still not be a problem, as it will be performed in other dialects.

- Outside school standard Setswana is less important. The government does not seem to recognise it.

- Not every Motswana supports and uses standard Setswana. Non-Setswana-speaking Batswana regard their vernaculars as more important than standard Setswana.

Item 25.

Can standard Setswana be used to preserve our cultural identity?

Table 5.18   Standard Setswana towards cultural identity

Yes	No
26	12
68.4%	31.6%

Looking at the above responses, it can be deduced that the issue of cultural identity and standard language can create a lot of conflict. This is largely a result of culture being a very controversial and sensitive issue in any community. Even though the majority (68.4%) of the respondents believe that standard Setswana can be used to preserve cultural identity, the percentage that does not agree is moderately high (31.6%). Language is one of the cultural aspects that can be regarded as an important feature in any given society. The information concerning the historical background of a particular society is transferred from one generation to the next through the use of language (Prah, 1995:49). However, although language is regarded as a cultural phenomenon, there is no way that standard language can be used to preserve cultural identity, because it is a common language variety used by people from different speech communities. Cultural artifacts that can be used to preserve cultural identity include traditional attire, music, dance, traditional dishes as well as art. All these aspects differ from one speech community to another, while the standard variety is common to all dialect communities under one government.

Items 30 & 31

Are there some ways of improving standard Setswana? If yes, how can it be improved?

Table 5.19   The existence of ways to improve standard Setswana

Yes	No
31	6
83.8%	16.2%

The majority of the respondents (83.8%) believe that the use of the standard Setswana can be improved. When requested to give ways in which this variety could be improved, the respondents suggested that workshops and seminars should be conducted for Setswana teachers. Standard Setswana should be made a requirement for further education and in the employment fields, and teachers

should specialise in the teaching of Setswana as a subject. The normal practice in Botswana is that in primary schools, teachers teach all subjects in the programme and, hence, the respondents advocate for areas of specialisation. The respondents also suggest that teachers' guides that match the objectives should be provided, and standard Setswana must be compulsory in schools. It can be assumed that the Setswana teachers are of the opinion that the language authorities should monitor the use of the standard Setswana.

Item 34.

Parents should encourage their children to use standard Setswana at home.

Table 5.20   The use of standard Setswana at home

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
17	10	5	7	1
42.5%	25%	12.5%	17.5%	2.5%

A higher percentage (67.5) of the respondents supports the idea that learners should be encouraged to use standard Setswana at home. Even though this is the feeling more than two thirds of the respondents, the opinion of the researcher is that learners should be encouraged to read books written in standard Setswana. To use standard Setswana at home does not seem proper, as there are non-standard varieties to be used in the daily communication at home. As stated in Chapter Two, when dealing with elaboration of functions, standard varieties are used in high public functions such as schools, while non-standard varieties are used in informal domains (in intimate functions). However, as stated in Chapter Two (2.1), some people, especially the elite, can use this standard variety as their vernacular, in most cases to gain prestige in society. In this sense, parents using the standard variety in their daily conversation can encourage their children to use that variety at home.

Item 35.

Teachers should feel at ease to use other Setswana dialects in the teaching of standard Setswana.

Table 5.21   The use of Setswana dialects to teaching standard Setswana

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
7	6	4	17	6
17.5%	15%	10%	42.5%	15%

A large percentage (67.5%) of the respondents believe that using different dialects in the teaching of standard Setswana might confuse learners as they might not know what is regarded as standard and what is not. As explained under item 34 above, non-standard languages are used at home, but the school is regarded as a formal domain where the standard variety is used.

Item 38

Most students are reluctant to use standard Setswana, as it is not recognised in the field of work.

Table 5.22   The learners' perception towards standard Setswana

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
14	13	7	3	3
35%	32.5%	17.5%	7.5%	7.5%

It can be assumed that learners do not know why they need to study the standard variety. It seems they may only take it seriously if they know that it will benefit them when getting employment or furthering their studies. Learners should be made aware that standard language is a multi-purpose phenomenon; that is, there are different purposes for which standard Setswana should be learnt. As

discussed in Chapter Two, the main function of a standard language is communication in high public function contexts. For example, in schools, standard Setswana is used as an instrument of learning. Thus the variety is used when conducting lessons in other subjects apart from Setswana. Setswana is used as a medium of instruction from standard one to standard four. At these levels, all subjects (except English) are taught in Setswana.

In courts of law, interpreters are expected to use standard Setswana. Correspondence between different government departments as well as with the public is written in this standard variety. Standard Setswana should be learnt for the sake of communicating with foreigners and people from different language groups. For instance, where people from different communities attend a conference, the standard variety should be used. Learners should also know that standard Setswana could play a role in bringing the nation together. People of Botswana are regarded as one nation that uses a common language variety.

Item 39.

The service of a Setswana education officer is necessary to promote the teaching of standard Setswana.

Table 5.23   The need to have the Setswana Education Officer.

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
17	15	1	3	3
43.5%	38.5%	2.6%	7.7%	7.7%

The majority of the respondents (82%) support the existence of Setswana education officer. The officer may act as a co-ordinator between the schools and the National Setswana Language Council and the Ministry of Education. For instance, Setswana teachers may discuss issues concerning the increase in the use of standard Setswana in present-day society, and come up with suggestions and

recommendations. The Setswana education officer may then present all these issues to the National Setswana Language Council and to the Ministry of Education. The officer may also organise workshops and seminars on standard Setswana, and contact the resource persons and participants. The officer could additionally monitor the progress in the use and teaching of standard Setswana and to conduct needs assessments in various schools as far as material for standard Setswana are concerned.

Item 40.

Setswana teachers put little effort into the teaching of standard Setswana.

Table 5.24   Teachers' effort in the teaching of standard Setswana

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	6	8	17	8
2.5%	15%	20%	42.5%	20%

Most of the Setswana teachers believe that they work hard to teach standard Setswana. However, other Setswana teachers think that a lot of effort is still needed and more has to be done. This is due to teachers not having enough material available for the teaching of this standard variety.

Looking at the responses of Setswana teachers, it is now pertinent to outline some issues of concern. It can be assumed that, on the one hand, the government has opted to implement standard Setswana by making it a compulsory subject in primary and secondary schools. On the other hand, the respondents believe that, even though teachers are expected to teach the standard variety to the learners, the authoritative language body and the Setswana curriculum designers have not provided them with adequate material and sources to assist them in performing this task. This poses a question of whether Setswana teachers know what is expected of them as far as the use of standard Setswana is concerned, or whether

they only teach dialects of Setswana. From the Setswana syllabus, topics and objectives to be achieved are listed, which implies that teachers should know the content of those topics.

It is the opinion of this researcher that, given the responsibility of implementing standard Setswana, Setswana teachers should not be failed by those who assigned them the task. These teachers should have plenty of assistance in performing their tasks successfully. They should be able to achieve competency in their work by having adequate material and resources for standard Setswana. On the other hand, they should be encouraged to produce own material that could be used in schools.

From the responses, it is also clear that the teachers blame the learners for not taking the study of standard Setswana seriously. However, the teachers could be the ones to carry the blame as it can be assumed that they do not provide adequate content to the learners. Because of this, learners do not believe that standard Setswana is important and worth paying attention to. This implies that if the teachers do not know what to teach, then the learners will not know standard Setswana as well. These learners will, after the completion of their studies, work in different institutions that are regarded as the formal domains where the use of standard Setswana is expected. Therefore, if they never consider it necessary to study it seriously, it will not be used in high public functions.

The conclusion made from the Setswana teachers' responses is that it is their wish that standard Setswana should be encouraged and used. In terms of this study, the public should be made aware of the importance of standard Setswana. At the same time, the standard variety should not be a threat to other non-standard varieties. Each of the varieties has its own functions assigned to it in the society and should be given the respect it deserves.

5.4 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE NATIONAL SETSWANA LANGUAGE COUNCIL

The responses to the fourteen open-ended questions posed to the National Setswana Language Council were also analysed. Fifteen copies of the questionnaire were sent to the National Setswana Language Council members through the Council secretary. As explained in Chapter Four, (section 4.5.1), the secretary could not send copies to the other members as he claimed that their contact addresses were not known. Those that were sent out were not returned to the researcher except for the one completed by the secretary. It was also stated in Chapter Four that the secretary provided a transcript that, he said, contained the necessary information needed for the questionnaire. Realising that the information in the transcript was not adequate, a follow-up was made via the telephone, but the secretary could not be reached and the researcher could not receive the copies from other members of the National Setswana Language Council. It is not clear whether the secretary ever gave the copies to the other Council members or not. Because of this, it was assumed that the National Setswana Language Council does not function in a meaningful way. The information analysed here was obtained from the copy of the questionnaire completed by the secretary as well as the pamphlet he provided.

The questions were intended to elicit information on the membership of the National Setswana Language Council, the duties of the Council, norm determination, the processes of standardising Setswana and problems encountered with regard to standard Setswana.

5.4.1 Responses from the National Setswana Language Council

According to the information obtained, the National Setswana Language Council consists of persons nominated from the following bodies:

- Ministry of Education (Permanent secretary as the chairperson)
- Office of the President
- All other ministries
- University of Botswana
- Botswana Teachers Union
- Botswana Civil Servants Association
- Four Church Ministers Fraternal
- Members from the working group of experts
- Two persons known for their interest in Setswana.

The council has been assigned various tasks to perform, and its terms of reference include the standardisation of Setswana, the prescription of schoolbooks as well as advising the media on the appropriate use of Setswana.

In standardising Setswana, the council determines the dialectal form of the linguistic items to be accepted as the standard. As stated in Chapter One, linguistic aspects such as lexical items from different dialects are combined to form a standard variety. This is the selection stage.

The council also deals with orthography, spelling and word formation, acquisition of foreign words and coining or creating new words. In this regard, the National Setswana Language Council held a meeting from 10-15th August 1994 to discuss the orthography (Martin, Chebane and Tsonope, 1994:5). The decisions that were made have, to date, not been published. The following are the issues that were discussed:

- words that are used interchangeably
- spelling
- vowels (a, e, i, o, u) and semi-vowels (w and y)
- consonants

- stress and intonation
- borrowed and coined words
- word formation and word division
- punctuation

Among other things, the Council discussed the criteria to determine a particular linguistic item to be regarded as standard, for instance, in the case of interchangeable words:

- *boboko* and *boko* (brain). The word *boboko* (noun class 14, prefix /bo-/) is recommended because it has the noun plural *maboko* which falls under noun class 6, prefix /ma-/. But the word *boko* could not be considered as standard because it has no plural form that falls under any of the noun classes.

- *boupe* and *bupe* or *bope* (mealie-meal). The word *boupe* is regarded as standard because the term is derived from the verb stem /-upa/ of the noun *leupa*.
- *lelobu* instead of *leobu* (chameleon). The word was considered according to its historical origins, that is, older people referred to a chameleon as *lelobu*.

On the basis of the information above, it can be assumed that the National Setswana Language Council attempted the codification stage and norm determination was described in this stage. The other stages, that is, elaboration and acceptance, still need to be attended to. With regard to the acceptance stage, the Council secretary believes that the National Setswana Language Council has a problem of lack of skilled manpower to carry out the task. In an interview with Jankie (2000:11-12), the Council secretary explained that the failure of the National Setswana Language Council to perform its duties resulted from the members of the Council having to perform other duties. According to him,

people must be employed specifically to perform the Council tasks, such as travelling through the country and informing people about standard Setswana.

The National Setswana Language Council falls under the Ministry of Education and is funded by the government. According to the Council secretary, in most cases the funds are returned to the government, as the majority of the tasks assigned to the Council are usually not performed. This confirms the notion that the Council does not function efficiently and effectively. The information that was obtained indicates that the National Setswana Language Council operates with the help of the University of Botswana, especially in codifying the standard variety. However, the Council has not performed some of its tasks. The information obtained confirms that the council has not achieved anything except discussing issues concerning orthography, which is not yet published. The Council has not been involved in the prescription of schoolbooks, even though it is one of its tasks. The National Setswana Language Council needs to reschedule its plan of action, (if indeed, one exists), to ensure that the Council duties are carried out.

5.4.2 Discussion of the responses from the National Setswana Language Council

The composition of the National Setswana Language Council is appropriate in the sense that each ministry and other relevant bodies are adequately represented. Each member can present the problems that his/her ministry has with regard to the use of standard Setswana. Language problems could be discussed and resolved in this forum. However, it is not clear as to whether the representatives are from different dialect communities, the same dialect groups or speakers of languages other than Setswana. It is also not clear how and by whom members are appointed. The researcher believes that the represantation of the media and the writers' associations is also important. They need to express their views as far as the use of standard Setswana is concerned, mainly because

their writings deal with that particular variety of Setswana. The representation of each Setswana-speaking group can also be of great importance, since it could solve the problem of standard Setswana marginalising other dialects (should such a problem arise). The assurances of the Council secretary with regard to the adequate representation of all dialect groups are not reflected in the membership list.

The terms of reference of the National Setswana Language Council are also outlined. It is surprising to find that some of the secretary's responses contradict each other. For instance, the National Setswana Language Council deals with the prescription of morally acceptable books for use in schools. On the other hand, the National Setswana Language Council does not contribute to the prescription of schoolbooks. This leads one to believe that the duties of the National Setswana Language Council are stipulated, but not implemented and that the Council does not, in fact, fulfil its responsibilities.

A detailed analysis of the responses obtained from the Council secretary leads this researcher to believe that, apart from issues of orthography and attempts to persuade the parliament to use standard Setswana, the Council has not achieved much. This can clearly be gleaned from the statement;

> *Jaanong khansele ga e dire tiro ya yone e e e tlhametsweng.*
> *Tiro e nngwehela hela e ke ka reng khansele e e dirile. ...Ke ya*
> *mokwalo... orthography. ...Jaanong re ne ra ntsha buka mme*
> *ga re ise re e neele setshaba ka gore re bone go tshwanetse gore*
> *e ye go baakanngwa (Jankie, 2000:12).*

(**Translation**: The council does not perform its duties as it was intended. The only task that I can say has been dealt with is orthography. We have produced a book but it is not yet published because it needs to be edited.)

From the above quotation, it can be argued that the issue of orthography cannot, at this point, be taken as an achievement, since the book has not yet been published. The orthography used in Botswana is the 1937 version, revised in 1981 and put into practice in 1982 by the Setswana Language Committee. This has been retained as the country's official orthography (Janson and Tsonope, 1991). According to these authors, after the publication of the 1981 orthography, the committee ceased to exist. The National Setswana Language Council was then established in 1986 by presidential directive, to replace the 1977 Setswana Language Committee (Molosiwa, Ratsoma & Tsonope, 1996:116). The National Setswana Language Council has been inefficient and it is clear that little has been achieved during the ten years of its existence. Bearing in mind the period of the council's operation, the question of standard Setswana should no longer be a problem in Botswana.

According to the National Setswana Language Council secretary, interviewed by Jankie (2000:11-12), the failure of the National Setswana Language Council to perform its duties results from the commitment of various members to other duties. The obligations of the council suffer because the members are not employed specifically for the council. It can also be assumed that the progress of the National Setswana Language Council is hampered by the lack of a clear national language policy that would provide guidance for the education system in Botswana. The National Setswana Language Council could be guided by the same national language policy.

From the above discussion, it is discerned that, even though the National Setswana Language Council has attempted the selection and codification of standard Setswana, a lot still has to be done by this language body. People need to be made aware of the existence of standard Setswana, as well as where and when to use non-standard varieties. They need to be informed of the importance of these varieties. It is also important that the Batswana accept the standard variety so that it could be regarded as a norm by the whole society. This will only

be possible if the National Setswana Language Council carries out the acceptance stage successfully, since the Council is aware that not all Batswana accept the standard variety. The Council also needs to revisit the standardisation process and revive it to suit the needs of the present society.

Lastly, as stated in Chapter Two's discussion on language codification, a number of bases that can be used to determine a norm were presented. In Chapter Three, it was additionally stated that, since the standardisation of Setswana by the missionaries, different bases have been used. For instance, taking one dialect as a basis was used by Robert Moffat (*Setlhaping*) and Casalis (*Serolong*). The Setswana Language Committee that resulted from the 1910 conference developed a composite of dialects. From the responses to the questionnaire, it is clear that the National Setswana Language Council has not developed anything different from their predecessors, but used the composite of dialects already in existence. It is the opinion of this researcher that the National Setswana Language Council should assess the bases used to determine the norm and check whether what is being applied is suitable for present day Setswana.

5.5   CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to analyse and interpret the data that had been collected through the use of two questionnaires, one aimed at Setswana teachers and the other at the National Setswana Language Council. The study revealed that both the teachers and the National Setswana Language Council are responsible for the establishment of standard Setswana. However, the results indicate that most of the Batswana do not know standard Setswana and do not use it in high public functions. Even the learners do not study it seriously. This calls for the National Setswana Language Council and the Setswana teachers to work together to make the establishment and implementation of standard Setswana a success.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the study, the research findings linked to the problem discussed in the first chapter, a conclusion and a set of recommendations.

6.2 SUMMARY

In Chapter One, the problem statement was outlined and the purpose of this study was stated. The sociolinguistic profile of Botswana and the Setswana language profile were discussed at length. It was explained that a variety of languages including Setswana, are used in the country. Setswana comprises a number of dialects; these were combined to form a standard variety. The problem identified and stated was that this standard variety seems not to be known by most of the Batswana and is not used in high public functions.

Chapter Two focused on the theoretical framework, and the basic linguistic concepts dealt with in the study were defined and discussed. Chapter Three gave the historical background of Setswana-speakers as well as the history of the language and the development of standard Setswana initiated by the missionaries in 1806.

The methods and techniques of collecting data were described in Chapter Four. The instrument used for data collection was a questionnaire and the exercise was done in some schools in Botswana. Data was collected from different educational levels such as primary schools, junior secondary schools, senior secondary schools as well as colleges of education. The study was limited to the Setswana

teachers in the above mentioned institutions. Chapter Five gave the analysis and interpretation of the data. The findings are presented below. The results are linked to the problem discussed in the first chapter. The conclusion and the recommendations are listed at the end of this chapter.

6.3   RESEARCH FINDINGS

The results of the research indicate that the majority of the target group (97.5%) of this study has a positive attitude towards standard Setswana. The positiveness may be attributed to the fact that the respondents were Setswana teachers who have a stake in standard Setswana and could not respond negatively. The teachers indicated that they value standard Setswana and would like it to be used in schools. Even though the Setswana teachers agree that standard Setswana should be compulsory in schools and should be used in the curriculum, both teachers and learners are faced with the problem of limited material in standard Setswana. This lack is not only encountered in schools but is also noted by the National Setswana Language Council. The problem of appropriate and improved teaching material seems to be an ongoing issue as it was first discussed by the National Commission on Education in 1977. The Commission recommended that material in standard Setswana be developed (Baral, 1991:7). It is the opinion of this researcher that teachers should also contribute to the production of material. They should not wait for teaching aids to be provided for them, since it seems that neither the authoritative language body, nor the Setswana curriculun developers are taking any steps in this direction. Teachers should rather produce their own materials and the government should, perhaps, offer remuneration as a means of encouragement.

The results also indicate that standard Setswana, as a subject, is not taken seriously by most of the learners in schools. The respondents believe that this is because standard Setswana is not recognised in the work environment. Janson and Tsonope (1991:75) observe that:

... the language has a comparatively weak position in the school curriculum and, more importantly, there are virtually no rewards for proficiency in Setswana in urban life.

In addition to this, Baral (1991:8) states that:

The Setswana language is not viewed as an important factor in the contemporary economic and cultural life of the country, and it is not seen as an appropriate vehicle for secondary and tertiary education.

From the above quotations, it seems that even the policy makers never regarded standard Setswana as important. It is, therefore, not surprising that learners tend to neglect it. To most people, the standard variety has no value, as it offers little or no economic benefits. It can be assumed that people still lack detailed information on the goals of education. Standard Setswana, just like English, should not only be learnt in order to get employment, but should be regarded as a multi-purpose phenomenon that needs to be aquired and utilised for communication purposes.

Additionally, since standard Setswana is not approached seriously at schools, it can be assumed that learners and teachers are at liberty to use their own dialects instead of using the standard variety regarded as the language of education. The school must be seen as a formal domain where the standard language has to be used. From the results it is clear that, even though the majority of the respondents are against the idea of using other Setswana dialects when teaching standard Setswana, a fairly high percentage (42.5%) is of the opinion that dialects may be used. It can be assumed that some teachers encourage the use of dialects in schools. This calls for a clear written policy that discourages the use of different

dialects in schools, especially within the classroom, if standard Setswana is to be implemented effectively.

The results show that 87.5% of the target group feels that standard Setswana should be used in the media. In practice, this standard variety is not used. The National Setswana Language Council is also concerned about the use of standard Setswana in the media. This is confirmed by the following excerpt from an interview conducted by Jankie (2000:17), with the National Setswana Language Council secretary. (In the quotation, *Int.* refers to interviewer, while *DN* is for the respondent).

Int.   *Ehee. Jaanong le na le thata ya go ka raa*
        barutabana lwa re a lokwalo lo lotswe mo
        dikolong?

(Translation: Okay, so you have the right to tell teachers that a particular book should not be used in schools?)

DN.   *Yes. Ke khansele e nang le thata gore e gakolole kwa,*
        le ko Radiong. E ka raya ba Radio ya re le dirisa mafoko
        a jaana le jaana le jaana mme ga a dirisiwe jalo, ga lo bue
        Setswana sentle. Gompieno jaana ke na le mathata nna janong
        nkile ka bua le bangwenyana. Jaanong mathata a ke gore ...
        batho ba ba balang dikgang mo Radiong ba tshwanetse gore
        ba bale se se kwadilweng.

(Translation: Yes. It is the council that has the right to advise the schools as well as the Radio. It can advise that a particular word is not supposed to be used that way, but this way, because that way is not standard Setswana. Right now I have a problem and I once talked to some of the people about it. The problem is…the Newsreaders in the Radio are supposed to read what is written.)

Int.   *Ga ke tlhaloganye sentle.*

(Translation: I do not understand.)

99

DN.   *Jaaka, re na le batho ba le bantsi ba e leng gore ke*

Bangwato ba badisiwa dikgang. Ha o bua wa re tla

ke re ga a ye gore tla o ya gore ta. Tota ha o bua hela

le ba bangwe ko ntle koo ga go molato o ka dirisa ta

wa bua Sengwato hela. Mme ga a bala dikgang o

tshwanetse gore a bale se se kwadilweng . Ba mo rute

gore ha o bala o re tla ha go kwadilweng tla, ha e le tlha

ke tlha. O seka wa re tolatola go kwadilwe tlotlatlola.

Jaanong mole ga a bale Setswana o bala Sengwato.

Jaanong o tshwanetse gore o bale Setswana se se kwadilweng,

the standard Setswana se se dumalanweng gore ke sa setšhaba

sotlhe e seng Sengwaketse.   E seka ya re go kwadilwe lona

a ba a re nyena. That's what we want.

(Translation: Like, we have many newsreaders who are Bangwato. When they read news, where it is written "tla" they say "ta". There is nothing wrong with saying "ta" when one is conversing with friends outside work. But when on duty reading news on the radio, one should read what is written. They should teach him/her to say *tla* where it is written *tla* and to say *tlha* where it is written *tlha*. If you do not read what is written it means you are reading Sengwato and not standard Setswana. One has to read what is written, standard Setswana that has been agreed upon and which is for the whole nation, not Sengwaketse. One should not say *nyena* when it is written *lona*. That's what we want.)

Int.   *...Ke gore e ne e le maikaelelo a me go botsa*

gore ke bone e ka re, e ka re khansele ya Setswana

e tlhobaela thata ka ha Setswana se dirisiwang ka teng

mo seromamoweng.

(Translation: ...It was my intention to ask you about this, because it is as if the Council is very concerned about the use of standard Setswana on the radio.)

DN.	Exactly.

From the quotation, it is clear that the use of standard Setswana in the media is also a problem. The National Setswana Language Council is well aware that the standard language is not used. It can be assumed that people are concerned about the use of standard Setswana, as it is clear that the variety is not well known. The society needs to be educated and made aware of the standard variety. People need to be persuaded to accept and use standard Setswana in all formal domains and refrain from using non-standard varieties in high public functions. The National Setswana Language Council needs to have a language awareness campaign throughout the country; by doing so they will be promoting the acceptance of standard Setswana. Until this campaign is undertaken, the majority of the people will remain ignorant of standard Setswana. The National Commission on Education (1977:12) states that, because the majority of people in the country belong to the same ethnic and linguistic group, the tribal cleavages are not as serious a problem as in other countries. In actual fact, the differences do not pose problems in daily informal conversations; they may, however, become problematic in formal situations where only standard Setswana is to be used. Some people may deviate from the norm because they are not proficient enough in standard Setswana.

It can be deduced from the results that standard Setswana is viewed as an important means of communication between the government and the nation. This variety could also act as a unifying force in the process of national development. In addition, standard Setswana can also play an important role in preserving the Batswana's cultural heritage. In this regard, the standard variety can be used to educate young generations about the cultural heritage of Batswana. Books and other sources kept in museums and national archives are written in the standard variety. It is clear that schools are given the responsibility to develop skills in standard Setswana, while the National Setswana Language Council and the Setswana curriculum designers monitor the whole procedure, especially the

accuracy and the proficiency in this language. This implies that standard Setswana plays a crucial role in the Setswana curriculum.

6.4   LINKING THE RESEARCH FINDINGS WITH THE PROBLEMS

The findings of this study cover the problems discussed in Chapter One. The main problem under consideration is that standard Setswana is not known by most Batswana and, because of this, it is not used in high public functions such as schools and the media. This issue can be resolved only if the parties involved, namely the National Setswana Language Council, schools and the curriculum developers, co-operate with regard to language promotion and development. The National Setswana Language Council has to educate the public on the role and importance of standard Setswana. The society needs to be well informed about this standard variety. Similarly, the language council needs to know the opinions of the public about standard Setswana. This researcher suggests that the National Setswana Language Council should revisit the process of standardizing Setswana and reconsider the stages of acceptance and the elaboration of functions to make sure they are carried out. If the two stages are carried out effectively, the public is likely to accept standard Setswana and use it appropriately.

The Setswana curriculum developers should also revisit the Setswana syllabus to check whether the use of standard Setswana is catered for. For instance, the content to be taught should include activities that will enable learners to practice the use of standard Setswana. The Setswana curriculum should be designed in a way that will allow the learners to acquire the knowledge and skills to use standard Setswana. Teachers should also ensure that the teaching methods used in the classroom, the teaching material and the creative activities are geared to improve the use of standard Setswana by the learners.

The results also indicate that, in schools, learners do not take standard Setswana seriously and in formal situations people tend to use their dialects instead of

standard Setswana.This is especially evident in the case of television and radio newsreaders. Teachers should create meaningful activities that will be interesting to the learners and motivate them to use standard Setswana. Teachers should also provide learners with skills and knowledge necessary for their future, especially in the work environment. Both teachers and learners should take the teaching of standard Setswana seriously; this will lead to more effective communication, notably in official matters. In addition, teachers must become more creative and produce material in standard Setswana that can be used in schools. Such creativity will be as a way of practicing self-reliance in schools, which is one of the national principles of Botswana, and will resolve the problem of lack of material.

Another problem discussed in Chapter One is that standard Setswana is not accepted by most Batswana. The problem is confirmed by the results obtained from the National Setswana Language Council. The Council secretary stated that the Batswana, especially those in the north of the country, do not accept standard Setswana. It can be assumed that, as already stated above, the problem may emanate from the lack of consultation and information about the role and importance of having standard variety of Setswana. The National Setswana Language Council should consult the nation and make the public aware of standard Setswana.

6.5   CONCLUSION

This study was intended to investigate standard in Setswana in Botswana and to discuss some of the emerging problems with regard to the use of this particular variety. The study revealed that, although standard Setswana exists together with other dialects of Setswana, this standard variety is not used. People use Setswana dialects in high public functions mainly because the standard variety is not well known by most Batswana. Learners in schools do not study the standard variety seriously because they do not see any need to do so. However, Setswana teachers

are positive towards the use of standard Setswana and would like it to be used in high public functions. They regard standard Setswana as an important tool for effective communication between the government and the public. The main problem faced by Setswana teachers as well as learners is the lack of material and resources on standard Setswana.

The study also aimed to investigate the process of standardising Setswana in Botswana. It is revealed that the National Setswana Language Council is responsible for the standardisation of Setswana but the council has not yet achieved its goals and objectives. Similarly to the schools, the National Setswana Language Council also faces the problem of lack of material and skilled manpower. This makes it difficult for the council to carry out its task of implementing standard Setswana successfully. It can be deduced from the collected data that only the selection and codification stages have been attempted. The stages of acceptance and elaboration of functions still need to be considered. This is probably part of the reason why the public is ignorant of standard Setswana: people were not consulted on the issues concerning standard Setswana. The study revealed that not all Batswana accept the standard variety.

The membership of the National Setswana Language Council was also reviewed in this study and it can be concluded that even though different departments and ministries are represented, some important bodies such as the writers' association and the media are not represented.

The problems revealed during the research may be resolved and corrected by those responsible for the implementation of standard Setswana working together. The National Setswana Language Council in conjunction with teachers and the Setswana curriculum developers need to reconsider the importance of standard Setswana as well as ways of persuading the public to develop a positive attitude towards it. On the other hand, non-standard varieties should not be overlooked or be regarded as unimportant. Standard Setswana is important in high public

functions, while non-standard varieties are necessary in informal situations such as daily conversations. Therefore, in promoting standard Setswana, dialects should not be discarded as they also play a major role in the society and in the development of the standard language.

6.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following general recommendations are made on the basis of the problems revealed in this study. The recommendations aim to improve the use of standard Setswana in Botswana and are directed at the authorities responsible for the implementation of standard Setswana (such as teachers, the National Setswana Language Council, Setswana curriculum developers and the Ministry of Education).

1. Awareness campaigns should be launched by the National Setswana Language Council to educate the public on the role and importance of standard Setswana.

2. All bodies responsible for the implementation of standard Setswana should work together to ensure the success of the process.

3. Standard Setswana should be seen as a unifying force among the citizens of Botswana, and between the Batswana and foreigners in the country. Foreigners coming to Botswana on business or diplomatic matters should attend courses in standard Setswana.

4. All documents and sources intended to be used in the teaching of standard Setswana should be written in standard Setswana and not in English. If they are written in English, translations should be provided by skilled personnel. For instance, the Setswana syllabus should be translated from English to Setswana.

5. The consultants who are to deal with issues concerning standard Setswana, such as syllabus review, should be Batswana from Botswana or South Africa and should display proficiency in Setswana.

6. The Setswana syllabus objectives should be geared at improving the learners' use of standard Setswana.

7. National competitions on topics in standard Setswana should be encouraged in order to persuade the public to use the written form of standard Setswana.

8. If standard Setswana is to be used in schools, there should be a written policy that discourages the use of dialects, especially in the classroom.

9. Standard Setswana should aim at providing learners with language skills that will allow them to cope better with the requirements of life after they finish school.

10. Schools and the National Setswana Language Council should publish monthly magazines that could be read by both learners and the public.

11. The National Setswana Language Council should release a list of terminology when new words are agreed upon, especially with the new technological terms that are linked to new inventions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDERSSON, L. & JANSON, T. 1997. *Languages in Botswana: Language Ecology in Southern Africa*. Gaborone: Longman.

APPEL, R. & MUYSKEN, P. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.

ASHER, R. E. (Ed) 1994. *The Encyclopedia of Languages and Linguistics, Vol. 10*. New York: Pergamon Press.

BARAL, D. P. 1991. *A Report of the Improvement of Teachers of Setswana: A Consultancy to the Botswana Primary Improvement Project, Phase ii*. Gaborone: University of Botswana.

BARTSCH, R. 1982. The Concepts "Rule" and "Norm" in Linguistics. *Lingua 58*, p. 51-91.

BARTSCH, R. 1985. The Influence of the Language Standardisation on Linguistic Norms. *Studia-Lingua*. Vol.39, No.1, p.23-50.

BATIBO, H. M. 1998. A Lexicostatistical Survey of the Bantu Languages in Botswana. *South African Journal of African Languages*, February, Vol. 18, No.1, p.22-28.

BERDIE, D. R. & ANDERSON, J. F. 1974. *Questionnaires: Design and Use*. Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press Inc.

BIBER, D. 1995. *Dimensions of Register Variations: A Cross Linguistic Comparison*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

BOLTON, W.F. & CRYSTAL, D. 1987. *The English Language*. London: Billing and Sons Ltd.

BOTSWANA, REPUBLIC OF. 1977. *Education for Kagisano: Report for the National Commission on Education*. Gaborone: Government Printer.

BOTSWANA, REPUBLIC OF. 1994. *Revised National Policy on Education. (Government White Paper No.2 of 1994)*. Gaborone: Government Printer.

BOTSWANA, REPUBLIC OF. 1985. *National Development Plan 6*. Gaborone: Government Printer.

BROOK, G. L. 1979. *Varieties of English* (2nd Ed). London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

BYRON, J. L. 1976. *Selection Among Alternates in Language Standardisation: The Case of Albanian*. Paris: Mouton and Co.

CALTEAUX, K. 1996. *Standard and Non-Standard African Language Varieties in the Area of South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

CHAMBERS, J. K.. & TRUDGILL, P. 1980. *Dialectology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

CHAMBERS, J.K & TRUDGILL, P. 1998. *Dialectology* (2nd Ed.) London: Cambridge University Press.

CHRISTIAN, D. & WOLFRAM, W. 1979. *Exploring Dialects*. London: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

COLE, D. T. 1955. *An Introduction to Tswana Grammar*. Johannesburg: Longman Penguin Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.

COULMAS, F. (Ed) 1997. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*.
New York: Blackwell Publishers.

CROWLEY, T. 1989. *The Politics of Discourse: The Standard Language Question in British Council Debates*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

CROWLEY, T. 1991. *Proper English: Reading in English: History and Cultural Identity*. London: Routledge.

CRYSTAL, D. 1980. *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Andre Deutsch.

CRYSTAL, D. 1985. *Linguistics* (2nd Ed). New York: Penguin Group.

DOWNES, W. 1998. *Language and Society*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

EDWARDS, J. 1988. *Language Society and Identity*. New York: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

FASOLD, R. 1987. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. New York: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

FRED, D. & ELLENBERGER, V. D. M. 1912. *History of the Basuto*. London: Caxton Publishing Company.

GUY, R. F., EDGLEY, C. F., ARAFAT, I. & ELLEN, D. E. 1987. *Social Research Methods*. London: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

HAUGEN, E. 1990. *The Ecology of Language*. California: Stanford University Press.

HERBERT, R. K. (Ed). 1992. *Language and Society in Africa.* CapeTown: Witwatersrand University Press.

HOFFMAN, C. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism.* New York: Longman Group Limited.

HOLMES, J. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* London: Longman.

HUDSON, R. 1980. *Sociolinguistics.* London: Cambridge University Press.

JANICKI, K. (1993). From Small to Large-scale Language Conflict: A Philosophical Perspective. In JAHR, E. H. (Ed). 1993. *Language Conflict and Language Planning.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

JANKIE, D. 2000. *Interview Transcription* (unpublished). Gaborone: University of Botswana.

JANSON, T. & TSONOPE, J. 1991. *Birth of a National Language: The History of Setswana.* Gaborone: Heinemann Botswana.

JOSEPH, J. E. 1981. *The Standard Language: Theory, Dogma and Sociocultural Reality.* New York: Microfilms International.

KAMWANGAMALU, N. M. 1998. Linguistic Frontiers in Africa:
Reality and Implications for Education and Development: The
Zaire-Zambia Boarder Area with Reference to the Bemba
Cluster. In PRAH, K. K. 1998. *Between Distinction and Extinction.*
The Harmonisation and Standardisation of African Languages.
Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

LEGERE, K. (Ed) 1996. *Cross-Border Languages.* Windhoek: Gamsberg
Macmillan Publishers.

LEITH, D. 1987. The Social Context of English: A
Sociolinguistic Approach to the Language and Literature.
In BOLTON, W. F & CRYSTAL, D. (Eds) 1987. *The English*
Language. London: Billing and Sons Ltd.

le ROUX, J. C. 1999. *Setswana 700 Study Guide.* Pretoria: University
of South Africa.

LODGE, R. A. 1993. *French from Dialect to Standard.* London:
Routledge.

MAHO, J. F. 1998. *Few People, Many Tongues: The Language of*
Namibia. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers.

MALAN, J. S. 1980. *People of SWA/Namibia.* Pretoria: Haum Publishers.

MALIMABE, R. M. 1990. *The Influence of non-Standard Varieties on the*
Standard Setswana of High School Pupils. (M A Dissertation).
Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaan University.

MARTIN, M. M., CHEBANE, A. M. & TSONOPE, J. 1994.
Report of a Workshop on Setswana Orthography. Gaborone:
University of Botswana.

MASON, E. J. & BRAMBLE, W. J. 1989. *Understanding and
Conducting Research* (2nd Ed). New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book
Company.

McARTHUR, T. 1992. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*.
New York: Oxford University Press.

MILROY, J. & MILROY, L. 1985. *Authority in Language:
Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*.
London: Routledge and Kega Paul Ltd.

MOGAPI, K. 1998. *The Teaching of Setswana*. Gaborone:
Mmampodi Publishers.

MOLOTO, E. S. 1964. *A Critical Investigation into the
Standardisation of Written Tswana*. (M A Dissertation).
Pretoria: University of South Africa.

MOLOSIWA, A., RATSOMA, N. & TSONOPE, J. 1996. A
Comprehensive Report on the Use of Setswana at All
Levels of Botswana's Education System: In LEGERE, K. (Ed)
1996. *Cross-Border Languages*. Windhoek: Gamsberg
Macmillan Publishers.

MSIMANG, T. 1998. The Nature of the History of Harmonisation
of African Languages. In PRAH, K. K. 1998. *Between Distinction
and Extinction: The Harmonisation and Standardisation of
African Languages*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

MUTASA, D. 1996. The Problem of Standardising Spoken Dialects: The Shona Experience. *Studies in the Languages of Southern Africa*, 1996-7, Vol. 27-28, p.79-93.

NYATI-RAMAHOBO, L. 1995. *A Review of the Setswana Programme to Implement the Revised National Policy in Education for the Ten Years of Basic Education*. Gaborone: University of Botswana.

OPPENHEIM, A. N. 1972. *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measure*. London: Heinemann.

PRAH, K. K. 1998. *Between Distinction and Extinction: The Harmonisation and Standardisation of African Languages*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

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

ROMAINE, S. 1994. *Pidgins and Creole Languages*. New York: Longman Ltd.

RUBIN, D. R. & RUBIN, J. S. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. London: SAGE Publications.

SCHAPERA, I. 1953. *Southern Africa III. The Tswana*. London: International African Institute.

SCHAPERA, I. 1952. *The Ethnic Composition of Tswana Tribes*. London: The London School of Economics and Political Sciences.

SCHAPERA, I. & COMAROFF, J. L. 1991. *The Tswana* (Revised ed.). London: International African Institute.

SILLERY, A. 1965. *Finding A Protectorate*. London: Mouton and Co.

TLOU, T. & CAMPBELL, A. 1984. History of Botswana.
Gaborone: Macmillan Botswana.

TRUDGILL, P. 1987. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. New Zealand: Cox and Wyman Ltd.

TRUDGILL, P. 1975. *Accent, Dialect and The School*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd.

WARDHAUGH, R. 1988. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*.
New York: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

WARDHAUGH, R. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (2nd Ed.)*
New York: Basil Blackwell Publishers.

WARDHAUGH, R. 1993. *Investigating Language: Central Problems in Linguistics*. New York: Blackwell Publishers

WEBB, V. N. 1999. *Study Guide (LIN 54. Verbal Communication)*
Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

WEBB, V. N. & Kembo-Sure 2000. (Eds) *African Voices: An Introduction to the Languages and Linguistics of Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

YOUNG, B. A. 1966. *Bechuanaland*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS/LECTURERS

SECTION A: *Personal Profile of the respondents*

Please tick or fill in the blanks appropriately.

1. Gender   Male ☐

                      Female ☐

2. Citizenship   Motswana citizen ☐

                      Non-Motswana Botswana citizen ☐

                      Non-citizen of Botswana ☐

3. Region/ district   ………………………………….

4. Language spoken/ dialect   ……………………………….

5. Age   Less than 25 ☐

                      26-30 ☐

                      31-35 ☐

                      36-40 ☐

                      41-45 ☐

                      46 and above ☐

6. Training

        (i) Highest qualification: Doctoral degree ☐

               Masters degree ☐

               Diploma ☐

               Certificate ☐

Other (specify) ....

(ii) Country where obtained ....

(iii) Formal teacher training   None ☐

Primary oriented ☐

Secondary oriented ☐

Adult/ Vocational ☐

(iv) Country where obtained ....

7. Years of teaching experience: Primary school ☐

Secondary school ☐

Teacher training college ☐

University ☐

Other (specify) ....

8. Highest Teaching Position: Classroom teacher ☐

Senior teacher ☐

Head of Department ☐

Deputy/ assistant/ principal ☐

Subject department
(area of specialisation) ....

9. Current position held: Lecturer ☐

Senior Lecturer ☐

Head of Department ☐

Assistant Principal ☐

Deputy Principal ☐

Principal ☐

10. Time in present institution (in years) ....

SECTION B: Questions

Please tick the one you think is an appropriate answer to the question.

11. Should standard Setswana be used in the school curriculum?   Yes/No

12. Should Setswana books used in schools be written in standard
    Setswana?   Yes/No

13. Give two reasons to support your answer to question 2.
    ....
    ....
    ....

14. Should standard Setswana be compulsory in schools?   Yes/No

15. Give two reasons for you answer.
    ....
    ....
    ....

16. Is there any need to use standard Setswana beyond the level of
    reading and writing, that is, should it be observed in speaking?   Yes/No

17. Give two reasons for you answer.
    ....
    ....
    ....

18. Is there any need for training teachers in standard Setswana so
    that they can teach Setswana?   Yes/No

19. Is it important to use standard Setswana in the media?   Yes/No

20. Is it necessary to write public notices in standard Setswana?   Yes/No

21. Do you ever encourage your learners to use standard Setswana?   Yes/No

22. Are there enough teaching and learning material in schools in standard Setswana?   Yes/No

23. Would it bother you if there was no standard Setswana?   Yes/No

24. Give two reasons to support your answer.
....
....
....

25. Can standard Setswana be used to preserve our cultural identity? Yes/No

26. Is there any difference between the language taught in schools (standard language) and the language used at home (dialects)   Yes/No

27. If yes how do they differ? ....
....
....

28. Apart from standard Setswana being taught in schools, are there other functions of standard Setswana that you know?   Yes/No

29. If yes, mention them.
....
....
....

30. Are there ways of improving standard Setswana?   Yes/No

31. If yes, how can it be improved? ....
....
....

SECTION C: Statements

Place a tick in the response you think is appropriate. If you are not sure or you have no option place the tick in the N (Neutral/ not sure) category.

The key is as follows:

S A	=	Strongly agree
A	=	Agree
N	=	Neutral/Not sure
D	=	Disagree
S D	=	Strongly disagree

32. Standard Setswana is not well known to most of the people in Botswana.

S A	A	N	D	SD

33. The use of standard Setswana is important.

SA	A	N	D	SD

34. Parents should encourage children to use standard Setswana at home.

SA	A	N	D	SD

35. Teachers should feel at ease to use other Setswana dialects in the teaching of standard Setswana.

SA	A	N	D	SD

36. Standard Setswana is used in the media, e.g., Radio Botswana

SA	A	N	D	SD

37. The use of standard Setswana is invalid.

SA	A	N	D	SD

38. Most learners are reluctant to use standard Setswana as it is not recognised in the work environment.

SA	A	N	D	SD

39. The service of a Setswana education officer is necessary to promote the teaching of standard Setswana.

SA	A	N	D	SD

40. Setswana teachers put little effort into teaching of standard Setswana.

SA	A	N	D	SD

41. When marking, teachers penalise learners who do not use standard Setswana.

SA	A	N	D	SD

42. There are enough teaching and learning material such as learners' textbooks, teachers' guides, dictionaries as well as syllabi to assist teachers and learners in the teaching and learning of standard Setswana.

SA	A	N	D	SD

43. Teachers and learners do not have difficulties concerning the use of standard Setswana.

SA	A	N	D	SD

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE NATIONAL SETSWANA LANGUAGE COUNCIL

You are kindly requested to respond to the following questions. Please write your answers in the space provided.

1. Who are the members of the National Setswana Language Council?

   ....
   ....
   ....
   ....
   ....

2. What are the main tasks of the National Setswana Language Council?

   ....
   ....
   ....
   ....

3. What criterion was used in standardising the Setswana language?

   ....
   ....
   ....
   ....

4. What process is followed in standardising Setswana?

   ....
   ....
   ....

5. Are the Setswana language speakers represented in the National Setswana Language Council?

   ....

6. Does the government of Botswana have any input in the decisions made by the National Setswana Language Council?

....
....

7. What is the input of the University of Botswana in the National Setswana Language Council?

....
....

8. Is the National Setswana Language Council an independent body or does it fall under any government department?

....
....

9. What problems does the National Setswana Language Council encounter with regard to standard Setswana?

....
....
....
....

10. So far, what would you say the National Setswana Language Council has achieved?

....
....
....
....

11. Do all Batswana accept standard Setswana?

....
....

12. Does the National Setswana Language Council make any contribution in the prescription of schoolbooks?

....

13. What measures are taken to establish standard Setswana throughout the
entire country?

....

....

14. Is there any possibility of the changing the present orthography?

....

....