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ABSTRACT

The primary aim of the study was to investigate the use of two different names for the same language, Northern Sotho viz.: Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa, from a sociolinguistic perspective of first language speakers from two selected South African universities, a university of technology in Pretoria (A) and a full-time university in Limpopo (B). The researcher endeavoured to explore the Northern Sotho language name discrepancies in informative and descriptive documents such as study guides, prospectuses, academic transcripts and language policies. Secondly, the aim was to establish why a particular language name was preferred, focusing on investigating the sociolinguistic context, including some historic facts, as well as speech varieties and dialectal classification. Thirdly, the idea was to determine which name students and lecturers at the selected universities identified with or preferred namely Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa. Lastly, the study was aimed at determining whether Sepedi is considered a standard language or a dialect?

Reasons for support for each name was investigated by means of survey questionnaires and interview questions based on the mixed-methods research approach including qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The sample population consisted of a hundred participants who were mother tongue speakers of the Northern Sotho language from two selected South African universities, their age groups varying from seventeen to seventy-five. Ninety students participated in survey questionnaires while ten lecturers participated in survey questionnaires and interview questions. The lens incorporated was a sociolinguistic perspective; (what did the speakers of the language say and which language (name) did they prefer between the two and what reasons did they give for their choice). The two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) are currently used for one official standard language. It was found in this study that Sesotho sa Leboa was the name opted for by most of the research participants who considered Sepedi as a dialect, not as a standard language.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

(Note: For the purpose of this study, the two different names for the language under the study are Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa. Therefore, any one of these two names will be used to refer to a specific language context, where applicable. However, when the researcher refers to one official or standard language, in the collective sense in writing up the research for this study, both names are implied but the researcher will then use the English term ‘Northern Sotho’ so as to avoid confusion to the reader).

1.1 Introduction and background to the study

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa is known as the supreme law of the country (Republic of South Africa). Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 200 of 1993) designated Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa.

Thereafter, Section 6 (1) of the Final and present Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996) declared Sepedi as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa. Great confusion arose when the language name Sepedi was eventually designated as one of the official languages in 1996, while the earlier Interim Constitution of South Africa of 1993 designated the language name as Sesotho sa Leboa.

In taking into consideration the contradiction between Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 200 of 1993) and the Section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution South Africa (Act No. 108 of 1996), the researcher is of the view that the reasons are still quite obscure, and somewhat debatable as to what caused the name change from ‘Sesotho sa Leboa’ to ‘Sepedi’.

It is implied that the use of two different names in informative and descriptive documents, as is the current practice by first (and other) language speakers, can be seen as a misinterpretation of the Final Constitution of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996), particularly by those who use Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name. However, it can thus be assumed that those who are using Sepedi as a language name are guided by the present Constitution, more especially within the context that Sepedi was declared one of the eleven (11) official languages of South Africa.
In Parliamentary Constitutional Review (2011: 34), Mojela holds the perspective that nobody knew what caused the change from Sesotho sa Leboa in the Interim Constitution to Sepedi in the Final Constitution, primarily because the Northern Sotho language speakers were not consulted. This is confirmed by Mojalefa (2011: 6-7) in the same Parliamentary Constitutional Review when highlighting that the Interim Constitution was supposed to serve as a temporary measure until an acceptable version could be produced, and it reflected the status quo at that time. The Language Board had recommended that Sepedi should replace Sesotho sa Leboa in the final version, in taking into consideration the historical reasons. A research committee of the Language Board agreed unanimously that the correct name was in fact Sepedi. Mojalefa (2011: 6-7) concludes by saying that decision was made official even though there was no consultation with the affected communities. Taking cognisance of the views of Mojela and Mojalefa in a Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011), it can thus be realised that both share a similar perspective that the replacement of Sesotho sa Leboa in the Interim Constitution with Sepedi in the Final Constitution was an underground movement.

Many academics and traditional leaders as well as the speakers of the Northern Sotho language have different perspectives regarding the designation of Sepedi as one of the official languages; others claim that Sepedi is one of the dialects of the Northern Sotho language being the same as Khelobedu, Setlokwa, Sepulana, Sepedi, Sephalaborwa, Hananwa, Seroka, etc. Therefore, they claim that Sesotho sa Leboa is the correct name for the ‘whole’ official language while others claim that Sepedi is the correct name of the official language (Parliamentary Constitutional Review, 2011: 1).

1.2 Research problem

The use of two different names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) in informative and descriptive documents causes confusion in the domain of language study and language practice sectors. The present situation is that some departments or institutions prefer Sepedi while other organisations prefer Sesotho sa Leboa in informative and descriptive documents. For instance, the Department of Basic Education prefers Sepedi while other institutions like a University of Technology in Pretoria (A) and a Full-Time University in Limpopo (B) prefer Sesotho sa Leboa. However, it cannot be assumed that students who study at these universities are satisfied with the name the university has chosen to designate this language.
For 20 years since 1996, speakers of the Northern Sotho language have been dealing with this confusion, particularly evident in the General Education and Training (GET), Further Education and Training (FET) and Higher Education and Training (HET) educational sector. Umalusi (Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training), for instance, use Sepedi for recording the language as a subject on matric certificates while academic transcripts of some Universities use Sesotho sa Leboa.

Focusing on ethnicity has long been acknowledged to affect linguistic variation and is linked with other social factors, amongst others the aspects of age or gender. Yet, it should be noted that the linguistic correlates of ethnicity have been a neglected field of study and can thus be regarded as understudied. There is consequently little unanimity about the specific nature of ethnolinguistic variation (Newlin-Łukowicz, 2016: 100). To investigate the language variation of dealing with the various terminolgy for ethnic groups, is consequently a new contribution to the field of sociolinguistic studies.

1.3 Research questions

In taking into consideration the research problem stated above, the following research questions are posed:

Main research question

- Which language name (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) is preferred by the Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers, socially and culturally, from two selected South African universities?

Secondary research questions

- How does the use of both Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa in informative and descriptive documents affect the Northern Sotho first language speaking students, lecturers and other speakers of this language in general?
- Is Sepedi considered a language or a dialect, sociolinguistically speaking?
1.4 Aims and objectives of the research

The aim of this study is to provide a sociolinguistic perspective of the dual naming of the Northern Sotho language. Forthcoming from this perspective, the objectives of the study are to:

- Explore the effect Northern Sotho language name discrepancies in informative and descriptive documents have on both first language students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language;
- Investigate the views of Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers from two selected universities, socially and culturally, about their preferred language name; and
- Establish why a particular name is chosen, investigating the sociolinguistic context, historic facts, as well as the dialectal classification of the Northern Sotho language.

1.5 Research design

The mixed-method employing both a quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed in this study as a research design since questionnaires were distributed and interviews were conducted. Survey questionnaires were administered to the students who were then doing Northern Sotho as a first or an applied language module and the lecturers who were then lecturing Northern Sotho as a first or an applied language module. However, the interview questions were directed only to the lecturers.

1.5.1 Research methods

In order for the researcher to achieve the aims and objectives of the study, and in taking into consideration the purpose and nature of the investigation, he employed the mixed-methods approach (triangulation), meaning a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Creswell (2014: 3) rightly observes that mixed-methods research resides in the middle of this continuum simply, because it incorporates elements of both qualitative approach and quantitative approaches. This mixed-method approach served the study well in that the one was complementary to the interpretation of the other.
1.5.2 Population and sampling

Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers were targeted to investigate their views and preferred language name between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa. The sample population of the study consisted of hundred participants who were Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers from the two selected South African universities: A university of technology in Pretoria (A), and a university in Limpopo (B). The targeted student population of the study was strictly those who were academically registered during the 2015 academic year for Northern Sotho as a module.

1.5.3 Research instruments

Ninety students and ten lecturers were selected to participate in a questionnaire consisting of biographical information, 11 Likert Scale statements and research questions. These tools were used to collect data from the students and lecturers who were doing Northern Sotho as a first language module. Ten lecturers were chosen to participate in a face-to-face interview since the assumption of the researcher was that lecturers are more informed about language planning, the study of African languages and linguistics in general, than students.

Furthermore, the researcher highlights that text analysis contained in documents such as university year books, study guides, prospectuses, academic transcripts, names of academic departments and the language policy of the selected universities were also employed in the study to supplement the research instruments.

1.5.4 Data analysis

In the case of the Likert scale questionnaires, an excel spreadsheet was used to capture data and then data were analysed statistically by the researcher in the quantitative format. Thereafter, the researcher used descriptive qualitative analysis to analyse the collected data. As for interviews, the researcher used three steps in order to present the qualitative data. The first step was to sort out the lecturers’ responses, the second step was to code lecturers’ responses and the last step was to memoing lecturers’ respondents. Furthermore, the
researcher used dominating themes emerging from the collected data to formulate different findings which were discussed and synthesised in this study.

1.6 Clarification of the key concepts

**Sepedi** is the name used by the government in the 2011 census for the specific race that consists of 9.4% of the total South African population (Horsthemke, Siyakwazi, Walton & Wolhuter, 2013: 105).

**Sesotho sa Leboa** is the name which is used to accommodate all the Northern Sotho dialects (Poulos & Louwrens, 1994: 2).

**Sociolinguistics** is a field of linguistics that studies how language variation is influenced by sociolinguistic variables embracing: gender, age, ethnicity, class, educational level and identity formation (Stroud, 2014: 298).

**Dialects** are regarded as traditionally distinguished from languages as they are viewed as language varieties with their own vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation (Stroud, 2014: 304).

A **standard language** is a variety of language which is associated with specific sub-groups serving a wide community of speakers (Da Costa, Dyers & Mheta, 2014: 335).

An **official language** is a language which enjoys legal status as the language for official, legal or high functions (Bock & Mheta, 2014: 549).

A **national language** is a language which is widely understood in a state or province and which is used for official functions (Bock & Mheta, 2014: 548).

**Onomastics** is the study of names and naming systems (Koopman, 2002: 8).

**Translation** is defined as the replacement of a text in the source language by a semantically equivalent text in the target language (House, 1981: 29-30)
1.7 Ethical issues

Research should be based on mutual trust, acceptance, cooperation, promises and well acceptable conventions and expectations between all parties (in most cases, the relationship between the researcher and participants) in a research project (De Vos et al., 2011: 113). Furthermore, \textit{(op cit.)} emphasises the fact that human beings are the objects of study in the social sciences; the ethical issues are pervasive and complex, and data should never be obtained at the expense of human beings.

The research proposal including an outline of research instruments (questionnaire and interview questions) were submitted to the Research Ethics Committee of a University of Technology in Pretoria (A) after which ethical clearance approval was obtained. A full-time university in Limpopo (B) also requested the researcher to submit such research ethics clearance documentation for approval.

It was the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that the responses from the respondents would be regarded as confidential all the time. When necessary, the researcher used letter codes to refer to certain respondents for data analysis. The respondents were also ensured that the only people who were going to have access to the participants’ responses were the primary researcher and the supervisor. The field worker as assistant was also involved to manage the conflict of interest as far as the researcher, being a lecturer at University A, was concerned.

The respondents were reminded that their participation was voluntarily and there was no payment that would be made after their participation. Information leaflets were also supplied to the respondents so that they could understand the nature of the study and their rights as respondents.

1.8 Anticipated field problems

The researcher wanted to involve more universities in his study but encountered problems of ethical approval at some targeted universities which were not part of the study, because the authorities of some language departments mentioned, in broad terms, that the debate on the correct language name was quite a sensitive issue linguistic and constitutionally wise.
However, although some lecturers at these universities saw the relevance of the study, the researcher could not interview them on their personal capacities outside university premises.

Furthermore, the researcher was not allowed to collect data at a university of technology in Pretoria (A) due to the fact that he was one of the academic staff members. Therefore, a research assistant had to administer questionnaires and interview questions in order to manage conflict of interest. However, the researcher is of perspective that it would have been easier for him to ask follow-up questions during the interviews since he understood the nature of the study much better than the research assistant.

1.9 Significance of the study

The significance of the study lies in determining whether it is feasible, after 22 years of democracy, to use two different names for the Northern Sotho language (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa). The study may contribute in maintaining consistency in this dialectical-linguistic and onomastic dilemma. At present, matric learners are doing Sepedi at Grade 12, but when they arrive at some universities such as University (A) or at a University (B) they will be calling it Sesotho sa Leboa (translated as Northern Sotho), not Sepedi.

Language educators and lecturers may also gain sociolinguistic insight into matters such as official language, standard language and the accommodation of these in the designation of a language such as Northern Sotho. Students may also be exposed to the underlying sociolinguistic complexities and politics surrounding the Northern Sotho language domain.

Academic departments may also use the study to their advantage and check if their chosen language name corresponds with their University’s Language Policy. Furthermore, they may also verify if their chosen language name is the one which is declared by the Section 6 (1) of the Constitution of South African, (Act No. 108 of 1996) or not.

Language authorities such as PanSALB, SsLNLB and PLCs may also use the findings and recommendations of the study to come up with a constructive way of ensuring that the Northern Sotho language has one name like other South African official languages.
1.10 Chapter outline

The study is organised according to the following chapters:

**Chapter 1: Introduction**

A general encapsulation of the study is given regarding:
- What initiated the research?
- Research problem;
- Research aims and objectives;
- Research design and methods;
- Research instruments;
- Data analysis;
- Clarification of the key concepts;
- Research ethics; and
- Significance of the study.

**Chapter 2: Literature review**

A theoretical background of the study was conducted on:
- Constitutional documentation that initiated the study,
- The origin of Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa language names;
- Contradiction between Interim and Final Constitution of South Africa;
- Loss of translation;
- Onomastics;
- The relevance of sociolinguistics to this study;
- Classification of the Northern Sotho dialects by scholars;
- Role played by missionaries during the standardisation of Northern Sotho;
- Views of Northern Sotho traditional leaders on language name; and
- Views of Northern Sotho scholars on standardisation.
Chapter 3: Research methodology
The focus on this chapter was based on:
- Research methods employed in the study;
- Research design;
- Population and sampling;
- Data collection techniques; and
- Data analysis.

Chapter 4: Data presentation, analysis and discussion of findings
The focus on this chapter was based on:
- Students and lecturers’ language name preference;
- Why a particular name was chosen;
- Synthesis of students and lecturers’ responses;
- Comparison between students and lecturers’ responses;
- The dominant argument;
- Synthesis and discussion of the qualitative data; and
- The discussion of qualitative themes.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and recommendations
The focus of this chapter was on:
- Main conclusions;
- Summary of findings;
- Language inclusivity;
- Language exclusivity;
- Recommendations;
- Significance of the study;
- Suggestions for future research; and
- Limitations of the study
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The use of two different names variants (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) that are currently used in informative and descriptive documents to refer to one official language is currently causing confusion in language sectors, to the students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language and also to the speakers of the Northern Sotho language in general. For example, prior to 2001 the National Department of Basic Education used ‘Sesotho sa Leboa’ as language name for school question papers and certificates, but post 2001 the language name ‘Sepedi’ has been used for school question papers and certificates until today. On the other hand, some South African universities prefer Sesotho sa Leboa while other universities prefer Sepedi as a language name. On the basis of this complicated issue of the language name, the researcher mentions that the confusion still persists.

The aim of this study is to investigate the use of two different names for the same language, Northern Sotho (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa), from a sociolinguistic perspective. The question is: which language name is preferred by Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers from selected South African universities. Therefore, in this study, the literature review will aid to investigate the context of naming, including standardisation, onomastics, language identity and some historic facts (which language name was used prior the Interim Constitution of South Africa Act No. 200 of 1993), as well as speech variety and dialectal classification of the Northern Sotho language from different scholars. It needs to be mentioned that the Northern Sotho language is established and standardised, containing the same lexical content, whichever name is used, the only problem being the dual designation. The researcher, therefore first focused on the constitutional documentation that influenced the research before elucidating the sociolinguistic perspective that underpins the study. The sociolinguistic tenets are followed by an application of these principles referring in more detail to speech variants and how these apply to the topic of investigation. Various views as stated and proposed by scholars and sociolinguistic proponents are also included. Onomastics and translation theory are of necessity also involved, since the main focus involves the choice of a certain name in a specific language and these aspects are thus also covered in this chapter.
2.2 Constitutional documentation that initiated the research

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa is known as the supreme law of the country (Republic of South Africa). Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 200 of 1993) designated Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa.

Thereafter, Section 6 (1) of the final and present Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996) declared Sepedi as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa. Great confusion arose when the language name Sepedi was eventually designated as one of the official languages in 1996, while the earlier Interim Constitution of South Africa (Act No. 200 of 1993) designated language name as Sesotho sa Leboa.

In taking into consideration the discrepancy between Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 200 of 1993) and the Section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution South Africa (Act No. 108 of 1996), the reasons are still quite obscure, and somewhat debatable as to what caused the name change from ‘Sesotho sa Leboa’ to ‘Sepedi’.

In a more practical sense, there is lot of controversy in this double designation for the Northern Sotho language, primarily because some speakers hold the perspective that Sesotho sa Leboa is the correct language name while other speakers are of an opposite view that Sepedi is the correct one.

2.3 Discrepancies in informative and descriptive documents

Discrepancies found in the naming of the Northern Sotho language are commonly found in general governmental, regional and educational informative and descriptive documents as outlined below.

With regard to discrepancy of language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa), Tshwane University of Technology (2005: 2) lists the name Sepedi as one of the South African eleven official languages of South Africa. It is thus clear that this university (TUT) supports Sepedi as a language name in its language policy in accordance with the final constitution of South Africa, not Sesotho sa Leboa.
In the case of the University of Limpopo, the Ministerial Committee Report on the Development of Indigenous African Languages as Mediums of Instruction in Higher Education (2005: 23) recommends that the then University of the North which has now become part of the University of Limpopo (UL), should concentrate on the development and use of Sesotho sa Leboa, Tshivenda and Xitsonga as mediums of instruction (University of Limpopo, 2005: 2).

Furthermore, it states that English or either Sesotho sa Leboa or Tshivenda will be used as medium of instruction in bilingual and multilingual academic programmes such as Contemporary English Language Studies, Multilingual Studies, Translation Studies and Linguistics. However, English and either Sesotho sa Leboa or Tshivenda or Xitsonga will be used as mediums of instruction in Language Education. In the case where Language Education courses consist of African languages only, then the applicable African languages will serve as medium of instruction (University of Limpopo, 2005: 6-7).

Taking into consideration the language policy of the University of Limpopo (UL), it is thus clear that Sesotho sa Leboa is listed and preferred as language name (not Sepedi), being one of the indigenous African languages that should be used and promoted for equitable use in the entire hinterland of the university.

University of Johannesburg (2006: 4-5) lists Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the African indigenous languages which need to be developed. Furthermore, it is documented that given the University’s geographical context of higher education, Sesotho sa Leboa, English, isiZulu and Afrikaans are designated as primary languages. The institutional use of these languages will be guided by the principle of functional multilingualism as elaborated upon in the Language Policy Implementation Plan. This is evidence that the University of Johannesburg recognises and declares Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa. It is crucial to state that the very same Sesotho sa Leboa appearing in the university’s language policy is the one which is used by the academic departments in informative and descriptive documents such as study guides, prospectuses and academic transcripts.

As for University of South Africa, it is documented that in terms of the student communication and marketing strategy, all brochures will be produced in as many languages as possible but at least in Sesotho sa Leboa, isiZulu and Afrikaans (University of South Africa, 2010: 5). It is thus clear that the University of South Africa supports Sesotho sa Leboa.
as a language name, not Sepedi. Sesotho sa Leboa is also used in informative and descriptive documents such as study guides, prospectuses and academic transcripts.

On the other hand, University of Pretoria (2010: 1) advocates that the university shall use two official languages namely Afrikaans and English with Sepedi as a third language of communication, not Sesotho sa Leboa. Thus, the Sepedi language name which is declared by the university’s language policy is the one that is declared by the South African constitution (1996) and it is used in informative and descriptive documents of this university.

University of Witwatersrand (2003: 1) also recognises Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the African languages which need to be developed. However, Language Policy Research conducted at the university in 2002 shows that Sepedi language had approximately 11.8% speakers at the university. It is thus clear that the use of two different language names indeed causes confusion, not only to the speakers of the Northern Sotho language, but also to policy compilers. Especially within the context that in this university, Sesotho sa Leboa is listed as one of the official languages, but the Sepedi language name is used when statistics are given.

The researcher outlines that of the six universities’ language policies (Tshwane University of Technology, University of Limpopo, University of Johannesburg, University of South Africa, University of Witwatersrand and University of Pretoria) which are stipulated in this literature study, the University of Pretoria appears to be the only university which is in the alignment with the Section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution of South African, (Act No. 108 of 1996).

The Department of Basic Education recognises Sepedi as one of the official home languages which need to be learnt and studied at schools, the assumption being that learners come to school able to speak and understand their particular home language (Basic Education, 2013: 13). It is crucial to maintain that the Sepedi language name has been used and is still used by the Basic Education Department in informative and descriptive documents such as schools question papers, schools textbooks and is used on matric certificates. It is thus clear that Northern Sotho learners will always get confused when they reach university level, especially in universities where the Sesotho sa Leboa language name is used such as the University of South Africa, University of Limpopo, University of Johannesburg and Tshwane University of Technology.

The discrepancy of language designation is further highlighted in governmental documentation such as the South African Census which declares Sesotho sa Leboa as the
language of Limpopo Province, formerly known as Northern Province, where it is spoken by approximately half of the provincial population. This language is spoken by approximately 2826464 speakers who form 61.20% of the population in the Limpopo Province and is also commonly used in Mpumalanga and the Gauteng Province. In the Mpumalanga Province, it is spoken by approximately 372392 speakers who are 8.06% of the provincial population, while in Gauteng Province it is spoken by approximately 1282896 speakers who are 27.78% of the provincial population (Statistics South Africa, 2011).

The National Department of Arts and Culture (2005: 11) also declares Sepedi as one of the official languages of South Africa. It is imperative to mention that the Sepedi language name which is used by this National Department is the one which is declared by the South African constitution of 1996. Furthermore, the Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture in Gauteng Provincial Government (2005: 6) is in support of the South African constitution (1996) and the National Department of Arts and Culture by declaring Sepedi as one of the official languages which need to be developed.

This discrepancy between Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of South Africa, (Act No. 200 of 1993) and Section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996) (1993) and Final (1996), concerning the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) may have contributed to a great extent to the current confusion in the Northern Sotho language names used in universities’ language policy. Nonetheless, the study will come up with recommendations on how the Northern Sotho language name dilemma may be handled in order to overcome the current language designation issue.

Based on the current use of two different language names in informative and descriptive documents produced by different South African universities and schools, and even in governmental institutions, the researcher holds the perspective that this can be seen as the violation of the Final Constitution of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996), particularly to speakers or institutions which are using Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name. It can be assumed that speakers and institutions which are using Sepedi as a language name are guided by the South African constitution, especially when taking into consideration the fact that the Sepedi language name is declared by the South African constitution as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa.
In a Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 34), Mojela holds the perspective that nobody knew what caused the change from Sesotho sa Leboa in the Interim Constitution to Sepedi in the Final Constitution, primarily, because the speakers of the Northern Sotho speech community were not consulted at large. This is further confirmed by Mojalefa (2011: 6-7) when highlighting that the Interim Constitution was supposed to serve as a temporary measure until an acceptable version could be produced, and it reflected the status quo at that time (Parliamentary Constitutional Review, 2011: 6-7). However, (ibid.) the Language Board had recommended that Sepedi should replace Sesotho sa Leboa in the final version, for the historical reasons he had outlined after a research committee of the Language Board agreed unanimously that the correct position was in fact Sepedi. Furthermore, Mojalefa (2011: 6-7) concluded that the decision was made official even though there was no consultation with the affected communities. Based on the views of Mojela and Mojalefa (2011), it is thus clear that they are both in similar perspective that the replacement of Sesotho sa Leboa in the Interim Constitution with Sepedi in the Final Constitution was not a transparent process.

2.4 The relevance of sociolinguistics to this study

Since the study deals with language and speakers’ attitudes towards the two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) for the Northern Sotho language which are currently used to refer to one official language, sociolinguistics is involved.

2.4.1. A definition of sociolinguistics

The term sociolinguistics is used generally for the study of the relationship between language and society. Yule (2010: 254) explains that this is a broad area of investigation that developed through the interaction of linguistics with a number of other academic disciplines and that it has strong connections with anthropology through the study of language and culture, and with sociology through the investigation of the role language plays in the organisation of social groups.

The field of sociolinguistics was regarded as particularly apt as perspective as it is a branch of linguistics that probes the impetus of social factors (embracing social class, gender and ethnicity, geographical region and sexuality) on language variation. It explores how speakers
display a special preference for particular pronunciations and certain grammatical structures in order to present certain social identities (Stroud, 2014: 298).

Fishman (1968) as cited by Mokwana (2009: 29) defines sociolinguistics as a study of the complex interaction between language, its range and the roles it plays with or across speech communities. The field of sociolinguistics deals with speech variation pertaining to the sociolinguistic variables as mentioned above. Sociolinguistics is a sub-discipline which centres on describing how speakers of a language attempt to identify and apply the social functions they serve in a society at both the levels of personal application and social interaction. It boils down to different speakers following unique rules and norms when using the language. The subsequent, unique speech choices may carry social significance and are meaningful to the speakers involved (Stroud, 2014: 298).

The aspects: social class, gender, race, style and linguistic repertoires are briefly elucidated next as part of a sociolinguistic perspective. Regional dialects (a linguistics variety spoken in a specific region), ethnolects (a specific linguistic variety spoken by a particular race or ethnic group) and sociolects (a linguistic variety commonly spoken by a specific social class or group embracing working class and upper class varieties) all form part of a sociolinguistic perspective (Stroud, 2014:304).

The researcher concurs with scholars such as Mokwana (2009); Yule (2010); and Stroud (2014) that language is known as a human aspect that plays a very crucial role in society. This indeed applies to the context of Northern Sotho for which urgent interventions by relevant language stakeholders need to be taken to ensure that the social identity of the Northern Sotho speech community is protected. The researcher is of perspective that within society, culture is involved and where there is culture, language is also involved, implying that language, culture and identity cannot be separated and are sociolinguistically bound.

An enriched understanding of the concept of sociolinguistics embraces an emphasis on and incorporation of two perspectives on the relationship between the ‘socio’ and the ‘linguistic’ aspects of sociolinguistics: that is, there is the strand which investigates social factors to find out more about language variations and conditions and the strand that focuses more on society and the position of the speakers in it (how people use language uniquely in different situations as part of their performance for different ends). A complete understanding of
sociolinguistics, therefore requires both the approaches including a focus on speech variation and the speakers embedded in society (Angermeyer. 2015: 97).

Modern theorists focus on defining sociolinguistics as incorporating the following. They are:

- challenging the theoretical dualism embracing both language change and social change;
- offering broader and more perspectives on the social value of language change;
- opening a window on altering language-society relationships; and
- offering a framework that is mindful to historical and novel influential conditions (e.g. what it implies to be a speaker of a minority language impacted by post-nationalist conditions) (Coupland, 2014: 282).

Coupland (2014: 283) also incorporates linguistic ideology, social normativity cultural reflexivity and the influence of technology (mediation) as inherent to change within society and regards change as inseparable from language as nested within society. Language and social class are dealt with next.

2.4.2 Language and social class

Social class refers to the educational, occupational, and economic resources speakers inherited or acquired. Social class is also inextricably linked with status and power. Living in certain common, social environments of necessity influences the way the speakers who have shared values think about language. Their use of standard forms of the language influences the official prestige of the language in question (Stroud, 2014: 299).

2.4.3 Language and gender

It is observed that men and women who share the same values in a similar linguistic environment may differ in the way they display different speech behaviour. Women are seen to adopt speech forms faster than men. It was discovered that speakers from both genders displayed different speech varieties and that the difference was more distinguished when observing the middle class speakers. The reason for this speech behaviour was explained in terms of power relations as female speakers from a specific community might have adjusted
to male dominance in conversation whereas it could differ in other environments. Gender identities may therefore vary (Stroud, 2014: 301).

2.4.4 Language and ethnicity

It should be noted that South Africa has a rainbow nation and that eleven official languages were accepted as part of the diverse speech population. They are isiZulu (23.8%), isiXhosa (17.6%), Afrikaans (13.3%), Sepedi (Sesotho sa Leboa or Northern Sotho) (9.4%), English (8.2%), Setswana (8.2%), Sesotho (7.9%) Xitsonga (4.4%), Siswati (2.7%), Tshivenda (2.3% and isiNdebele (1.6%) (Horsthemke et al., 2013: 105). The focus in this dissertation is on the 9.4% Sepedi (or Sesotho-sa-Leboa) speakers and more especially the name of their language.

The perception of race and ethnicity may shift over time as perceptions towards different ethnic groups may change in the course of time. This is also clear in the more advantaged and less advantaged groups and their access to, e.g. English as the more disadvantaged groups had contact with the more prestigious economic and educational privileges. The more racially and technically marked variants of English are characteristic of the less-advantaged language variations (Stroud, 2014: 301).

2.4.5 Style

Style is perceived as the construction or representation of specific identities (personae). Individual speakers strive for distinction and uniqueness of their personal footprint and to make known their unique identities. Choosing a specific name to another is consequently also a preference for style. Style deals with the personal expression of the speakers’ unique speech identities and is a constant symbolic process (Bock & Mheta, 2014: 306). The social context of the name variation is discussed next.

2.4.6 Sociolinguistic principles applied

It is pivotal to note that language attitude in the context of this dissertation is not directed to the Northern Sotho language but to the name of this language which implies a choice between the two language names. Generally, it can thus be claimed that the attitude of first language speakers towards their mother tongue is positive. This is also valid for the context
of this study since the participants are either studying the language (students) or offering it as a subject at tertiary level (lecturers).

In taking into consideration the work of Mokwana (2009); Yule (2010); Bock & Mheta (2014); Stroud (2014) that language is known as a human aspect that plays a very crucial role in society. This indeed applies to the context of the Northern Sotho for which urgent interventions by relevant language stakeholders need to be taken to ensure that the social identity of the Northern Sotho speech community is protected. The researcher is of perspective that within society, culture is involved and where there is culture, language is also involved, implying that language, culture and identity cannot be separated and are sociolinguistically bound.

2.5 Language, culture and identity

With regard to language, culture and identity, the researcher will explore how these can have an impact on one’s identity. Su Kim (2003: 1) is of perspective that the relationship between language, culture and identity is an intriguing one, mentioning that culture is inextricably linked to language, without language, culture cannot be completely acquired nor can it be effectively expressed and transmitted and that without culture, language cannot exist. Su Kim (2003: 1) further mentions that in the early years of socialisation, both the linguistic and cultural symbolic systems that an individual is raised in will play an instrumental role in socialising individuals, and in shaping their perceptions and their identity.

In taking into consideration the work of Su Kim (2003), it is thus clear that the relationship between language, culture and identity is a special one and that the three cannot be separated. Therefore, these pose a crucial matter which needs to be taken care of, particularly with reference to the entire Northern Sotho speech community, namely the current use of two language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) in informative and descriptive documents and in general communication which may result in loss of identity. This is emphasised by Nunan and Choi (2010: 6) that in casual conversations with friends, colleagues, and even strangers, it is found that language, culture and identity are pervasive but invisible until pointed out, just like a fish is unaware of water until it is pulled from it, so most people are unaware of their language, culture and identity until they are confronted with other cultures and identities.
In accordance with Nunan and Choi (2010), the researcher concurs with them that this may be the case to Northern Sotho speech communities; some of them may not even be aware that there are two different language names and regard them as one and the same until they are confronted by other speakers of other languages about the difference between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa.

Llaman and Watt (2010: 1) hold a similar perspective that the relationship between language and identity is a fundamental element of our experience as being human, since language does not only reflect who we are but actually what we are, and its use defines us both directly and indirectly. Furthermore, Llaman and Watt (ibid.) mention that in reality of life, over very sense of who we are, where we belong and why and how we relate to those around us; all these aspects have language at their centre.

It can thus be assumed based on the work of Llaman and Watt (2010) that language does not only portray our image, but language itself can be regarded as an image of ourselves. This implies that the two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) which are currently used to refer to one official language may end up resulting in loss of identity to Northern Sotho speakers, especially within the context where one has to relate to either language name. It is imperative for the Northern Sotho speech community to know their roots and why they regard themselves as Bapedi (Sepedi speakers) or Basotho ba Leboa (Sothos of the North), because failure to comprehend the relationship between language and one’s roots may signal some identity loss.

2.6 Onomastics: the proper name

Since this study deals with the designation of a language name, onomastics is involved. Many academics and traditional leaders as well as the speakers of the Northern Sotho language have different perspectives regarding the designation of Sepedi as one of the official languages. Others claim that Sepedi is one of the dialects of the whole language of Northern Sotho being the same as Khelobedu, Setlokwa, Sepulana, Sepedi, Sephalaborwa, Sehananwa, Seroka, etc. Therefore, they claim that Sesotho sa Leboa is the correct language name that should be used and appear in the South African constitution as opposed to those linguists who concur that Sepedi is indeed the correct language name to be maintained in the South African constitution (Parliamentary Constitutional Review, 2011: 1).
The word ‘onomastics’ is derived from the Greek word *onoma* which means ‘name’. According to Koopman (2002: 8), onomastics is the study of names and naming systems. In any language, names are nouns, in the word category of proper nouns or proper names. As names are linguistic units which normally operate within a social context, onomastics can be considered as a branch of sociolinguistics (Koopman, 2002).

De Klerk (1996) as cited by Mphela (2010: 10) holds the perspective that naming is specifically a linguistic act, intimately linked with hopes, fears, values and events in people’s lives. This is confirmed by Chauke (1992) as cited by Mphela (2010: 10) that names play a significant role in reminding the next generation that once upon a time there lived a certain group of people in a particular place, names serve as symbols which will remain with people throughout their lives and culture, even within the next generation. Therefore, names are treasures of society and should be carefully preserved.

In taking into consideration the work of Mphela (2010), the researcher shares the similar perspective that the (language) name is regarded as a pivotal aspect to the entire Northern Sotho speech community as their identity is also captured within. Furthermore, it is of crucial importance for the entire Northern Sotho speech community to be proud of their language name, more especially viewed within the context that language can sometimes be regarded as part and parcel of one’s identity.

2.7 Translation of the Final Constitution of South Africa

According to Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 7), Boshego was the first person to inform the Parliament that the designation of language name ‘Sepedi’, according to him, was incorrect, and should have been ‘Sesotho sa Leboa’. After he had been asked by the parliament to translate the Final Constitution of South Africa into Sepedi, he allegedly discovered this ‘mistake’ of the language name since the previous Interim Constitution of South Africa (Act No. 200 of 1993) designated Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa, but 1996 as Sepedi.

Thereafter, Boshego had to request the parliament to amend the 1996 document by replacing Sepedi with Sesotho sa Leboa (rectifying the ‘mistake’), as it was reflected in the Interim
Constitution of South Africa (1993). Since translation brought about the discrepancy of dual naming in this review is also needs to be discussed below.

2.7.1 Translation theories

House (1981: 29-30) defines translation as the replacement of a text in the source language by a semantically equivalent text in the target language, while Brislin (1976: 1) sees translation as the thoughts and ideas from one language (source language) to another language (target language).

In accordance with House’s viewpoint, Nord (1992: 28) stresses the intended function of the target text as determined by the initiator’s needs and not the function of the source text (the criterion in traditional equivalence-based translation theories). Therefore, Nord (1992) defines translation as the production of a functional text maintaining relationship with a given that is specified according to the intended or demanded function of the target text.

In a more traditional sense, Nida and Taber (1974: 12) hold different views on the concept of translation’s definition. They view translation as reproducing in the receptor language, the closest natural equivalent of the source language first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.

In taking into consideration the work of scholars such as Nida and Taber (1974); Brislin (1976); House (1981); and Nord (1992), it can be realised that the fundamental duty of the translator is to preserve the meaning of the source text and therefore the translator’s loyalty should lie with preserving the meaning of the source text in the target text. It cannot be associated with editing or modifying whatever that the translator assumes is not right or correct.

In a Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 5-6), Mojalefa holds the perspective that the individual assigned to perform this task of translation tried to manipulate the Final Constitution of South Africa by allegedly influencing the translation team to change Sepedi into Sesotho sa Leboa, but was unsuccessful. Mojalefa’s argument was based within the context that it was not the translator’s position to do that, instead his position was to translate the Final Constitution into Sepedi. The researcher points out that it can thus be concluded that
Boshego had a translation task to perform and not a legal constitutional right of changing the language name in the constitution (1996).

In accordance with the above translation definitions and according to different scholars such as Nida & Taber (1974); Brislin (1976); House (1981); and Nord (1992); the researcher concurs with them in the sense that the primary aim of the translator is to protect or to preserve the meaning of the source text. Furthermore, it is the duty of the translator to ensure that the source text should be a quality equivalent of the target text. Thus, Boshego’s duty was not to address the designation of a language, but to adhere to the translator’s task.

2.7.2 Lost in translation: Northern Sotho language names

The researcher is of perspective that the dual designation of the language name Sesotho sa Leboa and Sepedi got lost in the English translation to ‘Northern Sotho’. Northern Sotho generally should be understood to include both Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa and not only Sesotho sa Leboa. When ‘Sepedi’ and ‘Sesotho sa Leboa’ are both translated into English, ‘Northern Sotho’ will usually be used as a direct or relevant equivalent, one does not know which name the translator refers to. The same applies to the Afrikaans translation ‘Noord-Sotho’. However, strictly speaking both the English and Afrikaans translations can be perceived as rather literal ‘Sotho of the North’. Often, the indigenous name ‘Sepedi’ is used as translation equivalent in both English and Afrikaans when both the language names Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa are being referred to. One can thus argue that very often, in direct or indigenous translation, one of the names of the language will be lost.

2.8 The origin of Sesotho sa Leboa and Sepedi language names

Since Sesotho sa Leboa and Sepedi are currently used to refer to one official language name, the researcher finds it pivotal to sketch an overview of the sociolinguistic origins of both language names and their dialectal classification by different scholars.

2.8.1 The origin of the Sesotho sa Leboa language name

On the origins of Sesotho sa Leboa language name, Mokgokong (1966: 7) mentions that Northern Sotho is a member of the Sotho group of the South-eastern zone of Bantu languages
and is spoken by approximately millions of people. Furthermore, Mokgokong (1966: 7) mentions that the boundary of the Northern Sotho area is an imaginary line drawn through Springs, Middleburg, Groblersdal, Lydenberg, Sabie, and from there, north of the Sabie River to Bushbuckridge as far as Messina, then westwards to the border of Bechuanaland, and then southwards through Potgietersrus district (now known as Mokopane), Warmbad to Pretoria.

Mönnig (1967: 11) holds a similar perspective that the name Sotho is derived from “batho ba baso”, meaning ‘dark’ or ‘black’ people. The researcher concurs with Mönnig (1967) stating that Northern Sotho means ‘Sotho of the North’, resulting in the name Sesotho sa Leboa.

This is emphasised by Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 334) that Sotho is the collective term used to refer to Sesotho sa Leboa (Northern Sotho), Sesotho (Southern Sotho) and Setswana (Western Sotho). Furthermore, Sotho, also identified as Sotho-Tswana, is the second largest of the present-day Bantu language groups after the Nguni group. These languages alone constitute 24.7 per cent of South Africa’s population (Census 2011). This classification is generally accepted in Bantu studies.

In a more traditional sense, Poulos and Louwrens (1994: 2-3) hold a similar perspective that these three languages are grouped together on linguistic grounds due to a variety of linguistic features which they share, they are nonetheless regarded as separate and autonomous languages due to unique features which clearly distinguish them from one another.

Doke (1954) as cited by Mokgokong (1966: 23) asserts that Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho and Tswana are regarded as dialect clusters of the Sotho group, this classification does not take into consideration the closer affinities of, say, the dialects around Sekhukhuneland. Furthermore, Mokgokong (1966: 8) mentions that the Northern Sotho speaking tribes live in several districts of the Northern and North-eastern Transvaal (old name of a province before 1994), such as Lydenberg, Pilgrim’s Rest, Middleburg, Letaba and Leydsdorp. The most important Northern Sotho groups are those formed by the Pedi (Bapedi), Tau (Batau), Roka (Baroka) and Kone (Bakone), who are concentrated in Sekhukhuneland and adjoining areas. It can thus be assumed, based on the work of Mokgokong (1966) that Sesotho sa Leboa is a term which is used to refer collectively to a number of dialects which are concentrated in Limpopo, Gauteng and Mpumalanga provinces. This is confirmed by Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 345) that the term is also commonly used today to refer to what is known as the
‘official’ language, and which is primarily based on the Sepedi variety of North West Province.

In a more practical sense, Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 345) concur that Sesotho sa Leboa is referred to as Sepedi in the Constitution. However, this may be interpreted as inaccurate to some speakers and scholars since they consider Sepedi as just one of the many dialects of the Northern Sotho language, and the two are not interchangeable. Furthermore, the standardised version of Sesotho sa Leboa (Northern Sotho) is based on Sepedi, although it also has some influences of Kopa, another Northern Sotho dialect, and other varieties.

Poulos and Louwrens (1994: 1) define Northern Sotho as a term which is used to refer collectively to a number of dialects which are concentrated in the Central, Eastern, North Eastern, North Western and Northern Transvaal (Transvaal is an old designation for province before 1994, which now consists of Gauteng, North-West, Mpumalanga and Limpopo Provinces). This term is also commonly used today by scholars and speakers to refer to what is known as the official language, and which is primarily based on the Pedi dialect of Sekhukhuneland.

It can thus be assumed, based on the work of Poulos and Louwrens (1994) that Northern Sotho comprises a variety of dialects such as Pedi, Lobedu, Tlokwa, Hananwa, Phalaborwa, etc. according to the population census of 1985, the language is spoken by approximately 3.5 million people of which 2.5 million live in the Northern, Eastern, North Eastern and North Western Transvaal (now known as Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Gauteng and North West Provinces), and one million in other areas – even as far as the Cape and KwaZulu-Natal. When Poulos and Louwrens (1994) use ‘Northern Sotho’ name, it is regarded as literal translation of ‘Sesotho sa Leboa’. However, it can also be interpreted as the translation for ‘Sepedi’ (see 2.7.2). Yet, Ziervogel (1988; 1) holds the perspective that what is termed Sesotho sa Leboa is in fact a standardised written form of about 22 dialects of the North-Eastern area of today’s South Africa, some of which differ significantly from one other, of which Sepedi, the language of the Pedi, forms its basis.
2.8.2 The origin of the Sepedi language name and its speakers

Mönnig (1967: 11) mentions that the name Sotho is derived from batho ba baso, meaning ‘dark or black people’, there can be no doubt that the Pedi are of pure stock, the Pedi are, undoubtedly of Sotho origin. Furthermore, Mönnig (1967: vi-viii) mentions that the term ‘Pedi’ is used to describe only the people and tribal groups directly descendant from the original Pedi tribe which settled in Sekhukhuneland and eventually became the paramount tribe of that country; they are the only people who call themselves primarily, and only, Pedi. The Pedi area, or heartland, is known as Sekhukhuneland, and is situated between the Olifants and Steelport Rivers, which is also known as the Lepelle and the Tubatse. This area is named after Chief Sekhukhune 1, the son of Sekwati.

Mphahlele (1978: 24-25) holds the perspective that the Bapedi trace their origin or ancestry to the Barolong. As a result of prolonged bickering, a section of the Barolong tribe broke away from the main body and called themselves Bahurutsi and became known as Bakgatla, named after their founder, Chief Mokgatla and it is under the headship of the latter chief that the Bapedi originated. Furthermore, after breaking away from Bakgatla, the Bapedi, under Thobela (Le-Ilela-teng) literally meaning (crying inside), changed their totem name from kgabo (monkey) to noko (porcupine).

Mokgokong (1966: 9) holds the similar perspective as Mphahlele (1978) stating that the Pedi originally broke away from the Kgatla tribe under the leadership of a certain Thobele, moved eastwards, and finally settled in the area between Olifants and Steelpoort Rivers, now known as Driekop (Ga-Ratau). From this area, they adopted the name Bapedi, discarded their original totem kgabo (monkey) and venerated noko (porcupine).

Mokgokong (1966) and Mphahlele (1978) thus agree with tracing the origin of the Bapedi in stating that:

- They originate from Barolong and later became Bakgatla;
- They changed their totem from kgabo (monkey) to noko (porcupine);
- They are now found in the area of Sekhukhuneland; and that
- They are the only people who regard themselves as Bapedi (Sepedi speakers) primarily because they live in Bopedi.
It is implied that scholars such as Mokgokong (1966); Mönnig (1967); and Mphahlele (1978) share the similar perspective that Bapedi are the most dominant and influential group or tribe in the whole of Lebowa (now known as Limpopo Province). Furthermore, they overpowered every tribe they came across in the old Transvaal and were the first, in the Northern Province (now Limpopo Province) to come into contact with the German missionaries and Voortrekkers. The former, after some friction, succeeded in reducing the Pedi dialect to a written language representative of all the other Northern Sotho speaking tribes. This enhanced the popularity of the Bapedi and their dialect called Sepedi.

Mönnig (1967: viii) highlights that from a linguistic point of view, the Pedi language is classified as belonging to the Sotho group of the South Eastern Zone of the Southern Bantu languages, and more particularly to the Northern Sotho cluster of that group. This implies that Mopedi is a Pedi person and Bapedi the Pedi people, also Sepedi is the Pedi language and Bopedi the Pedi country, Bapedi ba dula Bopedi ba bolela Sepedi, (the Pedi people live in the Pedi country where they speak the Pedi language (Mönnig, 1967: viii).

It is thus clear that the Pedi people are similar to the Lobedu people, who live in the Lobedu country where they speak the Lobedu variety, Pulana people, who live in Mapulaneng country where they speak the Pulana variety, Phalaborwa people, who live in Phalaborwa country where they speak the Phalaborwa variety, as well as the Tlokwa people, who live in the Tlokwa country where they speak the Tlokwa variety. As in common linguistic practice, speech communities’ dialects can be linked to specific areas, rendering a rather geographical classification.

The Sotho division is so classified principally on the linguistic grounds of the particular type of Bantu language characteristics of all such languages. The Sotho classification is valid, as a collective term, on ethnic grounds (Mönnig 1967: 11). The Northern Sotho can, on ethnic grounds similar to the above classifications, be subdivided into a number of groups. These are the Eastern Sotho, particularly the Kutswe, Pai and Pulana; the North Eastern Sotho, particularly the Phalaborwa, Mamabolo and Lobedu; the Northern Sotho, particularly the Kgaga, Birwa, Tlokwa and some Koni; and the Central Sotho, particularly the Pedi, Kwena, Roka, Koni and Tau (Mönnig 1967: 11).
Based on the work of scholars such as Mönnig (1967); Mokgokong (1966); and Mphahlele (1978), it can be assumed that Sepedi is in fact one of the dialects of the whole Northern Sotho language and is the language of Sekhukhune ethnic group who live in the area of Sekhukhune.

In taking into consideration the work of the above scholars, the researcher justifies their argument with some popular names that are used in Sekhukhune area, e.g. Bopedi-Bapedi High School, the name of one of the high schools in the area of Sekhukhune, as well as the name Bapedi in general, which is used strictly to refer to people who originate from the Sekhukhune area. Furthermore, regionally and language variety bound names such as Bopedi, Bopedi-Bapedi High School, Bopedi Shopping Centre, etc. are all found in the area of Sekhukhune and obviously one would not come across such names in other districts of the Limpopo Province. Therefore, it thus clear that the name Bopedi is particularly used to refer only the speakers in the areas around Sekhukhuneland, not the other parts of the Limpopo Province.

2.9 The concepts of language and dialect

With regard to language and dialect, it is imperative to give a clear definition of both terms language and dialect. The term ‘dialect’ is defined by Mokgokong (1966: 30) as a form of speech peculiar to a district class, or person, a subordinate variety of a language with distinguishable vocabulary, pronunciation or idioms. While on the other hand, Louwrens (1995) as cited by Ramajela (2011: 8) states that to the traditional dialectologist, the term dialect refers to a regional variety of the standard language. According to this approach, dialect is primarily defined in terms of the differences which exist between the dialect and the standard language in a geographical region. Furthermore, Louwrens (1995) says that a dialect, in the traditional sense, was looked upon as language variety of a lower status than the standard language, usually spoken by illiterate or poorly educated people or people with a low social standing.

Crystal (1985) as cited by Mojela (1999: 31) holds the perspective that a dialect is a regional or socially distinctive variety of language, identified by a particular set of words and grammatical structures. Spoken dialects are usually also associated with a distinctive pronunciation or accent. Any language with a reasonably large number of speakers will
develop dialects, especially if there are geographical barriers separating groups of people from one another, or if there are divisions of social class. Mokwana (2009: 9) is of the view that any language with a reasonably large amount of speakers will develop dialects, especially if there are geographical barriers separating groups of people from one another, or if there are divisions of social class.

Ferguson (1960) as cited by Mokwana (2006: 26) asserts that dialect is any set of one or more varieties of a language which share at least one feature or combination of features setting them apart from other varieties of the language, and which may appropriately be treated as a unit on linguistic or non-linguistic grounds.

This is confirmed by Stroud (2014: 304) by stating that dialects are traditionally distinguished from languages in that they are seen as varieties of that language which have their own distinctive grammatical forms, vocabulary choices and punctuations. They further say dialects are often mutually intelligible, which means that speakers of related dialects can generally understand one another. For instance, Pulana and Pai are completely two different dialects but speakers of both can understand each other.

As for language and dialect, Fries (1962), as cited by Mokgokong (1966:32), gives a clearer and more comprehensive exposition of the terms ‘dialect ‘ and ‘language’ in the following way:

“Language and dialect are only two names for the same thing, as looked at from different points of view. Any body of expressions used by a community, however limited and humble for the purpose of communication and as an instrument of thought, is a language, no one would think of crediting its speakers with the gift of dialect but not of language. On the other hand, there is no tongue in the world which we should not with perfect freedom and perfect propriety apply the name of dialect, when considering it as one of a body of related forms of speech”.

This is confirmed by Ziervogel (1955) as cited by Mokgokong (1966: 32) by holding a similar view in his application of the terms ‘dialect’ and ‘language’ to Nguni, saying:

“The term language should be used synonymously with cluster, but it should be limited to individual references to these, and not to reference to them as subdivisions
of a larger group, viz. Nguni. In other words: they are clusters of Nguni, but languages in their own right. Of course, it would be more convenient to reserve the term language for the written forms only, which would exclude Swazi, for instance, which is obviously not a mere “dialect” in the European sense of the word for it has its own dialects.”

In taking into consideration the work of Mokgokong (1966), the researcher concurs with him in a sense that dialect can be defined as any form of language that is spoken by a particular group of people, especially those who can understand one another and in most cases, the speakers of that particular sub-language may share some words and terms with another group of the same language.

Similarly to the difference between the Setswana language that is spoken in South Africa and the one that is spoken in Botswana is heavily outnumbered by the resemblances and it is only occasionally that a speaker of one form of English can completely or definitely fail to comprehend the speaker of another form of English. It can be justifiable that these two forms of Setswana language (South African Setswana and Botswanan Setswana) are all different dialects of the same language). The Xitsonga language that is spoken in Giyani and the one that is spoken in Bushbuckridge are not the same, but speakers of both can understand one another. Therefore, both are considered as dialects of Xitsonga. The same applies to the Lobedu dialect used in Bolobedu and the Tlokwa dialect used in Botlokwa; speakers of both can speak completely different dialects but can understand one another since both are considered as the dialects of the Northern Sotho language.

### 2.10 Classifications of the Northern Sotho dialects

Different scholars classified the dialects of the Northern Sotho language in different ways. In taking into consideration the manner in which these dialects were classified, the researcher mentions that it can thus be claimed that some scholars are in favour of the language name Sesotho sa Leboa, while other scholars are in favour of the Sepedi language name, similarly to the current mother tongue speakers of the Northern Sotho language. The different classifications are based on the work of scholars such as Van Warmelo (1935); Doke (1954); Mokgokong (1966); Mönnig (1967); Van Wyk (1969); Ziervogel (1969) and Lombard (1985).
2.10.1 Van Warmelo

Van Warmelo (1935) as cited by Mojela (1999: 32) gives a geographical classification of the Sotho dialects (which later came to be known as the dialects of Northern Sotho) as follows:

- Central Sotho, which includes Pedi, Tau, Kone, Roka, and Kopa;
- Eastern Sotho, which includes Kutswe, Pai, and Pulana;
- North-Eastern Sotho, which includes Phalaborwa, Lobedu, Mamabolo, Letswalo, Mametša, Mahlo, and Kgaga; and
- Northern Sotho, which includes Mphahlele, Tšhwene, Mathabatha, Maja, Mothapo, Matlala, Molepo, Tlokwa, Dikgale, Moletši, and Hananwa.

In taking into consideration the classification of Northern Sotho dialects by Van Warmelo (1935), it can thus be realised that the Pedi dialect existed some time ago. However, Sesotho sa Leboa as language name is excluded by this classification in all four regions mentioned above.

2.10.2 Doke

Doke (1954) as cited by Mojela (1999: 32) proposes a classification of what he termed ‘the Northern Sotho cluster’ as follows: Pedi, Kone, Tau (Masemola), Kgaga, Kwen, Hananwa, Tlokwa, Ndebele-Sotho. To these dialects he adds Lobedu, Phalaborwa, Pai, Kutswe and Pulana, which, he says differ consistently from Northern Sotho.

On the basis of Doke’s classification of 1954, it is clear that he considers Sepedi as a dialect like Kone, Tau, Lobedu, Tlokwa, Kgaga, Hananwa, Ndebele-Sotho, Phalaborwa, Kutswe, Pai and Pulana. The directive from this classification is that Sesotho sa Leboa (Northern Sotho cluster) is unifying mentioned dialects.

2.10.3 Mokgokong

With regard to the classification of the Northern Sotho dialects, Mokgokong (1966: 8-9) highlights another different but somewhat similar classification of Doke (1954) for the Northern Sotho ‘tribes’ as follows:
In the North of the Pedi area, one finds the Mphahlele (Ba ga Mphahlele), Matlala (Ba ga Matlala), Tšhwene (Ba ga Tšhwene), Mathabatha (Ba ga Mathabatha), Dikgale (Ba ga Dikgale), Mothiba (Ba ga Mothiba) and Nkwana (Ba ga Nkwana) tribes, who are all of Kone origin, as well as the Molepo (Ba ga Molepo), Mamabolo (Ba ga Mamabolo), Tlokwa (Batlokwa), Birwa (Babirwa), Kwena (Bakwena), Moletši and Hananwa (Bahananwa) tribes. In the North-eastern part of the Sotho area, there are the Lobedu (Balobedu), Phalaborwa (Baphalaborwa), (Makhušane, Selwane, Mašišimale), Nareng (Banareng), (Sekorokoro and Letswalo), Maake (Ba ga Maake), Mametša (Ba ga Mametša) and Tlhabeine (Batlhabeine). In the eastern region, mostly in the districts of Pilgrim’s Rest, Bushbuckridge and Lydenburg, one finds the Pulana, Pai and Khutswe tribes who although comparatively few numerically, have maintained their identity.

2.10.4 The classification of the Northern Sotho subgroup by then Department of Bantu Languages (UNISA)

Mokgokong (1966: 3-4) mentions the provisional classification of the Northern Sotho subgroup into dialect clusters by then Department of Bantu Languages, University of South Africa (UNISA), is as follows:

- The Central Sotho Dialect Cluster: from whose dialects the written Northern Sotho language has developed, e.g. Pedi, Tau, (Masemola), Kone, Mphahlele, are the most important dialects of Sekhukhuneland and adjacent parts;
- The Eastern Sotho Dialect Cluster: Here the dialects are (1) Pulana and Kutswe, and (2) Pai. These dialects bear a strong impression of Tsonga Swazi, especially Pai.
- The North-Eastern Sotho Dialect Cluster: Here the most important dialects are Lobedu and Phalaborwa, and related languages such as Kgaga. They show a strong influence of Venda; and
- The North-Western Sotho Dialect Cluster: Here we have the dialects common to the Polokwane and Mokopane districts, i.e. Hananwa, Matlala, Tlokwa and Mamabolo. Birwa, a nearly extinct language, may also be included.

It is clear that the provisional classification of the Northern Sotho subgroup into dialect clusters by then Department of Bantu Languages, view Sepedi as one of the dialects which are spoken in the area of Sekhukhuneland. It is interesting to note that there is a link between
this classification and the one of Van Warmelo (1935), more especially within the context that the Pedi dialect is still falling under the Central Sotho dialect cluster. Also see 2.10.1. It can be realised that the Sesotho sa Leboa language name indicated by ‘Northern Sotho subgroup’ for dialects, may be the one supported by this classification instead of Sepedi.

2.10.5 Mönnig

Like many other Bantu scholars, Mönnig (1967) also follows a regional classification of the Sotho dialects. Mönnig (1967: 11) states that the classification of Northern Sotho, on ethnic grounds can be sub-divided into a number of groups, these are:

- Eastern Sotho, particularly the Kutswe, Pai and Pulana;
- North-Eastern Sotho, particularly the Phalaborwa, Mamabolo and Lobedu;
- Northern Sotho, particularly the Kgaga, Birwa, Tlokwa and some Koni; and
- Central Sotho, particularly the Pedi, Kwenas, Roka, Kone, and Tau.

Furthermore, the Central Sotho live in Bopedi, and are classified as a group on ethnic and historical grounds, and not on grounds of common descent, as will become clear from an ensuing review of the population of the country (Mönnig, 1967: 11).

In accordance with Mönnig’s classification of 1967, it is clear that Sepedi is one of the dialects which fall under the Central Sotho. Furthermore, he advocates that the Central Sotho dialects are found in Bopedi (Sekhukhuneland). This implies that Sepedi may be seen as a dialect of the Pedi people. It is interesting to note that there is a correlation between the classification of scholars such as Van Warmelo (1935), Mokgokong (1966) and Mönnig (1967) since they are all holding the similar perspective that Sepedi is one of the dialects which are spoken and found in the Central Sotho dialect cluster or in the area of Sekhukhuneland. Also see 2.10.1 and 2.10.3. On the basis of the work of these scholars, it can be reasoned that they would have favoured Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name since they would regard the varieties spoken by the different ethnic groups such as Tlokwa as dialects.

2.10.6 Van Wyk

On the other hand, Van Wyk (1969) as cited by Ramajela (2011: 4) classifies the Northern Sotho dialects in the following way:
a) Central dialect cluster
   - Pedi (also spoken by the Tau, Masemola, Kwena and other tribes);
   - Kone;
   - Certain dialects of the Pietersburg (now known as Polokwane) dialects; and
   - Kopa (which today has a very restricted occurrence).

b) East-central dialect cluster
   - Kutswe; and
   - Pulana.

c) Northern dialect cluster
   - Tlokwa (also spoken by the Kgaga and Kone tribes north of Pietersburg); and
   - Hananwa (also spoken by the Kwena, Moletši and Birwa).

d) North-eastern dialect cluster
   - Lobedu (also spoken by the Kgaga, the Letswalo and probably other smaller tribes); and
   - Phalaborwa (probably also spoken by the Tlhabe, the Kone of Maake, the Narene and the Tubatse); and
   - Mahlo.

In accordance with Van Wyk (1969), it is observed that the majority of scholars such as Van Warmelo (1935); UNISA (1966) and Mönnig (1967) grouped the Northern Sotho dialect clusters into Central, East-Central, Northern, North-Eastern dialect clusters. It can thus be assumed that the Northern Sotho language name originated from these different but somewhat similar classifications. The researcher observed that the classification of Van Wyk (1969) strictly speaking, considers Sepedi as a dialect like other Northern Sotho dialects, actually postulating Sesotho sa Leboa, is the preferred language name.

2.10.7 Ziervogel

Ziervogel (1969) as cited by Mojalefa (2007: 4) further classifies the dialects of Sepedi into 22 dialects and he differs with other classifications as follows:

- Southern dialects such as Kopa, Setebele-Sotho, Molepo, Mothiba, Mothapo and Makgoba;
- Central dialects such as Pedi, Kone, Tau, Roka, Moletlane;
- North-Western dialects such as Hananwa, Tlokwa, Matlala, Moletši and Mamabolo;
- North eastern dialects such as Lobedu, Phalaborwa, Kgaga, Tswapo; and
Eastern dialects such as Pulana and Kutswe.

The researcher points out that Ziervogel’s (1969) classification is of the view that Sepedi is not a dialect but a language on its own. It is interesting to note that so far Ziervogel appears to be the only scholar in favour of Sepedi as a language name. It is crucial to observe that Ziervogel (1969) grouped the ‘Sepedi’ language into 22 dialects, meaning that Sepedi is a language on its own and not a dialect. On the other hand, it can be argued that when Ziervogel starts to list the dialects of the Sepedi language, Sepedi is the first dialect to be listed on this classification. With regard to the classification of Ziervogel (1969), it can be assumed that Ziervogel (1969) views Sepedi as a dialect and language simultaneously. In actual sense, it can be claimed that Sepedi was a dialect which at a later stage was elevated to the status of an official language.

2.10.8 Lombard

Lombard (1985: 5-6) provides another view by claiming that the dialects of Northern Sotho can be divided into three groups according to their position and mutual solidarity. Pietersburg, currently known as Polokwane, more or less serves as the central point for the description of this subdivision.

- South of Polokwane dialects such as Pedi, Kopa, Kone, Tau, etc. are encountered;
- North of Polokwane dialects such as Tlokwa, Hananwa, Matlala, Molepo, Dikgale, Moletši, etc. are encountered; and
- East of Polokwane dialects such as Phalaborwa, Lobedu, Kgaga, etc. are found.

Based on the classification of Lombard (1985), it can be reasoned by the researcher that he supported Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name and Sepedi as one of the dialects of the Northern Sotho language.

2.11 A synthesis of the scholars’ classification of the Northern Sotho dialects

In accordance with the different classifications of the Northern Sotho language by various scholars, the researcher observes that their classifications are quite similar but somewhat different. Based on the work of scholars such as Van Warmelo (1935); Doke (1954); Mokgokong (1966); Mönnig (1967); Van Wyk (1969); Ziervogel (1969); and Lombard
(1985), it can thus be realised that the majority of scholars hold the perspective that Pulana, Pedi, Lobedu, Tlokwa, Hananwa, Kgaga, Kopa, Mamabolo, Moletsi, Kutswe, Phalaborwa, Thabane, Matlala, etc are all considered as part and parcel of the dialects of the Northern Sotho language. In actual sense, these scholars view Sepedi as one of the dialects in the area of Sekhukhuneland. On other hand, it is crucial to point out that Ziervogel (1969) appears to the only scholar who holds a different perspective from the rest of the scholars, it is that Sepedi is a language which has 22 dialects.

It can be concluded that the above scholars did not actually prefer either Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name *per se*, but the researcher can reason that Ziervogel (1969) appears to be in favour of Sepedi as a language name while the rest of the scholars such as Van Warmelo (1935); Doke (1954); Mokgokong (1966); Mönnig (1967); Van Wyk (1969); and Lombard (1985) would most probably have preferred Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name. Similarly to the speakers of the Northern Sotho speech community, some speakers are in favour of Sepedi and others are in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa, based on particular sociolinguistic reasons suited to each. The researcher thus aims to investigate these reasons by means of researching aspects encompassed in his research title.

Based on the work of these scholars, it is clear that the argument of language name choice between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa has been existing for some time, but indirectly within the context of classification of dialectal varieties. The researcher’s assumption is that it is the reason why there has been a discrepancy of language name in informative and descriptive documents, and in general even now. Therefore, it is crucial for the entire Northern Sotho speech community to have one language name that can be used in written documentation and in general language use within the South African society, since it is not only the Northern Sotho speech community which is affected by this dual disignation but also other language speakers as they may take them as one and the same.

2.12 Standardisation

By language standardisation is meant “the process of one variety of a language becoming widely accepted throughout the speech community as a super dialectical form of the language related above regional and social dialects, although these may be felt to be appropriate in some domains” (Ferguson, 1966: 31).
Crystal (1985) as cited by Mojela (1999: 8) views standardisation as a natural development of a language in a speech community or an attempt by a community to impose one dialect as standard. This definition is line with Hudson’s (1980) view as cited by Mojela (1999: 8), whereby standardisation is regarded as a direct and deliberate intervention by society to create a standard language where before there were just dialects.

Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 335) advocate that standardisation is seen as the process of selecting, codifying, accepting and elaborating a particular language variety as the standard variety. Therefore, during this process of standardisation, a language goes through various crucial processes, namely selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance.

Thereafter, Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 335.) mention that language codification has to precede acceptance, and a variety is normally only chosen as the standard because it is codified. Similarly, acceptance should follow directly after selection because in order for a language to be selected and codified (written down in the form of grammars, dictionaries, and so on), it needs to be accepted by the community of speakers. Yet, acceptance should also follow elaboration, because a speech community must continue to accept the standard form once it has reached a stable stage.

Selection logically is seen as the first step towards the standardisation of a language, even though on some occasions the languages selected may already be codified or have great acceptance in its community. This stage entails choosing the dialect to be used as the standard form or picking the dialects which are then unified or harmonised to form the standard language. Therefore, the process of selection is quite a difficult task, since it is impossible to consult the majority of speakers and many may feel excluded from the process. Various factors are taken into account in the selection process. First, the chosen dialect must be accepted by speakers of other dialects too (Da Costa, Dyers & Mheta, 2014: 336).

In taking into consideration Da Costa’s, Dyers’s and Mheta’s (2014) stated process of standardisation, it is noticeable that the process of selection can be quite difficult, but this is not justification of underestimating first language speakers in such cases where their preferred or chosen language or dialect has to be selected for standardisation. The researcher concurs that Northern Sotho first language speakers should have been given enough time to
select their own representative official language dialect that can serve as one of the official language (dialect) of South Africa.

Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 338) advocate that acceptance is one of the most crucial stages in language standardisation. In fact, acceptance by the prospective community of speakers is important at all stages of this process because the newly standardised variety will be used in newspapers, book, schools as a medium of instruction (MOI), government institutions and service providers, to mention but a few. There is a clear link between acceptance and this study, since the fundamental focus is to find out which name (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) is accepted by the first language speakers of the Northern Sotho speech community. Meaning, the first language speakers of this speech community should have a say in choosing an official language.

This is confirmed by Kosch (1993: 50) when mentioning that language is what the native speakers say, not what some speakers think they ought to say. In a more practical sense, there is a correlation between Kosch’s view and this study, primarily because the major issue in this study is the language name, of which it can be argued that before someone can call one by one’s name or surname, that particular person should ask what they are, meaning the name chosen by the Northern Sotho speech community should be the preferred one.

It can thus be assumed that, if the process of standardisation (selecting, codifying, accepting and elaborating) is equally and thoroughly followed, experiencing such confusion of using two different names in documentation and general language use would not occur. Within the context of acceptable standardisation, mother tongue or first language speakers should accept the name of the dialect or language chosen as standard.

2.12.1 The role of missionaries in the standardisation of Northern Sotho

Many scholars point to the major problems the missionaries have created for the Bantu languages. With regard to the Sotho cluster, (Banda, 2002) as cited by Bock and Mheta (2014: 346) states that that the emergence of Sesotho sa Leboa, Sesotho and Setswana as distinct languages owes much to the three different missionary societies whose activities were centred in different areas where the Sotho languages were spoken: the London Missionary Society was active in the West and the Sotho language there became Setswana; the Catholic
missionaries were active in the South, and the Sotho language there became Sesotho, while the Lutheran missionaries were located in the North and the Sotho language there became Sesotho sa Leboa.

In 1865, the missionary Endemann founded the Botšhabelo Missionary Station on the banks of the Olifants River which became an important education centre for the *Basotho ba Leboa* meaning ‘Sotho’s of the North’ communities (Mojela, 1997: 13). Therefore, the first Northern Sotho dialects the German missionaries learned to speak and convert to writing were the Sekopa and Sepedi dialects. Thereafter, other Northern Sotho dialects did not have coverage by the missionaries, since their areas had little, or no missionary activity. This can be seen as some form of language engineering by them, preferring to work with the dialect in the regions where they settled.

On the other hand, Kosch (1993: 14) states that, in the case of Northern Sotho, it is also a missionary who deserves special tribute for his pioneering work, namely Karl Endemann. He had received his training from the Berlin Missionary Society which not only required of its candidates knowledge of the Bible and of Lutheran dogmatics, but also thorough knowledge of foreign, *inter alia* ‘heathen’ languages and practical skills. It was probably this profound linguistic training which enabled Endemann to produce a grammar book on Northern Sotho of truly authoritative format in 1876 (published in Berlin by Hertz). For the purpose of discussion, the year 1876 is therefore taken as the point of departure for the development of Northern Sotho grammatical studies.

Esterhuyse (1974) as cited by Kosch (1993: 14) mentions that, the first words in Northern Sotho which were published in an article, appeared in a contribution by Merensky, namely “*Beitrage zur Geschichte der Bapedi*” (Contributions to the history of the Bapedi) in *Berliner Missionsberichte* (1862, XX: 353-8). Hereafter, references to Northern Sotho words and expressions appeared from time to time in reports by the missionaries in *Berliner Missionsberichte*. Furthermore, in 1874 a grammatical sketch of Northern Sotho of about 13 pages by K. Endemann appeared under the title “Mittheilungen uber die Sotho-Neger” meaning (Reports on the Sotho Negroes) in *Zeitschrift fur Ethnologie*.

Mojela (1997: 13) holds the perspective that the first Northern Sotho dialects the German missionaries learned to speak and convert to writing were the Sekopa and Sepedi dialects.
Other Northern Sotho dialects did not have coverage by the missionaries, since their areas had little, or no missionary activity. Poulos and Louwrens (1994) as cited by Bock & Mheta (2014: 345) on the other hand, mention that the selection of Sepedi was due to activities of early missionaries in North West province.

This is confirmed by Lombard (1985: 7) who states that Northern Sotho as a written language was first developed a little more than a century ago by German missionaries such as Endemann and Schwellnus. The first publication appeared in the dialects spoken to the South of Polokwane and the Bible was later translated into Pedi (Sepedi) which resulted in Sepedi still being used as the Northern Sotho name in certain circles even until today. The written language of that time was used more widely, with other dialects also contributing to its development. However, there is a written Northern Sotho language today which cannot largely be linked to any specific dialect (Lombard, 1985: 7).

Based on the work of Mojela (1997); Lombard (1985); Poulos & Louwrens (1994), the researcher agrees with these scholars that the first dialect the German Missionaries learned to speak was Sepedi, more especially within the context that the German missionaries were founded on the bank of Olifants River, in Sekhukhuneland.

On the basis of the work of Bloomfield (1950) as cited by Mokgokong (1966: 36), in the cases of Northern Sotho, the Pedi dialect or rather a mixture of Pedi and Kopa dialects, was the first to be used in writing. The early Berlin Lutheran missionaries first established mission stations at Schoonoord and at Maadagshoek and then, under pressure from Chief Sekhukhune I, moved to Botšhabelo. Therefore, the researcher concurs that the Pedi dialect was the dominant one.

Bloomfield (1950) as cited by Mokgokong (1966: 36) further says that Bapedi and the Bakopa coverts lived, and were taught together, and when the Bible had to be translated into Northern Sotho, Abraham Serote, a Kopa, was sent to Lobethal to study the Pedi dialect. The result was that the first complete Northern Sotho biblical translation contained linguistic characteristics of both Pedi and Kopa dialects. On the other hand, Mphahlele (1978: 24) asserts that the Bible was translated into Sepedi and most of the literature in Lebowa is written in the Sepedi dialect.
Mphahlele (1978: 34); Bloomfield (1950) as cited by Mokgokong (1966: 36) and Lombard (1985) all share a similar perspective that the missionaries played a very instrumental role in the codification of the Pedi dialect. Furthermore, since the Bible was later translated into Pedi (Sepedi), with some elements of the Kopa dialect, it resulted in Sepedi being elevated and still being used as the name for the Northern Sotho language in certain circles even until today. These translated religious texts prove that indeed the Sepedi dialect was the first to be converted to a written form, and furthermore in a significant text such as the Bible.

However, the joint petition that was submitted in (2011) on behalf of the Magoší of the affected areas (Mopani District, Capricorn District and Waterberg District) in support of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name highlights that the first German missionary who landed at Maleuskop in 1860 and who founded Botšhabelo Mission station in 1865, was Karl Endemann of the Berlin Evangelical Missionary Society. Endemann published the following works: The first Northern Sotho grammar book called: ‘Versuch einer Grammatik des Sotho (1876). A dictionary called: Worterbuch der Sotho Sprache (1911). Furthermore, a joint petition (2011) acknowledges that the German missionaries worked in the Sekhukhune area, and wrote in the Pedi dialect, but they referred to the language as Sotho, not Pedi. This can be attributed to the lack of linguistic classification of the Bantu languages back then.

2.12.2 The views of Northern Sotho scholars on standardisation

In a Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 8), Mokgoatšana argues that the main issue at stake was to determine how language is standardised. There are three basic principles. Firstly, it must have been a language or a dialect with historical value and associated with historical and juridical powers and political influence. In Limpopo Province, the most dominant and influential group had always been the Bapedi Kingdom. The second principle is based on the fact that this dialect should be reduced to writing. Lutheran Missionaries in Sekhukhune Kingdom recorded Sepedi in writing for purposes of instruction and proselytizing, and had translated the Bible into Sepedi and there is no doubt that Sepedi is the dialect to be codified. Thirdly, the language had to have a literature of its own, and this was true reflection of Sepedi.

Furthermore, (ibid.) he concluded by advocating that Sepedi was therefore a dialect that historically rose to the stature of an official language based on these three standardisation
principles. Although Sepedi was a major dialect, there were others that emerged as a result of publishing and writing, but he argues that those scholars advocating that Sesotho sa Leboa be an official language, were not accepting the stated historical facts.

The researcher observes that scholars such as Mojalefa (2011) and Mokgoatšana (2011) share a similar perspective that Northern Sotho is the language of the North, not of the south (Sesotho) or of the West (Setswana). This is very queer in the history of naming languages internationally as there is no English-North or English of the North or isiXhosa of the South or of the East. In standardisation, languages are named after superior (the first recorded) dialects within the dialects of a particular language, hence English, isiZulu, isiXhosa, Setswana, Sesotho, Xitsonga, etc; these are no longer dialects but written standard languages. Accordingly, Sepedi is no exception. It has been chosen on the very same grounds. This is a superior dialect which was elevated to become a written (standard) language (Parliamentary Constitutional Review, 2011: 5-6).

According to this review, Sepedi was in fact the correct language to be included in the constitution (1996). Sepedi was a name long used by its native speakers, and the name had been used since 1862, in an article published in a German journal, and in writings by German missionaries. Furthermore, in 1969 there was a study of ‘Bantu’ languages, during which Van Wyk divided the languages into Nguni and Sotho groups, with Sotho then being sub-divided further into ‘Southern Sotho’, ‘Western Sotho’ and ‘Northern Sotho’, these groupings were not accepted widely except by those who were meant to classify, yet they were seen as imposition from outside (Parliamentary Constitutional Review, 2011: 6).

Furthermore, Mojalefa (2011: 5-6) asserts that the Sesotho sa Leboa language name became an artificial language crafted by foreigners and was imposed on Sepedi speakers and that the origin of the Northern Sotho name was seriously defective and lacked legitimacy. Northern Sotho was classified as the language of the North, but the geographical designation was suspect and languages were named after superior dialects (Sepedi), according to their dominance.

In taking into consideration the work of Mojalefa and Mokgoatšana in a Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011:6-8), it can be assumed that Sepedi is in fact a dialect, but on the basis of its historical recordings and dominance, it deserves to be elevated to the status of
an official language. This implies that Sepedi is the correct official language name that should be maintained in the Final Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) and be used as such.

On the other hand, a Joint Petition (2011: 1-2) of behalf of Magoşi (Traditional Leaders) of the affected areas (Capricorn, Waterberg, Mopani and Mapulaneng) emphasises that the replacement of Sesotho sa Leboa in the Section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution of South Africa, (Act No 108 of 1996) was an ‘underground work’ by individuals who wanted to elevate the status of their own dialect at the expense of more than 27 other dialects of the Northern Sotho language. Furthermore, the decision of changing the name Sesotho sa Leboa, (the name which was used in the Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of 1993) to Sepedi was taken without consulting the relevant stakeholders.

In a Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 3), Mojela expresses the need to restore the name of the Sesotho sa Leboa language to its rightful place and to remove the name ‘Sepedi’ from the constitution. Mojela holds the perspective that Sepedi is just one of the 27 dialects of Sesotho sa Leboa, a standard language spoken by the Basotho communities in the Northern parts of South Africa, including Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Gauteng and North West, and that the Sepedi dialect is spoken in one of the four districts of Limpopo which is Sekhukhune. Furthermore, speakers who are advocating for the retention of Sepedi in the constitution, including academics and traditional leaders, are all originally from Sekhukhuneland, and they would be satisfied if their dialect were to be elevated to the position of an official language at the expense of other dialects.

Monareng in the same Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 4) argues that Sesotho sa Leboa is the correct language name to be used as an official platform, language as written, spoken and taught. Furthermore, students in Limpopo classrooms were taught in Northern Sotho, an all-encompassing language that accommodates other languages. He concluded by stating that one of the district municipalities inhabited by the Basotho ba Leboa of Limpopo Province was named ‘ Sekhukhune’, and each of those four districts had their own municipality and language. The Sepedi language is used in the Sekhukhune District Municipality. However, for all four districts (Mopani, Capricorn, Waterberg and Sekhukhune), the standardised language was Sesotho sa Leboa and it does not promote any dialect or ethnic group.
In taking into consideration the views of Parliamentary Constitutional Review (2011), it can thus be stated that Mokgoatšana and Mojalefa are both of perspective that Sepedi is the correct official language name since it was the first dialect to be codified and in taking into consideration historical facts. On the other hand, Mojela and Monareng hold a different view that Sesotho sa Leboa is the language of the Limpopo Province, since it accommodates all other dialects of the whole Northern Sotho such as Pulana, Pai, Lobedu, Kgaga, Hananwa, Tlhabine, Tswapo, Sepedi, Tau, Kone, Roka, Tlokwa, Phalaborwa, Mamabolo, etc. while Sepedi is promoting only the Sekhukhune ethnic group. In a more practical sense, it is observed that scholars such as Mojela and Monareng view Sepedi as a pure dialect that has nothing to do with a standard language while scholars such as Mokgoatšana and Mojalefa view Sepedi as a standard language.

2.12.3 The views of traditional leaders on standardisation

In Parliamentary Constitutional Review (2011: 9), Sekhukhune as a representative from the Sekhukhune Royal House states that history could not be erased. The history of the Sepedi language and people could be traced a long way back, as early as 1700. The purpose of King Sekhukhune fighting with other leaders was to unite people of the North. Furthermore, the concept of Sepedi is relevant to be used as it specifies the identity of the Bapedi.

Furthermore, in the same Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 9), Sekhukhune notes that at that time Sesotho sa Leboa became a prescribed language under apartheid rule, the language name was in fact Sepedi. Sesotho sa Leboa was the result of an imposition by the apartheid system, and the delegates who were advocating Sesotho sa Leboa were in fact representing apartheid in disguise.

Sekhukhune in a Parliamentary Constitutional Review (2011: 9), further argue that Sepedi is in fact the correct language name for the Batho ba Leboa meaning (people of the North). He further claims that the Northern Sotho language name was brought by the apartheid government in order to separate instead of uniting people.

On the other hand, Sekororo in a Parliamentary Constitutional Review (2011: 8), as one of the members of Congress of Traditional Leaders in South Africa (Contralesa), as the chairperson of Limpopo Province, indicates that his mother came from the Sekhukhune
Kingdom. He says that he grew up speaking Seroka and Sotho, and that if it was necessary to state which type of language was used, it was ‘Sesotho sa Leboa’ not ‘Sepedi’. At the school he attended, for the children of royalty, he received instruction in Sesotho sa Leboa language not Sepedi (Parliamentary Constitutional Review, 2011: 8-9).

In the same Parliamentary Constitutional Review of (2011: 9), Dikgale as he is representing Capricorn District, is of the perspective that from the best of his knowledge, Sepedi is not a language but a dialect; he grew up speaking Sesotho sa Leboa and the language that they spoke and wrote was Sesotho sa Leboa and never had anything to do with Sepedi. The dialects in the province were equal and people of the North wanted to keep it that way. Thereafter, he asked that if Sepedi was indeed a language name, why would the people in the Limpopo Province consider it as an offense when Sepedi is appearing in the Final Constitution of South Africa. He concludes that Sesotho sa Leboa was the language that was spoken and written and he acknowledges the efforts of King Sekhukhune; he further highlights that King Sekhukhune did not fight alone for liberation, but was supported in the struggle by other traditional leaders.

A Joint Petition that was submitted to Constitutional Review Committee (2011: 3) by Magoşi (Traditional Leaders) of the affected areas where they claim Sesotho sa Leboa language is spoken (Capricorn, Waterberg, Mopani and Mapulaneng) mentions that the sinister irony about the Sepedi language name is that, all the people fighting for the retention of Sepedi in the constitution are all Bapedi people residing in the Sekhukhune District. Furthermore, those Bapedi people (Sepedi speakers) and their researchers are not only fighting to keep their Sepedi dialect to themselves in Bopedi (Sekhukhuneland), but to impose it on all speakers of the Northern Sotho language, maintaining their superior status over the rest of the Northern Sotho dialects.

A Joint Petition (2011: 5) that was submitted to Parliamentary Constitutional Review Committee (2011) by Magoşi (Traditional Leaders) of the affected areas where the Sesotho sa Leboa language is spoken (Capricorn, Waterberg, Mopani and Mapulaneng) mentions that the Sepedi dialect is known to be dominated by words or lexical items like:

- ‘Weni’ (you)
- ‘Ke fo ja’ (I am eating)
‘Ke fo ria’ (I am doing)
‘Nalete’ (needle)
‘Nkoko’ (koko)
‘Nnenyane’ (young)
‘Mamma’ (mother)
‘Monnela’ (that man)
‘Motheela’ (that person)
‘Ria’ (do)
‘Ntitia’ (to beat me) etc. (Joint Petition, 2011: 5).

However, all these words above are not allowed in the standard Northern Sotho language. For these reasons, it is unknown why the dialect Sepedi should replace Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa.

Furthermore, it can also be argued that the Sepedi language, which is recognised by the Section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution of Republic of South Africa as one of the official languages (as it appears in the English version of the 1996 Constitution) has no Standard Orthography publications governing the use of the language like Northern Sotho Spelling and Orthography publications (No. 1 of 1953, No.2 of 1962, No.3 of 1972 and No.4 of 1988 which was revised by PanSALB in 2008). Therefore, Sepedi cannot be considered as a standard language, since its orthographical rules pertain to Sesotho sa Leboa (another language designation).

In taking into consideration the perspectives in this Joint Petition (2011), Sekhukhune represented the Royal House of Sekhukhune, Dikgale from the Capricorn District, as well as Sekororo, on behalf of Limpopo Contralesa. It can thus be stated that they differ in their perspectives of the language designation, mainly based on the geographical settlement. Dikgale and Sekororo who belong to different districts (Capricorn and Mopani Districts) in Limpopo Province are in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name while Sekhukhune who belongs to the Sekhukhune District, is in favour of Sepedi as a language name.
2.13 Is Sepedi considered a standard language or a dialect?

From a dialectal point of view, the researcher asserts that the concept ‘dialect’ can be defined as any form of language that is spoken by a particular group of people, especially those who can understand each other and in most cases, the speakers of that particular sub-language may share some words and terms with another group of the same language (Stroud, 2014: 302).

Similarly, the difference between the Setswana language that is spoken in South Africa and the one that is used in Botswana are characterised by resemblances and a speaker of one form of Setswana can comprehend the speaker of another form of Setswana (also see 2.9).

According to Holmes (2013) as cited by Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 335), a standard language is generally one which is written, and has undergone some degree of regularisation or codification, for example, in grammars and a dictionaries. A standard language is recognised as a prestigious variety or code by a community, and it is used for higher (H) functions alongside a diversity of lower (L) varieties (also see 2.9).

This is confirmed by Gavin (1993) as cited by Da Costa, Dyers and Mheta (2014: 335) who reasons that standard language can be defined as a codified variety of a language that serves the multiple and complex communicative needs of a speech community that has either achieved modernisation or has the desire of achieving it.

As for the Northern Sotho language, standard is based on the Sekone dialect and the various dialects spoken in the vicinity of Polokwane, Mankweng, Matlala, Moletši, Mokopane, Mphahlele, Chuenespoort and the areas to the west of Makgobaskloof, Sepedi and Sekopa which have some resemblances which contributed to the development of the Standard Northern Sotho, but not in the same way as the other dialects mentioned above as it is recorded in the Northern Sotho Spelling and Orthography No. 4 of 1988, which was revised by PanSALB in 2008. The latter document is still the only document containing the written spelling and orthography rules of the whole Northern Sotho language (A Joint Submission or Petition, 2011:4-5).

Based on a Joint Submission or Petition of (2011), the researcher asserts that each and every language should have its own grammars, like *A Linguistic Analysis of Venda* and *A Linguistic
Analysis of Zulu. The work of Poulos and Louwrens (1994) is called A Linguistic Analysis of Northern Sotho. Languages also have their own orthographies such as Terminology, Spelling and Orthography for Northern Sotho language (1988) which was revised in 2008 and published by Sesotho sa Leboa National Language Body. This raises a very crucial question. How can users of the Northern Sotho language use the latest orthography of a language (Sesotho sa Leboa) that is not the official language as Sepedi?

From a linguistic point of view, the researcher suggests that this can be one of the reasons why Sesotho sa Leboa was designed as one of the official languages in the Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of South Africa, (Act No. 200 of 1993). The researcher concludes by stating that the argument of scholars and traditional leaders who are against the use of the language name Sepedi, particularly as one of the official languages can be justified since the Sepedi language has no Standard Terminology Spelling and Orthography (Melao ya mongwalo le mopeleto wa Sesotho sa Leboa) published in 2008.

2.14 Summary

The primary aim of this chapter was to provide a sociolinguistic perspective of language variation, explore the Northern Sotho language name discrepancies, look at the relationship between language and identity, differentiate dialect from language, provide the classification of the Northern Sotho dialects proposed by different scholars, present the process of standardisation and share the views of scholars and traditional leaders regarding Sepedi and Sesotho language names. From a sociolinguistic and dialectal point of view, the researcher considered the process of standardisation based on the work of different scholars embracing the views of Van Warmelo (1935), Mokgokong (1966), Mönning (1967), Van Wyk (1969), Mphahlele (1978), Lombard (1985), Poulos & Louwrens (1994), and Mojela (1997). It emerges that Sesotho sa Leboa is the language of Limpopo Province, formerly known as Northern Province. Sepedi, on the other hand, may be considered as one of the dialects of the whole Northern Sotho language which has more than 27 dialects, namely: Kopa, Pedi, Setebele-Sotho, Molepo, Mamabolo, Mothiba, Mothapo, Makgoba, Pedi, Kone, Tau, Roka, Moletlane, Hananwa, Tlokwa, Matlala, Moletsli, Lobedu, Phalaborwa, Kgaga, Tswapo, Pai, Pulana, Kutswe, etc. On the other hand, scholars such as Ziervogel (1969), Mojalefa (2007) and Mokgoatšana (2011) hold the opposite view, contending that Sepedi is indeed a dialect,
but a dialect with historical status, since it was the first one amongst Northern Sotho dialects to be codified, thus being elevated to the status of a standard official language.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The fundamental focus of this chapter is to outline the research design applied in this study. Research approaches are also discussed. The sample population and sampling technique are thoroughly explained. Furthermore, methods of collecting data, as well as methods which will be used to analyse and interpret the data are discussed and exemplified.

In this study, research methodology and procedures are directed towards the aim to determine which name (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) is preferred by the first language speakers of the Northern Sotho language from two selected South African universities, specifically university students who are doing Northern Sotho as a first language module or as an applied language, as well as lecturers who are lecturing Northern Sotho as a module. Secondly, the study explored the Northern Sotho language name discrepancies in informative and descriptive documents such as study guides, university year books, prospectuses and academic transcripts. See 2.3. Thirdly, the researcher investigated whether Sepedi is considered a standard language or a dialect. Fourthly and lastly, the study established why a particular name was chosen by respondents, investigating the sociolinguistic context, including some historical facts, as well as speech varieties and dialectal classification of the Northern Sotho language.

3.2 Research questions

As highlighted in Chapter 1 (introduction), the study aims to answer the following research questions:

- How does the use of both Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa in informative and descriptive documents affect the Northern Sotho first language speaking students, lecturers and other speakers of this language in general?
- Which language name (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) is preferred by the Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers, socially and culturally, from two selected South African universities?
3.3 Aims and objectives of the research

As highlighted in Chapter 1, the aim of this study is to provide a sociolinguistic perspective of the dual naming of the Northern Sotho language. Forthcoming from this perspective, the objectives of the study are to:

- Explore the effect Northern Sotho language name discrepancies in informative and descriptive documents have on both first language students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language;
- Investigate the view of Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers from two selected universities, socially and culturally, about their preferred language name; and
- Establish why a particular name is chosen, investigating the sociolinguistic context, historic facts, as well as the dialectal classification of the Northern Sotho language.

3.4 Research design

A research design is defined by Kumar (2014: 122) as the roadmap that one decides to follow in one’s research journey to find answers to research questions as validly, objectively, accurately and economically as possible. Furthermore, Kumar (ibid.) reasons that it is a procedural-cum-operational plan that details what and how different methods and procedures are to be applied during the research process.

Kerlinger (1986: 279) agrees that a research design is a plan, structure, and strategy of investigation so conceived as to obtain answers to research questions or problems. Furthermore, (ibid.) the plan is the complete scheme or programme of the research; it includes an outline of what the investigator will do from writing the hypotheses and their operational implications to the final analysis of data.

Selltiz et al. (1962) as cited by Kumar (2014: 123) formulate that a research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure. This is confirmed by
Bless et al. (2013: 130) that a research design relates directly to the answering of a research question. Therefore, for the mere fact that research is a project that takes place over an extended period of time, it is unthinkable to embark on such an exercise without a clear plan or design, a sort of blueprint. It is a specification of the most appropriate operations which need to be performed in order to test a specific hypothesis under given conditions.

It can thus be assumed, based on the work of Kumar (2014); Kerlinger (1986); Sellitz et al. (1962); and Bless et al. (2013) that the findings of the study depend on the study design chosen by the researcher. In other words, in order for the researcher to achieve aims and objectives of the study, the research design should be accurate implying that, there is no way in which the research questions can be answered without the correct usage of the research design.

Ivankova, Creswell and Clark (2007) as cited by Kruger (2014: 48) are of perspective that triangulation is used to compare and contrast quantitative and qualitative data. The researcher concurs with them in the sense that the very same approach has been applied in this study. Questionnaires and face-to-face interviews have been used to collect data and thereafter the findings from both approaches have been compared and contrasted. The primary aim of using the mixed-methods approach in this study is to gather as much information as possible. Therefore, it can also be assumed that a complete investigation will be expected from this approach and trustworthiness of the findings can be justified. After the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data, the researcher will have an opportunity to analyse and make meaning of data by means of interpretation.

Furthermore, triangulation is a one-phase design in which the researcher uses both quantitative and qualitative methods during the same time frame and with equal weight to best understand the phenomenon of interest; it generally involves the concurrent, but separate, collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data in order to compare and contrast the different findings to see the extent to which they do or do not agree with each other (De Vos et al., 2012: 442).

De Vos et al. (2011: 443) advocate that the advantage of using triangulation as design is that it takes less time to complete than a sequential design, each type of data can also be collected and analysed separately and independently, using techniques traditionally associated with
quantitative and qualitative research. Taking into consideration the work of De Vos et al. (2011), it is clear that the use of a triangulation design will benefit the study since data can be collected and analysed independently. Thereafter, comparative data analysis will be done so as to verify if the findings of the investigation are corresponding since accuracy and credibility of the research is vitally important.

The triangulation method was employed in this study as a research design since the study relied on survey questionnaires and interviews as instruments of data collection. Structured questionnaires were administered to students who were doing Northern Sotho as a first language subject and lecturers who taught Northern Sotho as a first language. Students also completed an open-ended survey questionnaire. The face-to-face interview questions were directed to the lecturers only. The number of research instruments such as questionnaires, interviews and observations contribute substantively to the process of validating and triangulating the data.

3.5 Research approach

In order for the researcher to achieve aims and objectives of the study, and in taking into consideration the purpose and nature of the investigation, he is going to use the mixed-methods approach, involving a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Creswell (2014: 3) rightly observes that mixed-methods research resides in the middle of this continuum simply because it incorporates both qualitative and quantitative elements.

Newman and Benz (1998) as cited by Creswell (2014: 3) are of the perspective that unquestionably, the two approaches are not as discrete as they first appear. They should not be viewed as rigid, distinct categories, polar opposites, or dichotomies. Instead they represent different ends on a continuum. Since the mixed-methods approach, involves both qualitative and quantitative research approaches, it is imperative to clearly define both qualitative and quantitative research methods before discussing the mixed-methods approach which is the core one in this study.
3.5.1 Qualitative research method

Creswell (2014: 4) defines qualitative research as an approach of exploring and understanding the meaning of individuals or groups ascribed to a social or human problem. Furthermore, (ibid.) the process of research involves emerging questions and procedures, data typically collected in the participant’s setting, data analysis inductively building from particulars to general themes, and the researcher making interpretations of the meaning of data.

Kumar (2014: 14) observes that the qualitative approach is embedded in the philosophy of empiricism; follows an open, flexible and unstructured approach to enquiry, aims to explore diversity rather than quantity, emphasises the description and narration of feelings, perceptions and experiences rather than their measurement and communicates findings in a descriptive and narrative rather than analytical manner, placing no or less emphasis on generalisations.

This is confirmed by Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 3), that a qualitative research involves an interpretative, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. It attempts to make sense of, or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them. This definition of Denzin and Lincoln (2000) is applicable to his study since the selected speakers of the Northern Sotho language will be given an opportunity to view, state and interpret what they really know or understand regarding the topic, i.e. designation of two different names naming one language (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa).

The researcher concurs with Denzin and Lincoln (2000), Creswell (2014) and Kumar (2014) in a sense that a qualitative research approach means that the research will rely on the quality of the collected data. Therefore, he should be able to critically analyse and interpret the meaning of the particular collected data. In other words, it can be assumed that the findings of the study are entirely based on the interpretation of data by the researcher, so that aims and objectives of the study can be achieved.
3.5.2 Quantitative research method

Quantitative research is defined by Creswell (2014: xxiv) as a method which involves the processes of collecting, analysing, interpreting, and writing down the results of a study. Furthermore, specific methods exist in both survey and experimental research that relate to identifying a sample and population, specifying the type of design, collecting and analysing data, presenting the results, making an interpretation, and writing the research in a consistent manner. In accordance with this statement, the researcher collected data and analysed it in a quantitative manner to enable him to interpret and write up the final results of this study.

Kumar (2014: 14) is of the perspective that the quantitative approach is rooted in the philosophy of rationalism. It follows a rigid, structured and predetermined set of procedures to explore, aims to quantify the extent of variation in a phenomenon, emphasises the measurement of variables and the objectivity of the process and believes in substantiation on the basis of a large sample size. It also gives importance to the validity and reliability of findings and communicates findings in an analytical and aggregate manner, drawing conclusions and inferences that can be generalised.

Creswell (2014: 4) further states that quantitative research is an approach of testing objective theories by examining the relationships among variables. These variables, in turn, can be measured, typically on instruments, so that numbered data can be analysed using statistical procedures. On the basis of this definition, the researcher determined the relationship between Northern Sotho selected first language speakers, considering their perspectives regarding the designation of two different language names to refer to one official standard language. Thereafter, the researcher provided full statistics of those who prefer Sesotho sa Leboa and those of who prefer Sepedi as a language name.

Based on the work of Creswell (2014) and Kumar (2014) the findings of the research relied much on the interpretation of the data by the researcher. Therefore, it was of paramount importance for the researcher to be objective during the analysis of data and to also avoid misinterpretation of data. The collected data in this study were calculated and presented by numbers and statistics, mostly in the form of a mean presenting feedback by the respondents without any personal bias.
3.5.3 A mixed-methods research approach

Creswell (2014: 217) provides a clear background of the mixed-methods approach, stating that it can be seen as a new methodology originating around the late 1980s and early 1990s based on work from individuals in diverse fields such as education, management, sociology, and health sciences.

Teddie and Tashakkori (2009) as cited by Kumar (2014: 19) are of perspective that the mixed methods research tradition is less well-known than the quantitative or qualitative traditions because it has emerged as a separate orientation during only the past twenty years. Furthermore, it is more than a methodology but a philosophy that has come to be recognised as an approach.

In a more practical sense, McMillan and Schumacher (2010: 25) assert that the use of a mixed-method research design, which combines quantitative and qualitative methods, is becoming increasingly popular, simply because the use of both approaches together can provide a more complete investigation. The researcher shares McMillan and Schumacher’s (2010) perspective as the primary aim of this study is to come up with a complete investigation.

Mixed-methods research is defined by Creswell (2014: 4) as an approach to inquire involving collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, integrating them, and using distinct designs that may involve philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks. Furthermore, (ibid.) the core assumptions of this form of inquiry are that the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a more complete understanding of a research problem than either approach alone.

Kumar (2014: 14) concurs that the mixed-methods approach uses the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research. It aims to select the best methods, regardless of the qualitative-quantitative divide and to find answers to the research questions.

Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) in De Vos, et al., (2011: 434) hold the perspective that mixed-method research is a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions to guide the
direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in the research process.

This is confirmed by Creswel and Clark (2007) as cited by De Vos et al, (2011: 435) that the mixing of data is a unique element of mixed-methods research, primarily because it is not enough to simply collect and analyse quantitative and qualitative data; they need to be mixed so that together they form a more complete picture of the research problem.

In taking into consideration the work of Teddie and Tashakkori (2009), Creswell (2014) and Kumar (2014), the researcher used both the qualitative and quantitative data in order to get a thorough or more complete understanding of the respondents’ feedback regarding the designation of two different names used as one of the official languages of South Africa. This is confirmed by Creswell and Clark (2007: 6-9), who observe that mixed-methods research involves a researcher collecting both numeric and textual information. Furthermore, the core assumption of this form of inquiry is that the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a more complete understanding of a research problem than either approach alone (Creswell 2014: 4).

Creswell (2014: 217) mentions that, for the fact that mixed-methods research is relatively new in the social and human sciences as a distinct research approach, it is useful to convey a basic definition and description of the approach in a method section of a proposal. A complete set of core characteristics that describe mixed-methods follow next:

- It involves the collection of both qualitative (open-ended) and quantitative (closed-ended) data in response to research questions or hypotheses;
- It includes the analysis of both forms of data;
- The procedures for both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis need to be conducted rigorously;
- The two forms of data are integrated in the design analysis through merging the data, connecting the data, or embedding the data; and
- These procedures can also be informed by a philosophical world-view or a theory (Creswell, 2014: 217).
These outlined characteristics of the mixed-methods research approach guarantee the researcher to expect the data outcome of a high standard. Creswell (2014: 218) further outlines the value and rationale for the choice of mixed-methods in three different levels:

- At a general level, it is chosen because of its strength of drawing on both approaches and minimising the limitations of both approaches;
- At a practical level, it provides a sophisticated, complex approach to research that appeals to those on the forefront of new research procedures; and
- At a procedural level, it is a useful strategy to have a more complete understanding of research problems or questions.

3.6 Data sampling and population

A focus of this chapter is to define population and sampling and also to outline the manner in which the targeted population was sampled. The researcher could not accommodate the entire Northern Sotho first language speakers to participate in the study. Therefore, the targeted population needed to be sampled into a manageable number.

3.6.1 Sampling

In the main research endeavour; it is imperative that researchers understand sampling clearly before selecting a sampling plan (De Vos, et al. 2011: 222-223). Kumar (2014: 229-300) views sampling as a process of selecting a few (a sample) from a bigger group as the basis for estimating the prevalence of an unknown piece of information, situation or outcome regarding the bigger group. Therefore, a sample is a subgroup of the population that one is interested in.

De Vos et al. (2011: 434) emphasise that sampling is described as taking a portion of a population or universe and considering it representative of that particular population or universe. Generalising the results of a study based on working with such a sample means that it is assumed that any other portion of the same population would yield the same observations. Sampling is done to increase the feasibility, cost effectiveness, accuracy and manageability of the prospective survey.
This is confirmed by Unrau, Gabor and Grinnell (2007) as cited by De Vos, et al. (2011: 223) that a sample comprises of a subset of the population considered for actual inclusion in the study, or it can be viewed as a subset of measurement drawn from a population in which one is interested.

Bless et al. (2013: 161) hold the perspective that sampling is the scientific foundation of everyday practice. It is a technical accounting device to rationalise the collection of information, to choose an appropriate way in which to restrict the set of objects, persons or events from which the actual information will be drawn. Furthermore, instead of examining every single member or element of the group, it is possible to reach accurate information by examining only a portion of the total group. This kind of assessment is only used in both the social and natural sciences.

Bless et al. (2013: 161) mention the main advantages of sampling, as compared to the collection of data on the whole population, as follows:

- Gathering data on sample is less time consuming. If a student population numbers 4 000 it would take a researcher at least 4 000 hours to conduct a one-hour interview with each student whereas it would take only 200 hours, or 5% of the time, to interview a sample of 200 students;
- Gathering data on a sample is less costly since the costs of research are proportional to the number of hours spent on data collection; and
- Sampling is a practical way of collecting data when the population is infinite or extremely large, thus making a study of all its elements impossible.

Kerlinger and Lee (2000) as cited by (De Vos, et al 2011: 223) offer the following comments that may be helpful initial attempts at understanding the concept of sampling. They emphasise that in order to learn something about people, for instance, the researcher can take several people whom he knows or do not know and study them, and after the study, he will come to certain conclusions, often about people in general.

The researcher concurs with scholars such as Unrau et al. (2007); De Vos, et al. (2011); Bless, et al. (2013); and Kumar (2014) in a sense that a sample is a small portion of the total number of objects, events or persons from which a representative selection is made. In a more
practical sense, this is the group which is prioritised by the researcher to participate in the study.

### 3.6.1.1 Sampling technique

Sampling according to Bertram and Christiansen (2014: 207) involves making decisions about which people, settings, events or behaviours to include in the study. However, decisions also have to be made as to what sampling technique to use.

Quota sampling is used when the researcher is unable to take a probability sample but is still able to select subjects on the basis of characteristics of the population. Certain quotas are established so that the sample represents the population according to these characteristics (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010: 138).

Quota sampling is defined by Babbie (2014: 201) as a type of sampling in which units are selected into a sample on the basis of pre-specified characteristics, so that the total sample will have the same distribution of characteristics assumed to exist in the population being studied.

Babbie (2014: 201) mentions that like probability sampling, quota sampling addresses the issue of representativeness, although the two methods approach the issue differently. Therefore, quota sampling begins with a matrix, or table, describing the characteristics of the target population. De Vos, et al. (2011: 230) observe that this type of sampling is suitable for heterogeneous populations, because the inclusion of small subgroups can be ensured. Furthermore, stratification applies here since (ibid.); it consists of the universe being divided into a number of strata which are mutually exclusive, and the members of which are homogeneous with regard to some characteristics such as gender, home language and level of education.

The main purpose of a quota sampling is stretched by Bless et al. (2013: 173), the primary aim being to draw a sample that has the same proportions of characteristics as the population. However, the sampling procedure, instead of relying on random selection, relies on convenience, this simply means that this method is often more convenient and economical than purposeful sampling. This is confirmed by De Vos, et al. (2011: 232), that quota
samples are often used by market researchers and their main purpose is to draw a sample that is as close to a replica of the population as possible.

McMillan and Schumacher (2010: 140) highlight some of the crucial strengths of quota sampling technique as less costly and time-consuming. It is also easy to administrate; it ensures high participation rates; make generalisation to similar subjects and tends to provide more representative samples.

According to the researcher, it can be assumed, based on the work of scholars such as McMillan & Schumacher (2010), De Vos et al. (2011), Bless et al. (2013), and Babbie (2014) that a quota sampling technique tends to be more productive than other sampling methods such as purposeful sampling, for instance. Therefore, the researcher is of perspective that the quota sampling technique will best suit the nature of the study, more especially within the context that the primary aim of this study is to investigate the view of first language speakers who are university students and lecturers, linguistically, socially and culturally, about their preferred language designation for the Northern Sotho language.

3.6.2 Population

The word population is used to mean the total number of people, groups or organisations that could be included in a study (Bertram & Christiansen; 2014: 59). The sample population of this study consisted of participants who were Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers from two selected South African universities: A University of Technology in Pretoria (A), and A University in Limpopo (B). The sample consisted of hundred participants; the target group varying from the age group of seventeen to seventy five. From University A, twenty-seven (27) respondents were National Diploma Language Practice students; eighteen (18) respondents were B-Tech students; and four (4) were lecturers; all affiliated to the Department of Languages. From University B, thirty (30) respondents were undergraduate students enrolled for the following qualifications: BA in Languages (13), BA in Translation Studies and Linguistics (11) and BA in Media Studies (7); Honours in Northern Sotho (9) and Honours in Media Studies (5); lecturers affiliated to the School of Languages and Communication Studies (3); lecturers affiliated to the School of Education (3). As far as gender is concerned, 64% were female and 36% were male participants. The following tables indicate a sample of participants who participated in this study.
Table 1: Total number of students who participated in the form of structured questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme enrolled for</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>University of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Diploma in Language Practice</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Tech in Language Practice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Languages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Media Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Translation and Linguistics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours in Media Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours in Northern Sotho</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Total number of lecturers who participated in the form of structured questionnaires and in face-to-face interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course(s) responsible for</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi in School of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho sa Leboa in School of Languages and Communication Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Research instruments

Bless et al. (2013: 193) mention that there are many possible ways of gathering information or methods of collecting data directly from participants if such information cannot be obtained from observation. Furthermore, these methods all have advantages and disadvantages.
It is crucial to employ research instruments so that the responses from participants can correlate with the research questions and aims of the investigation. For the purpose of this study, questionnaires and interviews were used as methods of gathering data.

Furthermore, text analysis using documents such as year books, study guides, prospectuses, academic transcripts, names of academic departments and language policy of the selected universities were also incorporated (as covered in Chapter 2) in order to supplement the research data collection tools.

### 3.7.1 Questionnaires (qualitative and quantitative research instruments)

Babbie (2014: 262) is of the opinion that a questionnaire is a document containing questions and other types of items designed to elicit information appropriate for analysis. Furthermore, questionnaires were used, as they are primarily used in survey research, experiments, field research and other modes of observation.

Kumar (2014: 178) posits that a questionnaire is a list of questions, the answers to which are recorded by respondents. There is no one to explain the meaning of the questions to respondents; it is thus vital that the questions are clear and easy to understand. A questionnaire should be developed in an interactive style, implying that respondents feel as though someone is talking to them.

Furthermore, Bertram and Christiansen (2014: 73) state that the questions which the respondents answer can either be close-ended or open-ended questions; close-ended questions are questions where respondents must choose answers from given particular possible answers. Open-ended questions are the ones that allow the participants to motivate and justify their answers by supplying reasons.

For the purpose of this study, both closed-ended and open-ended questions were used in the construction of questionnaires.

In Section A of the survey questionnaire (see Addendum 1) the following demographic information was sought by means of the closed-ended option from students and lecturers as respondents: gender, age range, highest qualification, level of study of students, university
affiliation as students and lecturers, dialect of Northern Sotho spoken, and district and province of origin. On the other hand open-ended questions were used, primarily because the researcher wanted to know which language name (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) was preferred by the first language speakers who academically study the Northern Sotho language as main module or lecturers who lecture it and why the chosen name was important to them, eliciting their sociolinguistic views on language identity and attitude.

Babbie (2014: 262) highlights that researchers need to take into considerations the following elements when asking questions:

- Items must be clear;
- Double-barreled questions should be avoided;
- Ambiguous questions should be avoided;
- Respondents must be competent; and
- Respondents should be willing to answer.

Richards, et al. (2010); McMillan and Schumacher (2010); Bless et al. (2013); Kumar (2014); and Babbie (2014) state that sometimes respondents may underestimate the importance of the study during participation due to laziness or tiredness. Therefore, it is the duty of the researcher to ensure that questions are structured in a way that it will allow for easy completion by respondents. Therefore, the researcher may also repeat some of the questions in a different manner as this is one of the strategies of checking answers and the honesty of respondents.

Bless et al. (2013: 204) mention that a self-administered questionnaire should never be of such a length that respondents become tired to the point of refusing to collaborate; if this happens, they will use any means to end the exercise, thus reducing the quality of their answers. The researcher ensured that questions were structured in such a way that long, ambiguous and complex questions were avoided, making it quite easy for the respondents to comprehend and respond.

In taking into consideration the work of Bless et al. (2013), the researcher found it vital that before administering questionnaires to the selected population, five Northern Sotho speaking
students had to answer questions in the questionnaire to test their understanding of the questions posed.

### 3.7.1.1 Structured questionnaire

Bertram and Christiansen (2014: 74) are of perspective that a highly structured questionnaire which has closed-ended questions makes it possible to count how many answers are given in each category, with a quantity of data. These can be analysed using statistical methods. Therefore, the researcher agrees with Bertram and Christiansen (2014) in a sense that close-ended questions are useful, more especially within the context where a large number of respondents participated in the study (100). Since the researcher wanted to find quantifiable information regarding the views of the entire selected population, he opted for a Likert scale questionnaire.

According to Richards, et al. (2010: 346), the Likert scale is a rating scale with statements or numerical steps representing an order of magnitude ranging from low to high. Likert scales are often used on surveys of attitudes. Thus it proved to be a valuable research tool for this study, since the attitudes of the Northern Sotho speakers towards the dual language name were tested. McMillan and Schumacher (2010: 198) concurs that Likert scale questioning is a method in which the stem includes a value or direction and the respondent indicates agreement or disagreement with the statement. Furthermore, Likert-type items use different responses scales, of which the stem can be either neutral or directional. In a more practical sense, a Likert Scale structured questionnaire was used in the study to allow and capture the views and attitudes of the Northern Sotho speaking students and lecturers from two selected South African universities (A and B).

Structured questionnaires were thus best for this kind of research since the primary goal was to find out which language name (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) was preferred by a large number (100) of first language speaking students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language.
3.7.2 Interviews (qualitative research instrument)

For the purpose of this study, only ten participants were interviewed and recorded, more especially within the context that some may not have been be able to respond positively in writing but they could then have been be able to articulate their understanding, sociolinguistic views and attitudes orally. In this study, only ten lecturers of the Northern Sotho language from selected South African universities (A and B) were interviewed and recorded regarding their viewpoints and experience about the designation of the Northern Sotho official language. The researcher points out that the fundamental reason of involving lecturers only, in interviews, was based on their (socio)linguistic and language planning knowledge and their teaching experience in African languages.

Babbie (2014: 281) is of perspective that interview is an alternative method of data collection. Rather than asking respondent to read questionnaires and enter their own answers, researchers send interviewers to ask questions orally and to record respondents’ answers. Furthermore, ‘interview’ is defined by Babbie (2014: 281) as a data collection encounter in which one person (an interviewer) asks questions of another (a respondent).

De Vos et al. (2011: 342) mention that the interview is a social relationship designed to exchange information between the participant and the researcher. Therefore, the quantity and quality of information exchanged depend on how astute and creative the interviewer is at understanding and managing this relationship (Monette, Sullivan & DeJong 2005) as cited by (De Vos et al., 2011: 342).

This is confirmed by Lindlof and Taylor (2002) as cited by Sekere (2004: 17) that interviews provide accounts of people’s experiences, offer explanations of behaviour, to enable the researcher to understand native conceptualisations of communication and elicit the language forms used by social actors in natural settings. The qualitative interview is more focused on eliciting the interviewee’s point of view than confirming the researcher’s fixed options.

Bless et al. (2013: 192) observe that the interview involves direct personal contact with the participant who is asked to answer questions relating to the research problem. Furthermore, one way of getting people to express their views is the non-scheduled interview, which consists of asking respondents to comment on broadly defined issues. Those who are interviewed are free to expand on the topic as they see fit, to focus on particular aspects, to
relate their experiences, and so on. It is because of these involved, communicative and opinionated aspects mentioned above that the researcher has opted for face-to-face interviews with lecturers in this research.

However, there are a number of precautions the researcher or interviewer should take into consideration before conducting interviews. They are mentioned next:

- The time and venue must be convenient to respondents;
- Long interviews at places of work, during short lunch or on the street can be regarded as disturbing to busy interviewees;
- Interviews may be more acceptable when done after working hours at the home of participant, provided that the interviewee accepts the venue, and thus concentrates on the interview;
- The majority of participants prefer privacy, i.e. that other people do not listen to their answers;
- Cooperation of respondents should be gained by following official permission procedures and support, such as from relevant authorities, and by explaining the aim and relevance of the research; and
- The language and vocabulary should be adapted to suit the level of the respondent (Bless et al., 2013: 204).

The researcher took note of the above precautions but still felt that there are more advantages than disadvantages in conducting interviews. It is vital to conduct interviews since a more representative result in the study can be expected after utilising both closed-ended questionnaires and interviews. Furthermore, the researcher assured that the needs and comfort of the interviewees were taken into consideration during the process of data collection (Also see ethics documentation in Addendum 4).

Kumar (2014) explains that interviewing is a commonly used method of collecting data from people. Furthermore, there are many definitions of interviews, but it is essentially a person-to-person interaction, either face-to-face or otherwise, between two or more individuals with a specific purpose in mind. Burns (1997) as cited by Kumar (2014: 177) views an interview as a verbal interchange, often face-to-face, though the telephone may be used, in which an interviewer tries to elicit information, beliefs or opinions from another person. In accordance
with Kumar (2014) and Burns (1997) the researcher found it vital to outline that since there were different types of interviews, the structured interview was used in this study.

### 3.7.2.1 Structured interviews

Kumar (2014: 178) points out that in a structured interview, the researcher asks a predetermined set of questions, using the same wording and order of questions as specified in the interview schedule. Kumar (2014) further states that one of the main advantages of the structured interview is that it provides uniform information, which assures the comparability of data. Furthermore, structured interviewing requires fewer interviewing skills than does unstructured interviewing.

### 3.8 Validity and reliability

Kvale (1996) as cited by Bertram and Christiansen (2014: 187) describe the concepts of generalisability, reliability and validity as the “holy trinity” to be worshipped with respect by all true believers in science. This means that concepts have a very strong hold over us. The researcher observed that it was crucial to check the trustworthiness of the findings and also to check if the findings of the study reflected reality. Therefore, in order to determine the credibility of the study, the concepts of validity and reliability needed to be taken into consideration.

#### 3.8.1 Validity

Bertram and Christiansen (2014: 185) stretch that when we refer to something “valid” in our daily conversations, we often mean that it is sound or justifiable. This means validity for the postpositivist researcher is about how close to the truth about the world the research is, a concern throughout is objectivity. Therefore, in accordance with Bertram and Christiansen (2014), it is the duty of the researcher to ensure that the research is not biased, more especially in terms of data collection, interpretation, and in generalising findings.

Smith (1991) as cited by Kumar (2014: 213) state that validity is the ability of an instrument to measure what it is designed to measure; validity is also defined as the degree to which the researcher has measured what he has set out to measure. This is emphasised by Kerlinger
(1973) as cited by Kumar (2014: 213) that the commonest definition of validity is epitomised by the question.

Babbie (2007) as cited by De Vos et al. (2011: 172), reasons that the concept of validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration. This is confirmed by Salkind (2006) as cited by Fouche et al. (2011: 172) that validity refers to the truthfulness, accuracy, authenticity, genuineness and soundness.

It can be assumed, based on the work of Smith (1991), Salkind (2006), Babbie (2007) and Bertram and Christiansen (2014) that it is of paramount importance for the study to have accurate information which is reflecting the practical world so that the interpretation of the findings can also be of a realistic nature. Due to the practical nature of the study, the researcher used pragmatism research paradigm.

### 3.8.2 Reliability

Kumar (2014: 215) is of the perspective that the concept of reliability in relation to a research instrument has a similar meaning if a research tool is consistent and stable, hence predictable and accurate. Furthermore, Kumar (2014: 216) maintains that it is impossible to have a research tool which is 100% accurate in the social sciences, because it is impossible to control the factors affecting reliability, some of these including the wording of questions; the physical setting; the respondent’s mood; the interviewer's mood and the nature of interaction.

Considering the work of Kumar (2014), the researcher attempted to ensure that even if it was impossible to control these factors in terms of reliability, it was pivotal to avoid ambiguous statements, maintain consistency in terms of the physical setting and also to establish a good rapport with the respondents.

This is confirmed by Bertram and Christiansen (2014: 186) that the notion of reliability is particularly applicable to experimental research, when researchers would perform the same experiment over and over again, to ensure that the same results were achieved each time. Furthermore, it is standard research practice to replicate experiments or surveys from one
country in another to see if the findings will be the same so that they can be generalised to ever-increasing populations and considered one step closer to being universal.

The researcher assures that in order to obtain reliability in this study, comparative data analysis will be done to see if the findings at a University of Technology in Pretoria (A) would correspond with the findings at a University in Limpopo (B) since data were collected at both universities.

3.9 Ethical issues

Bless et al. (2013: 28) mention that the word ‘ethics’ is derived from the Greek word *ethos*, meaning one’s character or disposition. It is related to term ‘morality,’ derived from the Latin word ‘*moralis*’, meaning one’s manners or character. Furthermore, a moral issue is concerned with whether behaviour is right or wrong, whereas an ethical issue is concerned with whether the behaviour conforms to a code or a set of principles.

Research should be based on mutual trust, acceptance, cooperation, promises and well acceptable conventions and expectations between all parties (in most cases, the relationship between the researcher and participants) in a research project (De Vos et al. 2011: 113). Furthermore, De Vos et al (*ibid.*) advocate that since human beings are the objects of study in the social sciences, the ethical issues are pervasive and complex and data should never be obtained at the expense of human beings.

The study of ethics helps to prevent research abuse and assists investigators in understanding their responsibilities as ethical scholars. Therefore, research ethics places an emphasis on the humane and sensitive treatment of research participants, who may be placed at varying degrees of risk by research procedures; it is always the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that his or her research is ethically conducted and before a single participant is conducted, the researcher must ensure that the research plan can pass an ethical evaluation (De Vos et al., 2011: 28).

In taking into consideration the work of De Vos et al. (2011) and Bless et al. (2013), the researcher concurs with them in a sense that the research proposal and research instruments (questionnaire and interview questions) were submitted to a university of technology’s (A)
Research Ethics Committee for approval. A university in Limpopo (B) also requested the researcher to submit the research proposal including research instruments (questionnaires and interview questions) for approval. Furthermore, the researcher was also given a gate keeping permission for security and safety reasons.

3.9.1 Harm to respondents

Babbie (2007) as cited by De Vos et al. (2011: 115) agree that the fundamental ethical rule of social research is that it must neither bring harm to participants nor harm to respondents in the social sciences being mainly of an emotional nature, although physical injury cannot be ruled out completely. Furthermore, Creswell (2003) as cited by De Vos et al. (2011: 115) mentions that the researcher has an ethical obligation to protect participants within all possible limits from any form of physical or emotional discomfort that may emerge from the research project. Emotional harm to subjects is often more difficult to determine than physical discomfort, but often has more far-reaching consequences for respondents.

Respondents in this research were treated in such a way that both physical and emotional discomfort were ruled out, primarily because data collection methods were structured in such a way that it was easy for participants to comprehend questions and there were no personal questions.

3.9.2 Voluntary participation

Participants have a right to know what the research is about, how it will affect them, the risks and benefits of participation, and the fact that they have the right to decline to participate or discontinue their participation at any time during the process if they choose to do so (Bless et al., 2013: 32). Usually a researcher or an assistant will take some time to explain to participants what is required of them in terms of participation. This is emphasised by Rubin and Babbie (2005) as cited by Fouche et al. (2011: 116) that participation should at all times be voluntary and no one should be forced to participate in a study. In accordance with Bless et al. (2013) and Rubin & Babbie (2005) as cited by De Vos et al. (2011: 116), the researcher reminded the respondents that their participation was fully voluntarily and that they could withdraw at any time without even giving a reason. See ethics in Addendum 3.
3.9.3 **Informed consent**

Obtaining informed consent implies that all possible information on the goal of the investigation; the expected duration of the participant’s involvement; the procedures which will be followed; the possible advantages to which respondents may be exposed as well as the credibility of the researcher should be rendered to potential subjects (Royse 2004; William, Trusty & Grinnell 1995) as cited by Fouche et al. (2012: 117).

This is emphasised by Kumar (2014: 285) that in every discipline, it is considered unethical to collect information without the knowledge of participants, and their expressed willingness and informed consent. In this research the respondents were supplied with information leaflets in order for them to understand the nature of the study and to be familiar with the terms and conditions of the study. Thereafter, the researcher requested the respondents to sign an informed consent form, which is an indication that they indeed understood what was explained to them or to ensure that they agreed with terms of the study (See information leaflet and consent form in Addendum 3).

3.9.4 **Anonymity and confidentiality**

Babbie (2014: 68) distinguishes between anonymity and confidentiality and believes that confidentiality implies that only the researcher and possibly a few members of the staff should be aware of the identity of participants, and that the staff should also make a commitment with regard to confidentiality and anonymity, which means that no one, including the researcher or study leaders/supervisors, should be able to identify any of the subject afterwards.

This is confirmed by Kumar (2014: 286) that sharing information about a respondent for purposes other than research is unethical. Sometimes one needs to identify one’s study population in order to put one’s findings into context. Furthermore, it is the duty of the researcher that after the information has been collected, its source cannot be identified.

In taking into consideration the work of Babbie (2014) and Kumar (2014) the researcher ensured that the responses from the respondents would be regarded as confidential at all times. It was also not required for them to provide their surnames and full names. When
reporting about research, the researcher used letter codes to refer to certain respondents for data analysis. The researcher assured the respondents that the only people who were going to have access to the participants’ responses were the primary researcher and the study supervisors. The fieldworker assistant was also involved in order to manage the conflict of interest as far as the researcher was concerned, the latter being associated with one of the universities. However, she was reminded about the terms and conditions of being a fieldworker assistant and a mutual contract of agreement was signed in accordance with ethical clearance and confidentiality (See the signed agreement between researcher and fieldworker assistant in Addendum 5).

3.9.5 Compensation

The respondents were reminded by the researcher that no financial payment would be made after their participation but he assured the participants that the findings and recommendations of the study would benefit respondents in terms of further research and also the future Northern Sotho generation. See Addendum 3.

3.10 Data analysis

The primary goal of this chapter was to analyse the collected data form the research instruments which were used in this study, namely, survey structured questionnaires and interviews. On the other hand, De Vos et al. (2011: 385) advocate that when the processing of the data is completed, the validity and reliability of the material should be established in order to respond as objectively as possible to the research questions formulated at the beginning of the study. Therefore, the collected data can also be compared with the findings of other researchers.

Data analysis in this mixed-methods research consisted of analysing the quantitative data using quantitative methods, and qualitative methods and procedures. Furthermore, it also involved the processes whereby quantitative and qualitative data analysis strategies were combined, connected or integrated as suggested by (De Vos et al. 2011: 447) for research studies.
Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) as cited by De Vos et al. (2011: 447) describe in a nutshell, seven data analysis stages that a researcher should follow in analysing mixed-methods data, namely:

- Data reduction, which involves reducing the dimensionality of the qualitative data (e.g. via exploratory thematic analysis, memoing) and quantitative data (e.g. via descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis, cluster analysis);
- Data display, which involves describing pictorially the qualitative data (e.g. matrices, charts, graphs, networks, lists and rubrics) and quantitative data (e.g. table, graphs);
- Data transformation, where quantitative data are converted into narrative data that can be analysed qualitatively, and qualitative data are converted into numerical codes that can be represented statistically;
- Data correlation, which involves the quantitative data being data integration correlated with the qualitised data, or the qualitative data being correlated with the quantitised data;
- Data consolidation, wherein both quantitative and qualitative data are combined to create new consolidated variables;
- Data comparison, which involves comparing data from the qualitative and quantitative data sources; and
- Data integration, whereby both qualitative and quantitative data are integrated into either a coherent whole or two separates sets (qualitative and quantitative) of coherent wholes (De Vos et al., 2011: 447).

Therefore, the researcher agrees with the above-mentioned suggestions that since both qualitative and quantitative data were collected in this study, qualitative data were analysed qualitatively and quantitative data were analysed statistically using graphs, pie charts and codes to indicate and calculate the responses from the participants. Thereafter, qualitative data would be incorporated narratively.

3.10.2 Questionnaire responses

In the case of structured questionnaires, the researcher used descriptive analysis to analyse the collected data. An excel spreadsheet was used to capture data and therefore analysed mathematically and statistically by the researcher. Thereafter, the researcher made out
meaning by means of findings of the interpreted data. Since Sections C (see Addendum 1) of the questionnaire contained open-ended questions, some participants were directly quoted to support the general interpretation of the researcher. Thereafter, all the open-ended responses from the participants were sorted out into three steps in order to formulate the qualitative themes which were synthesised and discussed.

3.10.3 Interview responses

Lindlof and Taylor (2002) in Sekere (2004: 17) advocate that interviews provide accounts of people’s experiences, offer explanations of behaviour; enable the researcher to understand native conceptualisations of communication and elicit the language forms used by social factors in natural settings. The researcher then analysed and interpreted viewpoints of the participants so that a more complete answer to the research problem could be formulated.

In a more practical sense, the researcher generalised the participants’ perspectives but at some point, some participants were directly quoted, more especially within the context where the researcher wanted to match the interview question and his interpretation, as well as the participants’ responses.

3.11 Field problems

The researcher encountered problems of ethics approval at some targeted universities such as a correspondence university in Pretoria, a full-time university in Pretoria and at a full-time university in Venda, primarily because the authorities of language departments mentioned, in broad terms, reasoned that the debate on the correct language name is quite sensitive, sociolinguistically and constitutionally wise. However, some lecturers at some of the universities which were excluded in this study, were interested to participate in the investigation. The researcher could not interview them in their personal capacities without their institutions' approval and also because their students should also have been part of the study. Furthermore, the researcher was not allowed to collect data at a university of technology in Pretoria (A) taking into consideration that he was one of the academic staff members at the university. A research assistant therefore had to be appointed in order to administer questionnaires and interview questions. However, the researcher held the
perspective that it would have been better if he as primary researcher with a better understanding of the study, he had asked follow-up questions during the interviews.

### 3.11 Summary

The focus of this chapter was to outline the research methods which were used in this study. The sample population and sampling techniques were also explained as well as research instruments and methods of data collection. Furthermore, the capturing of quantitative data and their presentation in the form of pie charts and graphs were also mentioned. The process of incorporating quantitative and qualitative data as part of the mixed-method approach was also elaborated on. From the qualitative data, main themes would emerge and these would then be discussed qualitatively and synthesised in Chapter 4. Ethical issues and filed problems related to this research were also elaborated on.
CHAPTER 4

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The primary focus of this chapter is to discuss the findings of the study. Structured questionnaires (see Addendum 1) and face-to-face interviews (see Addendum 2) were employed as methods of data collection and the responses from respondents are thoroughly discussed in this chapter. This study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods, following the mixed-methods approach for data representation and discussion of findings. This process involved collecting data, originating from the responses of respondents from two tertiary institutions (A and B), and then analysing and comparing data in order to determine the outcome of the research.

The purpose of this study was to determine a sociolinguistic perspective of Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers from two selected South African universities which comprise a university of technology in Pretoria (A) and a university in Limpopo (B). Specifically students who were doing Northern Sotho as a first language module within different programs and Northern Sotho lecturers were part of this research regarding their views on the preferred language name since there were two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) referring to one language. Furthermore, their views were analysed based on identified sociolinguistic strategies contained in the questionnaire and interview responses.

In taking into consideration that South Africa is a multicultural and multilingual country, it is pivotal for African languages to be developed. Therefore, the researcher is of the perspective that before a language can be developed further, the issue of an official language name needs to be taken into consideration so that speakers of that particular speech community may be able to exercise their linguistic and identity right without any doubt. In the case of the Northern Sotho language, it appears as if some ethnic and language identity are lost due to the fact of two different, parallel language names. Within the multilingual context of all South African official languages, it is only Northern Sotho language speakers who use two different language names referring to one official language. It is vitally important to highlight
that the language is already standardised, and known as Sepedi in the South African constitution. However, be it Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa, the language content is the same but problem is the issue of using two different language names in official documents, publications and in general communication.

4.2 Questionnaire analysis based on students’ and lecturers’ responses

Hundred structured questionnaires were completed by students who were then doing Northern Sotho as a first language or as an applied language from six different qualifications ranging from first year, second year, third year, to B-Tech level and Honours level and the Northern Sotho lecturers from selected South African universities which were university of technology in Pretoria (A) and a full-time university in Limpopo (B).

Both the students’ and lecturers’ respondents were supplied with the English and Northern Sotho translated questionnaires to ensure that they responded in the language that they were comfortable with. It is crucial to point out that only 3% of the students’ respondent chose to respond to the Northern Sotho questionnaires whereas 97% of the respondents responded to the English questionnaire.

The presentation and analysis of lecturers’ responses were separated or combined, where applicable, from those of the students. Section A (demographic information) and Section B (Likert scale questionnaire) of the students and lecturers’ responses were not be separated.

See Addendum 1. However, particularly Section C in Addendum 1 is a survey on 'language name preference', directed to students, while Section D) contains interview questions directed to lecturers.

4.2.1 Analysis of Section A: Biographical information of student and lecturer respondents

The fundamental objective of this section is to indicate the respondents’ gender, age, highest qualification and level of study, the name of qualification enrolled for, the name of the institution attended, the dialect, district and province of the students’ respondents. This section was calculated and presented quantitatively.
4.2.1.1 Gender distribution of student and lecturer respondents

Since gender was taken into consideration when collecting data, out of hundred respondents who took part in this study, 64 respondents (64%) were female and 32 respondents (36%) were male. The females were in the majority, since the number of students enrolled for the module Northern Sotho as first language in different programmes were more than the male students. Figure 1 indicates the gender distribution of students:

![Gender distribution chart]

**Figure 1: Gender distribution of student and lecturer respondents**

4.2.1.2 Age distribution of student and lecturer respondents

The respondents were 22 (22%) students between the ages of 17-21 years, 51 (51%) students between the ages of 21-25 years, 13 (13%) students between the ages of 26-30 years, 4 (4%) students between the ages of 31-35 years and 10 (10%) were above 35. The following pie chart shows a clear view of age distribution of student and lecturer respondents:

![Age distribution chart]

**Figure 2: Age distribution of student and lecturer respondents**
4.2.1.3 Highest qualification of student and lecturer respondents

Of the 100 participating respondents, 57 (57%) students obtained matric which is their highest qualification, 33 (33%) students obtained a diploma/degree, 6 (6%) lecturers completed Master’s degrees and 4 (4%) lecturers completed Doctoral degrees. This means 57 (57%) students were working towards achieving their first university qualification and 33 (33%) students were working to achieve a B.Tech or Honours qualification. The researcher was of the perspective that based on the respondents’ level of education, their responses would be of a high level of integrity, especially within the context that some respondents had already completed their first university qualification. The assumption was also that lecturers with higher qualifications were already exposed to politics and language planning and would thus contribute sociolinguistically to the study. Figure 3 shows student and lecturer respondents’ highest qualification:

![Figure 3: Highest qualification of student and lecturer respondents](image)

4.2.1.4 Level of study of student and lecturer respondents

Of the 100 student and lecturer respondents in this study, 19 (19%) students were first year students, 19 (19%) were second year students, 19 (19%) were third year students, 33 (33%) were fourth year students (B.Tech/Honours students) and 6 (6%) lecturers were doctoral
students. The researcher was of perspective that a realistic study could be expected since the respondents were associated with competency, especially within the context that 33 (37%) of respondents completed their first diploma/degree qualification where Northern Sotho was one of the major subjects. Figure 4 below shows respondents’ level of study:

![Figure 4: Level of study of student and lecturer respondents](image)

4.2.1.5 Programme of study by student and respondents

The followings are the programmes of study of the student respondents: BA in Media Studies, BA in Languages, BA in Translation and Linguistics, Diploma in Language Practice, B.Tech in Language Practice, Honours in Media Studies and Honours in Northern Sotho. The researcher covered as wide a range of qualifications as possible in which Northern Sotho features as a module. It can be realised that 37% of respondents were postgraduate students of which the researcher found valuable on the assumption that they were already aware of the whole language issues, i.e. two different language names of the Northern Sotho language. Table 3 illustrates the divisions of students according to their respective qualifications:
Table 3: Programme enrolled for by student respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme enrolled for</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Language Practice</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Tech in Language Practice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Languages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Media Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in Translation and Linguistics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours in Media Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours in Northern Sotho</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.6 University affiliation of student and lecturer respondents

Since data were collected at both universities (University A and B), 45 (45%) students were the custodians of a University of Technology in Pretoria (A), 4 (4%) lecturers were from a university (A), 45 (45%) students were the custodians of a University in Limpopo (B), and 6 (6%) lecturers were from a University B as shown in Figure 5 below:

![Figure 5: University of student and lecturer respondents](image_url)
4.2.1.7 Dialect spoken by student and lecturer respondents

Of the hundred respondents, 18 (18%) respondents spoke the Lobedu dialect, 18 (18%) respondents spoke the Pedi dialect, 7 (7%) respondents spoke the Tlokwa dialect, 6 (6%) respondents spoke the Hananwa dialect, 11 (11%) respondents spoke the Molepo dialect, 2 (2%) respondents spoke the Pulana dialect, 5 (5%) respondents spoke the Tau dialect, 9 (9%) respondents spoke the Mamabolo dialect, 6 (6%) respondents spoke the Kone dialect, 9 (9%) respondents spoke the Tlhabine dialect, 5 (5%) respondents spoke the Kgaga dialect and 4 (4%) respondents spoke the Birwa dialect. This representation was significant for this study since a quite number of the Northern Sotho dialectal varieties were indicated as shown in Figure 6:

![Dialect spoken by student and lecturer respondents](image)

**Figure 6: Dialect spoken by student and lecturer respondents**

4.2.1.8 District distribution of student and lecturer respondents

Out of hundred student and lecturer respondents, 27 (27%) respondents belonged to the Mopani District, 35 (35%) respondents belonged to the Capricorn District, 24 (24%) respondents belonged to the Sekhukhune District, 4 (4%) respondents belonged to the Waterberg District, 3 (3%) respondents belonged to the Nkangala District, 5 (5%) respondents belonged to the Tshwane West District and 2 (2%) respondents belonged to the District 15. The different districts of origin indicated by the respondents were significant since they were quite representative of the Northern Sotho speech communities. It could be
realised that majority of the respondents were from the Capricorn District. Therefore, the researcher found it relevant since the Capricorn District is situated in the heart of Limpopo Province, the central point where the Northern Sotho language is spoken as shown in Figure 7 below:

![District distribution of student and lecturer respondents](image)

**Figure 7: District distribution of student and lecturer respondents**

### 4.2.1.9 Student and lecturer respondents’ province of origin

Northern Sotho is known as the language of Limpopo Province, formerly known as known Northern Province. It is also spoken in Mpumalanga and Gauteng provinces. 87 (87%) respondents belonged to Limpopo Province, 6 (6%) respondents belonged to Mpumalanga province and 7 (7%) respondents belonged to Gauteng Province. It can thus be inferred that the majority of student and lecturer respondents originated from the Limpopo Province. Therefore, the researcher found this interesting and relevant to this study since Northern Sotho is known as the language of Limpopo Province, geographically speaking, as also indicated in 2.9.1. It can also be realised as shown in Figure 8 below that the Northern Sotho language is also spoken in Mpumalanga and Gauteng Provinces:
4.3 Analysis of a Likert scale questionnaire (students and lecturers)

The primary aim of this section is to determine if respondents concur or disagree with the statements which are the perspectives (level descriptors) provided by the researcher regarding the linguistic dilemma of two different language names, which are Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa, referring to one official language. Thereafter, the respondents would indicate if they concurred or disagreed with the researcher’s statement by selecting 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 for each descriptor. 1 indicates strongly disagree, 2 indicates disagree, 3 indicates not sure, 4 indicates agree and 5 indicates strongly agree. Also see 3.7.1. The following statements are found in Section B of Addendum 1. The responses from students and lecturers were calculated quantitatively according to this structured Likert scale questionnaire and then analysed qualitatively.

4.3.1 Statement 1 (S1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 1</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There are two different language names referring to one official language which are Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement 1 revealed a high mean of 4.7 which implies the respondents strongly agreed with the statement that there are two different language names referring to one official language which are Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa. A high mean of 4.7 assured that respondents were competent enough to take part in the study since they were familiar with the names dilemma of the Northern Sotho language.

**4.3.2 Statement 2 (S2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 2</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The name of the language is important because it is part of one’s identity.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents agreed, and were more inclined towards strongly agree, with the statement that the name of the language is important since it is part and parcel of one’s identity, more especially within the context that a high mean score of 4.7 was reached. It was evident from the responses that the issue of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) for one language seemed unacceptable to the speakers of the Northern Sotho speech community, hampering unified identity. Therefore, this response could be linked to their loss of identity, sociolinguistically speaking (See also 2.5).

**4.3.3 Statement 3 (S3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 3</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. It is appropriate to have only one language name (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) for naming the official language.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents indicated that they agreed with the statement with a mean score of 4.3. The interpretation of this mean score was that respondents were indeed aware that there were two existing different language names which are Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa referring to one official language. Therefore, respondents were of the perspective that it was socially more appropriate to have only one official language name for the sake of sociolinguistic uniformity.
4.3.4 Statement 4 (S4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 4</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. It is not fair to the speakers of the Northern Sotho speech community to have two different language names in informative and descriptive documents as it causes confusion.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents scored a mean of 4.0 to S4 which simply means that they agreed with the unfairness of using two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) in informative and descriptive documents referring to one official language. It particularly applied to the Northern Sotho first language speakers, since all other 10 South African official languages have one designated name. It further implied that speakers felt that Northern Sotho should follow the same example set by other language groups.

4.3.5 Statement 5 (S4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 5</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. To assign someone with the name of a language which s/he does not approve, is like giving him a new surname on top of his/her surname.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 5 had a mean score of 4.1. This means respondents were agreeing with an opinion that to assign speakers with the name of a language which they did not approve of, was like giving them a new surname on top of their surname. This may lead to a two-sided interpretation, since the statement is not language or name specific. For example, some Northern Sotho speakers, especially those who are in favour of the name Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the official languages, felt insulted and at the same time inferior when they are called Bapedi; whereas those in favour of the name Sepedi may feel insulted too when referred to as Sesotho sa Leboa speakers. However, this statement dealt with the dissatisfaction of an unwanted language name being approved and not with the actual language name, whichever one it was. Dissatisfaction with the current dual language scenario was thus confirmed.
4.3.6 Statement 6 (S6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 6</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. It is contradictory to the Northern Sotho first language speaking students to have a matric certificate that reflects Sepedi and at the same time have a university academic transcript that reflects Sesotho sa Leboa/Northern Sotho.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents scored a high mean of 4.4 on Statement 6. S6 is a clear indication of a contradiction in terms of having a matric certificate and university transcript that reflected two different language names. This also becomes evident in school text books, several university year books, textbooks, study guides and prospectuses describing Northern Sotho courses. Also see 2.3. To some extent, it cannot be known by the general public if the content of the language offering covers the same field, or even that these two are one single language, especially to people who are not knowledgeable in the field of (South) African languages, linguistics over even national language policies.

4.3.7 Statement 7 (S7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 7</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. This confusion in language designation/naming does not suit a democratic country such as South Africa well.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents scored a high mean of 4.0 which means they agreed that the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) referring to one official language, especially in a democratic country such as South Africa, was not well suited. It can also be realised from this mean score that the confusion is still persisting as is the case to responses to S4, S5 and S6 earlier. This can imply that the issue of democracy is not clearly addressed.
4.3.8 Statement 8 (S8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 8</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Socially and culturally, the name which is preferred by the first language speakers should be respected.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 8 reached a mean score of 4.6 which means the respondents agreed, tending more towards strongly agree, that the name which is preferred by first language speakers should be respected. This mean score of 4.6 concurs with the process of standardisation which includes the processes of codification, selection, acceptance and elaboration. Also see 2.12. Therefore, it is evident that language authorities such as the Provincial Language Council (PLC), Sesotho sa Leboa National Language Body (SsLNLB) and Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) need to take into consideration the views of the first language speakers, even more so that of language scholars before finalising a decision on the language name. If proper procedures of standardisation are not followed, it will be seen as a form of disrespect to speech communities concerned with reference to the language name.

4.3.9 Statement 9 (S9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 9</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. All institutions (schools, universities, government departments, etc.) should adhere to the constitution of South Africa and not violate its language policy.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement 9 had a mean score of 4.5 which means the respondents agreed, tending more towards strongly agree, that what is stated in the South African constitution of 1996 should be respected by all institutions (schools, universities and government departments) and not violated. This is a contradiction in terms as this response is actually a positive response to adhere to the constitution, claiming respect for the name Sepedi, as it is indeed used in this official document (1996). However, responses to Q5 and Q6 (Section C) indicated that respondents claimed that Sepedi was a dialect and that Sesotho sa Leboa was the preferred language name respectively. It can be claimed that Section 6 (1) of the Constitution of South
Africa was right in terms of the response by respondents to S9, since it declares Sepedi as one of the official languages of South Africa.

The respondents actually agreed that they did not want to violate the constitution, accepting the name used in it, namely Sepedi and that this would also serve as the language of tuition in teaching the language, be it in schools, universities and other educational institutions. One could perhaps argue that the majority did not understand the context of the statement well, since they did not read or were aware of that relevant section dealing with this language in the constitution. However, their response in a wider sense, could also mean that if Sesotho sa Leboa was the language name, they would also respect its use in the constitution and its use in the educational domain.

4.3.10 Statement 10 (S10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 10</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The Constitution of South Africa should consider the language name that is preferred by the first language speakers of the Northern Sotho language only if their case is reasonable and justifiable.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents scored a mean of 4.4 which means they agreed that the needs of Northern Sotho first language speakers within their different speech communities should be considered by the compilers of the constitution. As far as institutions (schools, universities and government departments) are concerned, they should adhere to the constitution; it represents the needs of the Northern Sotho speech community. This means, the current language name which is preferred by the Northern Sotho speech community should be taken into consideration, more especially within the context where their case is reasonable and justifiable (actually sociolinguistically wise). However, responses to Q5 and Q6 (Section C) may have indicated the respondents’ needs, i.e. that Sepedi was a dialect and Sesotho sa Leboa was the preferred language name respectively. It should be stated that the constitution is not a working document and cannot change overnight and if the name were to be changed from Sepedi to Sesotho sa Leboa, for instance, it would be a long cumbersome legal process of debate and consultation with speakers of the Northern Sotho, language experts as well as language authorities.
4.3.11 Statement 11 (S11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT 11</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. All organisations should use the same language name in order to maintain consistency and encourage development of the language.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents scored a mean score of 4.4 as they agreed with the fact that consistency should be maintained, implying that one language name be used in future. This may improve the image of the Northern Sotho speech community and enhance its development. Such development and consistency are vital for the maintenance of this or any language. Continually arguing about the problem of using two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) brings to the fore the need for language authorities to discuss the problem with language and community interest groups, especially in the basic and higher educational discourse where one name should be used to prevent the current confusion in educational support material such as textbooks, study guides, prospectuses, etc. where any one of the two names are used at random. Also see S5 earlier.

4.4. Analysis of language name preference of students’ responses

The primary aim of this section is to focus on the issue of using two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) which are currently used to refer to one official language. Responses to students’ survey questionnaires (Addendum 1) contained in Section C, were analysed and presented here. The analysis from this section is quantitative and also qualitative since open-ended questions were used. The researcher highlights that this section is also a key section of the study since it is based on the topic that initiated the study and the responses from students and lecturers were separated as indicated earlier. What follows is a discussion and presentation of responses on students’ survey questionnaire:

4.4.1
Q1: As a speaker and student of the Northern Sotho language, which language name do you prefer between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa and why is that particular name important to you?
The researcher already pointed out that this question is the one that initiated the study since the primary aim was to find out which language name was preferred by the Northern Sotho first language speaking students from two South African universities. 51 (57%) of student respondents indicated that they preferred Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name while 39 (43%) respondents preferred Sepedi as a language name as shown in Figure 9:

![Figure 9: Language name preference by students: Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa?](image)

The majority of student respondent (57%) were in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name and held the perspective that they were taught that Sepedi is a dialect that is spoken in the Sekhukhune region. In this regard R77 indicated:

*My Northern Sotho lecturer told us the difference between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa; it is that Sepedi is a dialect and Sesotho sa Leboa is a language that accommodates all the Northern Sotho dialects.*

On the other hand, student respondent in favour of Sepedi as a language held the opposite view that they grew up speaking Sepedi and doing Sepedi at school and Sepedi would always be the preferred language name. R60 supported this saying:

*At home we are speaking Sepedi. I speak Sepedi when I am with my friends, I speak Sepedi at school and I also did Sepedi at high school.*
4.4.2

Q2: Add your social and cultural viewpoints, to say which language name is the best between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa.

Q2 was somewhat of a repetition of Q1 as to determine if the responses from the previous question would correspond with this question. 53 (59%) of student respondents indicated that according to their social and cultural viewpoint, Sesotho sa Leboa seemed to be the best language name, while 37 (41%) respondents indicated that from their social and cultural point of view, Sepedi was the best language name. It can be realised that there was a slight difference of 2% between (Q1) and (Q2). This is a clear indication of lack of consistency from the student respondents in providing information (answering questions). Figure 10 below gives a clear indication of which name was chosen:

![Figure 10: The chosen language name according to students’ social and cultural viewpoints](image)

The majority of student respondents (59%) in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name were of the similar perspective that the Sesotho sa Leboa language name accommodates all the dialects of the Northern Sotho language while Sepedi promotes the dialect of the Pedi people in Sekhukhune area. In this regard, R15 said:

"Sesotho sa Leboa is the best language name because is generalising all the speakers of this language but as for Sepedi it only gives the people who originate from Sekhukhune area a recognition."
4.4.3

Q3: As a speaker and at the same time student of the Northern Sotho language, describe how the use of two different language names affects you.

The researcher assumed that the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) caused confusion to speakers and students of the Northern Sotho language and also in academic sectors such as public schools and institutions of higher learning. Thus, this question aimed to prove if confusion existed due to the double designation of the language. The confusion caused by two different language names made this question a paramount one as it was one of the key reasons why the researcher initiated this study. 90 student respondents, 85 (94%) indicated that they were affected by the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) referring to one official language while 5 (6%) respondents indicated that they were not affected by double designation. It can thus be realised that the majority of respondents which is 94% concurred with the researcher’s perspective that the use of both Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa in informative documents such as study guides, prospectuses and academic records caused confusion to the speakers of the Northern Sotho language, particularly the students as shown in the Figure 11 below:

![Figure 11: Effect of two different language names of Northern Sotho on student respondents](image-url)
The majority of student respondents (94%) held the similar perspective that they were indeed affected by the use of Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa in informative an descriptive documents. Their argument was that the lexical content was the same but two different language names were used. They were always confronted by speakers of other South African official languages to differentiate between the two and the two different language names disadvantaged them when it came to employment. In this regard, R12 revealed:

*I once attended a job interview where they wanted a language practitioner who could translate from English to Sepedi; I ended up losing a job on the basis that the panel kept on saying we wanted someone who can translate from English to Sesotho sa Leboa and you can see that this is a Sesotho sa Leboa university, not Sepedi. In support of this, R31 said ‘my classmates in the Translation and Linguistics class are always asking me to give the difference between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa and the moment I fail to do so, they will tell me I don’t know anything about myself."

Based on this response, it is evident that the use of two different language names in informative documents do not only confuse the northern Sotho first language speakers, even the general public does not actually know what the difference between the two language names is.

4.4.4

**Q4: Do you think that a specific dialect played a role when the official language name for Northern Sotho was chosen for constitutional purpose? Say why.**

57 (63%) of student respondents were of perspective that a specific dialect played a role when the official language name for Northern Sotho was chosen for constitutional purposes, while 33 (37%) respondents were of an opposite point of view. It is interesting to note that response from Q1 is almost the same as Q4 which proves consistency from students as shown in Figure 12:
Figure 12: Determining the influence dialects had during the standardisation process of selecting Northern Sotho language name

The majority of student respondents (63%) held the perspective that the Sepedi dialect played an instrumental role in the standardisation of the Northern Sotho language, since it was the first dialect to be recorded. Some respondents indicated that this was not fair because other dialects were neglected during this process. In this regard, R13 outlined that *Sepedi had an influence in the process of standardisation because of its historical reasons.*

4.4.5
Q5: Add your social and cultural viewpoints to motivate why Sepedi is considered a standard language or a dialect.

This question forms a crucial part of the study. 55 (61%) of the student respondents were of the perspective that Sepedi was not a language but a dialect, while 35 (39%) respondents were of an opposite view that Sepedi is not a dialect but a language on its own as shown in the Figure 14 below. It was evident from Q1, Q2 and Q5 that student respondents maintained consistency in responding to the questions. It was clear that the majority of students considered Sepedi a dialect not a language. It may be interesting to note that the majority response actually meant that they did not rate a dialect higher than a language and that they intuitively felt that a dialect name is not worthy of designating the language Northern Sotho (as is the case in the present South African constitution of 1996). Also see 2.10.1 – 2.10.8.
The majority of student respondents (61%) were of the perspective that according to their social and cultural viewpoints, they considered Sepedi as a dialect, because it is spoken by a particular group of people. In this regard, R37 advocated that:

*A dialect is a language that is spoken in a particular region or by a certain group of people and this is a true reflection about the Pedi dialect, as it is spoken only in the area of Sekhukhune.*

### 4.4.6

**Q6: Which language name do you think should be used and appear in the constitution of South Africa and say why?**

At present, Section 6 (1) of the Constitution of South African, (Act No. 108 of 1996) declares Sepedi as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa. Therefore, this question would determine if Northern Sotho first language speaking students agreed or disagreed to what is stipulated in the constitution. Out of ninety student respondents, 52 (58%) respondents were of the perspective that Sesotho sa Leboa should be used and appear as language in the Constitution of South Africa while 38 (42%) respondents were of an opposite perspective that Sepedi was rightfully used and appearing in the South African constitution as indicated in Figure 15 below. This also implies that 52 (58%) of students respondents were of the view that Sesotho sa Leboa should be used in all official, informative and descriptive documentation. It is also interesting to note that the response to this question was in support...
of the response to Q5, indicating that Sepedi was indeed considered a dialect and not a fully fletched language.

Figure 14: Language name preference by students for use in official documents

The majority of student respondents (58%) in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name were of the perspective that the Sesotho sa Leboa language name was the one which should be used and appear in the constitution of South Africa, in taking into consideration the fact that it accommodated all the speakers of this speech community. However, Sepedi recognised only people who speak the Pedi dialect. In this regard, R44 mentioned:

*It cannot be right if a certain dialect is given an official status over other 27 Northern Sotho dialects.*

Yet, respondents in favour of Sepedi held the opposite view that Sepedi should be maintained in the Constitution of South Africa. In support of this, R25 stated that:

*The Sepedi language name is far more popular than the Sesotho sa Leboa language name and the speakers of this language consider themselves as Mapedi (Sepedi speakers).*
4.5. Language name preference based on lecturers’ responses

10 lecturers were sampled to participate in a questionnaire of this study. Four lecturers were from a university of technology in Pretoria (A) and six lecturers were from a full-time university in Limpopo (B). Three lecturers were affiliated to the School of Languages and Communication Studies while three lecturers were affiliated to the School of Education. Section C (Lecturers language name preference) will be presented here and the students’ language name preference is done separately. The researcher presents the quantitative part of the lecturers’ responses, then the qualitative analytical follows. The responses from both student and lecturer respondents will later be compared and contrasted and the dominant argument will be discussed and synthesised.

4.5.1

Q1. As a speaker and lecturer of the Northern Sotho language, which language name do you prefer and think is the best between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa and why is that particular name important to you?

Out of ten lecturer respondents, six respondents indicated that they preferred Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name while four respondents preferred Sepedi as a language name. It is interesting to note that lecturers’ responses on this question concur with students’ responses on Q1 (Section B) where 51 (57%) of the student respondents were also in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa.

Respondents in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name held the perspective that Sesotho sa Leboa accommodates all the Northern Sotho dialects such as Pulana, Lobedu, Tlokwa, Molepo, Mamabolo, Tlhabine, Phalaborwa, Kone, Tau, etc. In this regard, R5 inidicated that:

*Sepedi is a dialect of Bapedi (Sepedi speakers) in Bopedi and it promotes a specific ethnic group.*

4.5.2

Q2. As a speaker and lecturer of the Northern Sotho language, describe how the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) in informative documents is affecting you?
All ten lecturer respondents indicated that they were indeed affected by the use of two different language names referring to one official language. There is a clear link between this question and Q3 of the student respondents, since 85 (94%) of students indicated that they were affected by the dilemma of two different language names. In this regard, R3 held the perspective that:

*Northern Sotho is the one and only South African official language which has two different language names that serves as an official language.*

In support of this point of view, R5 indicated that:

*Language cannot be separated from culture and identity, and thus the two different language names make the Northern Sotho speech community to appear as if they do not know their roots.*

4.5.3

Q3. Do you think that a specific dialect played a role when the official language name for the Northern Sotho was chosen for constitutional purposes? Say why.

Six of the ten respondents were of the perspective that the Pedi dialect played a crucial role in the standardisation of the Northern Sotho language, since it was the first language to be codified which is one of the processes of standardisation which includes codification, selection, acceptance and elaboration. However, 4 other lecturer respondents were of the perspective that the combination of Kopa and Tau dialects played a role in the standardisation of the Northern Sotho language. R9 indicated that:

*Sepedi played an instrumental role in the standardisation of the Northern Sotho language because it is the first Northern Sotho dialect to be codified.*

4.5.4

Q4. Add your social and cultural viewpoints to motivate why Sepedi is considered a standard language or a dialect.

Out of ten lecturers’ respondents, six indicated that Sepedi is not a language but a dialect while 4 respondents were of an opposite perspective that Sepedi is not a dialect but a language. Q1 and Q4 reflect the the lecturers’ consistent opinions.

Respondents in favour of Sepedi as a dialect were of the view that Sepedi is the dialect that is used in Sekhukhuneland, and it should remain like that. In this regard, R2 outlined that:

*There is no doubt that Sepedi is the dialect of Sekhukhune people.*
On the other hand, respondents in favour of Sepedi as a language held the opposite view that Sepedi is a language, not a dialect. R9 in this regard said:

*People and scholars advocating that Sepedi is a dialect do not accept the historical facts of the Sepedi dialect and they should take into consideration the following:*

- **Sepedi is the first dialect to be codified;**
- **This is the reason why the Bible is translated into Sepedi, not in Sesotho sa Leboa;**
- **It is a dialect with historical value and associated with historical and juridical powers, as well as political influence; and**
- **In the Limpopo Province, the most dominant and influential group had always been the Bapedi Kingdom.**

### 4.5.5

**Q5. Which language name do you think should be used and appear in the South African constitution and why?**

Six of the lecturer respondents were of the perspective that Sesotho sa Leboa should be used and appear as language in the Constitution of South Africa while four respondents felt that Sepedi is rightfully used and appearing in the South African constitution. This also implies that Sepedi should be used in all official documentation. It is also interesting to note that the response to this question is in support of the responses of Q4, Q3, Q2 and Q1 of the students’ responses, indicating that Sepedi was indeed considered a dialect and not a complete language.

The majority of lecturers (6) in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as language name mentioned that Sepedi was a dialect, equal to other Northern Sotho dialects and they felt inferior and insulted when they were referred to as Mapedi (Sepedi speakers). In this regard, R3 commented:

*When someone calls me Mopedi (Sepedi speaker). I get confused because I cannot be Mopedi and Molobedu (Lobedu speaker) at the same time.*

In support of this point of view, R1 indicated that:

*If the Sepedi language name were to be maintained in the constitution of South Africa, there will always be divisions between the Northern Sotho speakers in favour*
of Sepedi as a language name and the ones in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name.

On the other hand, lecturer respondents in favour of Sepedi as a language name outlined that the Sesotho sa Leboa would be the correct language name if it was the only language that is spoken in the Limpopo province. In this regard, R7 was of the perspective that:

*There are other languages in the Limpopo Province, so ‘Sotho of the North’ cannot work for us.*

4.6 Analysis of the interview responses by lecturers

Ten lecturers were interviewed and recorded in face-to-face situations. Four lecturers were from University A and six lecturers were from University B. The researcher chose to interview lecturers because of the assumption that they were linguists and language experts functioning on a higher academic level than the students. Their responses would therefore be more insightful and revealing in this language debate as compared to students’ responses in this regard. The students seemed to be less informed regarding linguistic matters as well as the political context of the Northern Sotho language. What follows next are the interview questions directed to lecturers. See Addendum 2:

4.6.1 IQ1. What do you think caused the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) in informative and policy documents?

Six lecturer respondents were of the perspective that the use of both language names in informative documents shows that speakers of the Northern Sotho language were not satisfied to what is stipulated in the Constitution. In this case, R2 said:

*If the speakers of the Northern Sotho language were thoroughly consulted this would have been avoided, but the problem with people of high authority is that they to tend take vital decisions without consulting people on the ground.*

Four of the lecturer respondents outlined that speakers in the favour of the Sesotho sa Leboa language name did not want to adhere to the South African constitution. This was the reason
why they were stuck with the problem of two different language names in informative
documents and in general language use. In this regard, R9 indicated that:

_Sesotho sa Leboa study promoters do not respect the constitution._

4.6.2
IQ2. In your understanding, which route do you think guided your university to choose the name that is preferred by your institution?

The majority of lecturer respondents (7) indicated that the language policies of their respective universities were manipulated by then Head of Departments/Subject Heads who were responsible for the African Languages Departments. R7 outlined that:

_The universities which were promoting the Sesotho sa Leboa language name was because of the people who were then in charge of African languages and the universities in favour of Sepedi was because of the people who were then in charge at the time of the compilation of the language policy._

On the other hand, one lecturer respondent held the opposite view. It is that at some universities Section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution of South African, (Act No. 10 of 1996) was taken as a point of departure, opting for Sepedi as language name with the idea that a policy cannot supersede the constitution.

4.6.3
IQ3. From your academic experience, how do you think this dual designation of a language impacts on the current and future Northern Sotho generation?

All lecturer respondents shared a similar perspective that language could not be separated from culture and identity and that the moment the speakers fail to identify their native language it would imply an automatic loss of identity. The argument was that the future generation would not even know where the problem started. In this regard, R8 reasoned:

_You are Mosotho (Sotho speaker) simply because you are speaking Sesotho, not because of your physical appearance or colour of your skin. This implies that the future Northern Sotho generation will not know if they will be speaking Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa._
It is interesting to note that this question corresponds with S2 where respondents strongly agreed that language is regarded as part and parcel of one’s identity.

4.6.4
IQ4. Within the context of your students, do you think it is fair for them to have a matric certificate which reflects Sepedi and at the very same time have a university academic transcript which reflects Sesotho sa Leboa/Northern Sotho? Motivate your answer.

All ten lecturer respondents who were interviewed on a one-on-one basis shared a similar perspective that it was really not fair for the students to suffer the consequences of the people who were in charge of drafting their own language policies. It is interesting to note that respondents in S5 and S6 strongly agreed that it was unfair to have two different language names in informative, descriptive documents and in general language use. In support of this, respondents on Q3 of the Section C (language name preference) of the students and lecturers’ questionnaire outlined that they were indeed affected by the use of two different language names in informative documents. The interpretation of this is that the two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) did not sit well with the entire Northern Sotho speech community.

4.6.5
IQ5. If you were in a good position of clarifying this language naming confusion, how were you going to solve this problem?

All ten lecturer respondents indicated that proper research needed to be done and the language name which would be supported by this research should amend or maintain the constitution of South Africa with immediate effect. In this regard, R6 was pointing out that:

*The process of standardisation which includes codification, selection, acceptance and elaboration should be thoroughly followed in ensuring that all speakers of the Northern Sotho language may have an opportunity to express their views regarding their preferred language name.*
4.7 Summary and presentation of the data based on students and lecturers’ responses

This presentation covers the outcome of the responses of all the closed-ended questions (structured Likert questionnaire) as well as all the open-ended questions (language name preference from both student and lecturer respondents) including the interview questions which were directed at the lecturers. In short, it is a summary of the triangulation of both quantitative and qualitative data. Therefore, the researcher used three steps: The first step was to sort out the students and lecturers’ responses; the second step was to code students and lecturers’ responses; and the last step was to memo students and lecturers’ responses. Thereafter, the researcher used the dominating codes to formulate five different themes which were synthesised and discussed below. Language and identity, language and power, historical facts, Sepedi language name and Sesotho sa Leboa language name are the themes which emerged from the codes which are discussed below:

4.7.1 Manner in which language portrays one’s identity

The study shows that language formed part and parcel of one’s identity. This means, if one could not identify one’s language, it could be claimed that one did not know oneself and one’s roots. It is interesting to note that majority of respondents were not comfortable with the use of two different names in informative and policy documents. The majority of respondents indicated that the use of Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa as the names for one language caused confusion to language speakers, more especially within the context where one has to differentiate these two designations to non-speakers of the Northern Sotho language. At the same time, all African languages have one name; it is only Northern Sotho which seems to be problematic which resulted in a loss of unified identity. Also see 2.5 for S2 where student respondents indicated that language cannot be separated from culture and identity. This implies that the relationship between language and identity was integrated and important to first language speakers of the Northern Sotho language.

4.7.2 The impact of political authorities in choosing an official name

Mostly the lecturer respondents indicated that one of the reasons for this dual name problem for the Northern Sotho language is the power of politics in our everyday life. The power of politics also seemed to have infiltrated educational institutions of higher learning where decisions were taken by African languages heads of departments concerning the correct language name for language subject offerings. The majority of speakers in favour of Sesotho
sa Leboa as a language name were of the perspective that the Sekhukhune ethnic group had political authority at the time of the finalisation of the South African constitution of 1996. Therefore, they manipulated the constitution by changing Sesotho sa Leboa which was the name appearing in the South African Interim Constitution of 1993 with that reflecting their Pedi dialect, namely Sepedi as they apparently regarded themselves superior to other Northern Sotho dialectical groups. Furthermore, it was indicated that the process of choosing the official language was not made transparent to the speakers of the language.

4.7.3 Consideration of historical facts

One of the themes which emerged from the lecturers’ responses is the historical facts regarding the Sepedi language name. Respondents in favour of Sepedi as a language advocated that all speakers who were against the Sepedi language name as one of the official languages needed to take into consideration the fact that Sepedi was the first dialect to be codified which is in line with the standardisation process (see 2.12.1-2.12.3). Furthermore, it is generally known in the wider Northern Sotho speech community that the Bible and other religious texts were translated into Sepedi. Therefore, for historic reasons it can be argued that Sepedi deserved to be the official language. This is also supported by the classification of the Northern Sotho dialects by Ziervogel (1969) where he classifies Sepedi as a language which has 22 dialects. Also see 2.10.1-2.10.8.

4.7.4 The Sepedi language name

The study showed that the Sepedi language name had special reference to the Sekhukhune ethnic group (see 2.9.1-2.9.8). It is interesting to note that all the respondents in favour of Sepedi and those in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa agreed that the name Sepedi originated from Sekhukhune area and thus it is a dialect that is used there and these were the only people who regarded themselves as Mapedi (speakers of Sepedi) because they spoke Sepedi and they lived in Bopedi (explain). Therefore, if Sepedi was indeed spoken in a specific region like Sekhukhune, it is thus clear that both student and lecturer respondents acknowledge and assert that Sepedi is indeed a dialect. Also see 2.13.

4.7.5 The Sesotho sa Leboa language name

The majority of student and lecturer respondents held the perspective that if the Sesotho sa Leboa language name were to be amended in the Section 6 (1) of the Constitution of South
Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996) as one of the official languages, this would be a positive development towards the Northern Sotho speech communities as a whole. The argument was that the name Sesotho sa Leboa implies that these are the 'Basotho from the North' and they speak 'Sotho of the North'. In a more practical sense, the argument was that no one is going to feel undermined or excluded since the name itself accommodates all the Northern Sotho dialects mostly spoken in Limpopo Province but also in other provinces such Gauteng. Also see 2.8.1.

4.8 Comparison and synthesis of students’ and lecturers’ responses

The researcher identified certain similarities and differences in perspectives between the students’ respondents and lecturers’ respondents in favour of the Sepedi language name and those in favour of the Sesotho sa Leboa language name. They are stated separately so as to allow easy comparison of both responses so that the dominant argument can be formulated.

4.8.1 Students’ responses

Students seemed not having a clear view of the language name which is declared by the South African Constitution, stated in 1993 and later changed in 1996, and this resulted in lack of consistency when responding to questions, i.e. they agreed with the language name Sepedi used in the constitution, but at the same time they mainly preferred Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name.

Student respondents were not emotional about the use of two different language names in informative documents and their concerns had nothing to do with the future Northern Sotho generation. Some student respondents indirectly indicated that they were not even affected by the use of Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa as official languages. On the whole, they were less concerned with language planning issues and more concerned about their identity, linked to a specific name and/or dialect.

4.8.2 Lecturers’ responses

Lecturers seemed adequately informed about the whole issue of two different language names which were currently used to refer to one official language, namely Northern Sotho. They
were aware of what was included in the South African constitution for 1993 and what is included since 1996 in terms of official languages and were also well informed about language planning, the study of African languages and linguistics than the students. This comparison resulted in maintaining realistic validity when responses of both students and lecturers to the questions were analysed and compared.

Lecturers seemed to be more emotional and politically sensitive than the students when responding to questions. The researcher’s interpretation was that one of the fundamental reasons is that lecturers were already aware and exposed to the consequences of two different language names which are currently used to refer to one official language in informative documents such as academic transcripts, prospectuses, study guides, institutional language policies and published research papers. Therefore, their concerns were focused on the future generation of the entire Northern Sotho speech community, more especially within the sociolinguistic context of choosing one language name.

4.9 The dominant argument choosing between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa as language name

The Sesotho sa Leboa language name appears to be the dominant or favoured language name since (57%) of respondents (students and lecturers), according to the structured Likert questionnaire, were of the perspective that Sesotho sa Leboa was indeed the correct language name which should be used in informative documents, publications and in general communication. However, 43 (43%) of respondents (students and lecturers) were of the opposite perspective that Sepedi is the correct and rightful language name to be maintained in the South African constitution.

It is imperative to note that 57% respondents who were in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name based their argument on unity amongst the Northern Sotho speech communities. They were mainly concerned about the loss of identity and the lecturers, specifically, were also sensitised about the fact that Northern Sotho is the only South African official language with two different language names in informative and policy documents. Based on these reasons, the researcher found their argument far more convincing than the respondents in favour of Sepedi as a language name.
Both the students’ and lecturers’ respondents were holding similar views that Sesotho sa Leboa seemed to be the best language. However, the lecturers held a more informed view that it could replace Sepedi in the Section 3 (1) of the Constitution of South African (Act No. 108 of 1996). These respondents argued that the Sepedi language name did not sit well with the majority of the Northern Sotho speakers since it was considered as one of the dialects of the Northern Sotho language, and at the same time, it was associated with the Sekhukhune ethnic group and thus it appeared as if Sekhukhune ethnic group regarded themselves more superior to other Northern Sotho ethnic groups (or dialects).

It is interesting to note that the argument of respondents in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa also supported the literature conducted in this study. Based on the literature conducted in this study (see 2.5; 2.8.1-2.8.2; 2.9; 2.10.1-2.10.8 and 2.12), the Sepedi language name is not generally supported by scholars and researchers such as Van Warmelo (1935); Doke (1954); Mokgokong (1966); Mönnig (1967); Van Wyk (1969); Lombard (1985); Poulos & Louwrens (1994) and Mojela (1997). Ziervogel (1969) was an exception in support of Sepedi as a language name.

Objectively speaking, the above scholars did not actually prefer Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name, but the researcher can reason that they did, in taking into consideration the manner in which they classified the dialects of the Northern Sotho language. Also see 2.10.1-2.10.8.

4.10 Summary

The primary aim of this chapter was to present the most important findings of the study. The language name which was preferred by students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language has been identified as the most inclusive in contrast with Sepedi which proved to be more dialectically exclusive, sociolinguistically speaking. The quantitative data and results from students’ and lecturers’ structured questionnaires were compared and /or contrasted with the qualitative data gathered from the students’ and lecturers’ survey question responses and lastly face-to- face interview responses provided by lecturers. It was found that, as planned both the quantitative and qualitative data eventually proved to be in supplementary triangulation.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The fundamental focus of this chapter is to encapsulate the findings of the study and thereafter recommendations will be supplied on how the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) for the same language in informative and descriptive documents can be treated. The study was conducted in order to determine the language name which is preferred by the Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language from two selected South African universities, specifically university students who are doing Northern Sotho as a first language or as an applied language module, as well as lecturers who are lecturing Northern Sotho as a first language module. The literature indicated that Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa are currently both used as one official language in informative, descriptive and policy documents and general language use. This problem motivated the researcher to investigate the use of dual language names by doing a sociolinguistic study involving a university of technology in Pretoria (A) and a university in Limpopo (B).

5.2 Achieving the aims and objectives of the study

The aim and objective of this study were to provide a sociolinguistic perspective of the dual naming of the Northern Sotho language. A mixed-methods approach was employed in this study administering structured questionnaires and facilitating face-to-face interviews in order to collect data from first language speaking students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language at Universities A and B.

The aim of this study was met based on the observations found in the literature and findings of the study. Forthcoming from this aim, the objectives of the study were achieved as follows:
5.2.1 Objective one (1)

Exploring the effect Northern Sotho language name discrepancies in informative and descriptive documents has on both first language students, lecturers and on the entire speakers speakers of the Northern Sotho language.

For this exploration data were collected from two selected South African universities: a university of technology in Pretoria (A), and a full-time university in Limpopo (B) in the form of questionnaires and interviews. The language name Northern Sotho (English name which is actually a translation of Sesotho sa Leboa) and Sesotho sa Leboa are used in academic and informative documents such as study guides, academic transcripts and prospectuses at University A. At this same university, however, Sepedi is listed as one of the official languages in its language policy, pointing to a name discrepancy.

At university B, the language policy designates Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the main languages to be promoted for equitable use. It is crucial to point out that there is a discrepancy between the university’s language policy and the language names which are used by academic departments. Sesotho sa Leboa name is used in the School of Languages and Communication Studies whereas the Sepedi name is used in the School of Education (in alignment with the south African Constitution of 1996). It can thus be noted that there is a discrepancy between the language policies of both universities A and B and the language name which is used by academic departments at these universities.

The different names that are used for the same language by the same university (B) for different schools (sections) evidences that confusion prevails in the designation of the language. This contradiction needs to be discussed by all stakeholders of the language, not only at universities, but also at all basic educational and tertiary institutions in South Africa, most particularly the Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Gauteng Provinces where Northern Sotho is taught. From their responses it is clear that lecturers (more so) than students at both universities were aware of these language name discrepancies and that these affected them negatively. For both the students and lecturers it created confusion and negative perceptions of their sociolinguistic and cultural identity.
5.2.2 Objective two (2)

Investigating the view of the Northern Sotho first language speaking students and lecturers from two selected universities (A and B), socially and culturally, about their preferred language name.

It is important to note that Section 3 (1) of the Interim Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 200 of 1993) designated Sesotho sa Leboa as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa. Thereafter, section 6 (1) of the Final Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996) declared Sepedi as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa.

A significant majority of respondents preferred Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name whereas a substantial minority of the respondents held the opposite perspective that Sepedi is indeed the correct language name. This was the perspective of the majority of respondents from their sociolinguistic and cultural point of view. Sesotho sa Leboa seems to be the best name that should be used as one of the official languages of South Africa, since they consider Sepedi as one of the dialects of the Northern Sotho language, similar to other dialects like Lobedu, Tlokwa, Tlhabine, Kgaga, Phalaborwa, Pulana, Kutswe, Pai, Molepo, Mamabolo, Tau, Pedi, Roka, Kone, etc.

The reasons why Sesotho sa Leboa was chosen above Sepedi are mainly twofold, one being that Sesotho sa Leboa is more inclusive and the other being that Sepedi is more exclusive.

5.2.2.1 Inclusivity

A significant majority of respondents indicated that the Sesotho sa Leboa language name seems to be more accommodative and inclusive than the Sepedi language name which accommodates only speakers originating from the Sekhukhune ethnic group. The Sesotho sa Leboa language name indicates that it is the language of the North, spoken by Basotho. It can therefore be realised that the language name Sesotho sa Leboa is not promoting any specific region, ethnic group, district or dialect but accommodating all the regions, ethnic groups, districts and the dialects of the whole Northern Sotho language such as Kopa, Pedi, Setebele-Sotho, Molepo, Mamabolo, Mothiba, Mothapo, Makgoba, Pedi, Kone, Tau, Roka, Moletlane,
Hananwa, Tlokwa, Matlala, Moletši, Lobedu, Phalaborwa, Kgaga, Tswapo, Pai, Pulana and Kutswe. See 2.10.1-2.10.8. It can thus be argued that if sociolinguistic and regional factors are taken into consideration, Sesotho sa Leboa is a unifying language name when compared to Sepedi that can be seen as a more exclusive regionally specific language name.

5.2.2.2 Exclusivity

A significant majority of respondents in the study indicated that Sepedi is not a language but a dialect. This was even a higher response than that in favour of Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name which can be used as one of the official languages of South Africa. It is crucial to note that even some of the respondents in favour of Sepedi as a language name concurred that Sepedi is not a language but a dialect. As indicated in 2.9.1-2.9.8, the majority of scholars were of the perspective that Sepedi is a dialect associated with the Sekhukhune ethnic group, emphasising that Sepedi is spoken by Bapedi (Sepedi speakers) in Bopedi (Sekhukhune area). These Sepedi speakers, as it surfaced in the interview responses of lecturers, tended to be more exclusive since they saw their language as the officially, elevated appropriate one (which it now is), excluding the other dialects such as Molepo, Mamabolo, Kone, Tau, Roka, Moletlane, Tlokwa, etc Matlala, Moletši, Lobedu, etc. instead of including them in a unifying language name (Sesotho sa Leboa).

5.2.3 Objective three (3)

Establishing why a particular name is chosen, it is imperative that the sociolinguistic context, historic facts, as well as the dialectal classification of the Northern Sotho language should be taken into account.

As stated in 2.9.1-2.9.8, the inclusion of Sepedi in the final constitution of South Africa seemed to lack transparency, since the speakers of the language in different speech communities, linguists and language planners were not consulted by means of a language survey and decisions seemed to have been taken in haste. In a more conservative sense, the process of standardisation which includes the aspects of selection and acceptance of the language name was neglected. A language or dialect needs to be selected and accepted by the first language speakers before it can be elevated to the status of an official language.
As proven by the literature in this study, Sepedi is the first Northern Sotho dialect to be codified and this resulted in the translation of the Bible and other religious texts. Taking into consideration these historical facts, it can thus be stated that for these reasons it was elevated to the status of an official standard language, the aspect of codification, also being part of the process of standardisation. From the classification of the Northern Sotho dialects by scholars it became clear that scholars such as Van Warmelo (1935); Mokgokong (1966); Mönnig (1967); Van Wyk (1969) and Lombard (1985) classify Sepedi as one of the dialects of the Northern Sotho language whereas Ziervogel (1969) appears to be the only scholar who classifies Sepedi as an independent language which has 22 dialects.

The qualitative data emerging from lecturers’ responses indicate that the majority felt that language could not be separated from power and politics. These lecturer respondents felt that people who had political powers by the time of the finalisation of the constitution abused their political powers to replace Sesotho sa Leboa (1993) with Sepedi (1996) without valuing ideas and opinions of representatives from different regions of the entire Northern Sotho speech community.

5.3 Conclusion: Synthesis of the main findings as a means to answer the research questions

The main aim of the study was to determine the name which is preferred by first language speaking students and lecturers of the Northern Sotho language since this language has two different names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa). These are the crucial conclusions which were drawn from the literature review and main findings:

- The vast majority of respondents were aware that there are two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) which are currently used to refer to one official language while a very small minority indicated that they were not aware of the existence of the two different language names used to refer to one language, making the confusion caused by this dual naming quite evident;
- A significant majority of respondents indicated that they preferred Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name while a substantial minority respondents preferred Sepedi as a language name;
The respondents who preferred Sepedi as language name actually adhered to the South African constitution of 1996 while the respondents who preferred Sesotho sa Leboa were not adhering to it in the strictest sense. This implied that the respondents’ attitude was more positively inclined towards Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name, despite the constitution;

A significant majority of respondents indicated that according to their social and cultural viewpoint, Sesotho sa Leboa was the best language name while a substantial minority of respondents indicated that Sepedi was the best language name;

A vast majority of respondents indicated that they were affected negatively in the South African sociolinguistic context by the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) referring to one official standard language while a very small minority indicated that they were not affected, implying some indifferent attitude;

A significant majority of lecturer respondents were of the perspective that a specific dialect (Sepedi) had an impact when the official language name for Northern Sotho was chosen for constitutional purposes while the minority of them were of an opposite view;

A significant majority of respondents indicated that Sepedi is a dialect not a language and a substantial minority of respondents indicated that Sepedi is not a dialect but a language in its own right.

A significant majority of respondents were of the perspective that Sesotho sa Leboa should be used and appear in the Constitution of South Africa while a substantial minority of respondents felt that Sepedi should be maintained as it is used in the Constitution of South Africa (1996);

It is imperative to note that the Sesotho sa Leboa language name which was preferred by the majority of respondents in this study were in opposition to Section 6 (1) of the Constitution of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996) since it declares Sepedi as one of the eleven official languages of South Africa;

At University A, there were three academic departments; Applied Languages, School of Education and Journalism which were using Sesotho sa Leboa as a language name in informative documents such as prospectuses, study guides and academic transcripts. However, in its language policy Sepedi was stated as one of the official languages. Furthermore, the Sepedi language name is also listed as one of the home languages in the students’ form for study application. This implies that there was a
discrepancy of language name between the university’s language policy, documentation and the academic departments;

- At University B, there were also such language name discrepancies. Sesotho sa Leboa was declared as one of the African languages which needed to be developed in its language policy and this name was also used in informative documents such as prospectuses, study guides and academic records. At this university, there were three schools; of Languages and Communication Studies, and of Social Sciences where Sesotho sa Leboa is taught as a subject. However, at the School of Education, the Sepedi language name was used, the reason being that this department was training teachers to teach Sepedi in schools. This was in alignment with the South African constitution;

- This implies that students from same university (B) and under the same Faculty (Humanities) were having two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) appearing in their informative and descriptive documents such as prospectuses, study guides and academic transcripts;

- A substantial minority of respondents in favour of Sepedi as a language indicated that speakers and scholars who advocated that Sesotho sa Leboa is the correct language name should take into consideration the fact that Sepedi is the first Northern Sotho dialect to be codified; this is the reason why the Bible and other religious texts were translated into Sepedi; and

- A significant majority of respondents were of the perspective that language cannot be separated from culture and identity. Respondents indicated that the name of the language is important since it portrays one’s identity and that the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) for one language seems unacceptable to the Northern Sotho speech community primarily because the unified identity is hampered.

5.4 Recommendations

The study proves that language forms part and parcel of one’s identity. It is crucial to note that language can divide and at the same time unite people, which is the current issue in the entire Northern Sotho speech community. It seems as if speakers in favour of the Sesotho sa Leboa language name and those in favour of Sepedi language name are currently divided which is the consequence of the existence of two different language names referring to one
official language. Some speakers feel undermined (their dialects are left out) while others feel honoured (their dialect is chosen). To assist in solving this sociolinguistic confusion of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) in informative, descriptive documents and general language use, the following recommendations may aid language authorities, language planners and linguists concerned with the Northern Sotho speech community to solve the problem of dual language designation.

5.4.1 Consistent implementation by language authorities

It is really disturbing and not fair for the Northern Sotho learners, students, academics and entire speech community to have two different language names used in qualification descriptors or in informative and general documents, especially when taking into consideration the fact that all official (African) languages have only one language name. Language authorities should liaise with speakers of the Northern Sotho language, language planners and linguists in terms of research to ensure that the aspect of selection and acceptance which are regarded as the most crucial of the processes of standardisation, are thoroughly applied.

If the issue of the language name is to be addressed, it should happen with proper consultation of the first language speakers of the Northern Sotho language within the relevant communication. The process of involving first language speakers should happen on the most representative level including schools, students in tertiary institutions and language authorities at local and government level, for instance. Furthermore, the process should be driven by language authorities such as National Department of Arts and Culture, PanSALB, Sesotho sa Leboa National Language Body and Provincial Language Council. In addition, these language authorities should also include the Department of Basic and Higher Education in the discussions.

The researcher acknowledges that language cannot be separated from power and politics, but the language name should reflect the Northern Sotho first language speakers’ honest opinions in the practical and real world. Language and political authorities should take into consideration the sociolinguistic values and ideas of the Northern Sotho speakers attached to the designation of their language. However, it should not be not be a top-down process but a grass-roots consultation with the Northern Sotho speech community at large.
5.4.2 Regard for the South African constitution

The researcher recommends that the members of the Northern Sotho speech community who are promoting the language name Sesotho sa Leboa in official and general documents should rather adhere to what is stipulated in the South African constitution of 1996 and use the name Sepedi for the sake of official consistency in the present language planning and sociolinguistic context. Thus, at this stage, Sepedi can strictly-speaking not be regarded as the name of a dialect but as the name of an official standard language.

However, as was proven in this research, the majority of respondents are upholding an opposite view, i.e. that Sesotho sa Leboa should be the official name of the language and Sepedi should be considered a dialect. On the other hand, linguists and language planners should do some follow-ups on how the official language was chosen, involving the speakers of the language at all different regions. Northern Sotho first language speakers need to note that this research, hopefully on quite a large scale, will be done to the best interest of the Northern Sotho future generation. If the problem of dual naming for the Northern Sotho language is not solved, it can continue to harm the sociolinguistic image of the language and its speech community in the South African context.

5.4.3 Development of the Northern Sotho language

Language plays a crucial role in the identification of one’s identity. Section 6 (1) of the Constitution of South Africa, (Act No. 108 of 1996) declared Sepedi as one on the official languages in South Africa. It is also mentioned in the constitution that the state must take practical and positive measures to elevate the status and advance the use of African languages. Instead of focusing on promoting writing in the language and initiating the development and elaboration of the Northern Sotho lexicon, the argument about the language name (which one is correct and which one is incorrect) may redirect these measures. In actual fact, the focus should rather be on the development and maintenance of Northern Sotho than on the sociolinguistic conflict of the choice of a language name.

In a more practical sense, there should be a good movement from the state to encourage speakers of the African languages to love and respect their own languages so that they can be developed like other developed languages in South Africa such as English and Afrikaans. It is
also the responsibility of the language authorities such as PanSALB, Sesotho sa Leboa National Language Body and Provincial Language Councils to ensure that there is unity amongst Northern Sotho first language speakers, more especially within the context that the language cannot be developed to its fullest potential if speakers are divided about its name.

5.4.4 Avoiding language name discrepancies

The language authorities should at least come to an agreement after an opinion survey was conducted at national level about the actual chosen language name. Furthermore, the language policies of the universities should be in line with the academic language programmes offered at those institutions, as well as with informative documents and transcripts used. Researchers’ research titles should also be in line with the language policy and naming of languages at universities.

The choice between two different language names should be ended. It cannot be right when all speakers of the Northern Sotho language are given the random right to choose whether they want to use either Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa language name. The same applies to all government departments, also to public and private institutions where the Northern Sotho language is used for official, local and business purposes.

Language authorities such as Pan South African Language Board, Provincial Language Council and Sesotho sa Leboa National Language Body should take into consideration the fact that all should be done in the best interest of the Northern Sotho language speakers, with special reference to the learners and students who are taking Northern Sotho as a first language or practical subject, as well as their educators and lecturers since they appear to be the ‘linguistic’ victims of the use of two different language names in informative documents such as prospectuses, study guides, academic transcripts and language policy documents. It may also cause conflict in the tuition of the Northern Sotho language, especially in the class environment where students and/or lecturers disagree about the correct language name.
5.4.5 Unifying the Northern Sotho speech community

If the language name Sesotho sa Leboa is used, it could be seen as a more unifying name than Sepedi, as proven by this research. The reason for this is that it can be regarded as a name unifying the difference dialects (of which Sepedi proved to be one) under the umbrella term ‘Sotho of the North’. However, an intensive regional sociolinguistic survey will reveal the outcome. This unifying name may eradicate the speakers of the Northern Sotho speech community’s lack of identity when compared with the other ten official languages which only have one name to designate the respective languages.

5.5 Significance of the study

The significance of the study lies in determining whether it is feasible after 22 years of democracy to use two different names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) for the Northern Sotho language to refer to one official language. This study may contribute in maintaining consistency in this dialectical-linguistic and onomastic dilemma. At present, matric learners are doing Sepedi at Grade 12, but when they arrive at some universities such as a University in Limpopo (B) or at a University of Technology in Pretoria (A) they will be calling it Sesotho sa Leboa (translated as Northern Sotho), not Sepedi.

Language educators and lecturers may also gain sociolinguistic insight into matters such as official language, standard language and the accommodation of these in the designation of a language like Northern Sotho. Learners and students may also be exposed to the underlying politics surrounding the Northern Sotho language which may motivate scholars to research and write about the Northern Sotho language. Academic departments will also use this study to their advantage and check if their chosen language name corresponds with the university’s language policy. Furthermore, they may also verify if their chosen language name is the one which is declared by the South African constitution or not.

5.6 Limitations of the study

The fundamental scope of this research was to determine the language name which is preferred by first language speaking students and lecturers since the Northern Sotho language have two different names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) which are currently used in official
and informative documents and general language use to refer to one official standard language.

The researcher chose to do this research since he is of perspective that students and lecturers are representing different sections of the Northern Sotho speech community in selected academic environments A and B. Only registered university students and lecturers who were first language speakers of Northern Sotho at these two universities were able to participate in the study, thus representing a very small section of the Northern Sotho academic community. Unfortunately, however, the viewpoint on the topic emanating from younger participants, such as high school learners or elders in the relevant speech communities were not included. A great limitation of this study was not involving language authorities, language planners and officials for their opinions on the dual language name. The researcher took into consideration the political sensitivity of the topic and therefore decided to focus on the sociolinguistic aspects of the naming of the language based on student and lecturer respondents which he thought were more neutral.

Due to the political sensitivity that surrounds the naming of the Northern Sotho language, research on this kind of topic has thus far been limited, at times labelled as a ‘non-researchable’ title, therefore, the researcher approached it rather from a sociolinguistic perspective focusing on language varieties, identities, attitudes and ethnicities.

5.7 Suggestions for future research

Since the study excluded high school learners, language educators and older community members in general, it would be interesting to gather a sociolinguistic perspective of all the first language speakers of the Northern Sotho language about the viewpoints regarding the current use of two different language names. Heads of Departments from some of the initially selected universities were also excluded to participate into the study and it would be interesting to observe what guided their respective universities to use a particular name which is currently used in informative and descriptive documentation. It would also be interesting to have views of traditional leaders and members of language authorities such as PanSALB, PLCs and SsLNLB in this kind of study concerning dual language naming of the Northern Sotho language.
5.8 Conclusion

The researcher highlighted what the selected respondents answered in terms of the research questions and corresponding aims and objectives in order to complete the findings of the study. The main purpose of this chapter was to encapsulate the main findings of the study and also to give the researcher sufficient opportunity of coming up with recommendations which may help to solve the research problem and pave the way for future research on a larger scale, i.e. conducting a Northern Sotho community based language survey on language name preference. Some guidelines on how future researchers can approach the nature of such envisaged study have also been addressed.
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Preamble

Dear Respondent

I am Tebogo Jacob Rakgogo, M-Tech student at a University of Technology in Pretoria affiliated to the Department of Applied Languages. I am conducting research based on: Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa: a sociolinguistic perspective of first language speakers at five selected South African universities. I would like you to complete the attached survey questionnaire. Your responses will be regarded as confidential at all times. You are also not required to provide your surname and full names. When necessary, the researcher will use letter codes to refer to certain respondents for data analysis purposes. All the data provided will be handled confidentially and kept in a safe place and be accessible only to the researcher and the study leader. Your participation in this survey and response to a questionnaire will be highly appreciated. Should you have any further questions, you can contact the primary researcher at any time at email: rakgogotj@gmail.com.

**Instructions:** Please read each item below thoroughly, and respond as honestly as possible. Try not to leave any open space.

**A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.**

1. Gender: ________________________________________________
2. Age: ___________________________________________________
3. Highest qualification: ______________________________________
4. Occupation: ______________________________________________
5. Year/level of study: ________________________________________
6. Qualification: _____________________________________________
7. University/Institution: ______________________________________
8. Dialect: _________________________________________________
9. District: ________________________________________________
B: A LIKERT SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE

Read the statements below carefully in order to make the response that applies to you.

**Instruction:** Please, make a tick (✓) in the appropriate box. 1 = strongly disagree. 2 = disagree. 3 = not sure. 4 = agree. 5 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There are two different language names naming for one language which are Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The name of the language is important because it is part of one’s identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is appropriate to have only one name (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) for naming the official language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is not fair to the speakers of the Northern Sotho language to have two different names in informative and descriptive documents and in general language use as it causes confusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assign someone with the name of a language which he/she does not approve is like giving him a new surname on top of his/her surname.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is contradictory to the Northern Sotho first language speaking students to have a matric certificate that reflects Sepedi and at the same time have a university academic transcript that reflects Sesotho sa Leboa/Northern Sotho.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This confusion in language designation/naming does not suit a democratic country such as South Africa well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socially and culturally, the name which is preferred by first the language speakers should be respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. LANGUAGE NAME PREFERENCE

1. As a speaker and student/lecturer of the Northern Sotho language, which language name do you prefer between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa and why is that particular name important to you?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

2. Add your social and cultural viewpoints, to say which language name do you think is the best between Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa.
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

3. As a speaker and at the same student/lecturer of the Northern Sotho language, describe how the use of two different language names affects you?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

4. Do you think that a specific dialect played a role when the official language name for Northern Sotho was chosen for constitutional purposes? Say why.
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

9. All institutions (schools, universities, government departments, etc.) should adhere to the constitution of South Africa and not violate its language policy.

10. The Constitution of South Africa should consider the language name that is preferred by speakers of the Northern Sotho language only if their case is reasonable and justifiable.

11. All organisations should use the same language name in order to maintain consistency and encourage development of the language.
5. Add your social and cultural viewpoints to motivate why Sepedi is considered a standard language or a dialect?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

6. Which language name do you think should be used and appear in the Constitution of South Africa and say why?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation!!!!!!!
ADDENDUM 2

**Interview questions for university lecturers**

1. What do you think caused the use of two different language names (Sepedi and Sesotho sa Leboa) in informative and policy documents?

2. In your understanding, which route do you think guided your university to choose the name that is preferred by your institution?

3. From your academic experience, how do you think this dual designation of a language impacts on the current and future Northern Sotho generation?

4. Within the context of your students, do you think it is fair for them to have matric certificate which reflect Sepedi and at the very same time have academic transcript which reflect Sesotho sa Leboa/Northern Sotho? Motivate your answer.

5. If you were in good position of clarifying this language naming confusion, how were you going to solve this problem?
INFORMATION LEAFLET AND INFORMED CONSENT

PROJECT TITLE: SEPEDI OR SESOTHO SA LEBOA: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE OF FIRST LANGUAGE SPEAKERS FROM SELECTED SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES.

Primary researcher: Mr T.J. Rakgogo

Supervisor: Prof. L Van Huyssteen
Department of Applied Languages,
University of Technology in Pretoria,

Co-study leaders: Ms M.L. Mphahlele
Department of Applied Languages,
University of Technology in Pretoria,
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Ms K.M. Makgopa
Department of Applied Languages,
University of Technology in Pretoria,
DEAR RESEARCH PARTICIPANT,

You are invited to participate in a research study that forms part of my formal M-Tech. studies. This information leaflet will help you to decide if you would like to participate. Before you agree to take part, you should fully understand what is involved. You should not agree to take part unless you are completely satisfied with all aspects of the study.

WHAT IS THE STUDY ALL ABOUT?

The fundamental focus of this study is to investigate the use of two different names for Northern Sotho (Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa) for the same language from a sociolinguistic perspective of first language speakers at five selected South African universities. The study aims to investigate the meaning of ‘standard’ and ‘official’ language in the South African context of language planning. Secondly the study will establish why a particular name is chosen, investigating the sociolinguistic context including some historical facts as well as speech variety and dialectic classification. Thirdly the study aims to determine which name students and academic staff at selected universities identify as relevant to name the language and which one they prefer: Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa. This study is not about ethnicity or race per se but about the naming of Northern Sotho language in relation to its dialectical varieties.

WHAT WILL YOU BE REQUIRED TO DO IN THE STUDY?

Participants will be required to complete a survey questionnaire and take part in an interview session. Interview and filling-in of a survey questionnaire are a once-off event. If you decide to participate in this study, you will be required to sign an informed consent form, complete a survey questionnaire and do an interview, all of which do not take more than 30 minutes of your time.

ARE THERE ANY CONDITIONS THAT MAY EXCLUDE YOU FROM THE STUDY?

If you are not a student who is enrolled for Northern Sotho first language or part of an African language department, specifically Northern Sotho academic staff at selected South African universities, you will be excluded.
CAN ANY OF THE STUDY PROCEDURES RESULT IN PERSONAL RISK, DISCOMFORT OR INCONVENIENCE?

By completing this questionnaire will not involve any emotional discomfort or inconvenience in your personal life or your work environment. The survey questionnaire and interview questions will be conducted in such a manner in which participants will be comfortable as they will be no personal and emotional questions.

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS THAT MAY COME FROM THE STUDY?

The results of this study will not directly benefit you and your family, however, the fundamental purpose is to make the Northern Sotho speech community aware that there are two different names for one language, also making them aware of some historical and sociolinguistic factors pertaining to this language. The information received during the project will only be used for research purposes and will not be released for any academic assessment, study progress and/or disciplinary purposes. Besides these benefits, there will be no financial compensation for taking part in the research.

WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT IN THIS STUDY?

Your participation in this study is fully voluntary and anonymous. The participant has the right of withdrawing at any stage without any penalty consequence. You don’t even have to provide reasons for your withdrawal. All the information gathered from the survey questionnaire and interview will be treated as confidential.

HOW WILL CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY BE ENSURED IN THE STUDY?

The responses from the respondents will be regarded as confidential all the time. When necessary, the researcher will use letter codes to refer to certain respondents for data analysis purposes. All the data provided will be handled confidentially and kept in a safe place and only be accessible to the researcher and the study leader.
IS THE RESEARCHER QUALIFIED TO CARRY OUT THE STUDY?

Yes, the student completed B-Tech degree in Language Practice and he did Research Methods and Techniques as a subject; the researcher is thus aware of what is involved when conducting research. Furthermore, the researcher did a Postgraduate Certificate in Education and is a junior university lecturer.

HAS THE STUDY RECEIVED ETHICAL APPROVAL?

Yes, the research proposal has been approved by the Departmental Committee for Research and Innovation (DCRI), the Faculty of Higher Degrees Committee and the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of Tshwane University of Technology. All parts of the study will be conducted according to internationally accepted ethical principles. The appropriate formal permission for conducting research at your particular university will be obtained from university authorities.

WHO CAN YOU CONTACT FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE STUDY?

The primary investigator, Mr T.J. Rakgogo can be contacted on 012 382 9815. The study leader, Prof. L. Van Huyssteen can be contacted only during office hours on 012 382 9889. Should you have any queries regarding the ethical aspects of the study, you can contact the Chairperson of Tshwane University of Technology Research Ethics Committee, Dr WA Hoffmann, only during office hours at 012 382 6265, email: hoffmannwa@tut.ac.za. Alternatively, you can report any serious unethical behaviour at the University’s Toll Free Hotline 0800 21 23 41.

DECLARATION: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

I hereby declare that there is a conflict of interest because of the status of the researcher as a postgraduate student and a lecturer (although in another Faculty, ICT). The researcher will use an independent field worker to collect the signed consent documents of the students who choose to take part in the study, as well as to administer the questionnaires and interview questions. Due to the researcher’s dual role as lecturer and researcher, such an approach will
facilitate voluntary participation in a potentially power imbalance context that may result in student vulnerability.

A FINAL WORD

Your participation in this study will be highly appreciated.
INFORMED CONSENT

I hereby confirm that I have been adequately informed by the researcher about the nature, conduct, benefits and risks of the study. I have also received, read and understood the above written information. I am aware that the results of the study will be anonymously processed into a research report. The information received during the project will only be used for research purposes and will not be released for any academic assessment, study progress and/or disciplinary purposes. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may, at any stage, without prejudice, withdraw my consent and participation in the study. I had sufficient opportunity to ask questions and of my own free will and declare myself prepared to participate in the study.

Research participant’s name: ____________________________ (Please print)

Research participant’s signature: ____________________________

Date: __________

Researcher’s name: ____________________________ (Please print)

Researcher’s signature: ____________________________

Date: __________
Lenaneopotšišo la dinyakišišo (baithuti ba yunibesithi le bafahloši).

Matseno

Thobela Mokgathatema

Ke nna Tebogo Jacob Rakgogo, moithuti wa M-Tech. Yunibesithing ya Theknoletši ka Tshwane, ka tlase ga Kgoro ya tša Maleme. Ke dira nyakišišo mabapi le: Sepedi goba Sesotho sa Leboa: Maikutlo ka ga polelo ya setšhaba go baboledi ba polelo ya letswele ka diyunibesithing tšeo di kgethilewe tša Afrika-Borwa. Ke rata gore o feleletše dinyakišišo le lenaneopotšišo tšeo di tsentšwego ka mo sengwalweng se. Diphetolo tša gago di tla swarwa bjalo ka taba tša sephiri ka dinako ka moka. Ga go hlokagale gore o neelane ka sefane le maina a gago ka botlalo. Ge go hlokega, monyakišišo o tla šomiša ditlhaka tša dikhoutu go šupa tše dingwe tša dikarabo tša moheetodi ge go sekasekwa tshedimošo. Tshedimošo ka moka ga yona yeo e tšweleditšwego ke moheetodi e tla swara ka tlhokomelo yeo e tletšego, ya bewa lefelong leo le bologetšweke gommie motho yoo a tla bago le tokelo ya go e fihlelela ke monyakišiši še leetšwela pele go tšakego tša godimošo. Go kgatha tema ga gago mo nyakišišong ye le phetolo go tšeeng karolo gago ka lenaneopotšišong go tla amogelwa ka diatlus tše pedi. Ge e ba o ka ba le dipotšišo tšeo o nyakago go di tšweletša go tšwela pele, o ka ikgokagany le monyakišiši yo mogolo ka nako ye ngwe le ye ngwe go: rakgogotj@gmail.com.

Ditaelo: Ka kgopelo, badišiša ntlha ye ngwe le ye ngwe ka tlhokomelo, ebile o fetole ka bonnete bjoo bo tletšego ka moo o ka kgonago ka gona. O kgopelwa gape gore o se ke wa tlogela sekgoba.

A. TSHEDIMOŠO YA GAGO LE MOO O TŠWAGO GONA.

1. Bong: _________________________________________________________________

2. Mengwaga: __________________________________________________________________

3. Thuto ya godimo: __________________________________________________________________

4. Mošomo: ____________________________________________________________________
5. Ngwaga/Maemo a thuto: ________________________________

6. Mangwalo a dithuto: ________________________________

7. Yunibesithi: _______________________________________

8. Mmolelwana: _______________________________________

9. Selete: _____________________________________________

10. Profense: __________________________________________

B. LENANEOPOTŠIŠO LA GO ELWA

**Ditaelo:** Badišša ditatamente tše di latelago ka šedi ye kgolo, gore o tle o kgone go fetola ka moo go swanetšego.

**Ditaelo:** Ka kgopelo, swaya (✔) ka gare ga lepokisi la maleba.

1= Gana kudu; 2= Gana. 3= Ga o na bonnete. 4= Dumela; 5= Dumela kudu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DITATAMENTE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Na e ka ba o wa lemoga gore go na le maina a mabedi ao a reetšwego polelo e tee e lego Sepedi le Sesotho sa Leboa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leina la polelo le bohlokwa ka ge e le karolo ya boitsebišo bja gago.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Go maleba go ba le leina le tee fela (Sepedi goba Sesotho sa Leboa) go rea polelo ya semmušo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ga se selo seo se lokilego gore baboledi ba polelo ya Sesotho sa Leboa go ba le maina a mabedi ao a fapanego ka dingwalweng tša tshedimošo le tša tlhalošo le ka tšhomisong ya polelo ka kakaretšo ka ge se se baka kgakanego.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Go fa motho leina la polelo leo a sa le nyakego go swana le go mo fa sefane se seswa go seo a šetšego a na le sona.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Ke kgakanego go baithuti ba leleme la pele ba polelo ya Sesotho sa Leboa ge ba hwetša lengwalo la Marematlou leo le bontšhago gore moithuti o dirile Sepedi, ka morago ga moo, lengwalo la yunibesithing le bowe le laetše ge moithuti a dirile Sesotho sa Leboa/Northern Sotho.

7. Kgakanego ye ya go rea leina la polelo ga e sepelelane le naga ya temokrasi ya go swana le Afrika Borwa.

8. Mo setšhabeng le ka setšo sa gago, leina lefe la polelo leo o bonago le le kaone magareng ga Sepedi le Sesotho sa Leboa? Fahlela karabo ya gago.

9. Dihlongwa ka moka (dikolo, diyunibesithi, dikgoro tša mmušo, bjalobjalo) di swanetše go obamela molaotheo wa Afrika-Borwa e sego go tshele melawana ya polelo.

10. Molaotheo wa Afrika Borwa o swanetše go hlokomela leina la polelo leo le nyakwago ke baboledi ba polelo ya Sesotho sa Leboa ge fela taba ya bona e kwagala ebile e na le mabaka.

11. Mekgatlo ka moka e swanetše go šomiša leina la polelo leo le swanago ka nepo ya gore leina le šomišwe ka go swana le go hlohleletša kgolo ya polelo.

C. LEINA LA POLELO LEO O LE RATAGO

1. Bjale ka seboledi gape o le moithuti wa polelo ya Sesotho sa Leboa, ke leina lefe la polelo leo o le kgethago magareng ga Sepedi le Sesotho sa Leboa? Fahlela karabo ya gago.

2. Go ya le ka bowena le setšo sa gago, ke leina lefe la polelo leo o bonago le le kaone magareng ga Sepedi le Sesotho sa Leboa? Fahlela karabo ya gago.
3. Bjalo ka motho yo a bolelago polelo ya Sesotho sa Leboa/moithuti goba mofahloši, e ka ba maina a a mabedi a reetšwego polelo e tee a go ama bjang?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

4. O gopola gore mmolelwana wo itšego o bile le seabe ge go kgethwa leina la semmušo la polelo ya Sesotho sa Leboa? Fahlela karabo ya gago.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

5. Go ya le ka tsebo ya gago, e ka ba Sepedi ke polelo yeo e tletšego goba mmolelwana? Fahlela karabo ya gago.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

6. Ke leina lefe la polelo leo o gopolago gore le swanelwa ke go šomišwa le go ba ka gare ga molaotheo wa Afrika Borwa? Fahlela karabo ya gago.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Re leboga go kgatha tema ga gago!!!!!!!
**Dipotšišo tša dipoledišano tša bafahloši ba yunibesithi**

1. Naa o nagana gore ke eng seo se bakilego gore go be le maina a mabedi a polelo (Sepedi le Sesotho sa Leboa) ka gare ga dingwalwa tša semmušo tša tshedimošo le tša melawana?

2. Go ya le ka kwešišo ya gago, ke eng seo se hlahlilego yunibesithi ya gago go kgetha leina leo le šomišwago ke yunibesithi ya geno?

3. Go ya le ka maitemogelo a gago a tša thuto, o gopola gore tšomišo ye ya maina a mabedi e ka ama bjang moloko wa ka moso wa baboledi ba Sesotho sa Leboa?

4. Ka go kwela baithuti ba gago bohloko, o gopola gore ke toka gore ba be le maina a mabedi ao a fapanego e lego la Sesotho sa Leboa le Sepedi ka gare ga dingwalwa tša bona tša semmušo tša go swana le setifiqueitši sa marematlou le ka dipoelong tša bona tša yunibesithing? Fahlela karabo ya gago.

5. Ge o be o le maemong a mabotse a go ka rarolla bothata bjo bja maina a mabedi (Sepedi le Sesotho sa Leboa), naa o be o tlo rarolla bothata bjo bjang?
Yunibesithi ya Theknolotši ya Tshwane

Kgoro Ya Tša Maleme

LETLAKALA LA TSHEDIMOŠO LE TUMELO YA TSEBO

HLOGO YA NYAKIŠIŠO:

SEPEDI GOBA SESOTHO SA LEBOA: MAIKUTLO KA GA POLELO YA SETŠHABA GO BABOLEDI BA POLELO YA LETSWELE KA DIYUNIBESITHING TŠEO DI KGETHILWEGO TŠA AFRIKA-BORWA.

Monyakišišimogolo: Mna. T.J. Rakgogo

Mofahloši yo a hlokometšego: Prof. L Van Huyssteen
Kgoro ya tša Maleme,
Yunibesithi ya Theknolotši ka Tshwane,

Modirišanimmogo wa dinyakišišo: Mdi. M.L. Mphahlele
Kgoro ya tša Maleme,
Yunibesithi ya Theknolotši ya Tshwane,

Mdi. K.M. Makgopa
Kgoro ya tša Maleme,
Yunibesithi ya Theknolotši ya Tshwane.
THOBELA MOKGATHATEMA WA NYAKIŠIŠO,

O mengwa go tla go kgatha tema ka gare ga thuto ya nyakišišo yeo e bopago seripa sa thuto ya ka ya semmušo ya MTech. Letlakala le la tshedimošo ya tumelo le tla go thuša go tšea sephetho ge e ba o ka rata go kgatha tema ka gare ga nyakišišo ye. Pele o ka dumela go tšea karolo, o swanelwa ke go kwešiša ka botlalo gore go akareditšwe eng ka mo nyakišišong ye. Ga se wa swanela go dumela go tšea karolo ntle le ga ge o kgotsofaditšwe ke dikokwane mabapi le nyakišišo ye ka moka ga yona.

NAA NYAKIŠIŠO E MABAPI LE ENG?

Tabakgolo ya nyakišišo ye ke go nyakišiša tšhomišo ya maina a mabedi ao a fapanego a Sesotho sa Leboa (Sepedi goba Sesotho sa Leboa), ao a reetšwego polelo e tswa go tšwa go maikutlo a baboledi ba polelo ya letsewe le tšweletša gore diyunibesithing tšeo di kgethilweho tša Afrika-Borwa. Nepo ya nyakišišo ye ye ke go nyakišiša tlhalošo ya polelo ya go ‘lekanetšwa’ le ya ‘semmušo’ ka sebopego seo dipolelo tša Afrika-Borwa di bopiwago ka gona. Sa bobedi, nyakišišo ye e tla tšweletša gore ke ka lebaka la eng leina leo le itšego e le lona leo le kgethilweho, ya nyakišiša gape le maikutlo a baboledi ba polelo setšhabeng, ya akaretša le bonnete bja dilo tšeo di diregilego kgale mabapi le polelo ye le mehuta ya mebolelwana le karoganyo ya mebolelwana. Sa boraro, nyakišišo ye e tla leka go tšweletša gore ke leina le feng leo e lego gore le kgethwa goba gona go ratwa goba go amogelwa ke baithuti le bášomedi bao e lego baboledi ba leleme la letsewe le tšwa diyunibesithing tša Afrika-Borwa.

KE ENG SEO O TLA SWANELWAGO KE SE DIRA KA GARE GA NYAKIŠIŠO YE?

Bakgathatema ba tla swanelwa ke go tlatša nyakišišo ya lenaneopotšišo, ba tšeye le karolo ka gare ga poledišano. Poledišano le go tlatšwa ga lenaneopotšišo la nyakišišo ke tiragalo yeo e diregago gatee fela.

Ge o kgetha go kgatha tema mo nyakišišong ye, o tla swanelwa ke go saena foromo ya tumelo ya tsebo, wa tlatša lenaneopotšišo la nyakišišo, le gona go dira poledišano, – dilo tše ka moka ga tšona ga di tšeye metsotso ye e fetago ye masometharo (30) ya nako ya gago.
NAA GO KA BA LE MABAKA A MANGWE AO A KA DIRAGO GORE O SE KGATHE TEMA KA NYAKIŠIŠONG?

Ge e le gore ga se wena moithuti yo a ngwadišitšweyo dithutong tša polelo ya letswele ya Northern Sotho goba o se karolo ya kgoro ya tša maleme a Babaso, kudukudu o se mošomi yo e lego mofahloši wa Sesotho sa Leboa ka go ye nngwe ya diyunibesithi tšeo di kgethilwego, o ka se akaretšwe.

NAA E KA BA TŠE DINGWE TŠA TSHEPEDIŠO YA NYAKIŠIŠO YE DI KA FELELETŠA DI HLOTŠE KOTSI, GO SE BE LE BOIKETLO GOBA GO GO ŠITELA?

Ka go tlatša lenaneopotšišo le go ka se akaretše khuduego ya maikutlo goba go go šitiša bophelong bja gago bja sephiri goba tikologong ya mošomo wa gago. Lenaneopotšišo la nyakišišo le dipotšišo tša poledišano di tla sepedišwa ka tsetla yeo e lego gore bakgathatema ba tla lokologa ka ge go ka se be le dipotšišo tša sephiri le tša maikutlo.

NAA KE DIKOHELOGO DIFE TŠEO DI KA TŠWELELAGO KA MORAGO GA NYAKIŠIŠO YE?

Dipoelo tša nyakišišo ye di ka se go hole thwii le ba lapa la gago, le ge go le bjale, morero wo mogolo ke go dira gore setšhaba sa leleme la letswele la Sesotho sa Leboa se lemoge gore go na le maina a mabedi ao a reetšwego polelo e tee, le gape go ba lemoša ka ditiragalo tša kgale le mabaka a polelo le sešhaba le kamano ya polelo. Tshedimošo ka moka ga yona yeo e tla hwetšagalago ka morago ka nyakišišong ye e tla šomišwa fela mo mabakeng a nyakišišo ebile e ka se tšweletšwe dikelong tša gago tša dithuto, go kgatelopele ya dithuto tša gago le mabakeng a kgalemo. Ka ntle le dikholego tšeo, go ka se be le go holega ka sebopego sa go fiwa tšhelete ka ge o kgatha tema ka nyakišišong ye.

NAA DITOKELO TŠA GAGO KE DIFE BJALO KA MOKGATHATEMA MO NYAKIŠIŠO YE?

Go kgatha tema ga gago mo nyakišišong ye ke go ithaopa ga gago ebile leina la gago le ka se tšweletšwe. Mokgathatema o na le tokelo ya go ikgogela morago nako ye nngwe ye le ye nngwe ebile go ka se be le kotloye e ka bago gona. Ga go hlokagale gore o fe mabaka mabapi le go ikgogela morago ya gago. Tshedimošo ka moka ga yona yeo e tla bego e kgobokeditšwe mo lenaneopotšišong la nyakišišo le poledišanong e tla ba sephiri.
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Diphetolo go tšwa go bafetodi di tla swarwa bjalo ka sephiri ka dinako ka moka. Ge go kgonega, monyakišiši o tla šomiša ditlhaka tša dikhoutu go šupa ba bangwe ba bafetodi go sekasekeng diphetolo tša bona. Tshedimošo ka moka yeo e tlišitšwe e tla swarwa ka tlhokomelo ya dula lefelong leo le bolokegilego, batho bao ba tla bago le tokelo ya go ka e bona e tla ba monyakišiši le moetapele wa nyakišišo fela.

NAA E KA BA NYAKIŠIŠI YO O LOKETŠE GO DIRA NYAKIŠIŠO YE?

Ee, moithuti o phethile lengwalo la gagwe la B-Tech go Language Practice gape o dirile Mekgwa ya nyakišišo le Mehuta ya yona *(Research Methods and Techniques)* bjalo ka thuto; ka fao monyakišiši o a lemoga gore go akareditšwe eng ge o sepediša nyakišišo. Godimo ga fao, monyakišiši o dirile Setifiqueiti sa Morago ga Kgrata go tša Borutšiši (Postgraduate Certificate in Education) ebile ke mofahloši yo monnyane ka yunibesithing.

NAA NYAKIŠIŠO E AMOGETŠE TUMELELO YA MAITSHWARO A MABOTSE?

Ee, tšhišinyo ya nyakišišo e dumeletšwe ke Komiti ya Dinyakišišo le tša Boithomelo ya ka Kgorong (DCRI), Lefapha la Komiti ya Dikgrata tša Godingwana le Komiti ya Maitshwaro ka ga Dinyakišišo yaYnibesithi ya Theknolotši ya Tshwane. Dikarolo ka moka tša nyakišišo ye di tlo sepedišwa go ya le ka melawana ya maitshwaro ye e amogelegilego ya boditšhabatšhaba. Tumelelo ya maleba ya semmušo ya go sepediša nyakišišo yunibesithi ya gago e tlo hwetšagala go tšwa go balaodi ba yunibesithi.

NAA O KA IKGOKANTŠHA LE MANG GO HWETŠA TSHEDIMOŠO YA TLALELETŠO MABAPI LE NYAKIŠIŠO YE?

Monyakišišimogolo, Mna. TJ Rakgogo a ka hwetšagala go 012 382 9815. Moetapele wa nyakišišo, Moprofesara L Van Huyssteen a ka hwetšagala ka nako tša mošomo fela go 012 382 9889. Ge o ka ba le dipotšišo mabapi le dikokwane tša maitshwaro a mabotse ka ga nyakišišo ye, o ka ikgokantšha le Modulasetulo wa Komiti ya Maitshwaro a Dinyakišišo ka Yunibesithing ya Theknolotši ya Tshwane, Ngaka WA Hoffmann, ka dinako tša mošomo fela, go 012 382 6265, emeile: hoffmannwa@tut.ac.za. Goba o ka bega maitshwaro a mabe go nomoro ya go se lefelwe ya Yunibesithi e lego 0800 21 23 41.
**BOIKANO: THULANO YA KGATELEGO**

Ke tsebiša semmušo fa gore go na le thulano ya kgalego kudu bakeng la gore monyakišiši o dira nyakišišo ye yunibesithing yeo a lego mofahloši mo go yona (le ge e le gore ke ka Lefapheng le lengwe la Theknolotši ya Dikgokagano tša Tshedimošo). Monyakišiši o tla šomiša motho fela yoo a ikemego gore e be yena a kogoketšago mangwalo a tumelo ao a tla bego a saennwe ke baithuti bao ba dumelago go kgatha tema mo nyakišišong ye, motho yo wa go ikema e tla ba yena a hlokomela mananeopotšišo le go dira dipoledišano.

**LENTŠU LA GO TSWALELA**

Go kgatha tema ga gago mo nyakišišong ye go tla amogelwa ka diatla tše pedi.
TUMELO YA HLALOSETŠO

Ke nna, ke tiša gore ke tsebišitše ka moo go lekanego ke monyakišiši mabapi le tlhago, tshepidišo, dipolelo le dikotsi tša thuto ye. Gape ke amogetše, ka bala le gona go kwešiša tshedimošo yeo e ngwadilego ka godimo. Ke a lemoga gore dipelo tša thuto di tla sepetšwa ka go se tsebje go pego ya nyakišišo ye. Tshedimošo ka moka ga yona yeo e tla hwetšagalogo ka morago ga nyakišišo ye e tla šomišwa fela mo mabakeng a nyakišišo, ebile e ka se tšweletšwe dikelong tša gago, tšwelopeleng ya dithuto tša gago le pele ga lekgotlakgalemo. Ke a kwešiša gore go kgatha tema ga ka ke ga go ithaopa ebile ken a le tokelo ya gore nka gogela kgetho yaka morago ya go dumela go tšea karolo mo thutong ye nako ye nngwe le ye nngwe. Ke bile le sebaka seo se lekanego sa go ka botšiša dipotšišo, le, le ka ga kgetho yaka, ebile ke a ikana semmušo gore ke ikemiseditše go kgatha tema mo thutong ye.

Leina la mokgatha tema wa nyakišišo: ________________________________ (ka kgopelo gatiša)

Mosaeno wa mokgatha tema wa nyakišišo: ________________________________

Tšatšikgwedi: __________

Leina la monyakišiši: ________________________________ (ka kgopelo gatiša)

Mosaeno wa monyakišiši: ______________________ Tšatšikgwedi: ________________
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Research Ethics Committee

The TUT Research Ethics Committee is a registered Institutional Review Board (IRB 00005960) with the US Office for Human Research Protections (DOD #0004997) (Expires 9 Jan 2017). Also, it has Federal Wide Assurance for the Protection of Human Subjects for International Institutions (FWA 00015501) (Expires 22 Jan 2019). In South Africa it is registered with the National Health Research Ethics Council (REC-166009-21).

May 11, 2015

Mr Tj Rakgogo
C/o Prof L van Huyssteen
Department of Applied Languages
Faculty of Humanities

Dear Mr Rakgogo,

Decision: Final Approval

Name: Rakgogo Tj
Project title: Seputle or Seisothe se Leboa: A sociallinguistic perspective of first language speakers from selected South African universities
Qualification: M Tech Language Practice, TUT
Supervisor: Prof L van Huyssteen
Co-supervisor: Mrs KM Makgopa and Mrs LM Mphahlele

Thank you for submitting the revised project documents for ethics clearance by the Research Ethics Committee (REC), Tshwane University of Technology (TUT). In reviewing the documents, the comments and notes below are tailored for your consideration, attention and notification:

- Proposal
  > Sampling method (Section 3.2.1). The revised sampling method, namely quota sampling, is in order and duly noted.

- Information Leaflet & Informed Consent
  > Language Recommendation. The REC took due note of the Northern Sotho-translated Questionnaires and the Information Leaflet and Informed Consent documents.
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> Academic Vulnerability. The inclusion of an academic vulnerability statement is in order and duly noted.
> Contact information. The revised contact information for the Chairperson of the TUT Research Ethics Committee is in order and duly noted.
> Declaration: Conflict of Interest. The revised Conflict of Interest declaration is in order and duly noted.

> Questionnaires, Student & Lecturer Versions
> Race Item (Section A). The decision to omit the item enquiring about apartheid-based racial categories is in order and duly noted.

The Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of Tshwane University of Technology (TUT) reviewed the revised project document on May 11 2015. Final approval is granted to the project. The decision will be tabled at the next REC meeting on May 25, 2015 for notification.

The proposed research project may now continue with the proviso that:

1) The researcher/s will conduct the study according to the procedures and methods indicated in the approved proposal, particularly in terms of any undertakings and/or assurances made regarding the confidentiality of the collected data.
2) The proposal will again be submitted to the Committee for prospective ethical clearance if there are any substantial changes from the approved proposal.
3) The researcher will act within the parameters of any applicable national legislation, professional codes of conduct, institutional guidelines and scientific standards relevant to the specific field of study.
4) The current ethics approval expiry date for this project is December 31, 2017. No research activities may continue after the ethics approval expiry date. Submission of a duly completed Research Ethics Progress Report (available at: http://www.tut.ac.za/Other/minew/ResearchEthicsCommittees/Pages/default.aspx) will constitute an application for renewal of CRE ethics approval.

Note:
The reference number [top right corner of this communiqué] should be clearly indicated on all forms of communication [e.g. Webmail, E-mail messages, letters] with the intended research participants.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

WA HOFFMANN (Dr)
Chairperson: Research Ethics Committee
[Ref#2015=03007-Rakgogot2]
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FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED LANGUAGES

FIELDWORKER AND/OR RESEARCH ASSISTANT CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

1. Rosinah Lethabo Mokhubidu hereby agree to:

1. Abide by the confidentiality requirements of this study, as approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Tshwane University of Technology, by ensuring that the identities and information of the participants are not revealed during and after the course of study;

2. Keep all the research information shared with me confidential by not discussing or sharing the research information in any form or format with anyone other than the Principal Investigator(s);

3. Keep all research information in any form or format securely stored while it is in my possession;

4. Return all research information in any form or format to the Principal Investigator(s) when I have completed the research tasks;

5. After consulting with the Principal Investigator(s), erase or destroy all research information in any form or format regarding this research project that is not returnable to the Principal Investigator(s) (e.g. information sorted on computer hard drive).

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact:
Mr Rakgogo TJ, can be contacted during office hours at Tel (012) 382 9815 or on his cellular phone at 072 032 8240. E-mail: rakgogotji@gmail.com.
This study has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee at
Tshwane University of Technology. For questions regarding your rights and/or the
ethical conduct of research, contact the Chairperson of Research Ethics Committee
Dr. WA Hoffmann at (012) 382 6246 (hoffmannwa@tut.ac.za).

Research Assistant or Fieldworker:

Print name ucumber uthando motshwone  Signature

Date 27 April 2015

Principal Investigator:

Print name  rango  chago  Jacob  Signature

Date 29 April 2015
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University of Limpopo
Department of Research Administration and Development
Private Bag X3,100, Sovenga, 0727, South Africa
Tel: (015) 268 2212, Fax: (015) 268 2306, Email:noko.monene@ul.ac.za

TURFLOOP RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE

MEETING: 06 July 2015
PROJECT NUMBER: TREC/106/2015: IR
PROJECT:
Title: Sepedi or Sesotho sa Leboa: A sociolinguistic perspective of first language speakers from selected South African Universities
Researcher: Mr T Rakgogo
Supervisor: Prof L Van Huyssteen
Co-Promoter: Ms KM Magopa
Ms ML Mphahlele
Institution: Tshwane University of Technology
Degree: Independent Research

CHAIRPERSON: TURFLOOP RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

The Turfloop Research Ethics Committee (TREC) is registered with the National Health Research Ethics Council, Registration Number: REC-0810111-031

Note:

i) Should any departure be contemplated from the research procedure as approved, the researcher(s) must re-submit the protocol to the committee.

ii) The budget for the research will be considered separately from the protocol.

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES.
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Office of the Registrar
INTERNAL MEMO
Tel: 015 268 2407 Fax: 015 268 3048 E-mail: Office.Registrar@ul.ac.za

TO: Prof. TAB Mashego
Chairperson: Turfloop Research Ethics Committee

FROM: Dr. Jeffrey Mabelebele
University Registrar

DATE: 31 July 2015

SUBJECT: GATE KEEPING PERMISSION – TITLE: SEPEDI OR SESOTHO SA LEBOA: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE OF FIRST LANGUAGE SPEAKER FROM SELECTED SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES
RESEARCHER: MR. T RAKGOGO
SUPERVISOR: PROF. L VAN HUYSTsteen
CO-PROMOTERS: Ms. KM Makuipa
Ms. ML Mphaelele

Your letter dated 6 July 2015 refers.

The matter was discussed with Prof. MM Sibara (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic & Research) and we are in agreement that the research proceeds, provided all ethical issues are upheld.

Kind regards,

[Signature]

DR. JEFFREY MABELEBELE
UNIVERSITY REGISTRAR
Certificate of editing

I hereby testify that I edited the language of the following dissertation:

SEPEDI OR SESOTHO SA LEOBA: A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF FIRST LANGUAGE SPEAKERS FROM SELECTED SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES

by

Rakgogo Tebogo Jacob

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

MAGISTER TECHNOLOGIAE: LANGUAGE PRACTICE

Dr. C. Smith (Ph.D. English (NWU)

[Signature]

[Signature]