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Abstract

Recent language-policy developments at the University of South Africa (Unisa) indicate that the language attitudes of its students should be researched, particularly the attitudes of students who have an African language as their first language.

This study takes a first but solid step towards meeting this requirement. It conducts exploratory research into the nature of the relevant language attitudes and, based on the findings of this research, constructs an attitude scale that can be usefully employed in the measurement of such attitudes, both at Unisa and other tertiary institutions in South Africa.

In order to achieve its aims, the study places much emphasis on the use of proper methodology, in order to counteract the trend in much local language-attitude research of ignoring the complexity of language attitudes and avoiding methodologically sophisticated and rigorous statistical techniques that are equipped to accommodate such complexity.
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Chapter 1

Language Attitudes at Unisa

1.1 Introduction

Attitudes ... like many aspects of life, are far more complex than merely agreeing or disagreeing with particular statements (Adegbija 1994:54).

In sociolinguistic practice, the complexity of language attitudes is often neglected or ignored. In some cases this neglect is due to ignorance, but more often than not it points to a general unwillingness among researchers in the field to adopt sophisticated statistical methods. Although true of language-attitude research worldwide (Baker 1992:2), this neglect is particularly characteristic of research in sub-Saharan Africa (Adegbija 1994:53). The normal procedure is to draw up a list of questions that, in the opinion of the researcher, are adequate for the measurement of the language attitudes under consideration. A large scale survey is then conducted using a questionnaire, followed by individual interviews to clarify any unusual trends in the collected data. Concern for methodology, if any, usually takes the form of ensuring the representativeness of the sample population or, at best, attempting to relate the results of the survey statistically to other demographic variables such as gender, age, mother-tongue, level of education, etc. Little attention seems to be focused on ensuring that the questionnaire is measuring the right thing or on ensuring that the questionnaire’s component parts are all measuring the same thing.

In the South African context, this situation has led to a plethora of language-attitude studies or surveys that, as a whole, provide conflicting results and are difficult to interpret. Even worse, when reviewing this research, one is often struck by the degree to which the results of any particular language-attitude survey lend support to the academic, political or ideological convictions of the researcher in question. The fact that language-attitude surveys are often used to promote broader academic or policy agendas also explains why the focus of such research is often
solely on determining the language preferences of respondents. Interest lies in
simply determining whether, for example, the majority of respondents in any
particular context are pro-English or pro-mother-tongue. To borrow a set of terms
originally employed in a completely different field of linguistics (Chomsky
1965:24-27), emphasis often falls on the descriptive adequacy of the research,
rather than on its explanatory adequacy, i.e. on its ability to explain the why behind
the preferences described.

This dissertation is motivated by the considerations discussed above, and has, in
response, set out to focus on taking a few small but sure steps towards the thorough
investigation and accurate measurement of one particular kind of language attitude.
The focus of the research is on depth rather than breadth; on quality rather than
quantity; and on methodological rigour rather than on attempting a superficially
impressive large-scale sociolinguistic survey that is broad in scope but,
metaphorically-speaking, built on sand. To stretch this metaphor somewhat, the
aim of this dissertation is to provide a solid foundation on which future research on
language attitudes in Southern Africa can confidently build. This foundation takes
the form of an attitude scale, the construction of which has been informed by
engagement with the complex, multidimensional nature of language attitudes.

Although the primary focus of the research is on instrument construction and not,
as emphasised above, on the survey of attitudes as such, the process of construction
has, as a positive spin-off, provided some insights into the nature of the language
attitudes in question. In particular it provides some insight into the complex nature
of these attitudes and, more importantly, identifies the kinds of issues which, in
broad terms, underlie their nature.

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the reader to some of the issues and
questions that relate to the research under discussion. It provides information on
recent events that constituted the real-world context for the research and then
outlines the research problems which became evident as a result of the attempt to
meet the practical demands of this context. The aims and objectives of the research
are then specified. In addition, I provide an outline of the research methods used in
the research and a summary of the structure of the dissertation.
1.2 Background to the research problems

The task of this section is to provide information on the real-world context that framed the research. It was this context and the problems related to it that motivated the particular aims of the research as well as the methodologies employed within it. This section begins with a brief description of the events leading up to the formulation of the University of South Africa’s (Unisa) new language policy and then provides an analysis of the contents of this policy.

1.2.1 Unisa’s new language policy

On 25 November 1998 Unisa’s new language policy was approved (Herholdt 1999; Unisa 1999a; Unisa 1999b). One of the issues dealt with in this policy is Unisa’s languages of learning and teaching (LOLT)\(^1\). In terms of the new policy, Unisa will support the development of the official African languages\(^2\) so as to eventually allow speakers of these languages to study through them (Unisa 1999a; Unisa 1999b), a position which is in stark contrast with Unisa’s previous policy of using only English and Afrikaans as LOLT. What follows is a brief summary of the events at Unisa which led to the policy's final approval by Unisa's Council in November 1998. This summary is based on an account provided in Unisa (1999a).

In September 1995, on two separate occasions at Unisa, both Nelson Mandela (at the time President of South Africa) and Mr SME Bengu (then Minister of Education), stressed the necessity of transforming Unisa's language policy. As part of an acceptance speech for an Honorary Degree, President Mandela made the following observation:

```
today, when we have to deal with a new reality of a university most of whose students are
now black and predominantly rural or semi-urban, great challenges emerge. Not least
```

---

1. Note that the term *LOLT* is used in this dissertation to refer to either the singular or the plural, i.e. *language of learning and teaching* or *languages of learning and teaching*.

2. i.e. Northern Sotho, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, isiNdebele, isiXhosa and isiZulu.
among them is the vexing question of a language policy that should honour the preferences of the students themselves (Mandela 1995:3).

In a similar vein, Minister Bengu, during an opening address at an International Conference on Education, said the following:

the related question of the language competences and language preferences of the student body, not only with respect to teaching but in matters of official communication, must be a matter of serious concern to the university as it is to the students and to me (Bengu 1995:8).

In response, in 1996 Unisa's Broad Transformation Forum (UBTF) tabled Unisa's language policy as an issue that required urgent attention. A special sub-committee (the Language Policy Subcommittee) was formed to look into the matter and begin the process of formulating a new language policy for the university. The next few years were characterised by the submission of a number of draft proposals and numerous responses from both individuals and bodies internal to Unisa. Highlights of this period include a conference on language policy issues (Unisa 1996), the submission of a first draft of the proposed policy in April 1997, and a second draft in October of the same year (Unisa 1997). A revised document was submitted to the Unisa Council during March 1998 (Unisa 1998). After a period of debate relating to proposed amendments which are inconsequential to present discussion, the document was finally approved by Council on the 25 November 1998.

1.2.2 A brief analysis of the policy
The Revised Draft Language Policy at Unisa (Unisa 1998:1) states that Unisa's bilingual policy (English and Afrikaans) is in conflict with the South African Constitution, which makes a number of provisions for the promotion of multilingualism. In accordance with these provisions, the document advocates a policy of functional multilingualism for Unisa. The adoption of this principle is confirmed in Unisa (1999b; parenthesis added): 'UNISA has accepted a new policy based on the principle of functional multi-lingualism [sic]'.

Strangely, although functional multilingualism is the basic principle underlying the policy, it is only mentioned twice in the Revised Draft Language Policy at Unisa (March 1998). It is mentioned on the first page of the document as part of the general introduction:
it is recommended, therefore, that a starting point be, scrapping of bilingualism at Unisa as adopted by the Unisa Council in 1946; for the university to commit itself to a functional multilingual policy (Unisa 1998:1).

The second and last time the principle is referred to is in relation to recommendations dealing with the languages of public communication (Unisa 1998:10). At no point is a definition or description of the principle provided. In order to find one, it is necessary to review the contents of other policy documents that provided the framework for the development of Unisa's language policy. According to Unisa (1998:3), the main policy document that provided this framework was the 1996 report of the NCHE\textsuperscript{3} (1996). Unfortunately, no mention of the full phrase (i.e. functional multilingualism) is to be found in this document either. It is, however, mentioned in the LANGTAG\textsuperscript{4} (1996) Report, which the NCHE took into consideration when drawing up its recommendations on language policy in higher education (see Unisa 1998:3). The LANGTAG Report provides the following definition of functional multilingualism:

by functional multilingualism we mean - in the South African context - that various languages function in differing contexts, whilst others function in other contexts ... Functional multilingualism implies that each language need not always function in every context (LANGTAG 1996:111).

Functional multilingualism, therefore, refers to a state of affairs in which different languages fulfil different functions in society.

The term functional multilingualism, however, also appears to describe a programme, a set of language planning norms, as is clear from the following quotations:

functional multilingualism will encompass an approach which ... will indicate what further research is required to make better and more efficient use of languages... (LANGTAG 1996: 111);

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{3} National Commission on Higher Education.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} Language Plan Task Group.
\end{itemize}
appropriate language planning activities which are linked to national and economic
development should increase the range of functions for many languages in a more
systematic and ultimately profitable manner (LANGTAG 1996: 111);

an important component of functional multilingualism is that it involves responsible
planning (LANGTAG 1996:112).

In the sense that it encompasses a set of language planning norms, therefore, *functional
multilingualism* seems to underscore the desirability of extending the functional range of
the official African languages.

Furthermore, a close reading of the LANGTAG report's use of the term *functional
multilingualism* seems to indicate, on the one hand, a recognition of the impracticality of
using all 11 official languages in all contexts:

an 11-language policy could be interpreted as implying that all public functions should be
performed in all 11 languages. This is obviously not necessary, if one works with the

On the other hand, however, there is a desire to ensure the equal treatment of languages in
all contexts as far as possible:

nevertheless, it is the obligation of Government to follow through the linguistic implications
of the constitution which are firmly based on the principles of equality and democracy
(LANGTAG 1996:111).

From the above discussion it would appear that the notion of functional multilingualism is a
complex one, even verging on the self-contradictory: it stresses the importance of equality,
but at the same time admits to the inevitability of difference in function. The ambiguity of
the concept is, however, illusory. To show this, we need to begin with a brief analysis of the
language rights and provisions contained in the Constitution, one of the policy documents
on which Unisa's policy is based (Unisa 1999b:1).
The following provision in central to Section 6 of the Constitution: ‘all official languages must enjoy parity of esteem and must be treated equitably’ (cited in Unisa 1998:2).

Apart from this central provision, a number of other language-related rights are set out in the Constitution. These rights relate to issues such as language and culture, linguistic communities, and, most important for this discussion, language-in-education. Section 29(2) of the Constitution establishes it as a right to be taught through one’s language of choice:

everyone has the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice in public educational institutions where that education is reasonably practicable (cited in UNISA 1998:2).

Again, as with functional multilingualism, there is an apparent contradiction contained in these provisions. The notion of reasonable practicality seems to imply that all languages (and their users) need not be treated in the same fashion, yet they should all be treated equitably.

This apparent contradiction is resolved, however, when we consider the notion of equity more closely. The LANGTAG (1996:44-45) Report discusses the difference between the notions of equality and equity. It asserts that the former is definable in terms of sameness of function, amount etc., whereas the latter relates to ‘fairness, justice and reasonableness’:

in general, language equality implies that two or more languages are equal with reference to function or rank, e.g. prior to 1994 the language equality of Afrikaans and English was legislated. Section 6(2) of the 1996 Constitution refers to two distinct meanings, namely, equality ("parity of esteem") and equity "all official languages must enjoy parity of esteem and must be treated equitably".... The South African legislator clearly intended that fairness, justice and reasonableness should be the key components of the new language policy (LANGTAG 1996:45).

The term reasonably practical relates, therefore, to the notion of equity, as opposed to

---

5. Also see Du Plessis (2000:105-106).
equality. Two languages need not be equal in function in order to be treated equitably. The equality of languages should be pursued where practically viable i.e. where reasonable. Hence the functional in functional multilingualism. Naturally, some commentators view the advocating of equity as simply an attempt to obscure the fact that the African languages are being sidelined (for practical reasons) and that ‘the legal force of the guidelines concerning parity of esteem and equitable treatment has been greatly diluted by the qualifying factors’ (Strydom & Pretorius 2000:113).

With specific reference to the LOLT issue at Unisa, the adoption of functional multilingualism at Unisa implies that Unisa will commit itself to the development of the African languages as LOLT, where such development is practical and reasonable. This is confirmed in Unisa (1998:11-12), which stresses that the possible use of African languages as LOLT should be made subject to a number of practical considerations.

The principle of functional multilingualism embraces the entirety of Unisa’s new language policy. With particular reference to the LOLT issue, however, Unisa (1998:11) states that its recommendations are based on the following additional principles:

- tuition through the medium of the home language is cognitively the most beneficial to all students
- English and Afrikaans already have the capacity to operate as tertiary-level languages
- African languages should be supported so that they can develop the capacity to enable their speakers to study through the medium of their home language at some time in the foreseeable future if they so choose.

The policy stipulates three time frames (short, medium and long-term) for the implementation of policy. With respect to the development of African languages as LOLT the document proposes that, on a short-term level, the university should create an infrastructure suited to the development of these languages; that, on a medium-term level (over five years), these languages should be developed partly through their use as ancillary
teaching languages, and that, on a long-term level (5 to 10 years) courses should be taught in a variety of official languages. The report also includes the following pertinent statement:

decisions regarding other official languages [i.e. other than English and Afrikaans] as languages of tuition should be preceded by and based on a proper, scientific investigation into the needs and preferences of students for tuition in the other official languages. Such an investigation should make use of well-established methods of data collection (Unisa 1998:11; parenthesis added).

A similar sentiment is found in the first draft of the policy document in 1997:

we, as the Commission, acknowledge a need for continual research, through surveys, into students’ language choices and preferences. We reiterate the NCHE’s recommendation that five-yearly reviews be undertaken based on surveys of language attitudes and preferences of students (Unisa 1997:14).

1.3 The research problems
The aim of this section is to outline the research problems which arose as a result of my attempt to meet the demand at Unisa for adequate research into the language attitudes and preferences of its students. The first subsection deals with some of the preliminary problems that required attention and the second with an outline of those research problems that are central to the research and which provide the framework for its aims and objectives, as outlined in §1.4.

1.3.1 Preliminary considerations
If, on the one hand, it seems only natural and commendable to ensure that policy decisions at Unisa should be based on regular and proper assessment of student attitudes and preferences, on the other hand the manner of actually researching these attitudes and preferences is open to question. The first problem, therefore, is to establish how the attitudes should be researched.

One option is, of course, a large-scale survey which would, opinion-pole fashion, simply ask a large, representative sample of students to choose from a range of language-policy options. These options could conceivably relate to both the LOLT issue and other language-related policy issues, e.g. the language of public communication at Unisa. Useful data might also be gleaned from a comparison of these preferences with other pertinent demographic variables that could be collected as part of the survey, e.g. age, gender, mother-tongue, field of study, etc.

This option has been discarded as non-viable for a number of reasons. Primarily, it was reasoned, based on a review of the literature, that such an approach would obscure the complex nature of the language attitudes concerned and so would prevent policy-makers from accessing the kinds of data that they would require to make fully-informed and meaningful policy decisions. This is because it would be difficult to interpret the results of such a survey in any in-depth fashion. It would not be possible to ask, for example, why one particular group of students favoured one option over another or, more generally, what the general issues are that students take into consideration when deciding about which policy-option to select. Another reason for the exclusion of a large-scale survey approach is its lack of academic interest. It was reasoned that, from a research perspective, a simple survey of student preferences would provide no insight into the reasons for these preferences, or the nature of the attitudes that determine the choice of one policy option over another. The construction of an instrument that would accommodate the complexity of language attitudes would be of far greater interest. This is because, firstly, in the process of constructing such an instrument the full range of issues that the students take into account when considering policy-options would surface. Secondly, the construction of such an instrument would allow future researchers to conduct language-attitude research that would, in its turn, facilitate even greater levels of insight into the nature of the attitudes concerned, and also into the relationship between such attitudes and other significant variables.

Once the option of a large-scale survey is discarded, a number of additional problems surface:
• Whether to deal with all the language-related policy issues at Unisa (i.e. the LOLT issue; the language(s) of public communication; and the language(s) of internal communication), or to focus on only one of these issues.

• What alternative method of measurement to employ in order to ensure that the full complexity of the language attitudes concerned are taken into account.

In response to the first problem, a decision was made to focus on only one of the language-related policy issues, i.e. the LOLT issue. The reason for this was that if one aim of the research is to take attitudinal complexity into account, then it would not make much sense to deal with three separate policy issues because students would take different things into consideration when forming attitudes towards each of the policy issues. It was decided to focus specifically on the LOLT issue, given the degree of importance placed on this issue in the literature\(^7\). Since the main issue at stake is the future development of the African languages as LOLT, the decision was also made to focus solely on the attitudes of L1-African language students\(^8\).

1.3.2 **Statement of the research problems**

In response to the second problem outlined in the previous section, it is clear that the specific, contextualised conditions under which language attitude measurement would have to take place would first require the construction of an instrument that would be relevant to this context. As emphasised by Smit (1996:13) ‘[t]he obvious differences in communication according to participants, situation and topic must be taken into account when dealing with language-in-society issues such as language planning or language attitudes’. It has been decided, therefore, to place the emphasis of the research on the construction of an attitude scale that would satisfy the demands of methodological rigour and be useful to Unisa and other South African tertiary institutions. It was felt that the construction of such an instrument would in and of itself be a contribution towards the field of language-attitude

---

7. See, for example, Alexander (2001).

8. In order to avoid potential confusion it should be pointed out here that the expression *L1-African language student* does not refer to a student studying African languages, but refers instead to a student who has one of the official African languages as her or his first language.
research in South Africa; more so, in fact, than any large-scale survey based on the current norms of instrument construction.

The task of constructing such an instrument, however, leaves a number of questions unanswered:

- in what way are the relevant attitudes complex and multidimensional?
- how would this complex nature be investigated?
- how would the instrument itself be constructed in order to accommodate this complex nature?
- how would I ensure that the instrument I construct meets the criteria of reliability and validity; that the instrument as a whole measures the right thing and that its component parts measure the same thing?

In order to address these questions, the dissertation will:

- report on exploratory research into the complex nature of the students’ language attitudes;
- provide justification for the particular research methodologies employed in this research;
- describe and justify, in detail, the actual construction of the instrument; and
- describe how the process of instrument construction has ensured that the instrument meets the criteria of reliability and validity.

It should be emphasised again that the exploration of the complex nature of the relevant language attitudes and, more importantly, the construction of an instrument that will serve as a useful research tool in the future, could be a substantial step towards the fruitful and accurate study of language attitudes in South African tertiary education.
1.4 Aims and objectives

This research has two primary aims, one theoretical, the other more practical. The first aim is to conduct exploratory research on the attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students towards the proposed use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa. More specifically, the aim is to determine what the dimensions underlying these attitudes might be, i.e. to determine the different clusters of opinion and belief that influence and constitute the attitudes of these students (a definition of the term *dimension* in the context of factor analytic research is provided in §4.2.3). This accords with the various policy statements of both Unisa and other relevant bodies, as discussed in §1.2.2 above. More broadly, apart from attempting simply to determine students’ language attitudes, the research will be able to provide the beginnings of an explanation of these attitudes, given that the dimensions identified will be explicitly linked to theory (Chapter 2) and also to sociohistorical data (Chapter 3).

The second aim of this research is to construct an attitude scale that will be of use in future research on attitudes of this kind, i.e. both at Unisa and at other tertiary institutions. This aim is directly informed by the current lack of properly-constructed attitude scales in South Africa for measuring and researching such language attitudes.

In order to achieve this aim, the research has been divided into a number of specific, subsidiary objectives: to provide a theoretical background to the task of language-attitude research; to provide a sociohistorical context for Unisa’s LOLT policy and the attitudes of its students; to provide a review of South African language-attitude research which deals specifically with the attitudes of L1-African language speakers towards the LOLT issue; to motivate for the particular research design used and explain its methodological technicalities; to provide the research results, both qualitative and quantitative; to provide a theory-based synthesis of the quantitative research results and the sociohistorical analysis; and finally to use this synthesis in constructing an attitude scale.
1.5 The nature of exploratory research

Exploratory research (including the present study) does not lend itself to the construction of explicit hypotheses; rather, it requires from the researcher a lack of preconceptions about the data. With regard to qualitative exploratory research, this is confirmed by Taylor & Bogdan (1984:5; parenthesis added) who state:

researchers [engaged in qualitative research] develop concepts, insights, and understanding from patterns in the data, rather than collecting data to assess preconceived models, hypotheses, or theories.

The same principles apply to the quantitative exploratory research methodology used in the present work (i.e. exploratory factor analysis - see §4.2.3). As Kim & Mueller (1978a:9) point out, it is, instead, the role of confirmatory factor analysis to test specific hypotheses9. Exploratory factor analysis, on the other hand, is particularly useful in the construction of a measuring instrument, one of the main aims of this study. It allows the researcher to explore an array of issues which are potentially related to the attitude in question and then, using factor analysis, to ascertain which of these issues cluster together (Moser & Kalton 1971:366). This is particularly important for ensuring the internal reliability of the final instrument (see §4.2.4). The aim of exploratory factor analysis for general research purposes, unlike that of experimental research, is not to confirm or refute any one claim, but rather to simplify, to classify and to show the interrelationships between a range of variables (Gardner & Lambert 1972:10).

The use of factor analysis for instrument construction and exploratory research in the social sciences is well established, particularly in the field of attitude measurement and research (Moser & Kalton 1971:366). In the field of language-attitude research the classic example of the use of factor analysis for exploratory purposes is that reported on in Gardner & Lambert (1972:10). Kerkhoff, Van Hout & Vallen (1988) is another illustrative example of language-attitude research in which exploratory factor analysis is employed.

Although exploratory research generally demands a lack of preconceptions on the part of

---

9. A representative example of the use of confirmatory factor analysis in language-attitude research is Willemyns, Pittam & Gallois (1993).
the researcher it would be disingenuous to assert that, after a reading of the literature on language-attitude research, I had no expectations about the possible results of the research. My general expectations were that the factor analysis would confirm the complex, multidimensional nature of language attitudes and that two of the factors retained for final inclusion in the attitude scale would correspond, respectively, to the role of language as a marker of social identity and the role of language as a means of access to power (see Chapter 2).

1.6 The method of research

The research was conducted using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. This was appropriate because using a number of different methodologies allows the researcher to be more confident about the accuracy and relevance of her or his research results. Krueger (1994:29), for example, mentions ‘the benefits of combining qualitative and quantitative procedures, resulting in greater methodological mixes that strengthen the research design’.

The qualitative methods include individual interviews and a sociohistorical analysis of the societal treatment of languages of South Africa. The quantitative methods, on the other hand, include a mini-survey followed by a factor analysis and item analysis of the results.

A very broad description of the various methods used in language-attitude research is provided in §2.6. In addition, §4.2 provides detailed arguments for the use of the methodologies selected, and also reasons for the exclusion of other methods, such as the Matched-Guise Technique (MGT). This section also includes a discussion on some of the basic principles of questionnaire and attitude-scale design and construction.

Chapter 3 contains a sociohistorical analysis of the societal treatment of the African languages in South Africa, vis-à-vis English and Afrikaans. This is an analysis of the sociohistorical determinants that, realistically, may have impacted on the development of the current language attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students, and also on the development of Unisa’s new LOLT policy. In short, it examines relevant aspects of the history of the language question in South Africa, with a particular focus on LOLT policy in
the education of L1-African language speakers.

In the individual interviews Unisa's new LOLT policy is described to the interviewee in order to elicit her or his opinion of it. Often, a number of other issues which are seen as intuitively related to the LOLT issue at Unisa are discussed. Apart from eliciting an impressionistic overview of the attitudes of the students, the other main purpose of the individual interview is to generate belief statements for a questionnaire.

A mini-survey is then conducted using this questionnaire and the results are statistically analysed. The forms of analysis employed are factor analysis and item analysis. A description of factor analysis and a discussion of its applicability to language-attitude research is provided in §4.2.3. Its basic nature can, however, be profitably described here:

factor analysis has two basic purposes: to explore variable areas in order to identify the factors presumably underlying the variables; and, as in all scientific work, to test hypotheses about the relations among variables (Kerlinger 1986:590)\(^\text{10}\).

The point of the item analysis is to assist in the selection of items for the final attitude scale. This is discussed further in §4.2.4.

1.7 Structure of the dissertation

Chapter 2 provides a review of the relevant theoretical literature. Areas of focus include the relationship between language and society, attitude theory in general, language planning theory and language-attitude theory. The chapter also includes a brief outline of the methodologies that are used in language-attitude research.

Chapter 3 provides a sociohistorical analysis of the societal treatment of the African languages in South Africa vis-à-vis English and Afrikaans, focussing on the educational context; it also contains a review of South African research into the language attitudes of L1-African language speakers.

---

10. Note that these two purposes of factor analysis relate, in turn, to the two kinds of factor analysis mentioned in §1.5 above, i.e. the exploratory and the confirmatory. It is with the first kind of factor analysis that the present study is concerned.
In Chapter 4 the reasons for choosing particular methodologies are outlined, factor analysis is briefly described and its merits discussed. The chapter also includes a discussion of some of the basic principles of questionnaire and attitude-scale design and construction. It ends with a summary of some of the practical issues relating to the implementation of the respective methodologies.

The findings of the individual interviews and the mini-survey are presented in Chapter 5. These findings are then subjected to both a factor analysis and an analysis of reliability, the results of which are also presented in this chapter.

Chapter 6 synthesises the factor-analytic and sociohistorical data in terms of the theoretical background provided in Chapter 2. This is done in order to identify the underlying dimensions of the attitudes. Using an item analysis, an attitude scale is then constructed on the basis of these identified dimensions and the results of the analysis of reliability.

Chapter 7 ends with a summary of the research, an outline of some of its limitations, and a section on recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2
Theoretical foundations

2.1 Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to provide a review of the relevant theoretical literature. It is divided into five main sections.

The first section deals with the relationship between language and society (§2.2), the second with the general theory of attitudes (§2.3). According to Smit (1996:8) attitudes towards language come about because in a number of ways language reflects the structure of society. A full understanding of language attitudes thus requires an understanding of how language relates to society; and, in consequence, an understanding of concepts that have been used in the literature to explain this relationship, e.g. social identity. In addition, it needs to be borne in mind that language attitudes are a particular variety of attitude. Any successful attempt to understand their nature relies, not surprisingly, on an appreciation of the theory of attitudes in general. A brief review of this theory has, therefore, been included.

The inclusion of sections on the relationship between language and society and on general attitude theory was also necessary, given the absence of a strong theoretical foundation exclusive to language-attitude research (Giles & Ryan 1982:209; Smit 1996:31), and given that language-attitude research has been influenced by both the sociology of language (Smit 1996:40) and social psychology (Oskamp 1991:1-2; Rajecki 1990:7; Smit 1996:40).

According to Eastman (1983:203)¹ ‘[a]ltitude measurement and other forms of sociolinguistic survey are perhaps the chief tools of the language planner’. Because language-attitude research plays a central role in the field of language planning, the chapter includes a section (§2.4) on some of the relevant aspects of the theory of language planning.

---

The chapter then proceeds with an overview of language-attitude theory (§2.5). Using frameworks of previous attempts to provide a theoretical basis for language attitudes in particular, this overview attempts to show how the theory provided in the previous three sections has been adapted to the particular task of explaining language attitudes.

Lastly, §2.6 provides a brief overview of the various methodologies employed in language-attitude research. These are:

- the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties (§2.6.1);
- the direct methods of language-attitude measurement (§2.6.2); and
- the indirect methods of language-attitude measurement (§2.6.3).

More focus is placed on the first two methodologies, because they are the ones used in the research. The reasons for choosing these particular methodologies are more extensively discussed in §4.2.

### 2.2 Language and society

According to Smit (1996:12) ‘the two main structural criteria’ of any society are social identity and power. Ultimately, it is the complex relationships between language, social identity and power that explain why people have attitudes towards language. The main task of this section is to attempt an explanation of these relationships.

Regarding the issue of language and social identity, we can follow Smit (1998:8) in observing that apart from being instrumental in the processes of cognitive categorisation and interpersonal communication, language also plays a part in the process of social stratification. The languages or language varieties used by an individual are often an indication of the social groups to which that individual belongs, or, for that matter, the social groups the individual wishes to belong to. Because language attitudes are, in part, based on this role of language as a symbol of social identity, it is necessary, in order to understand language attitudes better, to understand the dynamics of social identity.
Section 2.2.1 provides a basic outline of a theoretical attempt to come to grips with these dynamics i.e. Social Identity Theory (SIT). Important concepts introduced in this section include *social categorisation, social comparison* and *positive distinctiveness*.

Section 2.2.2 introduces a further essential concept in SIT, namely *power*. Social identity refers to the horizontal structure of society, which is divided into a number of social groups. Some of these groups, however, are invested with more power than others\(^2\). This represents the vertical power dimension of society (Smit 1996:11). An appreciation of the impact of this hierarchical structuring of society also forms an important part of any broader understanding of language attitudes. Of importance is the description of various strategies used by minority groups and their members to ensure positive social identity. The relevance of these diverse strategies to language attitudes in particular is elaborated on in §2.5.

Section 2.2.3 looks at how language fits into the theoretical framework provided in the previous two sections, i.e. in terms of its role as marker of social identity. It discusses the various kinds of social group that employ language as a marker (ethnic groups, social classes and races), with a particular emphasis on the relationship between ethnicity and language. With regard to this particular relationship, it provides a brief description of relevant aspects of Giles, Bourhis & Taylor’s (1977:307) theory of language in ethnic-group relations.

In accordance with Smit’s (1996:13) recommendation that ‘situation ... must be taken into account when dealing with language-in-society issues such as language planning or language attitudes,’ §2.2.4 introduces and discusses the relevance of another concept, namely *domain*.

Section 2.2 ends with a discussion on the notion of language as power (§2.2.5) and emphasises the important distinction between the communicative and symbolic roles of language (Edwards 1985:17).

---

2. Related to this is the distinction between *majority group* and *minority group*. These groups are defined as such not because of their relative numerical superiority or inferiority (although this might be a determining factor - see the later discussion on ethnolinguistic vitality in §2.2.3) but rather in terms of the relative amount of power possessed by members of the groups.
2.2.1 Social identity & social comparison

SIT is a useful theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of social identity (Smit 996:8-9; Giles et al. 1977:318-319). According to SIT, each individual has a personal identity as well as a social identity. While personal identity refers to self-descriptions based on unique characteristics (e.g. I am the best squash player in the Eastern Cape) and specific relationships (e.g. I am Adelaide’s husband), social identity has its genesis in social categorization (Hogg & Abrams 1988:24-5). Social categorisation is the process of dividing the social world up into a number of social categories3. All normal human beings identify with a certain number of social categories. In turn, each individual’s perceived membership of an array of social categories constitutes her or his social identity. Moreover, other people are perceived (by the individual in question) in terms of whether they belong to the same social category (ingroup member) or whether they belong to another social category (outgroup member).

One of the consequences of our viewing the social world in terms of ingroups and outgroups is that the similarities between members of the ingroup, and also the differences between members of the ingroup and members of the outgroup, are accentuated (Hogg & Abrams 1988:21). So, for example, many women view all or most women as good listeners and all or most men as poor listeners. This process of accentuation is related to what Hogg & Abrams (1988:21) call self-stereotyping. This occurs when an individual categorises herself or himself as a member of a particular social category and, as a result, identifies with the relevant accentuations. So, to use the same example, a particular woman might have a distorted belief about her own capacity to listen, in accordance with her self-categorisation as a woman; and if there was a discrepancy between her belief and her behaviour, she might even change her behaviour to fit the stereotype.

---

3. To avoid potential confusion, it should be noted here that the terms social group and social category are used interchangeably in this text. The interchangeable use of these terms is consonant with the literature. See, for example, Giles et al. (1977:319).
Related to the concepts of social categorisation and accentuation is the concept of social comparison. This captures the idea that social categorisation and the accentuation of intragroup similarity and intergroup difference is motivated by a desire to compare one’s ingroup to other outgroups. But for what reason? For members of any particular social category it is necessary, in order to ensure positive social identity, that only those features that reflect positively on ingroup members and negatively on outgroup members be accentuated. This ensures positive distinctiveness for the ingroup. In short, individual members of a social group are motivated to create, by the use of social comparisons between ingroup and outgroup members, a positive distinctiveness for ingroup members. This is because their self-esteem is dependent on a positive social identity. Hogg & Abrams (1988:23; parenthesis added) explain this situation as follows:

when making an intergroup social comparison ... it is important [for the individual] to accentuate intergroup differences especially on those dimensions which reflect favourably upon the ingroup. By differentiating ingroup from outgroup on dimensions on which the ingroup falls at the evaluatively positive pole, the ingroup acquires a positive distinctiveness, and thus a relatively positive social identity in comparison to the outgroup. Since self is defined in terms of the ingroup ... this selective differentiation accomplishes a relatively positive self-evaluation that endows the individual with a sense of well-being, enhanced self-worth and self-esteem.

There are various behavioural consequences of this accentuation of differences between groups. These consequences depend on the context. Different contexts will evoke different responses from the individual. Contexts generally relate to two different types of dimensions, firstly, to dimensions of comparison relevant to personal identity and, secondly, to dimensions of comparison related to social identity. These contexts are, furthermore, definable in terms of the so-called interpersonal-intergroup continuum. At one extreme we find contexts evoking responses based wholly on personal identity, while, at the other, we find contexts evoking responses based wholly on social identity. Most contexts and thus most responses, however, lie somewhere between these two extremes.

### 2.2.2 Social identity & power

Although individuals are motivated to create positive social identity, the power relations
existing between social groups play an important role in the success of this operation (Hogg & Abrams 1988:26-27; Giles et al. 1977:319). According to SIT, the group with the most power will be in a position to disseminate its own system of beliefs, opinions and attitudes (i.e. its ideology) effectively and entrench it as basic common sense. Members of minority social groups are thus often under pressure to adopt this ideology. Included among these beliefs, opinions and attitudes will be those relating to the dimensions chosen by majority group members as the basis for creating positive distinctiveness, i.e. for creating social comparisons between themselves and various outgroups. Naturally, these will be effective in creating a positive social identity for members of the majority group (the ingroup), at the expense of the positive social identity of members of the minority groups (the outgroups). Members of minority groups often, therefore, have a negative social identity, which, in turn, leads to a lowering of their self-esteem. Given that most people wish to avoid a low self-esteem, such individuals are often motivated to change their negative social identity into a positive one. According to Hogg & Abrams (1988:27), the strategies these individuals employ to achieve this desired change in self-esteem depends on the particular subjective belief structure that they hold.

Hogg & Abrams (1988:54-59) and Giles et al. (1977:319-321) provide an excellent summary of the different kinds of subjective belief structure held by members of minority groups and also the behavioural consequences of each kind of belief structure. The different belief structures can be conveniently explained in terms of the individual mobility-social change continuum (Smit 1996:9). This continuum is related, on the one hand, to the previously mentioned interpersonal-intergroup continuum and also to the variability-uniformity of intergroup behaviour continuum.

In social contexts characterised by interindividual behaviour (i.e. those tending towards the interpersonal pole of the interpersonal-intergroup continuum) there will be a high level of variability in intergroup behaviour and a strong likelihood of belief in the possibility of individual social mobility, that is, the minority-group individual will believe that it is possible to change her or his social identity to that of the majority group. However, in social contexts which are characterised by intergroup behaviour (i.e.
those tending towards the intergroup pole of the interpersonal-intergroup continuum),
there will be a high level of uniformity in intergroup behaviour and a strong likelihood
that social change will be viewed as the only option available (Smit 1996:9).

Furthermore, a desire to engage in individual social mobility necessitates, on the part of
the minority-group member, a perception that social group boundaries are permeable.
Movement from one social group (the minority group) into another social group (the
majority group) is perceived as possible to a lesser or greater degree. According to
Hogg & Abrams (1988:56), however, individual social mobility often appears to be
easier than it actually is, particularly when group membership is based on overt features
(e.g. gender). Moreover, minority groups often place pressure, in a number of ways, on
their own members to refrain from attempts at individual social mobility. Also, it might
often be in the interests of the majority group to perpetuate a belief in the possibility of
individual social mobility, through various strategies such as tokenism and the
perpetuation of a work-ethic ideology, in order to obscure deeper societal divisions and
inequalities (Hogg & Abrams 1985:28). Note that the attribution of such motives to
majority groups is a common theme among more radical (often neo-Marxist) theorists
(e.g. Fairclough 1989), who are often focussed on providing a critique of modern
capitalist societies. Other theorists would, undoubtedly, disagree with such a
perspective, e.g. Edwards (1985).

When, on the other hand, minority-group members perceive that the boundaries
between groups are impermeable, they generally adopt a social-change belief structure.
There are various strategies subsumed under this belief structure, some of which pose a
threat to the power of the majority group. The particular strategy adopted by the
minority group depends on whether its members perceive there to be alternatives to the
existing power relations in the society in question, i.e. whether or not there are cognitive
alternatives. If there are none - if the existing power relations in society are viewed by
minority-group members as both legitimate and stable - then the minority group
ordinarily employs a strategy of social creativity. Hogg & Abrams (1988:56) discuss
three different forms of social creativity. What they all have in common is that they are
attempts to find a new basis for intergroup comparison with the aim of attaining some measure of positive distinctiveness for ingroup members.

One form of social creativity is discovering new dimensions on which to make social comparisons between the ingroup (minority group) and the outgroup (majority group) and thus create some degree of positive distinctiveness for the ingroup. If accepted as valid by the majority group, these new comparisons can help create some positive social identity for minority-group members. Generally, though, the majority group will only accept a few such comparisons. The classic example of this form of social creativity is the stereotype that ‘blacks have more rhythm’.

The second form of social creativity discussed by Hogg & Abrams (1988:57) is redefining ‘the value attached to various attributes.’ According to these authors (1988:57) ‘this is particularly effective if the attributes are central to or criterial of the ingroup’, e.g. the re-evaluation of ‘black as beautiful’. Again, it is uncommon for the majority group to tolerate more than a few such redefinitions.

The third form of social creativity discussed by Hogg & Abrams (1988:57) is the selection of new outgroups for comparison. Instead of comparing themselves with members of the majority group, minority-group members turn towards other groups which have power equal to theirs or less than theirs. Ingroup members can, in this manner, augment their social identity by comparing themselves with members of other minority groups on dimensions perceived to be favourable to their own group. According to Hogg & Abrams (1988:29) this accounts for the widespread phenomenon of minority groups displaying as much prejudice towards other minority groups as the majority group does, or even more than it does. The example provided by these authors (1988:29) is that of working-class sexism and racism. The same authors (1988:57) point out that this particular form of social creativity is often encouraged by the majority group because it allows this group to ‘divide-and-rule’.

The three forms of social change discussed above are all forms of social creativity and are all the result of minority-group members viewing extant power relations in the
relevant society as stable and legitimate, i.e. the group members have no cognitive alternatives. If, however, the minority group in question does harbour cognitive alternatives - if, in other words, it views the prevailing power relationships as either unstable or illegitimate - it may begin to engage in direct social competition with the majority group. All forms of social competition have as their aim a change in the existing balance of power. They range from the peaceful and lawful to the violent and illegal. An example is the anti-Apartheid movement in South Africa.

Giles et al. (1977:320) discuss a further strategy of social change, which ‘is for the group as a whole to assimilate culturally and psychologically with members of the dominant group’. This strategy is difficult to classify in terms of the framework provided above because members of groups adopting this strategy do perceive group boundaries as permeable (a characteristic feature of individual social mobility), yet it is a group strategy, which is normally the case when group boundaries are perceived as impermeable. Perhaps the best of way of conceptualising this strategy is as widespread individual social mobility. According to Giles et al. (1977:336), this is often the first strategy employed by groups whose members are experiencing negative social identity. Common among immigrant groups, this strategy is more often than not unsuccessful.

2.2.3 Language, social identity and power

Language is often a symbol or marker of ingroup (and outgroup) membership. Just like the groups themselves, the languages or language varieties of groups can, therefore, become the focus of social comparisons designed to create positive distinctiveness and positive social identity.

Although it is difficult to think of any social group that is not marked by some form of linguistic variation⁴, it is possible to isolate a few kinds of social groups for whom language can play a central symbolic role. The kinds of social groups discussed in this section are ethnic groups, social classes and races.

---

⁴ So, for example, even occupational groups are marked by the use of occupation-specific jargon.
A generally accepted definition of *ethnic group* and related concepts such as *ethnicity* and *ethnic identity* is still not available (Edwards 1985:5-10) and it is not my intention to attempt to provide one. For the purposes of this discussion, however, we can follow Fishman (1989:7) in observing that language is, in terms of its role of social identity marker, often closely related to ethnicity and thus to the ethnic group:

> at every stage, ethnicity is linked to language, whether indexically, implementationally or symbolically.

To this Smit (1996:10) adds that ‘ethnic groups who use specific languages or varieties of languages as ingroup markers can be referred to as *ethnolinguistic groups*’. Note that this definition implies that some ethnic groups do not make use of language in this way. Whether or not this implication is correct is a debatable point. Rather than arguing the point, however, I think it more worthwhile to make a distinction, with Edwards (1985:17) between the communicative and symbolic aspects of language. While there are cases where not all members of an ethnic group use the ethnic language as a means of communication, the language can still be important as a marker of ethnic identity. Although it is difficult to think of an ethnic group that makes absolutely no use of an ingroup language or language variety (i.e. neither for communicative nor for symbolic purposes), there are instances where the majority of members of a particular ethnic group employ language for symbolic purposes alone (e.g. Gaelic in Ireland). The importance of this distinction between the communicative and symbolic aspects of language will become increasingly apparent as we proceed with this chapter.

The complex relationships between language, ethnicity and power all fall within the explanatory ambit of the theory of language in ethnic-group relations, as developed by Giles et al. (1977:307-343). In its attempt to explain the role of language in intergroup relations it combines SIT, speech accommodation theory and the notion of *ethnolinguistic vitality*. Ethnolinguistic vitality is what ‘makes a group likely to behave as a distinct and active collective entity in intergroup situations’ (Giles et al. 1977:308).

---
5. See Giles et al. (1977:325-328) for an excellent discussion of the role of language as a symbol of ethnic-group identity.
According to Smit (1996:13), ethnolinguistic vitality is explained in terms of a number of factors that determine whether a group will behave in such a distinct manner. In other words, these factors are used to explain why certain groups have high ethnolinguistic vitality, whereas others do not. Together, these so-called structural variables or factors are indicative of how high or low the ethnolinguistic vitality of any ethnolinguistic group might be. In terms of this theory, ethnic groups with high ethnolinguistic vitality are more likely to survive as an ethnic group, while members of ethnic groups with low ethnolinguistic vitality are more likely to assimilate to the majority group. As indicated by Smit (1996), there are three main kinds of factor: status, demographic and institutional support factors. We will look at each of these kinds of factors in turn.

According to Giles et al. (1977:310-312) status factors can be broken down into economic, social, sociohistorical and language-status factors. Economic factors refer to the ethnolinguistic group’s degree of economic independence. Social factors refer to the degree of social status it is seen to have in any particular society. Sociohistorical factors relate to the fact that different ethnolinguistic groups differ in the degree to which they can make use of past events as symbols of group identity: some groups have a ‘grand tradition’ which can be used as a rallying point. Lastly, language status factors refer to the status of the language spoken by members of the relevant ethnolinguistic group, both within territorial boundaries and outside them. Examples of languages with a high status outside territorial boundaries are international languages such as English, French and German, and even languages with no territory, such as Latin and Ancient Greek. Languages can, on the other hand, have high status within territorial boundaries, but without the language having status elsewhere. An example is Catalan in Catalonia. There are even examples of languages with low within status in one territory but high within status in another territory and high without status overall. An example would be Spanish, which has low status within the USA, high status in Peru (vis-à-vis Quechua) and a high status internationally.

The next broad type of factor outlined by Giles et al. (1977:312-315) is the demographic factors. Demographic factors are, in turn, divisible into group-distribution factors and group-numbers factors. Under group-distribution factors the following
considerations are included: whether or not the ethnolinguistic group has a national territory, the level of concentration of members of the ethnolinguistic group within any particular territory and the proportion of ingroup members to outgroup members. The second division, group-numbers factors, includes the absolute number of members of the ethnolinguistic group, the birth-rate of the group, whether it allows mixed marriages (with other ethnolinguistic groups) and whether there is immigration into its territory or whether large numbers of group members are emigrating to another territory.

The final type of factor (Giles et al. 1977:315-318) is the institutional support factor. The authors define this type of factor as ‘the degree of formal and informal support a language receives in the various institutions of a nation, region or community’ (Giles et al. 1977:315). Informal institutional support refers mainly to community-based initiatives whereas formal support refers to the degree to which the language in question is represented in areas such as the mass media, the government and education. Formal support in the area of education is often viewed as of particular importance:

of crucial importance for the vitality of ethnolinguistic groups is the use of the minority language in the State education system at primary, secondary and higher levels (Giles et al. 1977:316).6

A more detailed discussion of the role of formal institutional support is provided in §2.4 as part of the general discussion of language-planning theory.

A particularly relevant development of the notion of ethnolinguistic vitality is that of perceived or subjective ethnolinguistic vitality. The distinction between ethnolinguistic vitality and subjective ethnolinguistic vitality is an important one, given that there can be a measurable difference between them (Bourhis, Giles & Rosenthal 1981; Edwards 1985:185; Edwards 1992:45-46). As pointed out by Giles et al. (1977:318):

it is possible for dominant groups to manipulate the information reaching subordinate groups through the mass media ... in such a manner as to attenuate their perception of vitality.

6. Also see Edwards (1985:118-138).
In other words, members of an ethnic minority might, quite plausibly, have an incorrect perception of their own group’s ethnolinguistic vitality. Of importance to the present study is the fact that there is a definite relationship between these perceptions and the language attitudes held by the group members (Giles, Hewstone & Ball 1983:88; Giles & Johnson 1987:71-72).

Theoretical discussions on the relationship between language and ethnicity are more often than not part of more general treatments; in particular, of language maintenance and shift (see Edwards 1985; Paulston 1994). Language maintenance and shift are, in the last analysis, about the choices of individuals (Giles & Johnson 1987:69)7 and the choice of which language to use is at least partially determined by the attitudes which individuals hold towards the languages concerned. It is not, however, my intention to provide an in-depth discussion of language maintenance and shift8. Suffice it to say at this point that language attitudes are to a lesser or greater degree determined by perceptions of ethnolinguistic vitality, although it must be stressed that the objective level of ethnolinguistic vitality of any particular group will be important in terms of constraining perceptions to some degree. Assuming that attitudes are related to behaviour (§2.3), we can also reasonably assume that, all other things being equal, a change in the perception of ethnolinguistic vitality (i.e. in attitudes) can accelerate or reverse language shift. Some factors subsumed under the concept of ethnolinguistic vitality are not generally amenable to intervention (e.g. sociohistorical factors), but others are (e.g. formal institutional factors). Conscious intervention in the form of language-policy initiatives is thus often motivated by a desire either to accelerate or to resist the process of language shift and the erosion of ethnic identity (Eastman 1983:58). In such cases it is hoped that such intervention will alter the perceptions, attitudes and thus, ultimately, the behaviour of the speakers concerned.

Language is not only a marker of ethnic-group identity. It can be employed as a marker of other kinds of social groups. One of these is social class. According to Chambers

---

7. Although more recent authors have criticised an exclusive emphasis on individual choice in language-related decisions. See, for example, Tollefson (1991:31-38).

8. See Crystal (2000) for an excellent introduction to some of the issues involved.
(1995:34), the concept of social class relates to a common phenomenon in most modern societies, i.e. ‘inequalities in the distribution of wealth, privilege and opportunity’. Definitional criteria for deciding on who belongs to which social class abound (Robinson 1972:149-150) but we can usefully follow Chambers (1995:37) in distinguishing between the two most important classes, the working-class (proletariat) and the middle-class (bourgeoisie), and in broadly distinguishing between these two classes in terms of their occupational status: ‘people who earn their living by working with their hands and those who earn them by pencil-work and services’. On a linguistic level this distinction is often marked by intralinguistic variation. In other words, different classes employ different varieties of a language to mark social-class membership (Trudgill 1974a:35). This relationship between social class and intralinguistic variety has been a main focus of sociolinguistics since its beginnings in work such as Labov (1966).

There are instances of overlap between social class and ethnolinguistic group. The linguistic implications of such an overlap are complex and there are various degrees and kinds. Brown (1988/9), for example, asserts that ‘[i]n South Africa, unavoidably, the history of colonialism, nationalism and ethnically based language policy all interrelate with social class, making the sociology of language a difficult task’. Needless to say, where there is a strong overlap, the relevant society is usually a deeply divided one. According to Chambers (1995:52-53), such a strict division into dominant (middle and upper class) and subordinate (working class), based on ethnic group and mother tongue, would be definable as a caste system, distinguishable from a purely class system by the fact there is very little social mobility between the groups involved. Arguably, an example of some degree of overlap between social class and ethnolinguistic group is to be found in the development of Afrikaans nationalism in the early twentieth century. After British rule of the whole of South Africa had been secured in 1910 as a result of Union, Dutch was afforded equal formal status with English (Brown 1988/9:35). Dutch, however, was soon replaced by Afrikaans, ‘the language of the newly urbanized white

---

9. Chambers (1995:37) states that ‘the “upper class,” consisting of people with inherited wealth and privileges, is so inconsequential ... and dwindling rapidly ... that it will not be considered’.

workers, whose peasant life had been destroyed in the war' (Brown 1988/9: 35). This overlap between social-class interests and ethnolinguistic-group interests was the dynamo for the development of Afrikaner nationalism.

Of particular relevance for the purposes of this discussion are those cases where middle-class identity and a particular language overlap quite strongly, but where the language in question has to a large degree lost its ethnolinguistic associations. To an increasing degree this is the case with English as an international language. There is an increasing perception of English as language of social mobility, but at the same time, depending on the society, English has to a lesser or greater degree become stripped of its colonial, racial or Anglo-American associations. This is particularly true of South Africa, where, for various historical reasons, the colonial and ethnolinguistic associations of English are often backgrounded. This idea of English as a sort of modern lingua franca will be taken up later in §2.2.5, while the historical factors leading to this disassociation between English and ethnolinguistic identity in South Africa will be discussed in the next chapter.

So far we have seen that, as a symbol of group identity, a language can be a marker of ethnicity or social class (or both). It can also be a marker of race. Again, as with social classes, different races are often marked by intralinguistic variety, e.g. Black American English has this function in the USA. Likewise, racial identity is being expressed to some degree, it would appear, through the use of different varieties of South African English. For example, we see the increasing use of so-called BSAE (Black South African English) as an ingroup marker (see Smit 1996:80-97 for further discussion). There are, however, cases where racial and interlinguistic divisions coincide within a particular society, i.e. where certain languages are associated with certain racial groups (are markers of both ingroup and outgroup membership of those groups). An example would be Afrikaans in apartheid South Africa\(^\text{11}\). As in the case of societal division based on ethnic group, societal division based on race would be definable as a caste system. Under such a system there would be very little opportunity for social mobility across the

\(^{11}\) The situation is not quite as simple as this, given that the so-called coloured group also uses Afrikaans as an ingroup marker, albeit a different variety of Afrikaans (Webb 1992:8). Suffice it to say, however, that black groups have almost never made use of Afrikaans as a marker of social identity (although they have used it for communication purposes).
racial barrier and the subordinate groups would be forced to take some form of group action in order to guarantee a positive social identity for their respective members. This state of affairs is succinctly summed up by Chambers (1995:34-5):

as soon as it becomes clear ... that the underprivileged belong to one sex or one race or one ethnic group ... - then the social system must undergo reform. The most powerful group must be persuaded to reform the social contract ... and if they refuse, as they might be inclined to do if doing so would leave them and their offspring vulnerable, then revolution becomes necessary.

The applicability of such a group strategy to language attitudes will be taken up again in §2.5.

2.2.4 A note on domains
Another essential concept for understanding the role of language, particularly in multilingual societies, is that of domain (Eastman 1983:141-147; Smit 1996:13-15). According to Smit (1996:13) ‘each domain describes one typical situation of communication differentiated by topic, participants and setting’. The notion of domain has been discussed by authors working in the field of Linguistics in Contact and Conflict in Africa (LiCCA)(Webb 1992:16-17; Smit 1996:14). Eleven domains have been identified by these authors. They are divisible into secondary, public or higher domains and primary, private and lower domains. The former category includes domains such as government, education and the media, and the latter category includes domains such as family and cultural life. Particularly in multilingual societies, different domains will be associated with different languages. The secondary domains are usually the preserve of one or two or at most three prestigious languages; these languages are, in turn, often the languages used to mark majority-group identity (Smit 1996:15).

2.2.5 Language as power
Related to the concept of domains is the notion of language as power, as opposed to language as a marker of a powerful (majority) social group. The latter idea is informed by the observation that language is a common marker of ingroup and outgroup identity and that different social groups have different degrees of access to power. In most
circumstances, it is true that the status of a language is inextricably bound up with the power and status of its speakers. As Ryan, Giles & Sebastian (1982:8)\textsuperscript{12} put it:

... the relative degree of standardisation of and institutional support for variants leads to differential associations with their speakers ... Moreover, the socioeconomic status of the native speakers of each variant significantly influences perceptions of their relative prestige.

Because of this close bond between a language and its speakers, the acquisition of a new language often implies the acquisition of a new social identity. According to this framework, based as it is on SIT, minority-group members wish to assimilate to the majority group and in their attempt (if permitted by the majority group) acquire the various markers of majority-group social identity, one of these being the language of the majority group. A high-status language (one used in higher, secondary domains) can, however, be acquired without the simultaneous acquisition of a new social identity. A theoretical distinction between language acquired as a majority-group marker and language acquired as means of access to power per se is therefore necessary to account for cases where acquisition of a new high-status language does not lead to the acquisition of a new social identity. In other words, a high-status language can be acquired for pragmatic, power-related reasons alone, without any desire to change social identity by adopting the target language (or language variety) as a marker of social identity. This distinction is, in essence, the same as the one proposed by Gardner & Lambert (1972), i.e. that between the integrative and instrumental orientations towards second-language acquisition. Edwards (1985:17), as we have already seen, has made a similar distinction between the communicative and symbolic aspects of language.

This possibility of languages being acquired for power reasons alone finds an echo in Bourdieu's notions of linguistic market and linguistic capital (Alexander 2001:12-14). The first notion refers to a situation in which the L1-speakers of a particular language or variety have become more advantaged than others due to the fact that their L1 has become the dominant language or variety in the society concerned (Alexander 2001:12). Speakers of the prestigious dialect, variety or language are thereby said to have acquired

\textsuperscript{12} Also see Smit (1996:15).
more linguistic capital that those who do not speak the prestigious variety or who do not have sufficient command of it. The link between these notions and more modern perspectives on language planning and policy will be taken up again in §2.4.

The distinction between acquiring a new language for both power and social-identity reasons and acquiring one for power reasons alone is of particular relevance to multilingual societies like South Africa and most other countries in sub-Saharan Africa (Webb 1992:5-6). In these countries, multilingualism is the norm and participation in many higher domains (such as the political, administrative, economic and educational) is dependent on knowledge of a particular high-status language such as English. In such societies, however, the acquisition and use of a new high-status language often has purely pragmatic value and does not entail an act of social identity. This analysis also explains what De Klerk & Bosch (1993:212), following Schmied (1991:173), mean when they refer to ‘the existence of a certain amount of linguistic schizophrenia in Africa, in which Africans admire educated English, especially the learned style, and tend to cultivate it, whole avoiding speaking “too well” or with a standard accent’. In terms of the analysis provided above, people who acquire a second language in this way are displaying an instrumental orientation towards English, while maintaining their integrative allegiance towards the mother-tongue and avoiding any act of identification with the majority social group (De Klerk & Bosch 1993:224).

In many cases the majority languages so acquired are also examples of lingue franca. A lingua franca is ‘a language used habitually by people who have different first languages so they can communicate for certain specific purposes’ (Eastman 1983:6). The ‘purely communicative’ role of these languages is stressed by Edwards (1985:34), who goes on to say that those who do not speak the lingua franca of a particular society as an L1 do not, as a consequence, necessarily abandon their L1 when acquiring the lingua franca.

Is English in South Africa a lingua franca? Is it in a sense value-free? In other words does its acquisition and use necessarily imply an act of identity or can it be acquired for power reasons alone? I would agree with De Klerk (1996:111-112), who states that ‘it would seem that English is becoming a de facto lingua franca across wide areas of the
country,' yet tentative answers to this question can only be given once the perceptions and attitudes of those concerned have been gathered and assessed.

2.3 The theory of attitudes
Following a long-standing tradition in attitude theory it is appropriate to begin with Allport's (1935:810) classic definition of an attitude:

- a mental or neural state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.

Even though the term attitude is part of non-scientific discourse and even though most laypersons have a rough idea of what the term refers to (Baker 1992:9), there is very little agreement among theorists on an appropriate definition of the term (Giles, Hewstone & Ball 1983:81; Jaspers 1978:256). According to Agheyisi & Fishman (1970:137) each theorist working in the field appears to have her or his own definition based on her or his theoretical background:

- the concept 'attitude' has been variously defined and characterised by almost every theorist or researcher who has concerned himself with attitude studies. The various definitions very often reflect the differing theoretical or research interests of the particular studies from which they stem.

One can follow authors such as Smit (1996:24) and Agheyisi & Fishman (1970:138) in dividing theories about attitudes into two main camps: the behaviourist and the mentalist. According to Agheyisi & Fishman (1970:138) the mentalist approach follows Allport (1935:810) in defining an attitude as a 'mental and neural state of readiness'. This means that attitudes are not directly observable (Baker 1992:11) and not necessarily directly related to overt behaviour. This makes the measurement of attitudes problematic, since there is no guarantee that a direct relationship exists between the responses and the attitude itself. The behaviourists attempt to solve this problem by asserting that attitudes are definable entirely on the basis of observable data (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:138). The main criticism of this approach is that it turns an attitude into a dependent variable with no explanatory value beyond the individual act of
measurement. The mentalist approach, on the other hand, is lauded by its apologists for preserving the independent nature of the attitude. As such it can be used to ‘explain other behaviours by the same organism’ (Alexander 1967, cited in Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:138).  

Remaining with Agheyisi & Fishman (1970:138-140), we find that another important theoretical debate is whether attitudes are unicomponental or multicomponental phenomena. We find that the mentalist and behaviourist schools are split on this issue too, with the mentalists generally adopting the multicomponental viewpoint and the behaviourists the unicomponental viewpoint. Unicomponentalists believe that attitude should be equated solely with affect (i.e. positive or negative emotion). Such scholars include Fishbein (1965, 1967), Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum (1957) and Oskamp (1991).

Multicomponentalists include Baker (1992:12-13), Giles et al. (1983), Lambert & Lambert (1964), McGuire (1969), Rokeach (1968), Rosenberg (1960) and Triandis (1964). The multicomponentalists usually posit a triadic structure, with attitudes being conceptualised in terms of three separate, though interrelated components, namely the affective (evaluation), the cognitive (knowledge) and the conative (action). There are, however, authors who posit alternative multicomponental theories, e.g. Rokeach (1968). It should be added that the multicomponental approach is the more traditional one. Even the Ancient Greeks conceived of attitudes as being comprised of cognitive, affective and conative components (Smit 1996:24).

Because of these theoretical and methodological difficulties most researchers, according to Smit (1996:25), rely on working definitions that suit their own particular research needs. In addition, most of these working definitions, ‘incorporate features of both approaches’ (Smit 1996:25), that is, the behavioural (unicomponental) and mentalist (multicomponental) approaches. The present research is no exception.

13. Also see Baker (1992:11).
Another important aspect of the literature that needs to be reviewed is the relationship between attitudes and behaviour. The importance of language-attitude research for language planning rests on the assumption that behaviour can, to some degree at least, be predicted by determining attitudes. As Baker (1992:10) observes, '[a]lthough is a hypothetical concept used to explain the direction and persistence of human behaviour'.

The relationship between attitudes and behaviour is, however, not a simple one and, in fact, at one point it was argued that attitudes were not predictive of behaviour at all. The famous basis for this denial of the predictive value of attitudes was LaPiere (1934, cited in Smit 1996:27), which indicated that there is often a difference between the things people say and the things that they do (Smit 1996:27). Since LaPiere (1934), however, research on the relationship between attitude and behaviour and theories about this relationship have spawned two different approaches to the issue. According to Smit (1996:27-8), some theorists posit a very close predictive relationship between attitude and behaviour and claim that the problems with LaPiere's (1934) research were methodological in nature. Other theorists deny that attitudes can be taken as the sole predictors of behaviour and suggest that numerous other sources need to be taken into account. The exact relationship between attitudes and behaviour is still unclear and one should be cautious, therefore, in the context of language-attitude research and language planning, about drawing rash conclusions about how individuals will react to a specific policy, say. As summarised by Smit (1996:28), there are, however, ways of improving the validity of language-attitude research. One of these is conducting attitude measurement on a regular basis.

Another important theoretical issue relating to attitudes is the relationship between attitudes and other constructs such as stereotype, perception, opinion, belief and behavioural intention. Smit (1996:28-30) provides a competent review of the relationship between attitude and all the above-mentioned constructs. In this and the next paragraph I would like to focus specifically on the relationship between attitude, opinion and belief. Smit (1996:29) mentions that, depending on the theoretical position of the researcher, belief is either viewed as a component of attitude (in the mentalist, multicomponentalist viewpoint) or as affecting attitude (in the behaviourist, unicomponentalist viewpoint). Either way, belief is closely related to attitude, and
although one may never be sure that a stated belief in any particular context will be fully indicative of an attitude, there will, undoubtedly, be some correlation. Another advantage of beliefs, as opposed to the more affective component of attitude, is that they are in practice more easily elicitable. An intuitively satisfying account of the relationship between attitudes and beliefs is to be found in Oppenheim (1966:106-111), who makes the following claim:

attitudes are reinforced by beliefs (the cognitive component) and often attract strong feelings (the emotional component) that will lead to particular forms of behaviour (the action tendency component [or conative component]) (Oppenheim 1966:106; comments in square brackets added).

More importantly Oppenheim (1966:109) posits a distinction between a number of levels. The first and most superficial one he calls beliefs, the next level is that of attitudes, and the final, deepest level is that of the personality. These distinctions are made clear in the following diagram:

Figure 1: taken from Oppenheim (1966:110)

![Diagram of attitude levels]

Figure 5-1.
The distinction between belief, attitude, value and personality is related, in turn, to the
case with which each of these can be changed, for example a changed belief relating to
a particular phenomenon does not necessarily imply than the individual’s attitude
towards that phenomenon will change, or as Oppenheim (1966:109) puts it:

it may not be difficult to convince a man with strong anti-Mexican views that he is
wrong in his belief that Mexicans have a high crime rate; but his underlying anti-
Mexican attitude remains unaltered, and he will soon find some other belief with which
to bolster his hostile attitude.

Oppenheim’s (1966) model of the relationship between attitudes and beliefs will be the
one used in this study.

The distinction between opinion and attitude is even more subtle. As mentioned by Smit
(1996:29), opinions are viewed in the literature on attitudes as either synonymous with
attitude or as the more overt side of the attitude coin. For Smit (1996:29; parenthesis
added)\(^{14}\) ‘opinions ... [are] ... manifested on the conscious level, directed towards
specific objects’.

However, Smit (1996) does not overtly discuss the difference between belief and
opinion. The difference would depend on whether opinion is viewed as synonymous
with attitude or only with the more conscious aspect of attitudes. Indeed, a brief perusal
of some standard literature on attitudes reveals a plethora of different definitions and
formulations. McGuire (1969:152), for one, talks of ‘names in search of a distinction,
rather than a distinction in search of a terminology’. Oskamp (1991:12-13), who in his
definition of opinion provides the above quotation from McGuire (1969), goes on to
mention the fact that traditionally opinion is used interchangeably with attitude, but
asserts a preference for the interchangeability of opinion and belief (i.e. the more
conscious aspects of attitudes from a multicomponentalist perspective), since the term
opinion seems to refer to phenomena that ‘are primarily cognitive rather than emotion-
laden’. Fishbein & Ajzen (1975:13) state that ‘opinion, knowledge, information,
stereotype ... may all be viewed as beliefs held by an individual’. Cooper & McGaugh

\(^{14}\) Also see Roos (1990:26).
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(1966:29) implicitly support both McGuire (1969) and Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) by ascribing the erroneous apparent synonymy of attitude and opinion in the literature to the 'loose' use of these words, and claim, instead, that like beliefs 'opinions play an important role in the thought processes in that they represent cognitive summaries'. I will use the terms opinion and belief interchangeably in the rest of this dissertation. In accordance with Oppenheim's model (1966), described above, the term attitude will be used to refer to an inclusive construct that is composed of beliefs (or opinions) but has, in addition, an affective and conative component.

Another important point is that attitudes are shared. According to Giles et al. (1983) the attitudes held by ingroup members often distinguish the ingroup members from outgroup members and can also provide a basis for positive distinctiveness. Thus attitudes themselves can stand as both ingroup and outgroup markers, i.e. as dimensions on which to base social comparisons and thus positive distinctiveness and social identity.

2.4 Language planning

Eastman (1983:29) provides the following definition of language planning:

the activity of manipulating language as a social resource in order to reach objectives set out by planning agencies which, in general, are an area's governmental, educational, economic, and linguistic authorities.

Following Smit (1996:16), we note that any attempt to manipulate language for particular reasons would need to draw on a large body of knowledge in order to guarantee that the relevant objectives are reached. It is for this reason that language-planning theory is often, of necessity, interdisciplinary. In their attempts to understand why certain plans succeed and others fail, language planners need to co-operate with disciplines such as politics, sociology, social psychology, economics, anthropology and, of course, linguistics.

Any language-planning effort, and any research in the field of language planning, can ordinarily be classified under one of two headings: corpus planning or status planning.
The first kind of planning deals with attempts to change the nature of the linguistic system itself, e.g. developing a writing system for a language (Eastman 1983:70); whereas status planning deals with attempts to alter the sociopolitical status of the language(s) concerned. It is with regard to status planning that the notion of domain becomes useful, since most status-planning attempts can be defined in terms of the domain(s) in which they operate, and, more specifically, according to which language(s) are reserved for which domain(s). For example, it is possible, following Dirven (1991:16-18, cited in Smit 1996:17) to distinguish between narrow language plans and ‘more democratic’ alternatives. Narrow language plans are characterised by the use of ex-colonial languages in the higher, public domains and the use of local languages in the private, lower domains. The more democratic alternatives involve the use of both ex-colonial and local languages in the higher domains. As mentioned before (§2.2.3), attempts to raise the status of minority languages by using them in higher domains are often motivated by a desire to reverse language shift and the erosion of ethnic identity in the face of growing Westernisation and modernisation (Webb 1992:6).

According to Webb (1992:8-10), the choice of a high-status language, like English, as sole official language is often, particularly in modern African states, motivated by a desire to avoid ethnic conflict arising from the choice of one of the indigenous languages of the country concerned, a most striking recent example being that of Namibia. Thus, according to Webb (1992:9; parenthesis added),

"daar is dus probeer om ’n “neutrale” taal soos Engels as nasionale taal van die ekonomie en die onderwys te ontwikkel" [trans: an attempt has thus been made to develop a “neutral” language like English into a national economic and educational language].

One of the higher domains that has received much attention by language-planning theorists has been education. As noted by Edwards (1985:118), ‘it is not putting things too strongly to say that education has often been perceived as the central pillar in group-identity maintenance’. The primary focus here has been the LOLT issue, i.e. in which

---

15. Note that these language-planning categories were developed within the context of language planning in post-colonial Africa.
language(s) students will learn and receive instruction. Arguments for and against the use of the mother-tongue in education abound and it is not my intention to provide a comprehensive review of them all. A brief outline of some of the main points of debate can, however, be provided. It should first be pointed out that arguments for the use of the mother-tongue as LOLT are not only cast in terms of the maintenance of language and ethnic identity. As Smit (1996:20) rightly states, it has been generally accepted that learning and teaching in the mother-tongue is best for the child in terms of her or his conceptual development and, since UNESCO’s\textsuperscript{16} landmark 1951 recommendation that, if at all possible, children should be taught in their mother-tongue (Eastman 1983:83; Fasold 1984:293; Corson 1993:71), there have been a plethora of attempts around the world to provide education for minority groups in the mother-tongue. It is in this context that Alexander (2001:10) recently made the following statement:

\begin{quote}
South African educators have to realise that the time has come to lay to rest the ghost of Dr Verwoerd and to lead South African education back into the mainstream of global education. One of the preconditions for doing this is to rehabilitate what, for the sake of convenience, we can loosely call mother-tongue education ...
\end{quote}

There is still much debate surrounding the question of what the exact nature and purpose of such attempts to provide some form of mother-tongue education should be, and it is in relation to this debate that the relationship between language and ethnicity has prominence.

According to Edwards (1985:126-128) there are two main approaches: transition and maintenance. The aim of the first approach is, briefly, to provide the child with mother-tongue education until she or he is ready and equipped to enter the mainstream.

In the maintenance approach, on the other hand, the preferred outcome of the education process is not solely entrance into the mainstream but rather the retention of L1-proficiency and ethnic identity. This is viewed as achievable through the implementation of bilingual instruction during the whole course of the individual’s

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{16} United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.
\end{footnotesize}
education (Edwards 1985:126). There are, however, a number of practical issues that might and do often interfere with the implementation of such maintenance programmes. These include the possibility that the mother-tongue is not suited for academic discourse, that there are a number of mother-tongues in any one student body, and most important, that the students themselves or their parents might not agree to mother-tongue learning and teaching. Such students or parents often perceive that it is only through the acquisition of the dominant language (and through instruction through this dominant language) that a student can increase her or his chances of social mobility. Such a “realistic” perspective is both endorsed and summarised by Edwards (1985:137):

promoters of ... maintenance-bilingual education ... pay too little attention to the needs and wishes of the potential beneficiaries of their policies. Given a reasonably tolerant society and education system, minority groups should and will define themselves vis-à-vis the mainstream as they think proper.

Edwards (1985) is, of course, assuming that the education system is not only tolerant, but also effective as well in terms of producing students who are fluent in the majority-group language. Such an assumption is questionable in many African countries (Webb 1992:5). It could be argued, however, that the emphasis in such countries should be on the provision of effective transition programmes rather than the implementation of maintenance programmes.

A pro-maintenance stance is to be found in more recent developments in language-planning theory, such as the approach taken by critical social scientists like Tollefson (1991), who distinguish between a historical-structural approach and a neo-classical approach to language planning (Tollefson 1991:26-38). The latter term refers to traditional language-planning efforts. In practice, these efforts often include some form of language-learning programme, which is viewed as a means of providing minority-language speakers with access to the relevant language of power. According to Tollefson (1991:26), ‘second language acquisition and language policy are dominated by a concern with learner variables such as motivation’. In other words, emphasis is placed on the individual: her or his age, language aptitude, attitudes, educational level,

17. Note that some or all of these problems might apply equally to transition programmes as well.
etc. In addition, those involved in the planning and implementation of such policies are generally uncritical of historical and structural constraints that impinge on the individual. Those taking the neo-classical approach are also seen as being too uncritical of language policies themselves, and thus as failing to make evident how such policies are often used to perpetuate existing inequalities and power relations.

In contrast to the neo-classical approach, the historical-structural approach has its roots in the work of modern thinkers such as the neo-Marxist critical theorist Jürgen Habermas and the postmodern philosopher Michel Foucault. According to Tollefson (1991:32), the historical-structural approach views language planning and policy as one mechanism by which the interests of dominant sociopolitical groups are maintained and the seeds of transformation are developed. The major goal of policy research is to examine the historical basis of policies and to make explicit the mechanisms by which policy decisions serve or undermine particular political and economic interests. Language-planning institutions are seen as inseparable from the political economy, and are no different from other class-based structures.

True to its Marxist roots, therefore, the historical-structural approach generally views language policy as a locus of class struggle. The success of any language policy is not posited as a relevant goal since success is seen as largely dependent on the degree to which policy serves dominant class interests. From a historical-structural perspective, evaluation of policy is more properly based on whether the policy in question has the potential to challenge current social inequalities (Tollefson 1991:35). Moreover, the historical-structural approach seeks to provide a broader sociopolitical explanatory basis for learner variables such as motivation and attitudes. Attitudes held by any particular individual to, say, the acquisition of a second-language (as well as towards the language learning programme) would, therefore, to some degree, be determined by sociopolitical factors outside her or his control. This situation is explained in terms of ideology and the manufacture of consent. What is meant by manufacture of consent is that dominant groups are often in a position to ensure the consent of minority-group members for prevailing structural inequalities (Tollefson 1991:11). In modern-day society, this is often achieved through the production of ideology. Language policy is one form of ideology, that is, certain assumptions which assist in the perpetuation of existing power
relations are held to be common sense (e.g. monolingualism is beneficial) by those in subordinate positions. In this way the beliefs and attitudes of those in subordinate positions lead directly to the perpetuation of power relations which are to their disadvantage.

Related to these notions of ideology and the manufacture of consent are the Gramscian notions of rule and hegemony, and also Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic power (Alexander 2001:12). According to Brown (1988/9:35),

.rule is expressed in directly political terms, asserting a coercive and legal power of state over groups that resist either actively or passively ... hegemony describes the apparently spontaneous consent within civil society of a dominant cultural form such as a language among dominated classes.

One expression of hegemony is, thus, positive attitudes towards the dominant language(s). Thus, returning to the issue of the LOLT to be used in minority-group education, students may be unaware that the prevailing system is designed to perpetuate existing inequalities and power structures, given that their reluctance to receive education through the mother-tongue is based on a common-sense (though ultimately incorrect) perception of what is in their own self-interest. The notion of symbolic power is similar. According to Alexander (2001:12),

.it is an invisible power that suffuses all spheres of social life in such a manner that the very people who are subjected to it are actively complicit in their subjection.

The notion of symbolic power is closely tied to the notions of linguistic market and linguistic capital already discussed in §2.2.5. In simple terms, certain varieties of language have more symbolic power than others on the linguistic market and thus the speakers of these varieties have more linguistic capital than others. Because those who do not have sufficient command over the more symbolically-powerful language engage in a ‘completely rational assessment of what counts in the market concerned’ (Alexander 2001:13) and attempt to change their linguistic behaviour accordingly (i.e. by seeking to acquire competence in the powerful language), they perpetuate the reigning structural inequalities (the linguistic market) and also their own subjugation.
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This is seen as the primary obstacle to attempts to alter the nature and rules of any particular linguistic market (Alexander 2001:13).

South African researchers have recognised the potential use of language policy and planning for the perpetuation of existing power structures (Smit 1996:18-19; Webb 1992:17-18) So for example, Alexander (2001:11) has recently stated that

language policy and language practices in institutions such as universities inevitably either reinforce or counter societal tendencies towards the unequal distribution of resources, opportunities and life chances.

More importantly, certain assumptions that in the past have been considered to be common sense are now being questioned. In general this has led to a theoretical shift, from viewing language and multilingualism as a problem, to viewing language as a right and as a resource. There has, in addition, been a growing emphasis on a democratic, consultative, bottom-up approach to language planning and policy as opposed to a top-down approach, which is always in danger of being used to perpetuate the interests of the dominant group. Researchers like Webb (1992:18) also emphasise the need for language-planning efforts to be sensitive to factors peculiar to the South African context.

With specific reference to language-attitude research, the above discussion of the historical-structural approach to language planning and policy should also serve as a warning concerning the interpretation of language-attitude research findings. Since it is the language attitudes of minority groups, more than anything else, that ensure minority-group members’ complicity in their own subjugation, Alexander (2001:17) maintains that we need to take care before we accept

disingenuous arguments based on empiricist research methods and surveys which allegedly demonstrate “conclusively” that black people are quite happy to use their languages in private and in low-status functions.

It is for this reason, in particular, that this dissertation strives to do more than just describe the language attitudes of its respondents. Rather, it attempts to explain their
genesis, both by isolating the various belief-complexes that constitute these attitudes (through the use of factor analysis) and also by tracing the sociohistorical roots of these attitudes (through an analysis, in Chapter 3, of the societal treatment of the various language varieties concerned). Chapter 5 then ties together the expressed beliefs, the underlying attitudes and the sociohistorical roots of both the beliefs and the attitudes.

Lastly, it should be stressed that although being pro-maintenance and pro-mother-tongue is generally characteristic of the historical-structural approach, being in favour of these things can just as easily be used to further the aims of an unjust society. This is particularly applicable to South Africa, where the mother-tongue ideology was used as one of the justifications for apartheid (Reagan 1987:137). Ironically the use of mother-tongue principles during apartheid has more than likely only served to strengthen a wholesale adoption of English as the language of public and personal liberation. This is confirmed by Reagan (1987:138), who maintains that an ideology opposing the mother-tongue ideology has emerged among African students in South Africa. This counter-ideology includes an unwillingness to use the African languages as LOLT, a rejection of Afrikaans and a preference, instead, for the use of English as LOLT in education.

From a historical-structural perspective, therefore, one might conclude that the use of mother-tongue education for segregationist aims during the Apartheid days has served to strengthen the symbolic power of English and the degree to which Africans themselves participate in their own subjugation to the current structural inequalities inherent in the English-dominated linguistic market.

2.5 Language attitudes

Why do people hold language attitudes? One can start to answer this question by noting, with Roos (1990:26), that the reasons are not internal to language, that is, negative or positive attitudes towards a variety are not based on real linguistic or aesthetic differences or inequalities between varieties. It is true, though, that holders of language attitudes will often assert that there are indeed differences on either or both of these levels (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:141). As already intimated in §2.2, the reason for the existence of language attitudes is that language is both a marker of social-group identity
and a means of access to power. The existence of language attitudes is explicable in terms of the various complex relationships between language and society.

Language attitudes can be defined as attitudes that have language as their referent (Smit 1996:31). Although such a definition captures a basic truth about language attitudes, it obscures the complexity of the construct. As can be gleaned from the foregoing sections, language attitudes imply the overlap of rather complex theoretical notions. It is mainly for this reason that 'the theoretical foundations ... are not strong and reliable enough for concise, generalisable descriptions of language attitudes and their implications on [sic] behaviour' (Smit 1996:31).

According to Smit (1996:40-41), however, another source of theoretical complexity in language-attitude research is that it is relevant to a number of diverse disciplines. Three of these disciplines, linguistics, sociology and anthropology, are interested in language attitudes because of their general interest in language, while social psychologists have become interested in language attitudes as a result of the central position of the concept attitude in their field. The first three fields have approached language attitudes through the sub-disciplines of sociolinguistics, the sociology of language and the ethnography of communication. These sub-disciplines introduced surveys, interviews and other qualitative methodologies like participant observation. Language attitudes can also be seen in terms of critical theory, which has its roots in sociology. We dealt briefly, in §2.4, with an example of the application of critical theory to language-in-society issues.

Another recent theoretical development has originated in the field of discourse analysis, 'which has contributed to language-attitude research by criticising its lack of functional orientation' (Smit 1996:41). According to Smit (1996:41), theorists in this field view the social world, including the referents of attitudes, as being under continuous reconstruction through discourse. Given this continuous reconstruction of the social world, it is incorrect to view attitudes as constants. Since the referents of attitudes are continuously changing, so are the attitudes towards them. In fact it is difficult, from this point of view, to distinguish between an attitude and its referent. In order to understand attitudes better, therefore, one should rather focus on how people construct social objects through their discourse.
The commonest approach, however, to language-attitude research (one which has its roots in social psychology) begins by focusing on the general observation that 'language, as a crucial ingroup and intragroup marker, can be used as a barometer of power and social identity within and between specific groups of a society ..., a fact which is mirrored in language attitudes' (Smit 1996:12 cf. Ryan, Giles & Sebastian 1982:1; Giles et al. 1983:81; Hartshorne 1987:83; Alexander 1995:38). This approach is discussed in full in §2.5.2.

2.5.1 Attempts to classify language attitudes

Let us first, however, review some attempts to classify language attitudes. The commonest method is in terms of the methodology employed to actually measure the attitudes. This classification scheme will be dealt with in some detail in §2.6. Another way of classifying attitudes is in terms of their referent (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:141-143; Cooper & Fishman 1974:6; Schmied 1991:164). Agheyisi & Fishman (1970:141) were the first to attempt a classification of language-attitude research (and, thus, indirectly, language attitudes per se) in terms of the specific referent of the attitude involved. They divided language attitude research into three broad categories:

- research relating to the direct evaluation of languages in terms of characteristics such as 'beautiful' and 'ugly';
- research which deals with the social significance of languages or language varieties and, in practice, with attitudes towards speakers of different languages or language varieties; and
- research dealing with language behaviour, including such topics as language use and choice.

The present research and the language attitudes it is attempting to determine and explain would, undoubtedly, be placed in the last category.

In a later work Cooper & Fishman (1974:6) provide their own distinction between:

- attitudes towards a language as a whole;
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• attitudes towards a particular feature of a language;
• attitudes towards the use of a language in a particular context; and
• attitudes towards language as a group marker.

More recently Schmied (1991:164)\textsuperscript{18} divided language-attitude research into ‘attitudes towards certain languages, attitudes towards varieties of a language, and attitudes towards sociolinguistic topics’. The present research falls into the last category, which generally refers to the kind of research that investigates attitudes towards the use of a language or language variety in a particular domain. The following statement by Smit (1996:39) is of interest:

\begin{quote}
\small
since this field is the one closest to linguistic practice, the responses are more influenced by the respondent’s knowledge of the situation .... For this reason, many language attitudes might be more accurately termed language beliefs or opinions, especially in those cases in which the responses are supported by communicative, national, personal, educational and cognitive arguments.
\end{quote}

Although the present dissertation follows general practice in calling itself language-attitude research, it should, however, be borne in mind that the kind of ‘attitudes’ it is attempting to investigate are different to those which are under scrutiny in the first two kinds of research mentioned by Schmied (1991) above. The reader is, in addition, referred back to §2.3 and, in particular, to the paragraphs dealing with the connections between the constructs \textit{attitude}, \textit{belief} and \textit{opinion}. Oppenheim’s (1966) outline of the relationship between beliefs and attitudes, described in this section, is, I believe, particularly useful in discriminating between the different kinds of language-attitude research outlined in Schmied (1991). The first two kinds of research mentioned by Schmied (1991) deal with the emotional component (Oppenheim 1966:106) of attitudes. No doubt, beliefs relating to these attitudes could, on request, be elicited in any particular case, but the fact remains that many of the favoured methodologies employed in such research, especially the Matched-Guise Technique (see §4.2.2), are focussed on ‘the elicitation of spontaneous attitudes less sensitive to reflection’ (Ryan, Giles & Hewstone 1988:1072). Schmied’s (1991) final kind of research category, of which the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{18.} Also see De Klerk & Bosch (1993:224) and De Klerk & Bosch (1994:50).
\end{footnotesize}
present research is an example, is, on the other hand, more concerned with the beliefs which reinforce and partially constitute the attitude in question.

Another method of classifying attitudes, found within the context of research into motivational factors relating to second-language learning, is that used in the work of Gardner & Lambert (1972). These authors distinguish between two basic orientations underlying language attitudes: the instrumental and the integrative. The instrumental orientation refers to a wish for social status or social mobility (Gardner & Lambert 1972:14), while an integrative orientation refers to wish to be a member of the relevant linguistic community. The relevance of this distinction has already been dealt with in §2.2.5. It is of particular significance within the context of this research, given that it postulates what could be called a number of dimensions underlying the attitudes of minority-group members. The notion of dimension is dealt with explicitly in §4.2.3 and its importance will become clearer during the course of this study.

2.5.2 The theory of language attitudes

In §2.2.3, aspects of Giles et al.'s (1977) theory of language in ethnic-group relations were introduced, in particular the various components of ethnonlinguistic vitality. Let us return to these authors and, by using further aspects of their framework for understanding the role of language in ethnicity and intergroup relations (Giles et al. 1977:308), see how the principles of SIT (as outlined in §2.2.1 and §2.2.2) apply to language attitudes. Of particular interest will be to see how different kinds of intergroup relations and the particular strategies employed by a group or its members to ensure positive distinctiveness explain the differences between the language attitudes of various groups.

As stated by Giles et al. (1977:325) "it is often the case that a group's evaluative attachment to its membership is reflected in its feelings about its speech style". This evaluative attachment to membership and language is based on the fact that there are other groups and other languages or language varieties in any particular society.

---

19. Note that these authors use the term speech style to refer to both separate languages and intralinguistic variety (Giles et al. 1977:327).
Language attitudes, therefore, are particularly salient in the context of language contact. Giles et al. (1977:329), for example, point out that ‘an ethnic group’s speech style can seemingly only assume salience as a marker of ethnic identity in relation to the existence of a contrasting ethnic group’. The precise nature of the language attitudes expressed by any particular ethnolinguistic group is, moreover, strongly determined by the power relations existing between the different groups in any particular society. Because of these power differentials, majority groups have the capacity to generate positive distinctiveness (and thus positive social identity) for their own members at the expense of the positive social identity of minority-group members. As was mentioned in §2.2.1, the processes of social categorisation, accentuation and positive distinctiveness can be found to operate on a number of different dimensions and with regard to a whole range of attributes, depending on the group in question. Language is a particularly salient attribute and is thus often the focus of attempts to create positive distinctiveness (Giles et al. 1977:324-331). Social comparisons are the mechanisms by which positive distinctiveness is created. If language is the object of these comparisons, then language attitudes come into being, an example of which is the common phenomenon of members of minority groups displaying negative attitudes towards their own language. In order to remedy this situation of negative social identity, minority-group members have a number of different strategies which they can employ. Because language is often used as a marker of social identity, the adoption of any particular strategy will have consequences for language attitudes among minority-group members, both towards their own language and that of the majority language. These various strategies and their consequences for language-attitude patterns constitute the next point of discussion.

According to Giles et al. (1977:332-333) and Hogg & Abrams (1988:54-56) the first kind of strategy employed by members of minority ethnolinguistic groups is that of individual social mobility. We have already seen that this occurs when the boundaries of the relevant groups are perceived to be permeable. Individual members of the minority group attempt to become members of the majority group by acquiring the markers of majority-group social identity. A common marker is language and, as such, minority-group members engaged in individual social mobility are often required to adopt the variety of the majority group in question. Positive attitudes towards the variety of the majority group and negative attitudes towards the variety of the minority group are to be
expected, in accordance with the re-identification of the individual with the majority ethnolinguistic group. As mentioned in §2.2.2, the case with which individual social mobility can in fact be achieved is often overestimated by minority-group members engaged in such attempts. Individuals attempting integration into the majority culture are, moreover, often pressurised by other minority-group members to desist in their attempts and are branded in various negative ways, e.g. as cultural traitors.

Following Giles et al. (1977:336-341), we now turn to focus on the different strategies that can be employed on a group level, i.e. ‘group strategies for social change’ (Giles et al. 1977:335), and on how these relate to language and language attitudes. The first strategy is the assimilation of the entire minority ethnolinguistic group into the majority ethnolinguistic group: the minority group usually attempts such a wholesale assimilation because it perceives such assimilation as having socioeconomic benefits for its members. This is very common with immigrant groups. In general and during the initial stages of the process, the strategy of group assimilation will usually generate a growing positive attitude towards the target culture and language at the expense of the original ingroup culture and language. Usually, however, the attempt at assimilation is unsatisfactory for ingroup members, both because of a sense of anomie generated by the loss of the previous social identity and because the majority group often takes steps to prevent total assimilation and to preserve positive distinctiveness. Within the context of minority and majority groups distinguished purely in terms of social class (i.e. members of the two classes belong to the same ethnic group and speak the same language but use different sociolects) a majority-group strategy of this kind has become known as pursuit convergence (Giles & Powesland 1975:178-179). In such cases, majority-group members will constantly endeavour to change their speech style in order to ensure positive distinctiveness, while minority-group members continuously endeavour to change their style in their attempt to assimilate to the majority group. It is interesting to speculate about possible majority-group member strategies in interethnic contexts (as contrasted with contexts that are purely inter-class), where the minority-group members in question are close, in the process of assimilation, to acquiring native-speaker and unaccented competence in the majority-group language. Presumably in such cases focus is often shifted to the non-linguistic characteristics of the minority-group speakers.
where possible, especially when these characteristics are immutable e.g. skin colour or certain physiognomic attributes.

The next group strategy mentioned by Giles et al. (1977:338) and Hogg & Abrams (1988:57) is that of the redefinition of negative characteristics. One of these characteristics can, of course, be language. As Hogg & Abrams (1988:57) note:

ethnic groups which consider their language to be of crucial importance can bolster and enhance their social identity by accentuating their language - that is for striving for positive ethnolinguistic distinctiveness.

In such cases there is often evidence of the beginnings of a linguistic movement and a growing positive attitude towards the language of identity, which is often seen as equal to or superior to the dominant language. An example of this strategy is the 20th-century resurgence of Welsh as an important symbol of ethnic identity (Khleif 1980:1)²⁰.

Another strategy (Giles et al.1977:338-339; Hogg & Abrams 1988:56-7) is the discovery of new dimensions on which to base positive distinctiveness. Language can, of course, constitute such a new dimension. The most prominent example of the use of language as a new dimension for ethnic identity, and a successful one at that, is the resurgence of Hebrew as the language of Israel (Fellman 1973:254-256; Nahir 1977:111-112). In cases such as these, attitudes towards the language concerned are bound to be on the positive side.

A further strategy, not mentioned in Giles et al. (1977) but discussed in Hogg & Abrams (1988:57), is the creation of new outgroups for comparison. As seen in §2.2.2, in terms of this strategy, the minority group in question turns its attention to other minority groups who have equal or less power for the purposes of social comparison. In this manner at least some positive distinctiveness is assured. The attitudes of the particular minority group towards the other minority group’s language will usually be negative and the attitudes towards the ingroup language positive. The positive attitudes

---

²⁰ However, see Jones (1996) for a somewhat less positive analysis of recent events in Wales.
towards the ingroup language will only, however, be relative, i.e. in comparison with
the other minority group’s language. Attitudes towards the ingroup language might be
more negative if ingroup members compare their language with that of the majority
group. As mentioned in §2.2.2, the example of this strategy, provided by Hogg &
Abrams (1988), is that of working-class sexism or racism. Language is not explicitly
mentioned by these authors but there is little doubt that racist or sexist perceptions
include negative attitudes towards the linguistic varieties used by these target groups.
An example which it is tempting to mention in the South African context is the
supposed negative attitudes of the so-called Coloured population21 towards the African
ethnolinguistic groups and thus, presumably, towards the languages of these groups.
There is very little evidence to support this supposition, however, and some research
(Morse & Peele 1974:255) seems to indicate that, on the contrary, this population is
‘caught in the middle between two larger blocs, each of which they partially identify
with and partially reject’. Since this strategy is mentioned by Hogg & Abrams (1988),
who do not concern themselves primarily with language, it would appear that the
language attitudes relating to it require further investigation.

The final strategy mentioned in Giles et al. (1977:339) and Hogg & Abrams (1988:57-
8), and one that generally leads to positive attitudes among ingroup members towards
the minority language, is that of social competition. The focus of competition can, thus,
be the relative status of the languages of the ingroup and the majority outgroup. Thus
the minority ingroup might make an attempt to increase the use of its language (usually
at the expense of the majority group’s language) in various higher domains, e.g. mass
media and education. A local example is, of course, the well-documented battle between
English and Afrikaans in South Africa and the eventual use of Afrikaans in all
secondary domains.

The above discussion has provided a relatively broad analysis of the role of language as
an ethnic-group marker in the development of language-attitude patterns as well as a
brief description of the resultant language-attitude patterns themselves. This analysis is,
however, one-dimensional and incomplete in its description. It requires additional

---

21. It is safe to assert, I believe, that during Apartheid, this group qualified as a minority group.
refinement if the complexity of language attitudes is to be properly understood. Above all it is necessary, in order to understand the development and nature of different kinds of language-attitude patterns, to separate clearly the two functions of language: language as social-group marker and language as route to power (§2.2.5). This basic distinction between power and social identity is similar to Ryan, Giles & Sebastian’s (1982) distinction between status and group solidarity, concepts which are used in their useful framework for discussing different language-preference patterns (which are indicative of the language attitudes underlying them).

In Ryan et al. (1982) we find a comprehensive theoretical attempt to describe and explain language attitudes. According to these authors, attitudes to language varieties are mainly determined by two features of any particular variety. These are the variety’s level of standardisation and the variety’s vitality. ‘A language variety is said to be standardised if a set of norms defining “correct” usage has been codified and accepted within a speech community’ (Ryan et al. 1982:3), whereas vitality

concerns the degree to which a variety has visible vitality (i.e. interaction networks that actually employ it natively for one or more essential functions). The more numerous and more important the functions served by the variety for the greater number of individuals the greater is its vitality (Ryan et al. 1982:4).

Typically, standardisation depends on those using the variety having the power to enforce codification and the acceptance of a standard. There is a close connection, therefore, between standardisation and power (Ryan et al. 1982:8; Smit 1996:44) or what Smit (1996:36) would call external strength. Vitality, on the other hand, is closely connected to the concept of ethnolinguistic vitality, which was described in §2.2.3 as part of Giles et al.’s (1977) attempt to account for the role of language in ethnic-group relations. In short, the higher the vitality of a particular ethnolinguistic group the higher the vitality of the variety it employs as ingroup marker. In comparison with standardisation, vitality is associated with social identity (Ryan et al. 1982:8; Smit

22. It is clear from a reading of Ryan et al. (1982) that the authors use the term language variety to refer both to separate languages (e.g. English and Afrikaans) and different varieties of one language (e.g. Standard South African English and Extreme South African English).
or what Smit (1996:36) would call internal strength. It should not, though, be thought that standardisation and vitality are completely independent. In fact they often influence one another, in the sense that the more vitality a language has, the more chance it has of becoming standardised, while a greater degree of standardisation usually leads to an increase in the vitality of a language. It is, however, possible to find real examples of languages or language varieties that have high degrees of vitality and low degrees of standardisation, and vice-versa. Ryan et al. (1982:5-6) provide good examples i.e. French in Southern Asia, (which is highly standardised but lacking in vitality in this particular area), and Black English in the USA, (which has not been subject to much standardisation, but which has a high vitality).

Ryan et al. (1982) have developed a sophisticated framework for the understanding of language preference patterns (see Figure 2 below).

Figure 2 (Ryan et al. 1982:9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of preference</th>
<th>LV1 speakers</th>
<th>Judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Majority group</td>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>LV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Majority group for Status/ingroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for solidarity</td>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>LV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Ingroup</td>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>LV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Majority group for status/ minority group for solidarity</td>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>LV2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Ryan et al. (1982:8) social status and group solidarity are directly related to standardisation and vitality respectively. Following Ryan et al. (1982:9), we note that Pattern A refers to a situation where both minority- and majority-group members view the majority language (i.e. the L1 of the majority group) in a positive light for both status (power) and solidarity (social-identity) reasons. The authors, however, refine this general framework by providing a description of two sub-categories of Pattern A. The first sub-category refers to a situation in which minority-group members have a more positive attitude towards the majority group’s language (for both power and social-

23. These sub-categories are not indicated in Figure 2. The same applies to the diagram provided in Ryan et al. (1982:9).
identity reasons) than the majority-group members. The example provided by Ryan et al. (1982:9) is that of the attitudes of some Canadian French speakers towards Canadian English. The other sub-category refers to a situation where, although the minority-group members are positive towards the majority-group language for both power and social-identity reasons, they are not as positive as majority-group members towards this language for social-identity reasons. Carranza & Ryan (1975:97-98) give an example of this: they report from their research that although their Mexican-American subjects were more positive towards English than Spanish for both status and solidarity reasons, they were not as positive towards English as a language of social identity (solidarity) as the L1-English speaking subjects. Included in this sub-category are also minority-group members that have a relatively lower positive attitude overall (i.e. on both status and solidarity dimensions) towards the majority language than majority-group members do (Ryan et al. 1982:10).

Pattern B refers to situations where members of the minority group prefer the majority-group language for power reasons alone, but not for social-identity reasons, i.e. they have no desire to identify with majority-group members and do not wish to use the majority language as a marker of social identity. The example provided by Ryan et al. (1982:10) is that of Quechua speakers’ attitudes towards Spanish in Peru.

Pattern C, on the other hand refers to a situation in which there is strong loyalty towards the minority language both in terms of social identity and in terms of power. This is most common in situations where individual social mobility is unlikely for minority-group members and where the only alternative is to change the social status of the minority group as a whole. Ryan et al. (1982:10) provide a number of examples, each one of which is related to a political movement, e.g. the Basque Separatist and the Chicano movements.

Pattern D arises when both minority- and majority-group members prefer the minority-group language for social-identity purposes and the majority-group language for power reasons. An example of this pattern is any local Arabic vernacular vs. Classical Arabic or any other example of ‘standard languages which are not spoken as a vernacular by any group’ (Ryan et al. 1982:10).
Ryan et al.'s (1982) framework is a useful one in that it provides categories for the classification of various de facto language-attitude patterns. It is, in addition, sophisticated enough to provide a theoretical justification for the existence of these categories. This is due mainly to Ryan et al.'s (1982) distinction between status and solidarity, i.e. these authors recognise that preferences for (and thus attitudes to) particular languages are not only determined by a desire for social identity, but can be motivated by pragmatic considerations alone.

2.5.3 Implications and applications of language attitude research

We end this section off with a brief look at the theoretical and practical importance of language-attitude research. Following Smit (1996:37-8) we note that language attitude-research is, for example, particularly useful to teachers, in that it can make them aware of how they might judge pupils in terms of their (i.e. the teachers’) attitudes towards language varieties and not on the basis of objective criteria. On a more theoretical level, language attitudes have a role to play in the rate of sound change and as a predictor of mutual intelligibility (Smit 1996:38). Most importantly, however, language-attitude research has a central role to play in language planning, and according to Lewis (1988:262, cited in De Klerk & Bosch 1993:209-210) this is especially true in the domain of education. It is important to note that any attempt to implement a language policy that is ‘democratic and based on bottom-up consultative procedures’ (De Klerk & Bosch 1993:210) needs to take the attitudes and preferences of those affected by the prospective policy into account. Thus, during a conference held in 1996 on Unisa’s possible language policy, Alexander (1996:109) stressed the importance of including regular assessments of language use and attitudes in any language-planning framework. This sentiment is echoed by authors such as Ferguson (1996:274-5):

in many ways the effectiveness of language policies in education is determined more by the attitudes of the people on language use than it is by the simple demographic facts of language distribution and use. Discovering language attitudes is more difficult than finding the basic data and also may raise political issues which threaten the successful carrying out of a survey, but it is of fundamental importance.
Baker (1992:9)\textsuperscript{24} is another author who claims that attitude surveys are useful for gaining insight into changing beliefs and also for determining the potential success of implementing any particular language policy.

This importance of language-attitude research for language planning naturally rests on the assumption that there is a reasonably strong relationship between attitude and behaviour; for example, that someone with a positive attitude towards the use of a particular minority language as LOLT will make use of this language if it is offered as a LOLT option. It is therefore important to note, with De Klerk & Bosch (1994:50), that ‘[e]xisting research reveals an apparent ... lack of congruence between language attitudes and overt language behaviour - language choice and usage’. An illustrative and topical example of such an incongruence between expressed attitude and observed behaviour is described by Meyer (1988:1), who shows, in her research on teaching practice in South African black schools, how even though both English and the L1 are used extensively in the classroom, the majority of teachers report a preference for the sole use of English. The results of language-attitude surveys, therefore, though important in informing language-planning operations, should be interpreted with caution. The more general relationship between attitude and behaviour has already been discussed in §2.3 above.

More generally, language-attitude research needs to be considered within a broader ecological framework, i.e. language-planning and policy efforts need to be based on more than just language-attitude studies but also on an appreciation of a number of factors that might impinge on the maintenance or loss of a language, whether generally or in specific domains. On a theoretical level, this implies viewing language-attitude studies as part of the broader field of language ecology, the central task of which is the determination of those factors that sustain the long-term maintenance of languages (Haugen 1972; Edwards 1992; Edwards 1994:136-145; Haarman 1986:1-35; Mühlhäusler 1996:1-8; Mühlhäusler 1997; Mühlhäusler 2000). A similar sentiment, expressed from a South African perspective, is found in Webb (1992:18) and Webb et al. (1992:27).

\textsuperscript{24} Also see Webb, Dirven & Kock (1992:37).
As stated in §2.4, it should also not be forgotten that the attitudes held by respondents (especially if they are members of a minority group) are often instrumental in the subjugation of these same respondents. Therefore any attempt to formulate policy based on the assessment of language attitudes needs to carefully weigh up the expressed attitudes and preferences of the respondents against what appears to be the respondents’ own complicity in the perpetuation of structural inequalities that are to their detriment. Although this places the language planner in a predicament to some extent, it is, after all, the responsibility of the researcher to make her- or himself aware of all the possible facts before adopting a particular course of action.

2.6 The methodology of language-attitude research

As mentioned above (§2.5.1), the usual manner in which language-attitude research has been categorised is in terms of the methodology employed (Aghleyisi & Fishman 1970:141-150; Ryan et al. 1982:6-8; Giles et al. 1983:82-86; Ryan, Giles & Hewstone 1988; Cargile, Giles, Ryan & Bradac 1994:212-214; Smit 1996:44-49). The aim of this section is to provide a very broad overview of the various methodologies employed in the field and some of the advantages and disadvantages of each. A more in-depth motivation for the selection and inclusion of particular methodologies in the present research is provided in Chapter 4. Following Ryan et al. (1988) we will briefly discuss and exemplify the following three categories of research methodology:

- the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties (§2.6.1);
- the direct measurement of language attitudes (§2.6.2); and
- the indirect measurement of language attitudes (§2.6.3).

2.6.1 The analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties

This form of research generally relates to the content analysis of the public treatment of language varieties (Ryan et al. 1988:1068). In practice this involves a whole range of techniques; in short: 'all techniques which do not involve explicitly asking respondents for their views or reactions' (Ryan et al. 1988:1068). All these techniques are qualitative forms of research. One example would be content analysis, e.g. demographic and census analyses; analyses of government and educational language policies; analyses of
literature, government and business documents, newspapers and broadcasting media’ (Ryan et al. 1988:1068). Such content analyses are well represented in the literature, e.g. Fishman (1966), Fishman, Cooper & Roxana (1971), Bourhis (1982) and Carranza (1982).

Such an analysis is included in Chapter 3. The advantage of such a methodology is that it offers a broad overview of the social and historical roots of language attitudes. In addition, this approach highlights the dynamic nature of language attitudes and, in the words of Giles et al. (1983:83), helps to ‘provide some insight into the emergence of values over time’. A more general discussion of this method is included in §4.2.1.

Apart from the method mentioned above, a whole range of other qualitative research methods belong to this category (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:142-3; Ryan et al. 1982:7; Ryan et al. 1988:1068-1069), e.g. observational, participant-observation, ethnographic, autobiographical and case studies.

2.6.2 The direct measurement of language attitudes

The direct measurement of attitudes involves assessing attitudes through the use of either interviews or questionnaires. It should be mentioned here that ‘some scholars question the possibility that direct methods can ever elicit attitudes .... and others dismiss the use of direct methods in attitude research completely’ (Smit 1996:45 cf. Giles et al. 1977:327; Roos 1990:26). The main objection to direct questionnaires is that direct questions do not elicit unconsciously held attitudes.

Theoretical objections aside, however, in practice these techniques have been employed to measure and research a whole range of language-related topics. These include language preference, the prediction of second-language-learning outcomes, attitudes towards language-policy issues, bilingualism and bilingual education, and also attitudes towards the speaking of two separate languages or varieties (Ryan et al. 1982:7; Ryan et al. 1988:1069-1070). According to Cargile et al. (1994:213), the use of direct questioning has been more useful than analyses of societal treatment of language varieties (§2.6.1) since it allows researchers access to a greater range of language
varieties and attitudes. The two methods of measurement (interviews and questionnaires) are discussed in more detail below.

2.6.2.1 The interview
According to Agheyisi & Fishman (1970:149-150), the interview has never been used as extensively as the questionnaire in language-attitude research. It remains, however, a measurement technique in its own right, with its own particular advantages and disadvantages. These mostly arise from the personal nature of the interview. One advantage is the interviewer's ability to focus the attention of the respondent on the relevant subject matter. A disadvantage is the interviewer's tendency to influence the mood and opinions of the respondent. Another disadvantage is the nature of the data, which is generally not amenable to quantification. Interviewing is usually employed in combination with other, quantitative techniques and as part of the exploratory phase of the research. A more general discussion of interview techniques is included in §4.2.1.

2.6.2.2 The questionnaire
There are two types of questionnaire that have been used in language-attitude research: the open questionnaire and the closed questionnaire. Naturally a combination of the two is also feasible.

The open questionnaire is very much like the interview in that the respondent has the freedom to discuss, at length, her or his attitudes and feelings about a particular topic. It suffers from the same disadvantages as the interview, and also the fact that the researcher cannot ensure that the respondent focuses on the relevant topic, or that the respondent answers the questions as fully as she or he would during the interview (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:147-8).

Second in popularity only to the Matched-Guise Technique (MGT) is the closed questionnaire (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:144). Its popularity aside, however, it suffers from a number of defects in response to which indirect measurement techniques

---

25. These authors, in fact, assert that the questionnaire is the most popular method. Although this might have been true at the time they wrote their article, this trend seems to have changed (Edwards 1985:146).
like the MGT were developed. The main objections to this technique include its inability to 'reveal non-consciously held attitudes' (Giles et al. 1983:84) and the fact that respondents tend to answer in the manner in which they believe they are expected to. Another issue, of particular relevance to language-attitude research, is that of the language in which the questions are posed, since it can have an effect on what the respondent expects the correct response to be for any particular question i.e. it can 'communicate information about the expected “proper” responses' (Ryan et al. 1988:1071). Not all researchers are totally dismissive of this technique, though, and it has several obvious advantages. These include the fact that respondents do not fail to focus on the expected dimension and that closed questionnaires are easy to score (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:148-149).

Another advantage is that language-attitude researchers have been in a position to benefit from the wealth of research that has been conducted on attitude measurement in social psychology. Measurement instruments such as the Thurstone, Guttman and Likert Scales have all been more or less successfully used in language-attitude research (see Smit 1996:46 for a brief overview of the use of such rating scales).


2.6.3 The indirect measurement of language attitudes
The primary technique of measurement in this category is the MGT, first introduced by Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner & Fillenbaum (1960). Many authors consider it to be the commonest method of measuring attitudes (Cooper 1975:5; Giles et al. 1983:84; Edwards 1985:150; Giles, Hewstone, Ryan & Johnson 1988; Cargile et al. 1994:213). Its basic form involves tape-recording bilingual or bidialectical speakers while they read the same text, in both the languages or dialects which are being researched. These two versions (with other versions interspersed in between) are then played to respondents, who are asked to rate each speaker on a number of personality traits. The respondents are unaware that the two versions are read by the same speaker and the theory is that 'whatever evaluations are made of the speaker must be prompted mainly by the judge's
general reaction to the speakers of that particular language, rather than by his reaction to the specific speaker in the experimental situation' (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:146). The main advantage of this method of measurement is that it is meant to negate the problem of respondents providing answers on the basis of what they expect the right answers to be. It is also meant to help researchers tap into the more affective, evaluative side of respondents’ language attitudes (Smit 1996:47). See Smit (1996:47) for a brief overview of the MGT and related techniques.

2.7 Summary

The aim of this chapter was to provide a review of the theoretical literature on language attitudes. Given that language attitudes arise from the interrelationship between language and society, it was felt necessary to provide a theoretical framework that would deliver some insight into the nature of this interrelationship. This was achieved in §2.2, which begins with a broad discussion of some of the basic principles of SIT (§2.2.1 and §2.2.2). The former section is dedicated to an analysis of the concepts of social identity, accentuation, social comparison and positive distinctiveness. The main aim is to illustrate how members of a social group are motivated, in order to ensure positive social identity, to compare their own group on dimensions likely to reflect favourably on the ingroup.

Section 2.2.2 introduces the notion of power into the framework provided in the previous section. It points out that different social groups are invested with different degrees of power and that because of these differences, members of minority social groups are often burdened by a lack of positive social identity. In order to change this state of affairs, minority-group members have a number of strategies available to them. The nature of the strategy depends, firstly, on whether group boundaries are perceived as permeable. If so, members of the minority group usually engage in individual social mobility. If not, various group strategies are employed. The particular nature of the group strategy, in its turn, depends on whether members perceive there to be cognitive alternatives. If they do not, then group members usually employ some form of social creativity in order to enhance positive social identity. An example is the discovery of new dimensions on which to base intergroup comparisons. If minority-group members
do perceive the existence of cognitive alternatives, then the strategy is, ordinarily, some form of social competition.

Section 2.2.3 introduces language into the theoretical framework provided in the preceding sections. It points out that language is a prominent marker of social-group identity and then takes a closer look at some of the various types of social groups for which language plays this role. The first kind of social group it looks at is the ethnic group. In order to provide a better understanding of what is termed ethnolinguistic vitality, it makes use of aspects of Giles et al.’s (1977) theory of language in ethnic-group relations. Because the well-being of a language is closely tied to that of its speakers, a summary of those factors contributing towards the maintenance or dissolution of the vitality of any particular ethnolinguistic group is provided, based on the work of the above-mentioned authors. The section then proceeds to look briefly at the relationship between language and other social groups, i.e. social class and race. The section includes some general comments about the relevance of the concept of ethnolinguistic vitality to the fields of language-attitude research and language planning.

Section 2.2.4 provides a brief discussion of the notion of domain, which refers broadly to the different contexts in which language can be used, and which usefully distinguishes between higher domains (e.g. education) and lower domains (e.g. family life).

Section 2.2.5 looks at the notion of language as power, as opposed to the difference in power between different social groups which use language as a marker of social-group identity. This theoretical distinction is seen as necessary in order to capture the notion that some languages are often acquired for pragmatic, communicative purposes alone. In such scenarios, the individuals involved seem to have no desire to adopt the social identity related to the language in question.

Language attitudes are a sub-type of attitudes in general. The chapter, therefore, provides an overview of some of the basic issues and controversies in the theory of attitudes. This overview is provided in §2.3. Theoretical issues dealt with in this section include the differences in approach between the behaviourist and mentalist approaches.
to attitudes. The main controversy surrounds the internal structure of attitudes, i.e. whether they should be conceived of as being unicomponental (only affective) or multicomponental (comprised of cognitive, affective and conative sub-components). The sometimes tenuous relationship between attitudes and behaviour is then touched on, and also its implications for language-attitude research and language planning. The section then focuses on the conceptual differences between the related constructs attitude, opinion and belief. It is pointed out that, depending on the viewpoint of the theorist, beliefs are either seen as effecting attitudes or as part of attitudes. Either way, the two constructs are intimately related. In addition, a particular model of the interrelationship between attitudes and beliefs (that of Oppenheim 1966) is adopted as a guide for the rest of this study. The section ends by pointing out that attitudes can, just like their referents, be markers of social identity.

The chapter continues by taking a brief look at some of the relevant considerations in the field of language planning. This brief overview is necessary, given the central role played by language-attitude research in the field. Section 2.4 begins by distinguishing between corpus planning and status planning. The latter is of particular relevance. With regard to this form of planning, it is shown how different language policies can be classified by using the notion of domain. The section then proceeds to take a closer look at the implementation of language policy in one specific domain, that of education. It touches briefly on the mother-tongue education controversy, distinguishing as it does between the two kinds of mother-tongue education programmes provided around the world, namely transition and maintenance. Some of the problems and arguments surrounding the implementation of such programmes (especially those of the maintenance type) are then discussed. It is noted that one particular recent development in language-planning theory views language policy within the broader context of social class struggle. Some implications of this new approach for language attitude research are then touched on.

Section 2.5 attempts to draw together the theory provided in the previous sections as it relates specifically to language attitudes. Some time is spent discussing the theoretical complexity of language attitudes, then in §2.5.1 some attempts to classify language attitudes are presented. The current research is positioned in terms of some these
classifications (i.e. those of Agheyisi & Fishman 1970 and Schmied 1991). Special emphasis is also placed on Gardner & Lambert’s classificatory scheme (1972), which distinguishes between the instrumental and integrative orientations underlying language attitudes. In §2.5.2, the discussion proceeds to an application of the basic notions of SIT, introduced in §2.2.1 and §2.2.2, to the particular context of language attitudes. It explains how language attitudes develop in terms of the notions of social comparison, positive distinctiveness etc., and then attempts an analysis of how the various strategies employed by minority groups and their members to ensure positive self-identity impact on the language attitudes the members hold. In the process, a broad framework of language-attitude patterns is drawn up. As pointed out in this section, however, this framework is a rather coarse one and requires refinement. Such refinement is provided in the remainder of the section by the introduction of a theoretical framework designed exclusively for an explanation of language attitudes. The framework is that of Ryan et al. (1982). These authors distinguish between a variety’s level of standardisation and its vitality. These two concepts are then related to those of social status and group solidarity. The two latter concepts are, in turn, used within a framework that outlines the different language-preference patterns possible in any particular society. The role of language attitudes is made explicit in this regard.

Section 2.5.3 then takes a look at some of the implications and applications of language-attitude research within the broader frameworks of language-planning and policy theory and also the field of language ecology.

The last section (§2.6) of the chapter provides a very brief summary of some of the main methodologies employed in the field of language-attitude research. These include the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties, interviews, the questionnaire and the Matched-Guise Technique.
Chapter 3

A sociohistorical perspective on the LOLT issue in South Africa

3.1 Introduction

This chapter constitutes an analysis of the societal treatment of those languages of South Africa most relevant to the focus of this research i.e. English and the official African languages. Given the central role played by its speakers in the political past of South Africa, some reference to Afrikaans (and Dutch) is also unavoidable.

As the current research is focussed on determining attitudes within a particular domain (i.e. education, and more specifically, tertiary education), emphasis in this chapter will be placed where possible on the societal treatment of these languages within an educational context. The chapter has been divided into three sections, each with its attendant focus. Section 3.2 provides an overview of the language demographics of South Africa as a whole, as well as Unisa in particular. Section 3.3 provides a historical background to the attitudes of Unisa L1-African language students towards the use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa. It examines the sociohistorical genesis of the forces that have impacted on the formation of these attitudes. The section provides insight into the development and nature of these forces by examining relevant aspects of the history of the language question in South Africa, with a particular focus on LOLT policy in the education of L1-African language speakers.

Section 3.4 provides a review of language-attitude research conducted over the past few decades. The focus is on language-attitude research that has attempted to assess the attitudes, beliefs and preferences of L1-African language speakers towards the use of the currently official African languages and/or English as LOLT. Although such a review can often play an important role in providing important confirmatory evidence for a sociohistorical analysis, such as the one contained in §3.3, the main conclusion that is reached as a result of this review is that research into language attitudes in South Africa is,
with a few exceptions, generally lacking in methodological rigour, an impression which is borne out by the conflicting results generated by this research.

3.2 Demographics
An appreciation of the societal treatment of a language variety or varieties depends on a broad appreciation of the demographics of the various languages involved. The current section intends to engender such an appreciation.

South Africa, like many African countries, is a multilingual country. It has eleven official languages, and a range of other languages, both indigenous and immigrant, are spoken in the country. According to the results of the 1996 Population Census (Orkin 1999:12), approximately 99% of the South African population claim to have one of the official languages as their 'first home language'. The following table, based on Orkin (1999), provides information on the number and percentages of L1-speakers of each of the official languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total number of speakers</th>
<th>Percentage of the population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>9 200 144</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>7 196 116</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>5 811 547</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Sotho</td>
<td>3 695 846</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3 457 467</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>3 301 773</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>3 104 199</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>1 756 105</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>1 013 194</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>876 409</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>586 962</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these figures do provide an indication of 'the relative sizes of the various language groups' (Smit 1996:54), they do not provide the total number of speakers for each language, i.e. both L1-speakers and speakers for whom the language is an additional language. This is of particular relevance to languages such as isiZulu, Afrikaans and English, which are used to varying degrees and in different areas, as lingue franche. Note that for various reasons 'no language qualifies to become the lingua franca' of South Africa (Du Plessis 2000:101).

With respect to English, Gough (1996:54), for example, confirms that this language has become a lingua franca among a proportion of L1-African language speakers. It should be noted, however, that a large number of L1-African language speakers still have little or no competence in English (Branford 1996:43; Webb 1992:6). Due to its prominent role during the Apartheid era, Afrikaans has also become a lingua franca among some sectors of the black population of South Africa (Titlestad 1996:170; Webb et al. 1992:32). With respect to isiZulu, not only is it the language with the largest number of L1-speakers, it is 'also spoken by the majority of people in the Gauteng province' (Maphalala 2000:152) as a lingua franca.

Naturally, there is an uneven distribution of the eleven official languages across different areas of the country. Most of the provinces have, numerically-speaking, one or two dominant languages, the exception being Gauteng Province (Webb et al. 1994:29). The Development Bank of South Africa (1994:20), Webb et al. (1992:29), Du Plessis (2000:99) and the National Education Policy Investigation (1992:23-24) all provide a good idea of the distribution of the various official languages.

1. Also see Webb (1992:10) and Webb, Dirven & De Kock (1992:32).
Census figures are, in addition, unable to provide an indication of the social and functional spread of the languages concerned. With regard to the socioeconomic spread of the South African languages it is in all likelihood safe to assert that the scenario outlined in Webb et al. (1992:30) still applies, i.e. that a large proportion of English and Afrikaans speakers belong to the middle and upper classes, whereas the majority of L1-African language speakers belong to the lower, working class. With respect to the functional spread of the languages (see the discussion on domains in §2.2.4) we can begin with the African languages by noting that the status of these languages has been enhanced somewhat since the adoption of South Africa’s new Constitution and its multilingual language policy (Unisa 1998:2). In general, however, the African languages are still mainly employed in the primary, lower domains, although exceptions do exist, e.g. the occasional use of the African languages in the South African Parliament. English on the other hand has changed from a language of preference (alongside Afrikaans), to the language of preference in most of the higher domains in South African society. So, for example, the following was noted even in the early 1990s by Webb et al. (1992:32; parenthesis added):

Engels meer sosiale, ekonomiese, opvoedkundige en politieke mag as Afrikaans het [trans: English has more social, economic, educational and political power than Afrikaans].

It is safe to say that this trend has continued and become more pronounced in the years since Webb et al.’s (1992) observation. Another difference noted by Webb et al. (1992), this time between the African and European languages (i.e. English and Afrikaans) of South Africa, is also for all intents and purposes still in existence, namely that, compared to English and Afrikaans, the African languages are still relatively underdeveloped as languages of science and technology:

terwyl Engels se tegniese registers oorsee ontwikkel is, en Afrikaans ná sy emansipasie in die twintigste eeu met staatsgeld en staatsteun ontwikkel kon word, is die sogenaamde swart tale relatief gesproke steeds onontwikkel as instrumente van die wetenskap en tegnologie [trans: while English’s technical registers were developed overseas, and while Afrikaans could, after its emancipation in the 20th century, be developed with money and support from the state, the so-called black languages are still relatively undeveloped as instruments for science and technology] (Webb et al. 1992:34; parenthesis added).
Moving now to the particular context of the research, we can note that although the main Unisa campus is situated in Pretoria, in Gauteng Province, it is a distance-education University. The language demographics of its student population do not, therefore, reflect the demographics of this province. An idea of the language distribution of Unisa students at the time of the actual survey (i.e. 1998-9) is contained in the table below, which provides figures for 1997:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>20 828</td>
<td>16.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>39 560</td>
<td>31.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans/English</td>
<td>1 583</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>1 511</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Sotho</td>
<td>13 176</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>3 255</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>1 879</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>4 091</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>6 967</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Language</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>3 281</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>8 636</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>13 783</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 662</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124 212</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing these figures with those provided in Table 1 above, it is of interest to note that some of the official African languages are under-represented² among Unisa students (isiZulu, for example), whereas, Northern Sotho, for example, is slightly over-represented. These trends are, no doubt, to some degree the result of the actual physical location of Unisa, but the comparatively low number of reported L1-African language speakers as a whole needs to be interpreted in the light of the fact that, generally, white students have a greater degree of access to tertiary education in South Africa, and, in addition, that many African students might be motivated to report English as their home language, as a consequence of the perceived status of this language, particularly within the domain of tertiary education.

3.3 The historical background

South Africa’s colonial past as well as its recent transformation into a democracy have both played roles in determining current language attitudes as well as Unisa’s current LOLT policy. This section will provide an overview of this historical context. Student language attitudes and language policy at an institution such as Unisa cannot be understood in a vacuum. In order to understand how these attitudes develop it is necessary to reach back into the past and investigate the social and political forces operating within

---
² In terms of the general population distribution in South Africa.
the history of a nation' (St. Clair 1982:164); such an investigation into the role played by extra-individual factors on the development of attitudes and policy is, in addition, in line with the so-called historical-structural approach to language planning, as advocated by Tollefson (1991), for example, and as discussed in §2.4.

The sociohistorical analysis provided below is divided into four broad historical periods: South Africa under the Dutch (§3.3.1), South Africa under the British (§3.3.2), the Apartheid years (§3.3.3) and the New South Africa (§3.3.4).

3.3.1 South Africa under the Dutch (1652-1806)

The history of South Africa is characterised by the domination of indigenous languages by colonial languages. This suppression of the indigenous languages of South Africa began with the arrival of the Dutch in 1652 (Crawhall 1993:6). Steyn (1980:106; parenthesis added), for example, points out that language contact between Dutch and the indigenous languages was almost always to the detriment of the latter:

van 1652 af het die Hollanders en Khoen met mekaar in aanraking gekom en van die begin af het die taalkontak Hollands bevoordeel ten koste van die Khoé-tale [trans.: from 1652 there was contact between the Dutch and the Khoikhoi³ and from the outset the contact between the various languages was to the advantage of Dutch at the expense of the Khoë³ languages].

Alexander (1989:12-15) and Steyn (1980:106) both mention the negative attitudes of the Dutch and other settlers towards the Khoë languages. The languages were compared to the sound made by turkeys or described simply as one long rattle. They were characterised as

³. In the use of this term I am following Davenport & Saunders (2000:6-8) in order to refer to the subgroup of the Khoisan people traditionally referred to as Hottentots. Smit (1996) uses the more general term Khoisan, which refers to the group that includes what were traditionally known as Hottentots and Bushmen (San). It is likely, though, that she is referring primarily to the Khoikhoi, as opposed to the San, given that it was with the former that the Dutch primarily had contact (Davenport & Saunders 2000:21-35).

⁴. The use of the term Khoë to describe the languages spoken by the Khoikhoi seems to be in line with modern usage. While Gregersen (1977:126) makes use of the term Hottentot, (without the inverted commas) to refer to both this sub-group and the languages that they speak, authors like Gúldmann & Vossen (2000) use the term 'Hottentot' (note the inverted commas) to refer to the people and both 'Hottentot' and Khoë to refer to the languages.
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extremely difficult to learn, although few colonists even bothered to try to learn them. It was decreed by the Dutch East India Company (D.E.I.C.) that the locals would have to learn the Dutch language and not the other way around (Alexander 1989:12-13).

These two authors also mention early attempts by the Dutch authorities to set up schools to teach Dutch to their subjects. These schools were mostly attended by the children of imported slaves, but there were cases of KhoiKhoi children being included in these classes. Interestingly, many of these schools were subject to repeated boycotts (Alexander 1989:15). Another interesting fact is that although attempts were made to separate the white children from the slaves and other groups, mixed schools were common (Steyn 1980:115). Although these negative attitudes and repressive language policies were directed primarily towards the KhoiKhoi and the East Indian slaves and the languages of both groups, and not towards the vast majority of Africans living in what would become South Africa, they can be viewed (Crawhall 1993:6) as the roots of later linguistic intolerance among the Afrikaner people, an intolerance that in a twisted and ironic fashion had a major impact on the attitudes of many Africans towards their own and other languages.

The absorption of the KhoiKhoi into the Cape Colony was parallel, according to Steyn (1980:105-7), with a gradual valorisation of Western culture and languages and a language shift from the Khoe languages to Dutch/Afrikaans. Firstly, it should be noted that this assimilation into Western culture refers to the minority of Khoisan people. ‘The majority ... either died or left the region’ (Smit 1996:57). Secondly, it is quite plausible that, initially at least, the language shift towards Dutch was a matter of economic necessity more than anything else, indicative of a purely instrumental orientation and not reflective of a positive attitude towards Dutch culture and language per se. This hypothesis is supported further by the culture of multilingualism that existed (and still exists) among the indigenous populations of South Africa. It is, however, likely that by the end of the Dutch period of colonisation an equivalent colonisation of the African mind had begun to take place, in the sense that the indigenous groups began to adopt the judgments and values of the white colonists. The African languages were, presumably, not exempt from such judgments. Furthermore, according to Smit (1996:57) this shift towards Dutch was often
characterised by mixing between Dutch and other languages, which led, in turn, to the
development of Afrikaans and a diglossic situation in the Cape Colony, with Dutch as the
high variety and Afrikaans as the low variety. The role played by the indigenous languages
in the original development of Afrikaans is ironic given this language’s eventual role of
symbol of oppression during the Apartheid and post-Apartheid eras.

3.3.2 South Africa under the British (1806-1948)

After the second and final British occupation of the Cape in 1806, language policy centred
around the British attempt to ‘replace Dutch with English as the dominant language in
public life in the colony’ (Reagan 1986:2). The language struggle between
Dutch/Afrikaans and English, has, however, little relevance to the present discussion. Of
more interest is British policy relating to the indigenous languages and the education of the
black majority, which is the topic of discussion for the remainder of this section. In
passing, however, it should be mentioned that the language-in-education policy of the 19th
century Boer Republics was to use the mother-tongue as LOLT (Alexander 1989:24).

Under the British, the task of educating the indigenous population fell mostly to the
missionaries, who considered it their duty to convert the African to Christianity. According
to Smit (1996:57-8), the missionaries believed that the best way to achieve this aim was to
both proselytise and provide education in the mother-tongue. One consequence of this
belief was that a number of the indigenous languages were written down, both for
educational and evangelical purposes. It was this process that, in fact, led to the existence
of the modern African languages that we know today. The choice of dialects for writing
down, standardising and teaching was generally made at random.

According to Alexander (1989:20), the colonial education authorities supported the
practices of the missionaries to some degree. They supported the use of the mother-tongue
at the primary level of education, but at the secondary level (and for the higher domains in
general) they insisted on the use of English, i.e. there was a policy of Anglicisation (Smit

5. Also see Crawhall (1993:6) and Lanham (1996:20-25).

6. Not completely at random though. According to Van der Spuy (2002) the missionaries usually
chose the variety of the area in which they lived.
Their motives were different from those of the missionaries. The policy of the colonial government was geared towards the cultivation of a small elite among the indigenous population, the primary function of which was to administer colonial policy (Smit 1996:57). For the rest of the population the aim was to maintain a pliant pool of cheap labour while instilling enough English to facilitate communication between employer and employee. This is confirmed by Alexander (1989:17-19)⁷:

British colonial language policy was one of tolerating basic (primary level) schooling in the relevant indigenous languages (i.e. for the small percentage of black children who actually went to school) and promoting English-medium instruction in a classically Anglocentric curriculum for the tiny mission elite.

The main consequence of these practices and policies was the adoption, among many members of the indigenous population, of positive attitudes towards English culture and the English language at the expense of their own cultures and languages. This was due to the fact that any attempt by members of these populations to improve their socioeconomic or sociocultural status demanded the acquisition of western values and habits; in particular, a command of the English language. In short, one of the consequences of the British language policy was a massive colonisation of the African mind (Alexander 1989:17-18).

Furthermore, according to authors such as Alexander (1989:28-30), Brown (1988/9:40), Crawhall (1993:6-7) and Schmied (1991:18), this attitude towards English vis-à-vis the indigenous languages was also evident among members of the early resistance movement in South Africa, a movement made up mainly of members of the black middle class:

the black middle class, true to its missionary origins, plumped for English and adopted an elitist and patronising attitude towards the languages of the people (Alexander 1989:28).

According to Brown (1988/9:41), this support for English as a lingua franca and as a basis for African nationalism was prevalent in the African nationalist movement and, in particular, the African National Congress (ANC) up until the 1940s. There were, however, a few exceptions, such as the writings of Joseph Nhlapo (Brown 1988/9:41) and the

⁷ Also see Lanham (1978:22).
support and use of the vernacular in the 1930s and 1940s by the South African Communist Party (SACP) in its newspaper *Inkululeko* (Brown 1988/9:42; Crawhall 1993:7).

Although the British policy encouraged only basic schooling in the L1, there were attempts during this period to extend the use and status of the African languages in education. Hartshorne (1987:86; 1995:308) mentions the introduction of isiZulu as a subject in Natal schools in 1885 and also the drive by continental European missions to extend the use and status of the vernaculars. By 1935 it was compulsory to study a vernacular in primary school in all the provinces.

Afrikaans was made an official language of South Africa, alongside English, in May 1925 (Smit 1996:59; Combrink 1978:69). By the mid-thirties the ascendancy of Afrikaans was beginning to have an effect on African education. In the Free State a dual-medium approach (i.e. the use of both English and Afrikaans as LOLT) was adopted after the First World War (Hartshorne 1995:308) and by 1938 Afrikaans was a compulsory subject in black schools in the Transvaal (Hartshorne 1987:87; 1995:309). The growing status of Afrikaans is related to the struggle of Afrikaner nationalists against the dominance of all things British (Hartshorne 1995:309). This struggle brought the NP to power in 1948.

### 3.3.3 The Apartheid years (1948-1990)

As had been the case under British rule, the main preoccupation of the NP government with regard to language issues was the battle between Afrikaans and English. But unlike those of the British, the NP’s policies towards the indigenous languages and the education of their speakers were to have explosive consequences. Again, not one of the indigenous languages was granted official or national status. Again, the indigenous populations began their schooling in their mother-tongues. Unlike during the missionary period, however, the policy of mother-tongue education under the NP government formed an integral part of this party’s policy of Apartheid, i.e. separate development. According to Brown (1988/9:40), the Apartheid government was highly critical of the education provided by the missionaries (see §3.3.2) which was seen as paternalistic. Ironically, these sentiments ‘echoed those of African movements of the time, particularly those with Africanist tendencies’ (Brown 1988/9:40). It was because of these superficial overlaps between
separate development and African nationalism that the Apartheid government was able to, at least initially, attain some degree of assent from the African population (Brown 1988/9:43).

The importance of language for the policy of separate development is succinctly described by Brown (1988/9:40):

few other countries, if any, have attempted through legislation to separate demographically different groups of people on the basis of their vernaculars. The vernacular became the defining feature of state nationalism.

In education this policy was rationalised as an attempt to preserve the diverse cultures of the indigenous populations, but it was, in reality, a divide-and-rule tactic (Robertson 1973:165; Marivate 1992:91; Webb 1992:10; Smit 1996:61; Fleisch 1998:61-64). This analysis of the Apartheid education policy as a divide-and-rule tactic is corroborated by the fact that each ethnolinguistic group’s education was the responsibility of a separate administrative body (Smit 1996:55).

The originators of Christian National Education (CNE) advocated an ethnocentric education system with an emphasis on mother-tongue education and the development of cultural values. The main aim, however, was racial and social segregation:

one of the prime functions of education in South Africa is to prepare each child to occupy a niche in a highly segregated, hierarchical and static society, with the relative position of each individual in that hierarchy being determined by the sole criterion of skin colour (Robertson 1973:ii-iii).

More specifically, the function of Bantu Education has been viewed as essentially to create a cheap and pliant labour force, as ‘a response to the needs of the capital accumulation process in South Africa in the late 1940s’ (Fleish 1998:51). This function is clearly illustrated in Marivate (1992:98-102), who provides enlightening extracts from speeches by NP Members of Parliament during the periods just preceding and concomitant with the implementation of Bantu Education. An example is the following statement by J.N. Le Roux (then Minister of Agriculture):
we should not give the natives an academic education, as some people are prone to do. If we do this we shall later be burdened with a number of academically trained Europeans and Non-Europeans, and who is going to do the labour in the country? I am in thorough agreement with the view that we should so conduct our schools that the native who attends those schools will know that to a great extent he must be the labourer in the country (Marivate 1992:99).

The NP’s language-in-education policy was, furthermore, aimed at the preservation of Afrikaans and the reduction of the influence of English (Hartshorne 1987:90; Adegbija 1994:36; Brown 1988/9:42-43). Secondly, it was sensed that the development of English into a lingua franca among the black population would be conducive to the development of African nationalism (Robertson 1973:165). As mentioned above, the policy therefore had a divide-and-rule function. Thirdly, there was the possibility that the acquisition of English could increase the social mobility of Africans and lead to the state of affairs that NP Members of Parliament like Minister Le Roux so feared. Thus the educational interests of black students were made subservient, in no small measure, to the political and ideological interests of those in power (Hartshorne 1995:310).

Hartshorne (1995:309) mentions a volkskongres, held in 1948, at which the principles of CNE were first formulated. Malherbe (1966:4), on the other hand, traces its origins to a 1937 paper published by the Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurverenigings. However, according to Fleisch (1998:51), the first formal step in the formulation of the NP policy was the creation at the beginning of 1949 of the Commission on Native Education, chaired by Dr W.W.M. Eiselen. The duty of this commission was to provide recommendations on the separate education of the African (Fleisch 1998:51). The main recommendations of the report generated by this commission (the Eiselen Commission Report) were the principle of mother-tongue education and the use of the mother-tongue as initial LOLT (Hartshorne 1987:89), and, more importantly, its extension to all eight years of the primary-school course (Hartshorne 1995:310).

Ironically, the Bantu Education Act of 1953, which was largely based on the recommendations of the Eiselen Commission Report, was passed soon after the United
Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) adopted the mother-tongue principal in education. The motives of the NP government were, however, far removed from the ethos of the UNESCO declaration (Brown 1988/9:43).

On the other hand, the crucial difference between the Bantu Education Act of 1953 and the recommendations of the Eiseelen Report was the introduction of both English and Afrikaans as LOLT once the mother-tongue instruction period had been completed (Hartshorne 1995:310). The NP government turned to the provisions of the Constitution, which specified that Afrikaans and English should be treated equally, as an argument for using both these languages as LOLT in African education (Hartshorne 1987:91).

Resistance to the Act was immediate, and took the form of demands for the use of only one LOLT, i.e. English. According to Hartshorne (1987:92), initial opposition came mostly from teachers, the commercial sector and a number of community organisations, e.g. the South African Council of Churches (cf. Marivate 1992:102-106; Hartshorne 1995:311). In 1954, the African National Congress (ANC) organised a boycott of Bantu Education schools, whilst arranging alternative forms of education in the form of cultural centres. The boycott eventually failed due to harsh legislative clamp-downs on these alternative schools.

In 1955, the ANC adopted the Freedom Charter, in which Bantu Education was roundly condemned. It is of interest that as early as 1955 participants in the formulation of the Freedom Charter recognised the superficial similarities between the charter and aspects of the NP government’s policy. This is confirmed by Marivate (1992:107):

> on issues of language the ANC was confronted with feelings of ambiguity within the organisation about opinions stated in the Freedom Charter, which called for equal language rights and the rights of all people to develop their cultures. To some members this sounded like adopting some of the worst elements of Verwoerdian cultural policy, that of developing each ethnic and racial group along its line.

Real differences between these viewpoints exist, however: essentially, the difference between a right and an enforced policy. This difference is confirmed in Brown (1988/9:42) who claims that the entrenchment of equal rights for languages in documents such as the
Freedom Charter was related to 'the right of the African majority to define the way in which the vernacular languages should be developed'.

According to Hartshorne (1995:311), the first real blow against the dual-medium policy came from one of the Bantustans or homelands created as part of the Apartheid system. In 1963 the Transkei Government legislated that English would be the sole LOLT after Standard 3. Other homelands soon followed suit (Hartshorne 1987:92-93; Hartshorne 1995:311; Kroes 1978:180; Marivate 1992:111-113). Later, even bodies closely aligned to the Department of Bantu Education became vocal in their opposition, e.g. the Advisory Board for Bantu Education. In 1971 this Board initiated a thorough investigation into the LOLT issue. In 1972, according to Hartshorne (1995:311), the Board came out strongly in favour of using only one of the official languages as a LOLT after six years of instruction in the mother-tongue, but the Department stubbornly maintained its dual-medium position (Hartshorne 1987:93; 1995:311). The Department did, however, accept the Board’s recommendation that the mother-tongue should only be used as LOLT for six years; at the same time it changed the whole educational structure from a 13-year to a 12-year one. The side-effects of these two changes led to much dissatisfaction among pupils and teachers. This is elaborated on in Hartshorne (1987:95)⁸:

> the public primary school-leaving examination, which also governed admission to the secondary school, was taken at the end of Std 5 (instead of Std 6) i.e. after seven years schooling instead of eight. It now also had to be written in English and Afrikaans, at the end of one year’s experience of using the dual medium approach.

Attempts to pressurize the Department into a more flexible stance failed, and on 17 May 1976 students in Soweto began to boycott classes on a wholesale basis. On 16 June 1976 a week’s confrontation with the police began that was to claim at least 176 lives (Hartshorne 1987:96-97; Thompson 1995:212-213; Marivate 1992:135-142). This resistance soon brought to an end the language policy of the NP government (Alexander 1989:25; Hartshorne 1995:312; Marivate 1992:142-143) and by 1978 the vast majority of African pupils were being taught only in English at secondary level (Hartshorne 1987:97; 1995:312). According to Hartshorne (1995:313), in 1979 a new Education Bill was passed,

---

⁸. Also see Hartshorne (1995:312).
which due to immense public pressure, allowed for the use of the mother-tongue up to and including Standard 2 but no further, i.e. the mother-tongue was used for four years as opposed to six. ‘Many school committees and principals proceeded to apply the provisions of the Act’ long before regulations were passed in 1982 legislating the use of English as LOLT from Std 3 (Hartshorne 1995:313).

The main result of the enforcement of the provisions of the Bantu Education Act of 1953 was not the rise of Afrikaans into a position of prominence vis-à-vis English, but rather the creation of negative attitudes towards this language and also distrust of the Department of Bantu Education among the African population (Hartshorne 1987:99; Hartshorne 1995:313; Webb & Kembo-Sure 2000:40). In terms of attitudes towards English it had the opposite effect from what was originally intended. Instead of depriving Africans of a basis for unity, it initiated a reflex movement towards an almost wholesale acceptance of English as a language of African nationalism and liberation. Another consequence was the discrediting of the principle of mother-tongue education. All this is succinctly confirmed by Crawhall (1993:7)9:

the liberation movement ... stigmatised both Afrikaans and the vernacular languages ... leading the progressive rank and file to join their leaders in a reactionary ... endorsement of English as the language of liberation.

According to Webb (1992:10), it also gave the whole notion of ethnicity a negative connotation among the black community.

The Soweto Riots of 1976 gave impetus to a growing people’s education movement (Marivate 1992:145-152). This movement played a large role in the continuing school boycotts of the 1980s and the subsequent general politicisation of education. In particular, 1986 saw the declaration of a year of no schooling (1986 was also the year the NP government declared a general state of emergency to deal with the escalation of violence), a boycott which was not supported by either the ANC or the National Education Crisis Committee (NECC), a body of parents formed in response to the boycotts. One of the outcomes of the boycotts, however, was that the NECC made a number of resolutions on

---

9. Also see Webb (1992:7).
education in a future South Africa. Among other issues, debate on the future position of English was being opened in the sense that its status as language of liberation was being questioned.

3.3.4 The New South Africa (1990 Onwards)

In 1990 President De Klerk unbanned the ANC, the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) and other political parties, and Nelson Mandela was released from jail (Thompson 1995:245). This was also a year in which the ANC conducted a language workshop to deal with the language issue in South Africa (Marivate 1992:152; Du Plessis 2000:103). Although it was recognised by conference attendees that ‘in a multilingual context such as South Africa, a linking or common language is necessary’ (ANC 1990, cited in Hartshorne 1995:315), one of the concerns that characterised the language debate, especially among the black intelligentsia, was the position of English as a colonial language, and the low status of the African languages. One of the issues addressed during the conference was, therefore, how to compensate for the status of English vis-à-vis the African vernaculars.

Such concerns were also expressed by various authors, for example Webb (1992:7-8), and Crawhall (1993:9), who claims as follows:

> English has been a double-edged sword for the liberation movement .... it has been a powerful instrument of liberation .... on the other hand ... it provides its speakers with an entry point into the capitalist class system thus potentially co-opting the leaders ... and alienating the rank and file ... it is a vehicle for a hegemony that may undermine participatory democracy.

Another outcome of this conference was the establishment of the ANC Language Commission, which was specifically tasked to deal with the language issue (Du Plessis 2000:103). According to Du Plessis (2000:103), the most important product of this commission was a 1992 press release which proposed that the eleven most widely spoken languages of South Africa (i.e. the ones that would eventually be listed in the interim Constitution of 1993 and the final Constitution of 1996 - see below) should be recognised, but that no language should be specified as official.
With specific reference to language in education, the National Education Coordinating Committee (NECC), a development of the National Education Crisis Committee of the 1980s (see §3.3.3), initiated the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) project in December 1990. This was given the task of providing policy options for all levels of education (NEPI 1992:vi; Hartshorne 1995:315-316). Another important move was the amendment in 1991 of the Education and Training Act of 1979 by the Department of Education and Training (DET). The amendment allowed the parents of school children to make their own decisions about the LOLT issue (NEPI 1992:25). The NEPI expressed a favourable attitude to this decentralisation of the power to make decisions about the LOLT issue, and encouraged the development of multilingualism in education (NEPI 1992:88-89).

The future status of Afrikaans and the position of English vis-à-vis the African languages were of central concern to those involved in the language-policy debates during the CODESA (Convention for a Democratic South Africa) and other negotiations preceding the endorsement of an interim constitution in November 1993 (Crawhall 1993). This constitution, on ratification, stipulated that South Africa would have eleven official languages: English, Afrikaans, isiNdebele, Northern Sotho, Sesotho, isiSwati, Xitsonga, Setswana, Tshivenda, isiXhosa, and isiZulu (Thompson 1995:250). This provision was retained in the final Constitution of 1996 (Du Plessis 2000:105).

By 1996, the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (DACST) and, in particular, its language directorate, the National Language Service (NLS), had successfully lobbied for the establishment of the Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB)(Marivate 2000:131) as well as the Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG). PanSALB was in essence a monitoring body:

PANSALB will be expected to monitor the observance of the Constitutional provisions and principles relating to the use of languages, as well as the content and observance of any existing and new legislation, practice and policy dealing with language matters (LANGTAG 1996:1)\textsuperscript{10}.

\textsuperscript{10} Also see Du Plessis (2000:105), Marivate (2000) and Mkhulisi (2000:124).
In order to achieve these aims, PanSALB has set out to establish a number of Provincial Language Committees (PLCs) which are meant to advise local government on language-related issues (Marivate 2000:133-134). Furthermore, PanSALB has implemented a range of National Language Bodies (NLBs), each of which will advise on a particular language (Barkhuizen 2000a).

LANGTAG, on the other hand, was established in order to provide the Minister of the DACST with a National Language Plan for South Africa (LANGTAG 1996:7). One recommendation of LANGTAG (1996:3) was the promotion of African languages in high-status domains such as tertiary education.

The DACST has continued with its investigations into a new language plan for South Africa. A first draft of a language-policy document, based largely on the recommendations of LANGTAG, was debated at a workshop in Pretoria on 26 February 1998. Since then the DACST has brought out a Draft White Paper on Language in 1999 (Mkhulisi 2000:125). In essence this White Paper, taking its cue from the recommendations of the LANGTAG Report, supports a policy of functional multilingualism (Mkhulisi 2000:126-127).

With respect to language in higher education, the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) submitted a report in 1996. This report advocated the promotion of multilingualism at tertiary level (NCHE 1996). A Language-in-Education Policy was published in 1997 by the Department of Education (DOE). Although this document does not deal specifically with language policy in tertiary-level education, it does support multilingualism in education in general and the right of individuals to decide through which LOLT they wish to be taught (DOE 1997a). The Higher Education White Paper of 1997, however, specifically mentions the LOLT issue at South African tertiary institutions. It recommends the creation of a Council for Higher Education (CHE)\footnote{The CHE was established in terms of the Higher Education Act of 1997 (DOE 1997b).}. One task of this Council will be to develop a national language framework for higher education. One issue that this framework would need to address would be ‘the languages of learning ... in higher education institutions’ (DOE 1997c).
3.3.5 Conclusion

The aim of this section was to provide a broad sweep of some of the main demographic features of South Africa and some of the main events in South African history that relate to the attitudes of L1-African languages speakers, both towards their own languages and the two colonial languages, English and Afrikaans. The data provided in this section will be employed in Chapter 6 in an attempt to provide an explanatory framework for the results of the mini-survey. This relates to one of the aims of this study which is to not simply describe the relevant attitudes, but to go some way towards explaining their genesis and development. Grounding language-attitude research sociohistorically ensures that any conclusions we reach about the nature of the attitudes concerned are supported by what we know about the history and demographics of the society in which these attitudes are situated.

3.4 Language attitude research in South Africa

3.4.1 Introduction

This section constitutes a review of the relevant language-attitude research in South Africa. Because of its focus on the use of separate languages in the domain of education, it generally ignores research that has concentrated on attitudes towards different intralinguistic varieties. In addition, it excludes language-attitude research that has concentrated on the attitudes of L1-English and L1-Afrikaans speakers. The general focus is on research into the attitudes of L1-African language speakers towards the various official languages, with a particular emphasis on attitudes towards the use of these languages as LOLT. It was decided to place this section at the end of chapter 3, on the grounds that a full appreciation of the research under review needed to be based on an understanding of the historical factors operating at the time of the research. It was also felt that such a review might provide additional support for some of the conclusions about language attitudes reached in the previous section. This is in line with Smit’s (1996:71) view:

the presentation of ... language attitude studies or studies including attitudinal aspects has shown that they can be used as a valuable source of information on the linguistic situation in general and the status and roles of some languages in particular.
The review is inclusive of research conducted after the present research (i.e. 1998-9), since it was felt that attitudes, say elicited in 2001, would, in all likelihood, be similar to those extant a few years before.

3.4.2 Apartheid-era research

3.4.2.1 Edelstein & the HSRC

The first attempt to garner information on the attitudes of L1-African language students to the LOLT at any level of education was that of Edelstein (1972). In his research on the ‘attitudes of Urban Bantu matric pupils in Soweto’ (Edelstein !972:1), the author includes a question which asked respondents ‘what language they would prefer their child to be educated in; Afrikaans, English or Vernacular’ (Edelstein 1972:78). Of the 200 respondents, 88.5% said that they would prefer English, 9.5% said their vernacular would be their preferred choice and only 2% opted for Afrikaans (Edelstein 1972:114).

In 1975, one year prior to the Soweto uprising, the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) sponsored research on the language preferences and attitudes of Black South Africans (Prinsloo 1987:26-28; Smit 1996:63). Two publications resulted from this research. The first, that of Schuring (1979),12 concentrated on the use of English and Afrikaans by Black South Africans (Schuring & Yzel 198313). The findings contained in this publication indicate that English had, at the time, more prestige than Afrikaans in some sectors of the African population (Prinsloo 1987):

> English [had] an edge on Afrikaans in spheres of communication where the fulfilment of secondary life needs, and aspirations towards greater prestige, come into play. According to Schuring, this preference for English is a distinguishing factor between the westernised and the tradition-oriented Blacks (Prinsloo 1987:27; parenthesis added).

The second publication, that of Schuring & Yzel (1983), attempts to provide ‘a general description of the most important language-sociological characteristics of the Black community in South Africa’ (Schuring & Yzel 1983:x cf. De Klerk & Bosch 1993:211; De

12. The original Afrikaans version was published in 1977 (Schuring & Yzel 1983:[the information is contained in the Forward - no small Roman numerals are provided]).

13. The information is contained in the Forward - no small Roman numerals are provided.
Klerk & Bosch 1994:51). In the original survey, apart from demographic, language-use and literacy-related information, data relating to attitudes towards different ethnolinguistic groups and also attitudes towards the use of various languages in various contexts was gleaned (Schuring & Yzel 1983:72-102). The first attitudes elicited in this study were those towards Fanagalo, a pidgin that has been used since the previous century on farms and in the mines. The results of the survey indicate that almost half of the respondents believed that mine-workers should learn another language in the place of Fanagalo; English was the most popular option as an alternative choice of language. A fair proportion of respondents also claimed that they felt insulted when addressed in Fanagalo (Schuring & Yzel 1983:46-47; Smit 1996:64; Prinsloo 1987:27). According to Smit (1996:64) these negative attitudes were ‘due to its traditional use as a master-servant language’.

Of more interest, though, for the purposes of this research, are the findings relating to the preferred LOLT at school. The following table is a simplified version of the one provided in Schuring & Yzel (1983:52):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pre-school</th>
<th>Lower-primary</th>
<th>Higher-primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African language</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see from this table that there is a great reduction in support for the use of the African languages as LOLT as one moves from the primary to the secondary level of schooling. Opposing this trend is a great increase in support for the use of English as

---

14. The figures are percentages. Note too that the percentages in any particular column do not add up to 100% (e.g. ‘Pre-school’ which adds up to 95.6), because some options in the original question have been excluded (i.e. ‘no answer’, ‘Fanagalo’ and ‘other languages’).
LOLT. Support for Afrikaans increases until the higher-primary level and then decreases in favour of English (Prinsloo 1987:27).

It is interesting to note the differences between the findings of Schuring & Yzel (1983) and those of Edelstein (1972). In Schuring & Yzel (1983), there seems to be a greater degree of support for the use of the African languages as LOLT. This may be a direct result of the differences between the types of question posed in the two surveys. In Edelstein (1972) respondents are forced to make a choice of one language for all levels of education, whereas in Schuring & Yzel (1983) the choices relate to specific educational levels. By forcing respondents to choose one language for all educational levels, Edelstein (1972) might have obscured the complexity of the issue and the degree of support among L1-African language speakers for the use of the African languages, especially at the lower educational levels. Schuring & Yzel’s (1983) study has its own problems, however. Of particular interest is the fact that a far greater number of respondents failed to answer the question relating to preferred LOLT than was the case with the other questions (Schuring & Yzel 1983:49). The average number of respondents not responding to other questions in the survey was 20, whereas 111 respondents failed to answer this particular question. This seems to indicate that respondents found this question to be a particularly sensitive one. Smit (1996:65) provides further criticisms of the HSRC’s language survey as a whole, of which Schuring (1977\textsuperscript{15}, 1979) and Schuring & Yzel (1983) formed only a part.

The next piece of HSRC research of relevance was another survey, this time in 1988, the results of which indicated the following:

of the 1200 Black urban informants, 64\% wanted to have English as sole medium of instruction from the first year of schooling onwards, while only 6\% agreed to replacing English with Afrikaans (Southey & Van Heerden 1988, cited in Smit 1996:67).

No mention is made, however, of attitudes towards the use of the African languages as LOLT.

In summary, therefore, Edelstein’s (1972) research seems to indicate a positive attitude

\textsuperscript{15} The earlier Afrikaans version of the 1979 English publication.
towards the use of English as LOLT: almost 90% of respondents chose English as their preferred LOLT. As noted above, however, these results need to be viewed in the light of the fact that respondents were provided with the choice of only one LOLT, i.e. they were not provided with an opportunity to specify whether different languages (or even a combination of languages) might be more appropriate at different stages in education. Schuring & Yzel (1983) provide for this sort of response and, as a consequence, their survey shows a bit more support for the use of both the African languages and Afrikaans as LOLT. Support is, however, confined to the lower levels of schooling. From higher-primary level upwards, English has the most support as the preferred LOLT. Schuring (1979, cited in Prinsloo 1987) and Southeby & Van Heerden (1988, cited in Smit 1996:67) also provide evidence for relatively positive attitudes towards the use of English in general or as LOLT.

3.4.2.2 Other Apartheid-era research

Another relevant attempt at assessing the attitudes of L1-African language speakers is that of Vorster & Proctor (1976), which was, however, based on research on the attitudes of these speakers to the so-called white languages (i.e. Afrikaans and English). Vorster & Proctor’s (1976) original hypothesis, that the respondents would be significantly more favourable towards English than towards Afrikaans, was confirmed through an adapted application of the Matched-Guise Technique. Their explanation (1976:104) was as follows:

Afrikaans has become the language of the civil service, of officialdom, and of the political party that has been governing the country for the past generation, whereas English is to a large extent the language of commerce, of entertainment, of the antigovernment press, and of the opposition parties in Parliament.

Duminy, MacLarty & Gasa (1980) seem to suggest that a similar difference in attitude was to be found among L1-African language speakers (in this case from the isiZulu ethnolinguistic group) towards the respective use of English and Afrikaans in the specific domain of education. The focus of the research is, however, on the teaching of English and Afrikaans as subject languages and not on their use as LOLT. Smit (1996:66) gives a summary of some of the results of the research.
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The next research was by Cahill & Kamper (1989) on language preferences (cited in Webb et al. 1992:38). The respondents were L1-African language students and teachers. Both categories of respondents indicated a preference for English (as opposed to Afrikaans or the African languages) in a variety of contexts, as set out in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Preferences of L1-African language students and teachers, as adapted from Webb et al. (1992:38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>African languages (%)</th>
<th>English (%)</th>
<th>Afrikaans (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student-teacher</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher-teacher</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student-friend</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student-stranger</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exception to this tendency is the preference for using African languages for communication with a friend. From this research it would appear that in the domain of secondary education there is a strong preference for English and even in a non-institutional, though potentially formal context, such as meeting a stranger, there is a slight preference for the use of English over the African languages.

Of peripheral interest to the present discussion, given that it deals with the attitudes of L1-African language speakers towards English and Afrikaans only, and not to the African languages, is the research conducted by Van Jaarsveld (1989, cited in Webb et al. 1992:41). This research seems to indicate that, in general, L1-African language speakers believe that courteousness and urbanity can be better expressed in English than in Afrikaans. Of interest is the fact that the figures seem to indicate that this belief is more prominent among certain of the African ethnolinguistic groups, i.e. Northern Sotho, Setswana and isiZulu speakers.

In the same year (i.e. 1989), research into the language preferences of students at the University of the Western Cape (UWC) was conducted by Louw-Potgieter & Louw (1991). This study elicited language preferences regarding official language policy and LOLT. With reference to each of these, respondents were asked to choose from a number of
options referring to ‘an imaginary intergroup situation’ (Louw-Potgieter & Louw 1991:96), the dynamics of which were similar to the situation extant in South Africa at the time, although the names of the groups and the languages were changed. English was called King, Afrikaans was called Spalang and isiXhosa referred to as Peki. Respondents came from all three main ethnolinguistic groups in the Western Cape, i.e. isiXhosa, Afrikaans and English speakers. For the purposes of this discussion, only details of the preferences of L1-isixhosa speakers will be provided. With regard to official language preferences the options were (Louw-Potgieter & Louw 1991:96):

- maintenance (where the two ex-colonial languages were retained as the official language, i.e. King [English] and Spalang [Afrikaans]);
- diversity (all three languages become official (Peki [isiXhosa], English and Afrikaans);
- unity (English becomes the only official language);
- transitional trilingualism (all three languages are at first recognised as official languages. At the same time, all people are taught in English so that in the end it becomes to the only official language); and
- bilingualism (English and isiXhosa are recognised as the official languages).

For the L1-isixhosa respondents ‘bilingualism was the first options [sic] followed by unity and diversity’ (Louw-Potgieter & Louw 1991:98), while the maintenance option was the option least supported by L1-isixhosa speakers. With respect to the LOLT issue, respondents were questioned on their preferences in relation to both schools and universities. When it came to preferences for LOLT in schools, the options on offer were mother-tongue, mother-tongue and English, mother-tongue and official language(s) and English only. In both cases where more than one language was to be used, the idea was to have mother-tongue education initially, with a slow move to instruction in the relevant other languages (Louw-Potgieter & Louw 1991:98). For L1-isixhosa respondents the most popular option was mother-tongue and official language(s), with mother-tongue and English following on as close second. The policy most rejected was that of mother-tongue alone. Most relevant to this discussion, however, were the preferences elicited with respect to LOLT options at tertiary level. Here the options were:
retention of English and Afrikaans as LOLT;
the use of English only as LOLT; and
‘the official language(s), democratically chosen by all the people of the country’

The preferred option by far of L1-isixhosa speakers (75%) was the democratic one. Only 27% of these respondents chose ‘English only’ as their option, with only 8% choosing the maintenance of English and Afrikaans as LOLT at tertiary institutions.

In summary, Vorster & Proctor’s research (1976) indicates a relatively positive attitude towards English vis-à-vis Afrikaans. More confirmation of this is provided in Duminy et al. (1980) and Van Jaarsveld (1989, cited in Webb et al. 1992:41), but only in an indirect manner. More direct support is to be found in Cahill & Kamper (1989, cited in Webb et al. 1992:38) and, in addition, this research appears to provide evidence of a preference for English vis-à-vis the African languages, particularly in the context of the classroom. In Louw-Potgieter & Louw (1991) there is much support for the use of isixhosa as an official language alongside English and, with regard to the LOLT issue, most of the respondents supported the notion of the official language or languages of the country being used as LOLT. It is, however, difficult to assess whether support for this option implies support for the use of the African languages as LOLT or not, given that at the time of the research the African languages were not yet official.

3.4.3 The transition into the New South Africa
3.4.3.1 Research by Young et al.

During the transition in South Africa from the Apartheid regime to a modern democratic state, Young, Ratcliffe, Boreham, Khiba & Fitzgerald (1991) conducted research whose main component was based on three preliminary pilot studies, only one of which is of direct relevance here. According to Young et al. (1991:10) this pilot study involved the administration of 98 Multiple Choice Questionnaires, in isixhosa, to secondary school students in a number of DET16 schools in Cape Town. Some of the students were in Standard 6, others in Standard 9. Each questionnaire comprised 28 questions (Young et al. 1991:7). Some of the results of this pilot study are of interest. Firstly, 43.9% of the
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16. Department of Education and Training: tasked with the administration of so-called black schools.
students indicated a desire for the use of isiXhosa (the mother-tongue) as LOLT, whereas 82.7% wished English to be used as a LOLT. 24% of the Standard 9 students rejected the use of English as LOLT (Young et al. 1991:10-12)\(^{17}\). It is, however, not clear from the data provided in Young et al. (1991) if respondents were asked to indicate whether they wished to have either English or isiXhosa as the only LOLT, or whether they wished to have both of these languages as LOLT in combination with other languages. It is of course also possible that neither of these alternatives were indicated and that it was left up to the students to infer the intended meaning.

In addition 51.7% of the respondents indicated as follows:

[they] would not like to use their mother-tongue when speaking to the teacher, while 64.3% would like their teachers to use isiXhosa as MOI\(^{18}\) only when explaining difficult words and terminology (Young et al. 1991:11; parenthesis and footnote added).

The aim of the main survey, in contrast to the above-mentioned pilot survey, which employed a quantitative method of data collection, was to collect primarily qualitative data and, thus, in the words of the authors, to elicit ‘affective language attitudes’ (Young et al. 1991:16). It is assumed that they use this expression to refer to the more affective, unconscious component of language attitudes (as opposed to the conative or cognitive components), in which case the methods employed in the research (i.e. questionnaires) seems rather anomalous. As mentioned by Smit (1996:45) and in §2.6.2, ‘some scholars question the possibility that direct methods can ever elicit attitudes .... and other dismiss the use of direct methods in attitude research completely’. The scholars being referred to here are undoubtedly those who would regard attitudes as referring solely to the affective component, the point being that these methods are not supposed to be equipped to elicit those very unconscious, affective attitudes mentioned by Young et al. (1991). As will be further explained in the next chapter, direct methods are more equipped to elicit beliefs or
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17. These responses were to two separate questions (as opposed to options relating to one question).

18. Acronym for medium of instruction.
the cognitive component of attitudes.

To continue, although the data was qualitative and open-ended, it was subject to classification and numerical coding (Young et al. 1991:18). The authors administered the relevant questionnaire at a number of different kinds of schools, but of relevance to this research are the results obtained from students attending DET schools, i.e. L1-isiXhosa students (Young et al. 1991:20-29). The questionnaire elicited both individual and group responses (Smit 1996:70; De Klerk & Bosch 1993:212).

With regard to the individual responses, it would appear that respondents placed much emphasis on the importance of the relationship between language and cultural identity and the usefulness of individual bi- or multilingualism for international communication and for communication with other races or cultures. Related to this was the view that multilingualism is instrumental in overcoming ‘racial and cultural barriers’ (Young et al. 1991:21). The L1-isiXhosa respondents were negative about the notion of changing the LOLT, but significantly less negative than other population groups targeted in the study. Reasons given included prior experience with such changes of LOLT. When asked which LOLT should be used at their schools, DET students chose either a combination of English, Afrikaans and Xhosa (35%) or English only (35%). Support for the former multilingual option was based on ‘a concern ... for communication and cross-racial/cultural understanding through language’ (Young et al. 1991:23-24). The other 30% of the students opted for a variety of other responses, including, among others, ‘Don’t know/No response’ (9%), English and Xhosa (12%) and English and Afrikaans (4%) (Young et al. 1991:23).

The most important results elicited during that part of the study in which questions were directed at groups of students (Young et al. 1991:26-29) were those related to the question of LOLT at schools in South Africa. According to Young et al. (1991:27) 51,2% of the DET respondents agreed that only English should be the LOLT at school, 24,4% opted for a bilingual policy of isiXhosa and English, while 10,30% agreed that it should be a matter of choice. Less popular responses included English, Afrikaans & Xhosa (7%), Xhosa only (5%) and English & Afrikaans (2%). The main reasons provided for these responses were that English is an international language and useful for intercultural communication.
Another interesting result was an 85% agreement with the notion that all citizens should speak one language for reasons of national unity. These group responses can be significantly contrasted with the individual responses: the groups seem to show a greater preference for an 'English only' policy than the individuals, a trend which Young et al. (1991:30) explain in terms of 'the predictable power of peer group pressure conformity in groups and the persuasive role of one or two strong personalities in each group'.

According to Young et al. (1991:31) their research points to the following 'attitude tendencies': a preference for English as LOLT in combination with the mother-tongue, support for English on both an instrumental and an integrative level and a tendency for the expression of attitudes to vary depending on whether the elicitation process is directed towards the individual or towards the group. It must be stated that Young et al.'s (1991) remark about integrative support for English seems a little strange. In this regard they have the following to say (1991:31): '... support for English as (LOLT) ... operates ... at an integrative level, with many students arguing for its use as a communication bridge between races and cultures'. Strictly, advocating the use of English as a 'communication bridge' between races and cultures is indicative of an instrumental appreciation of the use of the language and not of an integrative desire to become a member of the South African English ethnolinguistic group. This alternative interpretation of the facts corresponds, in fact, with the results of the earlier pilot studies, which point to a high instrumental orientation and low integrative orientation towards English (Young et al. 1991:10-12).

In summary, according to one of the pilot studies conducted by Young et al. (1991), about 44% of the isiXhosa students indicated a desire that isiXhosa be used as a LOLT, while approximately 80% indicated a desire for the use of English in the same capacity. Notice that these were responses to two separate questions. Some respondents, given the above statistics, must have indicated a desire for both English and African languages as LOLT. This would appear to indicate a positive attitude towards bilingual education. In addition, a large proportion of the students were favourably disposed towards the use of the L1 as a tool for explaining difficult English terminology. The results of the main survey conducted by Young et al. (1991) show a positive attitude towards multilingualism and a concern for social identity. English was generally viewed positively as a LOLT, but there was some
support for the use of isiXhosa as a LOLT, especially in combination with English. According to Young et al. (1991), the results indicate support for English on both an instrumental and integrative level. As pointed out above, however, I have a problem with this analysis of the results. It is also in Young et al. (1991) that we first come across responses relating to the notion of using one language (in most cases English) to ensure national unity and also to the importance of English as a language of international communication.

3.4.3.2 Other transition-period research

The next relevant research, a brief summary of which is contained in Smit (1996:70-71), was undertaken in 1992 in the Eastern Cape, and was aimed at assessing attitudes towards the main languages in this area, namely English, Afrikaans and isiXhosa. Respondents were drawn from the three relevant ethnolinguistic groups. The complete results of this research are contained in De Klerk & Bosch (1993, 1994) and Bosch & De Klerk (1996). The research was conducted using two methodologies: the MGT and a questionnaire. With regard to the MGT, respondents were asked to rate readers (three trilinguals reading a text in each of the three languages) on a scale of personality attributes. As is usual with the MGT, respondents were not aware of the fact that the readers were often the same people (De Klerk & Bosch 1993:213). The questionnaire asked a variety of closed-ended sociolinguistic questions, including a question which elicited respondents' preferred LOLT.

Of particular interest are the reported attitudes of the L1-isiXhosa respondents in relation to both the MGT and the questionnaire. It is interesting to note that as far as the MGT part of the research is concerned, L1-isiXhosa speakers rated the combined isiXhosa guises (i.e. isiXhosa with an English accent, isiXhosa with an Afrikaans accent and isiXhosa with a mother-tongue accent) far lower than the combined English guises (De Klerk & Bosch 1993:217; De Klerk & Bosch 1994:54). These facts have, however, I suspect, more to do
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19. The number of respondents who claimed that isiXhosa was their only home language was 72 (out of 298 respondents). There were 3 respondents who claimed to have all three languages (IsiXhosa, English and Afrikaans) as their home languages. 1 respondent who claimed to have English and isiXhosa as her or his home language and 1 respondent who claimed to have both Afrikaans and isiXhosa as her or his home language (De Klerk & Bosch 1994:52).
with negative attitudes towards the obvious use of the L1 by members of other ethnolinguistic groups than a general negative attitude towards isiXhosa. This is borne out when we observe that when it comes to the attitudes of L1-isiXhosa speakers towards isiXhosa and English accents there is no significant difference, and in fact the isiXhosa accents are rated a little more positively (De Klerk & Bosch 1994:54). This interpretation, I believe, provides a better explanation of the fact that ‘the rank order for Xhosa informants in terms of language is English, Afrikaans, Xhosa (which is surprising)’ (De Klerk & Bosch 1994:54) than the one given by De Klerk & Bosch (1994:54-55), who explain the “surprising” rank order in terms of ‘the tension between the love of one’s mother-tongue versus the perceived superiority of English and the other official language: Afrikaans’.

With regard to the questionnaire part of the research, the L1-isiXhosa speakers showed a generally favourable response to the use of English as LOLT (65.3%), with the remainder either choosing isiXhosa (19.4%) or a combination of languages (15.3%). An overwhelming majority of respondents also viewed English as a language for success (85.9%), as opposed to 5.6% who viewed isiXhosa in this manner and 8.5% who chose a combination of languages (De Klerk & Bosch 1993:222-223; De Klerk & Bosch 1994:57).

In 1993, Smit conducted further research into language attitudes in the Eastern Cape (Smit 1996). Although the focus of this research was on attitudes among the various population groups of the area towards the various varieties of English spoken in the area, a question relating to the LOLT issue was included in the study. This question asked the respondent whether she or he thought that other languages should be used alongside English as LOLT. Respondents who answered ‘yes’ were then asked which language(s) should be used in this manner (Smit 1996:217). Of the students attending DET schools, the majority of whom would have been L1-isiXhosa speakers, 54% agreed that other languages should be used alongside English. Of those who agreed with the statement, 42.2% stated that isiXhosa should be the designated language, with 22.2% choosing a combination of isiXhosa and Afrikaans (Smit 1996:247-248).

To summarise: it is first of all unclear exactly how one should interpret the MGT section of De Klerk & Bosch’s (1994) study described above. The fact that L1-isiXhosa attitudes
towards isiXhosa accents were slightly more positive than these speakers' attitudes towards English accents might be an indication of the important role played by isiXhosa as a marker of social identity. Unfortunately, however, De Klerk & Bosch's research (1994) does not provide details of how each accent was correlated with each trait provided in the MGT scale. Of more interest, though, are the results of the questionnaire part of the research, and, in particular, the responses to the question dealing with preferred LOLT. Approximately 63% of respondents indicated a preference for 'English only' as LOLT, approximately 19% opted for isiXhosa and approximately 15% opted for a combination of these two languages. These figures seem to indicate a slightly less favourable attitude towards the use of African languages as LOLT than the figures given by Young et al. (1991) or, for that matter, those given by Smit (1996), whose 1993 research elicited a reasonably favourable response from students to the idea of using other languages alongside English as LOLT. Approximately 54% of the respondents agreed with this idea. The only difference between the various studies than might account for the discrepancy between the results is the fact that De Klerk & Bosch's (1994) respondents were adults, whereas the subjects of Young et al. (1991) and Smit's (1996) research were scholars. It is, however, difficult to think of an uncontroversial reason why this difference in age might account for the differences in attitude, but one might venture a guess that the younger respondents were less effected by the events of Apartheid South Africa and more in tune with the notion of the equality of language as enshrined in the Constitution, although this analysis does seem to be somewhat contradicted by the findings of De Klerk (1996), discussed in the next section.

3.4.4 The New South Africa

3.4.4.1 Research by de Klerk

In 1995, a questionnaire survey was conducted at Rhodes University in the Eastern Cape, which, among other things, assessed the general attitudes towards English and the preferred LOLT of 2 975 students, of which 20% gave an official African language as their home language (De Klerk 1996:115). In this regard, the author appears to equate home language with mother-tongue and use the terms interchangeably (De Klerk 1996:116). I have some concern with this practice, given that some students with an African language as first language or mother-tongue might report English as their 'home language' because of the status that English holds. This, I believe, explains the fact 'that
several speakers of “other” languages indicated that their mother-tongue [sic] was in fact English” (De Klerk 1996:116).

With regard to the LOLT they preferred for lectures, respondents were given the options of ‘English only’, ‘English and Afrikaans’, and ‘English and isiXhosa’. The vast majority of the L1-isixhosa respondents (74%) chose ‘English only’, while only 22% chose a combination of English and isiXhosa. In the case of those L1-African language students whose languages were one of the other official South African languages, 96% chose the ‘English only’ option with only 3% choosing ‘English and isiXhosa’. When it came to reasons for attending an English-medium university like Rhodes, the responses were generally found to belong to one of seven categories. Among the L1-isixhosa students, the responses fell most often into three of these categories: ‘pro-English’ (23%), ‘improve English’ (31%) and ‘international’ (15%) (De Klerk 1996:118). The first category showed ‘a strong pro-English sentiment, often linked to fluency and competence and consequent greater facility in learning through it’, the second showed ‘a desire to improve competence in English’ and the third dealt with the perception of ‘English (as) an international language’ (De Klerk 1996:118). The distribution of responses for L1-African language respondents of ethnolinguistic groups related to the other official South African languages was similar, although for these respondents the most popular category was that of ‘pro-English’ (26%), followed by ‘improve English’ (21%) and ‘international’ (18%).

Another question in the survey assessed the ‘subjective self-assessments of English second-language informants regarding their fluency in English ... confidence in using English ... enjoyment from [sic] using English ... and positive feelings towards English’ (De Klerk 1996:119). The options given to students with regard to each of these questions were ‘Yes’, ‘No’ and ‘Maybe’. Two comments can be made here. Firstly, it should be mentioned that the term ‘second-language informants’ included students other than L1-African language students whose languages are any of the official South African languages. So, for example, this category included students who have other African languages like Shona (3% of all the respondents) as their L1, and also students who have Indo-European languages like German (23 students) and French (16) as their L1. Secondly, although issues of fluency and confidence are not of direct relevance to this discussion,
perceived fluency and confidence are conceivably among those beliefs directly affecting attitudes towards the use of various languages as LOLT at an institution like Rhodes University.

On all the questions mentioned above the majority of respondents answered 'Yes', 54% in the case of fluency, 75% with regard to confidence, 76% with regard to their enjoyment from using English and 84% with regard to being positive about English. Another point to note is that when respondents were compared in terms of the number of years they had been at the university there was, according to De Klerk (1996), some indication of a decline, as the number of years increased, in the percentage of respondents who answered in the affirmative to all the questions, i.e. 24% in the 1st year, 21% for 2nd-year students, 24% for 3rd-year students and 17% for postgraduates (note, however, that the jump from 21% to 24% from 2nd-year students to 3rd-year students seems to contradict this trend). According to De Klerk (1996:120) these figures seem to suggest 'that exposure to the reality of required linguistic standards has negatively affected levels of confidence'. The same, presumably, applies to self-perceptions of fluency, the degree of enjoyment from the use of English and also general positive attitudes towards the language.

In summary, in De Klerk (1996) close to three-quarters of the respondents (university students) chose an 'English-only' option, with only 22% choosing a combination of these two languages. Of interest, too, is the fact that when new students were compared to older students in terms of variables such as their enjoyment from the use of English or their positive feelings towards English, there was, in the opinion of De Klerk (1996:120) a decline in positive attitude as the number of years of study increased, a fact which might indicate a realisation, on the part of students, of the difficulties attendant on studying through a language other than one's L1.
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20. The figures provided by De Klerk (1996) tally very well with the figures provided in Chick (1998) (see §3.4.4.2), which is somewhat ironic given Chick's (1998:91) assertion that surveys of this kind create an over-simplistic impression of the attitudes and preferences concerned.
Of interest are the responses to a survey conducted in KwaZulu-Natal in 1996, reported in Chick (1998). The respondents were mostly tertiary-level students, and the results appear to indicate that English generally has positive associations (language of international contact and language of national unity) for the L1isiZulu respondents (Chick 1998:92). Furthermore, most respondents thought English should be introduced as a LOLT in the first year of schooling (Chick 1998:94). The vast majority of students anticipated using English in their future professions. Of particular relevance, however, are the responses to Question 7 of the survey questionnaire (Chick 1998:103), which asked respondents to choose one of five ‘language of instruction’ options. The three options and the findings discussed in the paper have been conflated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Result (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English throughout but opportunity to write examinations in Zulu</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English throughout but examination papers translated into Zulu or another African language</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English throughout (including examinations)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the findings shown in Table 5 above that the vast majority of respondents (73%) preferred English as LOLT. There were in fact two other options provided, namely ‘Zulu or another African language throughout’ and ‘Zulu in first year’ (Chick 1988:103). Together these options must have accounted for only 3.6% of the responses, and this indicates, on the basis of this survey at least, that the respondents were generally negative to the use of the African languages as LOLT in education, in this particular case within the domain of higher education. In deference, however, to the theoretical position underlying
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Chick's (1988) article, it should be pointed out that the whole focus of the article is that surveys of this kind create the impression 'that the sociolinguistic order is simpler and more stable than in reality it is, [and thus help to] maintain the inequities associated with that order' (Chick 1988:91; parenthesis added).

In the same year (1996) another language survey was conducted in KwaZulu-Natal, with a particular focus on the Durban area and on schools as opposed to tertiary-level students. The results of this language survey are reported in Broeder, Extra & Maartens (1998). The target population of the survey was 6 753 school children in the above-mentioned area (Broeder et al. 1998:125) and although the survey was designed to collect a host of different kinds of language-related data, one question in the survey asked students in which language they would prefer the teacher to communicate with them. An overwhelming majority of the students (5779) indicated a preference for English in response to this question, with 1108 students preferring an African language (Broeder et al. 1998:129). These findings are confusing as these two figures add up to 6887, a higher number than the target population\(^2\)\(^1\). Unfortunately, too, no indication is provided as to how many of the students opting for English as LOLT had an African language as their L1, although the authors (Broeder et al. 1998:123) do indicate that the students in the survey came from a variety of ethnic and language backgrounds.

Considering that 2143 (32%) of the students gave an African language as their L1, while 4221 said English was their L1 (63%) (Broeder et al. 1998:127), there do appear to be, as the authors point out, 'strong indications in the data that the preferences of the children can be related to their first home language' (Broeder et al. 1998:129). This of course assumes that the 1108 students who said they preferred an African language were in fact L1-African language speakers. This assumption is, I believe, a relatively safe one to make and would mean that 52% of the L1-African language speakers preferred the use of their mother tongue as LOLT; a relatively high percentage. It has to be asked, however, how the respondents interpreted the relevant question, which was 'In what language(s) would you like your teacher to speak to you' (Broeder et al. 1998:137). I believe it quite conceivable

\(^2\)\(^1\). It is assumed therefore that respondents were permitted to choose more than one language, although this is not obvious from a reading of the article.
that respondents interpreted this question as referring to personal communication, not teaching.

In 1996-1997 a language survey was conducted at the Vaal Triangle Technikon (Coetzee-Van Rooy 1998) in order to ‘facilitate [the] process of language policy development for the Vaal Triangle Technikon’ (Coetzee-Van Rooy 1998:1; parenthesis added). There were a number of different target populations and different topic areas in the survey, but one of the target populations was the student body and one of the topic areas was language preferences (Coetzee-Van Rooy 1998:9-10). It is, however, unfortunately not clear from the paper what proportion of the targeted students were L1-African language speakers. Coetzee-Van Rooy (1998:16-17) interprets the responses of the students as showing a preference for English as LOLT. In perhaps slight contradiction to this preference, however, students were almost equally divided when it came to the possible use of their L1 for functions such as the provision of key definitions of terms and, for example, using their L1 for asking and answering questions in class.

In summary, a relatively positive attitude towards the use of English as LOLT is indicated in Chick (1988), although these findings do need to be interpreted in the light of the fact that they are used in the article as an example of how surveys lead to a simplification of the issues involved. A relatively positive attitude among L1-African language speakers towards the use of African languages as LOLT also seems to be indicated by Broeder et al. (1998), but, as indicated above, the matter of interpreting the findings of this survey in terms of how it relates to the LOLT issue is problematic. Coetzee-Van Rooy’s research (1998) seems to indicate a preference for English as LOLT among students but at the same time a willingness to make use of the African languages for the provision of definitions of difficult English terms and also for more casual discourse in the classroom or lecture theatre.

3.4.4.3 Research by Dyers

During the period in which Coetzee-Van Rooy conducted her research (1998), a survey was conducted at the University of the Western Cape (UWC) in order to ascertain the
language attitudes, preferences and usage of the student speech community’ (Dyers 1999:73); but this took the form of a longitudinal study. An analysis of the attitudes towards English is to be found in Dyers (1997), whereas Dyers (1999) contains a similar analysis of the situation pertaining to the Black South African Languages (BSALs).

Dyers (1999:73) claims that although her article reports on research that was part of a larger survey which included students from all linguistic backgrounds at UWC, it focuses specifically on the attitudes, preferences and usage of L1 isiXhosa speakers. However, this appears to be contradicted later in the article when it is stated that ‘the respondents in the study are all students who did the English 105 course in their first year’ (Dyers 1999:75; emphasis added). Given that the author claims that ‘the survey has involved 198 Xhosa mother-tongue speakers in their first year’ (Dyers 1999:74) and that of the ‘multiple-choice answer sheets ... collected ... 252 were selected as valid for the larger study,’ (Dyers 1999:75) one is tempted to ask what the mother-tongues of the remaining 54 students were.

The study was longitudinal in the sense that the investigation took place over two years and involved a large pool of 1st-year students and then a selection of those of the initially-surveyed group who made it into 2nd year. Such an approach was necessary in order to test whether students would ‘show slight to significant change in their attitudes to, and preference for, languages’ (Dyers 1999:74). All students were provided with questionnaires. These were divided into a number of sections, two of which dealt with language attitudes, one with attitudes towards the BSALs in general and one with attitudes towards the BSALs within the particular domain of education (Dyers 1999:75). The questionnaire items relating to these attitudes took the form of a Likert-type scale, i.e. belief statements ‘to which the respondents can agree strongly or simply agree, be unsure, disagree, or disagree strongly’ (Dyers 1999:75). Table 6 below provides some of the belief statements relating to the use of BSALs in education and also an indication of the responses. The responses to only a few of the belief statements have been included, given that UWC is a residential university. It therefore provides forms of tuition like group tutorials which are either not available at Unisa or take place there to a much more limited degree. Questions in the study relating specifically to the use of the BSALs in tutorials were, accordingly, omitted from consideration.
Table 6: responses to statements dealing with BSALs in education, adapted from Table 4 in Dyers (1999: 78).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Statement</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year: Agree</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year: Disagree</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year: Agree</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year: Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: The mother-tongue should be used as the only medium of instruction at primary and secondary school.</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: Our constitution guarantees language rights for all. Therefore, each student should receive some, if not all, of his/her lectures, tutorials and study notes in his/her mother-tongue at university.</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: All African languages should be developed to the point where they can be used to study in at university.</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: A standardized version of Nguni (Zulu and Xhosa) should be developed as one language to be used in education.</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: A standardized version of Sotho and Tswana should be developed as one language to be used in education.</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this questionnaire indicate a relatively favourable attitude towards the use of BSALs in education as well as a general negative shift in attitude towards the use of BSALs in education, as students progress from 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> year. The majority of students do, 22. Note that ‘only the majority results are given, with categories like agree/agree strongly and disagree/disagree strongly grouped together’ (Dyers 1999:77). The missing percentages are, presumably, those students who answered ‘not sure’.  
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however, believe that the African languages should be developed for use as LOLT (see Q3 in Table 6 above). According to Dyers (1999:79), the findings indicate that ‘the majority of the students favour the combination of English and the mother-tongue as media of instruction at school’ as well as a ‘preference for English as the only medium of instruction at university’. To my mind, the first assertion (about the combination of languages at school) is not necessarily implied by the results of Q1, since disagreement with this statement could imply a preference for an ‘English only’ option. I assume that this observation was based on the individual interviews mentioned earlier in the article (Dyers 1999:75). With regard to the second assertion (preference for English at University) one can note that if there is a preference here it is a slight one. For example, in Q2, the majority of 1st-year students support the partial use of the BSALs and it is only at 2nd-year level that a preference for ‘English only’ is revealed. Another criticism is that other belief statements in the original questionnaire (Dyers 1999:78) relating to the use of languages in tutorials could have been interpreted as referring to the sole use of the mother-tongue i.e. disagreement does not necessarily imply support for the ‘English only’ option.

As mentioned above, another section of the questionnaire dealt with attitudes towards BSALs in general. Responses of interest are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Statements</th>
<th>1st year (Agree)</th>
<th>1st year (Undecided)</th>
<th>1st year (Disagree)</th>
<th>2nd Year (Agree)</th>
<th>2nd Year (Undecided)</th>
<th>2nd year (Disagree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive about my mother-tongue and its potential for further development</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Again, Dyers (1999) only provides figures for significant responses.
| It is essential to learn the dominant African language in your region in order to get employment in the New South Africa | 42.1% | - | 36.8% | 43.6% | 25.6% | - |
| My own language is being neglected so that other languages can develop and dominate nationally | 37.6% | - | 38.6% | 38.4% | - | 43.6% |

According to Dyers (1999:80) the results as a whole indicate that 'the general language attitudes of these students appear to be stable from one year to the next'. The particular results provided in Table 7 above seem to indicate a generally positive attitude towards the BSALs and their future development, a belief among a slight majority of students that knowledge of African languages is not essential for ensuring future employment, and also relative uncertainty about whether the African languages (in the case of most of the respondents, isiXhosa) are being neglected.

In summary, the research reported in Dyers (1999) tackles a number of issues relating to the use of African languages as LOLT. In the context of some of the research already reviewed above, the relatively positive attitudes expressed by students in Dyers (1999) is somewhat surprising. So, for example, 30% of first-year students and 40% of second-year students expressed agreement with the notion of having the mother-tongue as the only LOLT at primary- and secondary-school level. The other results indicate a relatively high preference (most apparent at first-year level) for the use of African languages as LOLT in combination with English, a desire to see the development of African languages for use as LOLT at tertiary level, and a belief in the instrumental value (in terms of obtaining employment) of the African languages. The results obtained by Dyers (1999) contrast very strongly, for example, with the results of Mutasa (1999) – see the next section.
3.4.4.4 Other post-apartheid research

Meyer (1998) gives the results of a survey, the aim of which was to investigate, among other issues, the tension ‘between the kind of policy teachers say they want and the policy they actually practice’ (Meyer 1998:16), i.e. between the expressed preferences with regard to LOLT and the actual use of languages as LOLT in the classroom. The respondents in Meyer (1998:2) were teachers at historically-black secondary schools. Although the discrepancy between preference and use (or attitude and behaviour) is in itself of interest (see §2.5), what is of primary relevance here is the LOLT preferences expressed by the respondents. Of the respondents, 82% opted for ‘English only’, 6% for ‘L1 only’ and 12% for a combination of English and the L1 (Meyer 1998:10). Of interest is that the survey recorded a difference in support for the use of ‘English only’ in the teaching of Standard 6 pupils (79%) as opposed to the use of ‘English only’ in the teaching of Standard 10 pupils (86%) (Meyer 1998:10).24 Of interest too are the reasons provided for choosing amongst these options. Beginning with the most popular ‘English only’ option, Meyer (1998:11-12) informs us that the reasons most commonly given were the de facto status of English as official LOLT, the fact that textbooks are written in English and that replacing these textbooks with others written in the African languages would take too much time and money. In addition, teachers indicated that African languages did not have the necessary terminology to be used as LOLT. A further reason given was that students generally had enough exposure to the mother-tongue in the domestic environment and should, therefore, be taught in English only in order to ensure their acquisition of this important language. Important too was the role played by English in ensuring access to higher education and employment. Lastly, teachers emphasised English’s role as lingua franca both on a national and on an international level.

The few teachers who opted for the mother-tongue-only option gave the following reasons, as outlined in Meyer (1998:12-13):

- students would be able to understand content better if allowed to learn and be taught in their L1;

24. The teaching of other standards was not surveyed.
• the use of African languages in the classroom would promote the development of these languages; and
• the use of African languages in the classroom would ‘avoid privileging a foreign language’ (Meyer 1998:13).

As mentioned above, some teachers also opted for the use of both English and the L1 for purposes of learning and teaching. According to Meyer (1998:13-14), reasons given were that:

• using both languages is the actual practice in most classrooms;
• a combination of the two would ensure that the students acquire the necessary terminology (English) but still understand the work (mother-tongue);
• teachers do not have enough proficiency in English, so should be entitled to codeswitch;
• the use of both languages was in the interests of fairness in the sense of allowing the African languages to develop;
• the use of the L1 alongside English would establish a solid link between home and school; and
• the use of the L1 besides English would ensure the maintenance of the learner’s culture.

Sarinjeive (1999) gives the results of a survey administered in 1998 at Vista University, Sebokeng Campus. The respondents were 100 first-year students (Sarinjeive 1999:132). Although the survey was focussed on eliciting preferences and attitudes towards English as a subject, as opposed to a LOLT, the reasons provided for learning English are strikingly similar to those advanced in other surveys for its use as a LOLT, i.e. its status as international language, its importance in terms of eventually obtaining employment and its usefulness for purposes of inter-cultural communication (Sarinjeive 1999:133).

Mutasa (1999)\(^{25}\) provides the findings of an informal survey of adult respondents in Pretoria, 100 of the 350 respondents were students. The rest of the respondents worked for

\[^{25}\] Republished more recently as Mutasa (2000).
different governmental and non-governmental departments (Mutasa 1999:88). Given that the author of this article works for the Department of African Languages at Unisa it is assumed that most of the student respondents were Unisa students, i.e. the target population was the same as that of the present research. The survey dealt with perceptions of the national language policy and the LOLT issue, and attitudes towards them. The respondents were asked, as parents, to indicate which LOLT they would prefer for their children and to provide reasons for their choice. 99% of the respondents chose English and only 1% chose an African language (Mutasa 1999:90-91). Reasons for choosing English included the following: it is an international language and the language of globalisation, it communicates concepts better, it is the language of the workplace, it facilitates inter-cultural communication and textbooks are written in the language. The sole reason given for choosing an African language was that concepts would be better understood through the use of the L1.

More recently, in 2000, Barkhuizen (2001:7) conducted a survey among Grade 11 pupils in high-schools in the Eastern and Western Cape in order to ascertain the ‘perception of XLT learners of the teaching/learning they experience in their Xhosa language classes at school’ (Barkhuizen 2001:6). The survey was large in scale, providing as it did insight into the perceptions of 2825 students (Barkhuizen 2001:7). Although the questionnaire (Barkhuizen 2000b: Appendix A) deals with a variety of issues, some of the questions have relevance for the current research.

The results of the survey show that the majority of students found English (in comparison to isiXhosa) easier to learn (55%), more enjoyable (62%) and as more useful once they had finished school (89%) (2000b:25) and that the perception of English as more useful applies to all domains (further study, jobs, etc.) except for talking with friends (Barkhuizen 2001:10). Furthermore, the majority of respondents agreed that the isiXhosa used at school was different to that used at home and among friends (Barkhuizen 2000b:31; Barkhuizen 2001:8). Most significantly, however, were the responses to the two questions in the survey that dealt with the LOLT issue at schools, i.e. whether this should be English or isiXhosa. The first question (‘Xhosa’ in Figure 1 below) asked students whether they thought

26. IsiXhosa first language.
isiXhosa should be *the* LOLT, whereas the second question (‘English’ in Figure 1 below) asked students whether they thought English should be the LOLT.

**Figure 1:** Student preferences regarding LOLT, adapted from Barkhuizen (2000:38) - figures are percentages.

![Bar graph showing student preferences for LOLT languages.]

In response to a subsequent question, students indicated that the only subject for which isiXhosa should be the LOLT was Biblical Studies (Barkhuizen 2001:11). On the surface, the most surprising aspect of these findings is the unexpectedly low preference for English as only LOLT, i.e. only 52% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that this option should be followed. I suspect, as Barkhuizen (2001:11) himself suggests, that these respondents 'have in mind a dual- or parallel-medium arrangement'.

The most recent data that could be found relating to the relevant attitudes, however, is that reported in Alexander (2001:10). The author reports on a recent survey conducted by PanSALB, which indicates that approximately 90% of respondents feel that mother-tongue education should be part of any South African education system.

In summary, the research of Meyer (1998), although aimed at teachers and not students, provides interesting data in terms of beliefs underlying LOLT preferences. A preference for English-only as LOLT seems to be informed by issues relating to the impracticality of using the African languages as LOLT (e.g. the costs of replacing the current English-only
textbooks), the lack of terminology extant in African languages, as well as the other reasons (e.g. English's role as international lingua franca) already touched on. Support for L1-only was informed by a belief that students would have a better understanding of the subject matter and that the practice would help develop the African languages. Interesting reasons were advanced for preferring a combination of the L1-African language and English. These included the idea that the combination would ensure comprehension of the teaching material coupled with the simultaneous acquisition of complex English terminology, and also the observation that a combination would still ensure the maintenance of the learner's culture. In general respondents in this survey expressed a preference for English-only as LOLT. In Sarinjeive (1999), the idea of using one language (in the case of most respondents, English) to ensure national unity and also the importance of English as a language of international communication are seen as motivating support and preference for English; in Mutasa (1999), 99% of respondents indicate a desire for English as LOLT for their children. Many of the reasons provided by respondents are similar to those elicited in the research already dealt with, except for references to the fact that English is the language used in textbooks and the idea that English communicates concepts better than the African languages. The above research seems, however, to be contradicted by both Barkhuizen (2000b), which provides evidence of surprisingly low support for the use of English-only as LOLT, and also by the research reported on by Alexander (2001).

3.4.5 Conclusion
This section has attempted to provide a review of language-attitude research in South Africa, with a particular emphasis on the language attitudes of L1-African language speakers. It was originally hoped that broad attitudinal trends underlying the data in §3.2, in particular those dating from after 1972, would be corroborated by independent research on the attitudes of those concerned. In an attempt to summarise this research, however, it has become clear that as a whole the research does not provide a unanimous impression of the attitudes of the relevant respondents.
It seems useful to point out here that none of the studies reviewed in this section make use of an attitude scale for the purposes of measurement. Particular attitudes are either measured with a single question or belief statement, or, if there is more than one belief statement, the items have not been tested for internal consistency or validity. As mentioned in §1.1, the current dissertation has been motivated by this apparent lack of attention to methodological issues. More information on pertinent methodologies and the use of an attitude scale is provided in §4.2.

3.5 Summary

It appears obvious from some of the data given in §3.2 that the low status of the official African languages of South Africa and the high status of English amongst L1-African language speakers, both within and without the domain of education, cannot be attributed to the relative number of speakers. On a national level the number of L1-speakers of each of the official African languages is sizeable if not substantial, and a few, such as isiZulu, have the privilege and status of being used as lingua franca. Yet these languages do not have the same status as English, which has only a relatively small number of L1-speakers and which is not, by all accounts, being used by a sizeable proportion of the South African population as a lingua franca.

An explanation is rather to be found in the history of South Africa and its people: in the case of the relative status of languages within the domain of education and the related attitudes and preferences of those L1-African language speakers affected, attention needs to be focussed on the function of language and language policy in South African history, with a particular emphasis placed on the role of LOLT policies both before and after the advent of democracy in South Africa. It was hoped that research conducted in the field could help confirm or deny conclusions derived from such a broad historical overview. This expectation was not, however, borne out by a review of the relevant research, the results of which do not support any general conclusions about the language attitudes of L1-African languages speakers.
Chapter 4

Methodology

4.1 Introduction
This chapter is divided into two main sections, the first (§4.2) of which provides reasons for the selection of the methodologies used in the research. In this section, a brief recap of the usefulness of qualitative methods of research and, in particular, the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties, as well as of individual interviews, is provided (§4.2.1). Arguments are then presented for the exclusion of the Matched-Guise Technique (MGT) in this research and for the use of a questionnaire instead (§4.2.2). A summary of the nature and usefulness of factor analysis in language-attitude research is then provided (§4.2.3). Lastly, a section is dedicated to questionnaire and attitude-scale construction (§4.2.4).

The next main section (§4.3) then provides details of the implementation of each methodology used in the research and how each methodology contributes to the aims of goals of the research, as outlined in §1.4. The section has been divided into five parts. The first sub-section (§4.3.1) deals with the analysis of societal treatment of language varieties while the second (§4.3.2) deals with the individual interviews. The next section (§4.3.3) focuses on the mini-survey. The penultimate section (§4.3.4) then explains how the factor analysis of the data proceeded and the last section (§4.3.5) takes a closer look at the item analysis that was used in the final construction of the attitude scale. With regard to the last two sections, it should be mentioned that each contains a summary of the technicalities and methodological significance of the relevant statistical operations.

4.2 The selection of methodologies
This section is focussed on providing a rationale for the particular methodologies employed in this research. It begins by taking a closer look at the role of qualitative research in general, then in language-attitude research in particular and, finally, at the applicability of
the two methods of qualitative research chosen i.e. the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties and individual interviews.

The use of the MGT is legion in language-attitude research (Cargile, Giles, Ryan & Bradac 1994:213; Cooper 1975:5; Giles, Hewstone & Ball 1983:84; Edwards 1985:150; Giles, Hewstone, Ryan & Johnson 1988). It was, therefore, felt necessary to provide some form of defence for the use of a questionnaire in this particular research context, especially taking into consideration that questionnaires suffer from a number of defects, some of which will be touched upon later in this section.

This section then provides a summary of factor analysis, both in terms of its general nature and in terms of its particular applicability to language-attitude research. This is a particularly important section given that the use of factor analysis constitutes the main method for achieving one of the main aims of this research i.e. to identify those dimensions which underlie the attitudes of L1-African language speakers towards the use of the African languages as LOLT at Unisa.

Lastly, the section spends some time dealing with the pitfalls of questionnaire and attitude scale design. The issues of reliability and validity are dealt with and a distinction made between the sort of questionnaires traditionally used in language-attitude research in South Africa and a proper attitude scale.

A word also needs to be said here about the use of a number of methodologies, both of a qualitative and quantitative nature, in research: in this case the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties, individual interviews and a pilot survey combined with factor analysis and the analysis of reliability. This combination of methods is very much in line with current research practice which emphasises the use of more than one kind of methodology and more than one kind of data (Bryman 1988:131). This emphasis is based on the belief that, especially if qualitative and quantitative research methods are combined, ‘the researcher's claims for the validity of his or her conclusions are enhanced if they can be shown to provide mutual confirmation’ (Bryman 1988:131). As will be seen later one of
the main methods used in analysing the data collected during the course of the research is that of comparing the different kinds of data relating to the different kinds of research methodologies employed.

4.2.1 The qualitative methodologies

Qualitative methodologies generally relate to methods of research that seek ‘to describe and analyse the culture and behaviour of humans and their groups from the point of view of those being studied’ (Bryman 1988:131). As the name qualitative implies the emphasis is on depth of information, as opposed to breadth, representativeness and measurability, which is a concern of most quantitative methods of research. Prime examples of qualitative research are participant observation and the individual case-study.

Turning now to the role of qualitative research methods in language-attitude research, we begin with a reconsideration of the three main categories of research methodology in language attitude research, as outlined in Ryan, Giles and Hewstone (1988): the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties, the direct measurement of language attitudes and the indirect measurement of language attitudes.

The analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties is a category of research methods which includes the following:

all techniques which do not involve explicitly asking respondents for their view or reactions
... These include observational, participant-observation, and ethnographic studies; demographic and census analyses; analyses of government and educational language policies; analyses of literature, government and business documents, newspapers, and broadcasting media; and analyses of prescriptive language books (Ryan et al. 1988:1069).

As can be seen, there are a range of different methodologies and sources of data that are subsumed under this general heading. Most involve qualitative methods of research and analysis (e.g. participant-observation and the analyses of government and educational language policies) whereas a few do involve quantitative forms of data (e.g. demographic

1. Also see Ryan, Giles & Sebastian (1982:7).
and census analysis). The general aim of such research is to gain an impression of ‘the relative status and worth of language varieties [in terms of] their public treatment’ (Ryan et al. 1988:1069; parenthesis added). In so far as it does not involve a concern with quantitative measurement and strict representativeness, this approach relates strongly to the aims of qualitative research as described above.

Included too in this approach is the one advocated by St Clair (1982:164) who claims that ‘to understand fully how language attitudes develop, it may be necessary to reach back into the past and investigate the social and political forces operating within the history of a nation’.

Chapter 3, which I contend constitutes such an analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties, incorporates some of the techniques mentioned by Ryan et al. (1988:1069) (i.e. a demographic and census analysis and an analysis, of some depth, of government and educational language policies). It, in addition, attempts to provide a relatively broad sociohistorical background to the development of both current attitudes and policy. This is, I believe, in line with St. Clair’s (1982:164) suggestions. Moreover, it includes a review of selected literature dealing with the actual measurement of language attitudes over the last few decades in South Africa. The choice of literature to review was constrained by the nature of the current research and the reader is referred back to §3.4 for a discussion of these constraints as well as for a rationale for the inclusion of such a literature review.

The other qualitative research methodology employed in this research is that of the individual interview. In terms of Ryan et al.’s (1988:1068-1071) classification of research techniques in language-attitude research, the individual interview is a direct measure of

---

2. From Ryan et al. (1982:7) it is clear that the method employed by St. Clair (1982) is to be subsumed under the rubric analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties.

3. Note that St. Clair (1982:164) does insist that such an analysis should involve the use of a proper theoretical framework, i.e. that the data should not simply be a list of events. In fulfillment of this requirement Chapter 3 does involve a degree of analysis, a task which is, however, accomplished fully in Chapter 6.
language attitudes, to be contrasted with indirect measures of language attitudes, such as
the MGT. As the rubric direct measure implies, these kinds of methodologies all ‘involve
the use of a series of direct questions, either presented in written form to large groups or in
individual interviews’ (Ryan et al. 1982:7). Like all direct measures of language attitudes
individual interviews suffer from a number of limitations. In this regard Ryan et al.
(1988:1071; parenthesis added) note the following:

[that the] direct approach does ... have some limitations that need to be kept in mind.
Demand characteristics may call forth certain socially desirable responses and repress
others ... and hence responses may not accurately reflect privately-held attitudes. Relatedly,
selection of which language to use in conducting the research can communicate information
about the expected "proper" responses'.

In other words, certain characteristics of the interview situation or the nature of the
questionnaire might create ideas in the mind of the respondent about what the expectations
of the interviewer or researcher are or, in general, what the most socially appropriate form
of behaviour is in the given context. Naturally, such ideas can influence the behaviour of
the respondent in a number of unpredictable ways.

More generally, it is also widely acknowledged that ‘intercultural interactions are always
subject to misunderstandings’ (Patton 1990:337). This is of particular relevance to the
individual interviews conducted as part of this research, given that they were conducted in
English between an L1-English interviewer and interviewees who were both L2-English
speakers and who, to varying degrees, belonged to a different cultural background.
Kaschula (1989:101) provides an extreme example of this process of intercultural
miscommunication in his work on interaction between South African farmers and labourers
and points out that ‘if one draws extensively on one's own cultural background in talking to
and interpreting others, communication breakdown may well result'.

These issues (i.e. both the fact that the choice of language in which to conduct the research
can create demand characteristics and the fact that different linguistic and cultural
backgrounds can create misunderstanding) will be touched on again in chapter 7, which
discusses some of the limitations of the research and provides recommendations for improvement.

Section 2.6.2.1 has already provided some information on the use of the individual interview in language-attitude research, in particular on a few of the advantages and disadvantages of this research methodology. Of greater concern, however, is deciding on which kind of interview schedule to employ in any particular research. Patton (1990:280-290 cf. Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias 1996:232-237) conveniently divides qualitative interviewing into three types, depending on the degree of standardization that takes place before the interviews begin. In the case of the informal conversational interview the questions to be asked have not been pre-determined and the interview generally guides itself. With the general interview guide approach, ‘a set of issues that are to be explored with each respondent’ (Patton 1990:280) is identified and helps the interviewer to direct the respondent towards the relevant topics of concern. The most standardized interview method is, however, the standardized open-ended interview which is characterised by a carefully worded and arranged set of questions.

In terms of deciding on the level of standardisation to be imposed when conducting a set of individual interviews it seems clear that a completely unstructured interview would be inappropriate in an environment where time-constraints are extant and where the subject matter of the interview does not necessarily allow the interview to remain within desired parameters. It is for such reasons that the informal conversational interview is more often than not, ‘part of ongoing participant observation fieldwork’ (Patton 1990:280).

With respect to the other two kinds of interviewing (the general interview guide approach and the standardized open-ended interview), one could, I believe, safely summarise the matter as a trade off between an increased comparability of responses against an increase in the salience and relevancy of responses (Patton 1990:288-289). Any decision between these two methods must, however, also be based on the general nature of the interview and on the methodological context in which the interviews are to be placed (i.e. which other methodologies are to be employed in the research). Given that this research also involves
quantitative research, in the form of a mini-survey, which will ensure complete comparability of response, it would appear unnecessary to sacrifice the specific benefits of a less structured approach. In terms of the level of standardisation for the interviews, therefore, the general interview guide approach appeared to be the best route to follow.

4.2.2 The MGT vs the survey questionnaire

As already stated (§2.6.3) the MGT is the most popular method for the measurement of language attitudes, a popularity borne out of the fact that it was designed specifically for use in this discipline. Indeed, it was primarily because of concerns relating to direct methods of language-attitude measurement, such as the interview and the survey questionnaire, that led to the development of this research instrument. The onus is, therefore, on any researcher, who declines the use of this powerful instrument, to explain why she or he has decided to make use of an alternative - in this case the survey questionnaire.

In my opinion, the MGT is unsuited for the current research for the simple reason that the MGT is typically viewed as eliciting, ‘attitudes towards the groups associated with the use of each language’ (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:146 cf. Cooper 1975:5; Cooper & Fishman 1974:9), rather than eliciting attitudes towards the use of a language in a particular domain. The reader will recall that the primary goal of this research is to conduct exploratory research on the attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students towards the proposed use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa (see §1.4). As such the focus of the research is too narrow, or contextualised, for the application of the MGT.

Related to the above is the observation that one of the main reasons for the inclusion of the MGT in much language-attitude research is the fact that unlike other, direct methods of investigation, such as the questionnaire, it is unlikely ‘to cut out possible subconscious and emotive responses’ (Smit 1996:45). In this regard the reader is referred back to §2.5 and, in particular, to the discussion of Schmied's (1991) attempt to classify language attitudes in terms of their referent i.e. ‘attitudes towards certain languages, attitudes towards varieties of a language, and attitudes towards sociolinguistic topics’. The MGT is particularly suited to the investigation of the first and second categories and its major strength in this regard ‘is
the elicitation of spontaneous attitudes less sensitive to reflection and social desirability biases than are directly assessed attitudes' (Ryan et al. 1988:1072); just as important is the principle that the elicitation of such non-reflective attitudes, as opposed to attitudes to the 'specific speaker in the experimental situation' (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970:146), is based on the strict control of other variables e.g. the voice quality of the speaker. The MGT is, therefore, designed to elicit relatively affective responses towards language varieties in general i.e. not to their use in any particular context. This is not to deny that the MGT can be exploited in such a way as to allow researchers to study the effects of a number of contextual variables (Cargile et al. 1994:224-226). In such cases, however, we are generally dealing with an immediate social context, and thus with variables that can be directly manipulated, rather than with the impact of the context of a whole domain, such as tertiary-level education, on the formation of attitudes.

The final kind of referent of language attitudes mentioned by Schmied (1991) is sociolinguistic topics. Smit's (1996:39; parenthesis added) description of this category is a 'field [that] covers all those investigations that want to study attitudes towards language uses i.e. the use of specific varieties for specific domains'. The current research would most certainly fall into this category. More important is Smit's (1996:39) further comments on this field of inquiry, when she remarks that 'the responses are more informed by the informants' knowledge of the situation than those for other fields. For this reason, many language attitudes might be more accurately termed language beliefs or opinion'. Given that language-attitude research in this particular field of inquiry deals more with beliefs than attitudes, the fact that questionnaires do not elicit affective, unconscious responses hardly constitutes a criticism in the context of this research. Problems relating to demand characteristics do, however, remain.

4.2.3 Factor analysis

The aim of this section will be to provide a brief summary of the nature of factor analysis and then, armed with this knowledge, to have a brief look at the usefulness of this technique when conducting language-attitude research.

Factor analysis, broadly defined, 'is an attempt to explain the correlates between observed
variables in terms of underlying factors, which are themselves not generally observable' (Baxter 2001), or, in Zeller & Carmine's (1980:19) words 'it highlights and clarifies the pattern of associations among a set of indicants designed to measure a particular theoretical concept'. An example of a theoretical concept might be a particular language attitude and an example of a set of indicants might be a questionnaire drawn up to measure this attitude. This can be better understood if we keep in mind the fact that each belief statement (or indicant) in a questionnaire qualifies as a variable (in a Likert-type questionnaire, like the one employed in this study, each belief statement has five possible values). Factor analysis, on a purely technical level, describes which of the variables (i.e. belief statements) belong together, given of course that the questionnaire composed of the belief statements has been answered by a number of the target population. Based on the responses to the questionnaire, factor analysis can determine which belief statements correlate with each other. By ‘analysing [the] interrelationships among variables in such a way … the variables can be described adequately and conveniently by a group of basic categories smaller in number than the original variables’ (Zeller & Carmine 1980:19; parenthesis added). This is the purely formal side of factor analysis. It is, of course, then up to the researcher to determine whether these basic categories (i.e. factors) relate to anything in theory or in the real world. This is done simply by looking at what the various variables (i.e. belief statements) have in common i.e. is there some theme shared by the belief statements in terms of what each of them is referring to? Thus, for example, if two belief statements such as strict measures should be taken against illegal immigrants and illegal foreigners should be prevented from working in this country together formed such a basic category or factor we could assume that given that they generally relate to the same thing i.e. policy towards illegal immigrants, that they form what is in the literature referred to as a dimension. Zeller & Carmine (1980:19) summarise this succinctly as follows:

The interpretation of factors is facilitated by observing which variables define a particular factor and inferring what these variables have in common that is not shared by variables not defined on that factor. A dimension is an interpretation attributed to a factor. Thus, factor analytic procedures redescribe the interrelationships among variables in order that their underlying dimensional structure can be discovered.

4. Also see Kim & Mueller (1978a:12).
Thus, to rephrase, the first step in a factor analysis is to determine which variables or belief statements belong together. Once that has been accomplished the researcher is then required to seek some common theme shared by these belief statements. If, in addition, these common themes are supported by either facts or theory, or both, then it is likely that the common themes thus identified qualify as valid dimensions, and relate to constructs in the real world.

Everitt (1996:225) makes the following distinction when it comes to the use of factor analysis in research:

the method is used as an 'exploratory' technique for examining the possible structure or pattern in a set of observed correlations. However, factor analysis can also be used as a 'confirmatory' technique, seeking to establish whether or not a specific model is compatible with the observed correlations.

Factor analysis is, in the social sciences, mostly used as an exploratory tool (Kim & Mueller 1978:9). This research is no exception and it is for this reason that no explicit hypotheses were made prior to the actual research (see §1.5).

It is in the context of exploratory factor analysis that one of the main aims of the research needs to be understood, i.e. to identify those dimensions which would realistically underlie the attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students towards the proposed use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa (§1.3). But what is actually meant when we talk about the identification of dimensions (and thus factors) underlying attitudes? Oppenheim (1966:142) describes the process of identification as 'based on correlating all the items with one another, which enables us to abstract one or more "factors" that the items, or some of them, have in common'. Oppenheim (1966:142) states:

We can use factor-analysis to show how a seemingly unified attitude complex in fact "breaks up" into several independent factors. A person's political orientation, for instance, has been shown ... to consist not merely of a left-wing/right-wing dimension, but of two independent dimensions.
In order to understand the relevance of factor analysis in the context of the present research as well as in the context of language-attitude research in general, it is also necessary to briefly revisit Oppenheim’s (1966) discussion of the distinction between belief and attitude. As illustrated in Figure 1 in Chapter 2, and as touched on in §2.3, beliefs are viewed as more superficial than attitudes and attitudes are, in some sense, composed of a number of reinforcing beliefs. As discussed above, in research dealing with language attitudes relating to the use of languages in a particular domain one is more likely to elicit a range of beliefs which, in their turn, reinforce a basic negative or positive attitude towards the use in question. The beliefs reinforcing the basic attitude are, however, unlikely to relate to one specific issue. There are, in all likelihood, a range of considerations and issues relating to the perceived benefits or deficits of using particular languages in any particular domain. As such, all beliefs that inform the attitude in question are unlikely to relate to only one common issue, and factor analysis would appear to be ideally suited to distinguish between the various considerations and issues (i.e. the various dimensions) to which such beliefs are related. In turn, the various issues mentioned are likely to relate to a whole range of social and political determinants which form the background to any study of language attitudes. As such, factor analysis has the added advantage of providing the researcher with an elegant method of connecting the observed attitudes with the sociohistorical determinants of these attitudes in a manner which is more precise and grounded than otherwise possible.

A further motivation for the use of factor analysis is the observation that there is a general reluctance displayed by language-attitude research in Africa towards the use of proper methodologies:

deficiency in methodology appears to be the principle weakness of most language attitude studies hitherto curried out in sub-Saharan Africa (Adegbi 1994:53).

This is of particular relevance when researchers make use of questionnaires, and in particular, that favourite tool, the Likert scale. Much research makes use of questionnaires based simply on the researcher’s intuitions of which matters or issues relate to the attitude
referent. Another common feature is the use of the so-called Likert-type scale, which does away with the obligatory item analysis. The misuse of the Likert-scale format is so pervasive in fact (presumably not only in language-attitude research) that a number of social psychologists such as Eagly and Chaiken (1993:54) and Oskamp (1991:56), have been moved to object to it:

... a more serious, and unfortunate, departure from Likert’s procedure is the frequent omission of an item analysis ... The situation is often signalled by the use of the term "Likert-type" scale, which is apt to be an indication of hasty, slipshod research (Oskamp 1991:56)

The use of factor analysis in this research therefore goes some way towards ensuring that the problems relating to the use of Likert-type scales are avoided. In fact, Oppenheim (1966:142) appears to indicate that it is the best method for tackling such problems:

... internal-consistency methods of item-analysis provide some safeguard against the inclusion of unrelated items in a scale, but clearly a better way of ensuring unidimensionality would be through the use of factor-analysis.

The main problem, however, is not so much lack of unidimensionality (i.e. that the questionnaire is measuring more than one thing), but rather the assumption that the attitude measured is some kind of coherent whole i.e. unidimensional. This relates to another deficiency of much language-attitude research in sub-Saharan African, as well as elsewhere. The common neglect of the possibility of multidimensionality in language attitudes (Adegbiya 1994:55; Baker 1992:2 & 8) is a point of serious concern since there is much evidence from both general attitude theory and research as well as language attitude research in particular that many language attitudes are in fact multidimensional in nature e.g. the instrumental and integrative orientations of Gardner and Lambert (1972), Hofman’s (1973, cited in Mparutsa, Thlondhlana & Crawhall 1991:235) extrinsic and intrinsic

---

5. This commonly-found deficiency has also motivated the use of individual interviews in this research i.e. in that the questionnaire belief statements are generally based on the data generated by these interviews.
language attitudes and Mparutsa et al.’s (1991:240) notion of attitudinal contradiction implying deeper ideological ambivalence. It is, therefore, highly misleading to conduct language-attitude research without entertaining the possibility that one might be measuring more than one thing. Neglect is to be found on two levels. On a methodological level it implies an unwillingness to apply statistical tools (Baker 1992:2 & 8). On a theoretical level it points to a general unawareness or deliberate avoidance of the complex, but ultimately fruitful, theoretical basis provided by general attitude research in social psychology. Baker (1992:1) comments as follows:

a deficiency is the relationship between general attitude theory and attitude research on the one hand, and research specifically on language attitudes on the other hand. The later seems rarely to have been informed by the former.

4.2.4 Questionnaire and attitude scale construction
This section looks at some of the issues pertinent to the construction of questionnaires and attitude scales. In particular, it focuses on the issue of question wording as well as the important notions of validity and reliability.

Starting with the wording of questions or belief statements we can follow Oppenheim (1966:49-69) in isolating a number of potential mistakes that can be made when it comes to deciding on the exact wording of a question or belief statement. One problem is, of course, the potential ambiguity of a belief statement (Oppenheim 1966:52; Black 1999:204), i.e. it is necessary to ensure that the statement is worded in such a way that the respondent is clear in her or his own mind concerning the meaning of the statement.

There is also the problem of ‘doubled-barrelled or double-negative questions’ (Oppenheim 1966:56), the first kind exemplified by questions like ‘have you suffered from headaches or sickness lately,’ where the respondent is being asked to answer two questions instead of one and the latter by ‘would you rather not use a nonmedicated shampoo,’ where it is unclear what a negative response would mean.

Another pitfall is including loaded words in a belief statement (Oppenheim 1966:59; Black
1999:229 & 205). The examples provided by Oppenheim (1966:59) for loaded words are ‘Nazi, bosses, interference, motherly, starvation etc.’. With regard to these Oppenheim (1966:60) points out that ‘respondents are reacting not so much to the issue posed by the question as to the loaded phrase itself’.

One other problem mentioned by Oppenheim (1966:38) is that of the sequence of questions or belief statements in any questionnaire. It is possible for a preceding item, because of the peculiar nature of its content, to influence the response to the next item, or as Oppenheim (1966:38) puts it ‘the respondent will have other preceding questions in mind when answering it’. More generally, Oppenheim (1966:38) stresses that the researcher pay attention to ‘the matter of total length and the amount of time and effort that can be requested from the average respondent’.

All of these problems, ultimately, either affect the reliability or validity of the questionnaire or attitude scale. Oppenheim (1966:69-70) defines reliability as referring to ‘consistency, to obtaining the same results again’ while validity ‘tells us whether the question or item really measures what it is supposed to measure’. The two notions are interrelated. If an item is unreliable it is unlikely to be valid, given that it is not measuring the same thing on different occasions; and, on the other hand, if the item has substantial validity it is likely that the responses to it will be consistent. Returning to the issue of question wording, it is obvious that if a question or belief statement is confusing (ambiguous, double barreled or a double negative) it is unlikely to elicit the same response on different occasions. Thus the reliability and, indirectly, the validity of the item has been compromised. As stated by Black (1999:204) ‘if an instrument ... is going to be highly reliable, it will be necessary for all respondents to interpret the question in the same way’. If, on the other hand, the item has loaded words one might ask whether the validity of the item has not been compromised given that the response has been influenced by the wording of the item as opposed to the respondent’s real attitude towards the relevant issue.

Particularly when it comes to the measurement of attitudes, Oppenheim (1966:73) urges researchers to show caution when using questions and belief statements:
questions are more sensitive ... to changes in wording, context, emphasis and so on [and] it becomes impossible to assess reliability by "asking the same question in another form." It will no longer be the same question.

In other words it is dangerous to use only one question or belief statement when measuring an attitude. One can never be sure that the question has any reliability. There is, however, also no point in employing a range of questions or belief statements if one is not sure whether these items are all measuring the same thing. This is known in the literature as 'unidimensionality or homogeneity' (Oppenheim 1966:121). In the previous section we have already seen how factor analysis is a statistical technique for discovering the different dimensions underlying an attitude. Black (1999:220; parenthesis added) explains this in the following manner:

starting with a concept [for example, an attitude], a set of questions is generated that is given to a trial group of subjects. Using factor analysis on the results, groups of questions are identified with sufficient commonality to determine constructs that make a concept.

Once the different dimensions have been discovered a test of internal reliability or consistency can be applied to ensure that each item elected to measure a particular dimension is consistent in its measurement of that dimension. It is only once the criteria of homogeneity and reliability have been met that we can be assured that the items used to measure an identified dimension do in fact do so. It is this difference i.e. between a survey questionnaire which has not been subjected to such criteria and a proper attitude scale which has, which is central to the methodology employed in this research.

With regard to the criterion of validity, on the other hand, there are greater difficulties. According to Oppenheim (1966:75) there is often just simply a lack of unquestionable criteria on which to base validity. One common approach, however, is to both 'compare our findings with the results of other studies' and to use other methods of investigation. It is for this reason that the present study has included a chapter on the theory of attitudes, a literature review of language-attitude research in South Africa as well as a number of qualitative forms of data collection.
4.3 The implementation of methodologies

This section provides details of the practical issues relating to the actual implementation of the various methodologies. Firstly, §4.3.1 and §4.3.2 deal with the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties and the individual interviews respectively. Then §4.3.3 deals with the implementation of the questionnaire. Lastly, §4.3.4 and §4.3.5 both look at some of the technical issues relating to the application of factor analysis and item analysis respectively.

Before dealing with each of the methodologies separately, however, it is appropriate to provide a brief summary of why each methodology was employed and the order in which the methodologies were implemented. The first step was an analysis of the societal treatment of the language varieties involved. The aim of this analysis was both theoretical and methodological. On the theoretical side it was seen as important to provide the reader of this dissertation with a broad background to the language question in South Africa, with particular reference to the LOLT issue. On a broad methodological level it was seen as necessary to provide an impressionistic idea of what the sociohistorical determinants of the policy and the attitudes might be. On a more specific methodological level, however, the analysis was seen as necessary for the final stage of the factor analysis i.e. confirming whether and which factors isolated as a result of the factor rotation would be retained in the final attitude scale. This will become clearer in §4.3.4 which deals with the procedures of factor analysis.

The next step was to conduct the individual interviews. The impressions gained from the analysis mentioned in the previous paragraph were employed to loosely guide the contents of the interview schedule, but, in general, respondents were permitted to discuss issues they viewed as relevant. The contents of the interviews were then used to draw up the questionnaire, i.e. the belief statements that formed the main part of the questionnaire were taken directly from statements made by the various interviewees. The questionnaire was then used in a mini-survey on Unisa students. The idea of this mini-survey was not to establish what the language attitudes of the respondents might be, but to rather collect data on which factor analysis could be performed. It should be stated here that it is in this respect that the current research is different to most other language-attitude research that has taken
place in South Africa. Most other research designs end with the collection of survey results or, at best, compare the survey results with other demographic variables collected as part and parcel of the survey.

A factor analysis was then performed on the data collected by the mini-survey. The point of this factor analysis was to establish, on a statistical level, which belief statements belonged together or, to use a more technical term, which belief statements covaried. Each of these groups of belief statements (i.e. factors) could then be compared with the theory provided in Chapter 2 as well as the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties conducted in Chapter 3 and §6.2. If the content of these factors is verified by the theory and the sociohistorical data then there is sufficient motivation for their inclusion in a final attitude scale. Moreover, once verified by the theory and the sociohistorical data there is evidence for each factor's validity (i.e. that they exist in the real word) and they are then called dimensions. It is the aim of attitude-scale construction to, therefore, construct a scale that can faithfully measure these dimensions. Factor analysis can only tell us how many factors there are and what they generally relate to. Another form of analysis needs to take place in order to assess to what degree each of the belief statements measures the dimension under consideration. This is the role of the item analysis. This analysis is useful in allowing the researcher to retain those items which are most suited for the measurement of the dimensions in question. Moreover, through the use of item analysis the future researcher can be reasonably confident that the group of belief statements selected for the measurement of a particular dimension are as a whole measuring the same thing.

4.3.1 The analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties
The implementation of this methodology is split between Chapter 3 and §6.2. The aim of this part of the research is to gain an impressionistic overview of the sociohistorical genesis of those forces that have impacted on the formation of the attitudes of L1-African language speakers towards Unisa's new LOLT policy and well as on the policy itself. This is achieved, in particular, by examining relevant aspects of the history of the language question in South Africa, with a particular focus on LOLT policy in the education of L1-African language speakers. Methodologically speaking, the other use of this analysis is to provide guidance in the construction of the attitude scale. The role played by the analysis in this regard will become clear in §4.3.5, which deals with the item analysis. Section §3.3
provides a basic narrative of the history of the language question in South Africa, whereas §6.2 applies the theoretical frameworks discussed in Chapter 1 (particularly SIT and the framework of Ryan et al. 1982) to this data. This is in line with St. Clair’s (1982:164) insistence on the use of a theoretical framework for the analysis of such sociohistorical data.

4.3.2 The individual interviews
The individual interviews were conducted in order to gain an impressionistic idea of some of the issues that L1-African language students at Unisa took into consideration when deliberating upon Unisa’s new LOLT policy; more importantly, the contents of the individual interviews were used as the source of the belief statements that went into the questionnaire (see the next section).

Appendix A is the interview schedule. Although the schedule is structured in the form of a set of standardised questions, it was used as a general interview guide, the aim of which is to allow the respondents the freedom to discuss the issues in their own terms, but at the same time not to allow them to wander too far from the topic, or in Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias’ (1996:234) words⁶,

> although the encounter between the interviewer and the respondents is structured and the major aspects of the study are explained, respondents are given considerable liberty in expressing their definition of a situation that is presented to them.

As such, on occasion additional questions were asked during an interview if the particular topic under discussion rendered these questions pertinent. Furthermore, some students responded in such a fashion that they answered questions from the schedule without being prompted. In these cases the relevant questions were, naturally, not posed. Occasionally, too, depending on the direction that the interview had taken, the order of questions, as

---

6. The format used in the interview schedule for this research also resembles Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias’ (1996:236-237) sample interview schedule for focussed interviews (the authors' term for an interview using a general interview guide).
presented in Appendix A, was not strictly adhered to. Questions were also often re-phrased in a number of ways, often for the purpose of clarification. The number of respondents was eight (8) and a summary of the interviews conducted with each of these respondents is provided in the next chapter.

4.3.3 The mini-survey
The data generated by the individual interviews was used as a basis for drawing up the questionnaire. Most of the items included in the questionnaire (Appendix B) were based on statements made by the respective interviewees. The aim of this section is to report on the nature of the questionnaire as well as the implementation of the mini-survey. It should be noted at this point that the aim of this mini-survey was not to draw conclusion about the attitudes of the respondents (although this would be the normal procedure in language-attitude research in South Africa); the aim was rather to collect sufficient qualitative data for a factor analysis of this data.

As can be seen the questionnaire is a Likert-type questionnaire and included 62 belief statements, with 5 response categories: strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree and strongly disagree. It should be mentioned that although the questionnaire is rather lengthy, the vast majority of respondents expressed interest in the mini-survey and some even requested that they be informed as to the outcome of the survey. Furthermore, it was decided to rather remain as true as possible to the contents of the individual interviews (in terms of the wording of the belief statements) than to change them out of fears relating to possible lack of precision or ambiguity (Oppenheim 1966:49-59 - see §4.2.4). Given that the aim was to subject the results of the mini-survey to a factor analysis it was expected that items which were imprecise, ambiguous or confusing in any way would be weeded out in the process, i.e. they would not load heavily on any particular factor. This process was also backed up by an analysis of the item-total correlations of each belief statement relating to each factor, during the final construction of the attitude scale, i.e. an analysis of reliability (see §5.2.5). This also contributed towards the exclusion of problematic belief statements. Issues of ambiguity etc. were, of course, taken into consideration when deciding on the belief statements that made up the final attitude scale. In addition, on a more practical level, it seemed superfluous to subject all 62 belief statements to intense scrutiny given that only a
small proportion of the original belief statements would be retained for final inclusion in
the attitude scale. It seemed best, therefore, to postpone the scrutiny until the final item
analysis and the construction of the attitude scale.

After the construction of the mini-survey questionnaire, which as mentioned above was
based on the content of the individual interviews, 107 copies of the questionnaire were
completed by Unisa students whom I located on the main Unisa campus. There is, thus,
a strong likelihood that the majority of these students had an urban or semi-urban
background. In addition, the main Unisa campus is situated in an area in which
Setswana and Northern Sotho are the dominant languages. The respondents are,
therefore, not representative of the entire Unisa population. This is not a major concern,
however, given that the aims of the research was an exploration of the nature of the
attitudes of these students as well as the construction of an attitude scale based on factor
analysis, as opposed to an attempt to gauge, census-fashion, whether students as a
whole were positively inclined or not towards the use of African languages as LOLT at
Unisa.

Returning to the application of the questionnaire provided in the form of Appendix B, of
the 107 questionnaires completed by respondents, 100 were retained. The remaining 7
were discarded either due to the fact that they were incorrectly completed or because the
respondent came from an African country other than South Africa.

4.3.4 The factor analysis of items
Before the results of the factor analysis are provided some time needs to be spent
explaining exactly what the steps are that were taken during the course of this factor
analysis, as well as the relevance of each of these steps. Firstly, however, it should be
mentioned that the computer package used for this factor analysis was the Statistical
Secondly, it is useful to outline the major steps in any factor analysis, as outlined in
Kim & Mueller (1978a:46-50). These are:

- Data collection and the preparation of the correlation matrix;
• Extracting initial factors; and
• Rotation to a terminal solution.

The first step is quite simple: data needs to be collected and summarised in a form suitable for factor analysis. Such data can be the results of the application of a mini-survey such as the one conducted in this research. The data is then arranged in a form suitable for factor analysis, i.e. the data matrix or correlation matrix (Zeller & Carmines 1980:25). What this matrix essentially provides is a matrix of the correlations between the various variables, i.e. if there are 62 variables (or belief statements, such as in this study) then the correlation matrix will show how each of these 62 variables (or belief statements) correlates with every other variable (or belief statement). An example of such a correlation matrix is provided in Zeller & Carmines (1980:24).

More intricate, though, is the second step, which is the initial extraction of factors. Technically speaking this involves finding ‘the number of factors that can adequately explain the observed correlations ... among the observed variables’ (Kim & Mueller 1978a:48). In other words, factor extraction involves determining the number of factors that can be viewed as underlying the results collected by, for example, a mini-survey. The solution obtained as a result of this factor extraction then, in most cases, needs to be interpreted in order to decide how many factors will be retained for the next step in the factor analysis, which is the rotation to a terminal solution. It is important to point out in this regard that the results of such a factor extraction only provide an indication of how many factors should be retained for the next stage in the analysis; they do not in any way provide an indication of which variables (i.e. belief statements) relate to which factors; this is the task of the rotation phase of the factor analysis.

The method employed for factor extraction in this research was what is known in the literature as principal component factor analysis, distinguishable from what Zeller & Carmines (1980:20) refer to as common factor analysis. The technical differences between these two models of factor analysis are irrelevant for the purposes of this discussion; suffice it to say that with principal component factor analysis ‘although the number of principal components will almost always equal the number of variables, only the first few components - those accounting for most of the variance of the variables -
are usually retained for further analysis' (Carmines 1980:20).

As mentioned above, the solution obtained as a result of this factor extraction needs to be interpreted in order to decide how many factors will be retained for the rotation phase. There are a number of different criteria on which such an interpretation can be based and a decision about which components (i.e. factors) to retain for further analysis (i.e. for the rotation) is always difficult, but the general principle mentioned in the previous quotation (of retaining only those which account for the most variance) is one yardstick. This means, in effect, analysing the eigenvalue of each factor. These values are, in general, indicative of the amount of variance explained by each factor (Zeller & Carmines 1980:32). There are various methods for interpreting such values (Zeller & Carmines 1980:32-35), but in general one accepts for further analysis factors whose eigenvalues account for more than the average amount of variance. In a questionnaire composed of 62 variables (i.e. belief statements) the total variance would be 62.00 and the average amount of variance would be 1.00. According to this principle, factors with eigenvalues equal to or higher than 1.00 should be retained and those less than 1.00 discarded for future analysis. This is summarized as follows in Kim & Mueller (1978a:48):

the most commonly used procedure of determining the number of initial factors to be extracted is a rule-of-thumb - the rule known either as the Kaiser or eigenvalue criterion (eigenvalue greater than or equal to one).

According to Kim & Mueller (1978b:44-45) there is, however, an alternative test known as the scree-test, which is based on a simple examination of the relevant so-called scree graph or plot. The procedure is simply to 'stop factoring at the point where the eigenvalues ... begin to level off forming a straight line with an almost horizontal slope' (Kim & Mueller 1978b:44). The use of such a scree-test will be taken up again in §5.2.4.

As mentioned the next step in the factor analysis is the rotation to a terminal solution. The purpose of this step is to essentially identify 'the basic structuring of variables into theoretically meaningful subdimensions' (Kim & Mueller 1978a:50 cf. Zeller & Carmines 1980:36-37). In other words, the aim of this step is to discover which
variables (i.e. belief statements) relate strongly to the factors extracted in the previous step, i.e. the factor extraction. It is once this rotation of factors has taken place that the belief statements relating to each of the factors can be assessed for uniformity and theoretical validity. This implies that on inspection of those belief statements relevant to the factor there should be an impression of an underlying factor common to all the items (uniformity) and that these factors should preferably be supported by data generated through the use of other methodologies (theoretical validity), in this case the analysis of the societal treatment of the language varieties concerned (chapter 2). If there is some thematic continuity between the belief statements that load strongly on a particular factor and if this theme relates to existing theory, or to an interpretation of existing data, a case can be made for asserting that this factor possibly relates to an existing dimension in the real world.

There are a whole range of different rotation methods available to the researcher, each with its own advantages and disadvantages. The differences between these methods are highly technical and as stressed by Kim & Mueller (1978a:50) ‘if identification of the basic structuring of variables into theoretically meaningful subdimensions is the primary concern of the researcher, as is often the case in an exploratory factor analysis, almost any readily available method of rotation will do the job’. The particular method used in this analysis is one of the more recent ones and is known as the Promax method (Comrey & Lee 1992:188).

4.3.5 The item analysis
The eventual aim of this analysis is to provide an attitude scale that can be employed for use in an extensive survey of the attitudes of L1-African language students at Unisa towards the use of these languages as LOLT at Unisa. The five factors retained above, if found to have some conceptual commonality and if confirmed by additional data, will form the conceptual basis of any such scale, i.e. the scale will have a number of belief statements representative of each of the factors (dimensions). If, however, the conceptual and theoretical analysis only, for example, confirms the theoretical validity of three factors, then the final scale will only consist of three sub-scales (or factor scales), each with its own representative belief statements (Radloff 2001).
It should, however, be emphasised that the role of the factor analysis is to provide an idea of the various dimensions underlying a set of variables. It does not, in itself, provide a technique for deciding which belief statements should be retained in any final scale designed to measure the factors in question. For such purposes a measure of the internal consistency reliability of each of the factors needs to be provided and, more importantly, an analysis is required of the degree to which each item contributes or detracts from this reliability. The measure of the internal consistency of each of the factor scales is the Cronbach alpha which, according to Black (1999:279)\(^7\):

is a reasonable indicator of the internal consistency of instruments that do not have right-wrong (binary) marking schemes, thus can be used for both essay questions as well as questionnaires using scales such as rating or Likert.

More important, however, for the purposes of this research is the fact that the results on each item contained in any particular factor scale can then be compared to the Cronbach alpha of the factor scale in order to determine to what degree the item is measuring the same thing as the factor scale as a whole. In the words of Black (1999:280-281) again:

having conducted a trial of an instrument ... it is possible to scan the results in a table for items that generate inconsistent responses ... The best indicator ... is the item-total correlation which is defined as the correlation between the individual response scores for the item and the total score on the instrument. This reflects how consistently the item is measuring the same thing as the instrument ... An item with a low (or even negative) correlation coefficient would indicate that it was not eliciting responses consistent with the instrument (or section of the instrument) as a whole.

Those items which generate inconsistent responses can then be removed from any final scale. The fact that the item-total correlation also provides a measure of the strength of the relationship between item and scale means that the researcher, if need be, can select the 'top' few items for inclusion in a final questionnaire.

For the purpose of constructing the final questionnaire, therefore, belief statements will be removed that either detract from the reliability of the scale or which appear to suffer from any of the defects outlined in §4.2.4. Both of these criteria will be applied in

---

\(^7\) Also see Kaplan (1987:252-253).
§5.2.5 and will together constitute what is known as an item analysis. The end result will be an attitude scale that will hopefully accurately measure the factors retained as a result of the various processes mentioned above. It will, however, be necessary to pilot test this attitude scale before future research is conducted in order to ensure that the dimensions are still valid for the population to which it is intended to be applied. This will be particularly important if the factor scale is to be applied at any tertiary institution other than Unisa. If such a pilot test reconfirms the existence of the relevant factors for the target population, then it is possible, I believe, that such an attitude scale can be used in a full-scale research effort on the attitudes of L1-African language students towards the use of the African languages as LOLT at Unisa or even other tertiary institutions.

4.4 Summary

This chapter's purpose has been to justify the use of the methodologies employed in this research and to deal with some of the practical issues relating to the implementation of these methodologies. The justification of the methodologies used in this research was provided in §4.2. In particular, §4.2.1 provided the background and reasons for the use of an analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties as well as for the use of individual interviews. The main focus was on explaining the nature of such analyses, on dealing with some of the problems associated with individual interviews and other direct measures of language attitudes; and on providing reasons for the selection of a general interview guide approach for the individual interviews. Next, §4.2.2 provided reasons for the use of a questionnaire in this research, as opposed to the use of the MGT. Focus was placed on the inappropriateness of using the MGT in the particular context of this research. Section 4.2.3 then looked at the nature of factor analysis and its applicability to the field of language-attitude research. Issues relating to current deficiencies extant in much language-attitude research, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, were dealt with as part and parcel of outlining the possible benefits of making use of a statistical method such as factor analysis. Section 4.2.4 then looked at some of the issues that need to be taken into consideration when constructing an attitude scale. Important in this regard were the concepts of reliability and validity.
The focus of the chapter then shifted in §4.3 to the implementation of the methodologies. First, §4.3.1 looked briefly at the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties, while §4.3.2 discussed the individual interviews. Focus then fell in §4.3.3 on the implementation of the mini-survey: information is provided on the number of belief statements included in the questionnaire and the number of respondents surveyed; issues dealt with include that of ambiguity, vagueness and representativeness. The factor analysis was the next point of discussion - in §4.3.4. This section included information on the actual procedures followed as part and parcel of a more general, step-by-step discussion of the methodological significance of the main steps in factor analysis. Lastly, §4.3.5 discussed the importance of an item analysis.
Chapter 5

Results

5.1 Introduction
The task of this chapter is to provide details of the results of each of the research methods outlined in §4.3. The chapter begins with the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties (§5.2.1) and with the individual interviews (§5.2.2). It then proceeds with a brief discussion of the mini-survey results (§5.2.3). Lastly, the chapter provides the results of both the factor extraction and rotation (§5.2.4) and the statistical analysis of reliability (§5.2.5) which will be used later in the item analysis in §6.4. The emphasis in this chapter is on the provision of raw data¹. A full discussion of the results is the task of Chapter 6.

5.2 The results
5.2.1 The analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties
As mentioned in §4.3.1 one aim of this analysis was to provide a broad impressionistic overview of the determinants of Unisa's LOLT policy and the language attitudes of its students. Its main aim, however, is to provide a framework, along with the theory provided in Chapter 1, for deciding which factors to retain for the final attitude scale. The role of such an analysis in this regard has already been touched upon in §4.3.4. This part of the methodology has been divided into two parts. The first part, which provides a general narrative of the language question in South Africa, which a particular focus on the LOLT issue, is contained in §3.3. Historical data of this kind, however, needs to be subject to a theoretical framework for analysis (St. Clair 1982:164). The application of such a framework is contained in §6.2 and the results of the analysis are outlined at the end of this section.

5.2.2 The individual interviews
As discussed in §4.3.2, the role of the individual interviews was to provide belief statements for the questionnaire. The interview guide is provided in Appendix A and

¹. The exception to this rule is the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties which is, of course, in itself a form of analysis.
summarised transcripts of each of the interviews are provided in Appendix C. The belief statements were derived with little change from comments made by the interviewees.

5.2.3 The mini-survey

The aim of the mini-survey, as pointed out in §4.3.3, was to provide data for the factor analysis. It was not the role of the survey to provide any indication of the current language attitudes of L1-African language students at Unisa. Given that much language-attitude research that has been conducted in South Africa makes use of unanalyzed survey data of this kind it was, however, decided to provide the results of the mini-survey for interested readers. Given the fact that the graphic presentation of the results for each belief statement takes up a substantial amount of space it was decided to place these results in an appendix, i.e. Appendix D. The following statistics are provided for each belief statement: the mean score (M), the standard deviation (SD) and the frequency for each response category (Y-axis). Given that the total number of respondents was 100 the percentage response for each response category has not been provided, since the frequency and percentage would be identical. The key for the response categories (X-axis) is as follows: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, NS=Not Sure, D=Disagree and SD=Strongly Disagree. Scores for the mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) have been determined by assigning a score of 5 to a response in the response category “Strongly Agree”, a score of 4 to a response in the response category “Agree”, etc., when an indication of strong agreement was viewed, prior to the scoring of each belief statement (see Oppenheim 1966:134), as supporting the use of the African languages as LOLT. When a strong agreement was viewed as being against the use of the African language as LOLT the opposite procedure was followed, i.e. a score of 5 was assigned to a response in the response category “Strongly Disagree”, etc. As in the example questionnaire itself (Appendix B) statements of the second kind have been italicised. Readers should, however, be very cautious about drawing any conclusion from the results contained in Appendix D about the language attitudes of the respondents. Without subjection to factor analysis and item analysis it is impossible to tell which belief statements measure the same thing or, for that matter, what any particular belief statement measures.
5.2.4 The factor analysis

As outlined in §4.2.3 as well as §4.3.4 the aim of factor analysis is to determine the factors underlying the mini-survey results. In other words, the aim of the factor analysis is to determine, based on the mini-survey results, which belief statements belong with each other, or, in technical terms, which belief statements covary with each other. In more general terms the role of the factor analysis will be to determine which factors to retain for final inclusion in the factor scale. Once the number of factors has been determined (factor extraction) and once the belief statements loading on each of the factors have been determined (factor rotation) it is then possible to compare the content of each of the factors with the theory contained in Chapter 1 as well as the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties contained in §3.3. and §6.2. If any of the factors are supported by the theory and the data then there is sufficient motivation to regard the belief statements relating to the particular factor as referring to a dimension i.e. something real in the world. Only factors which are supported in this fashion by the theory and sociohistorical data are then included, as dimensions, in the final attitude scale.

Looking now at the actual factor analysis conducted in this research, we begin, as outlined in §4.3.4 with the first step which is data collection and the correlation matrix. Given, however, that this step, in practice, simply involves providing the computer programme with the results of the questionnaire survey, it would appear unnecessary to provide the reader with a collection of unanalysed data.

Of greater importance is the next step, i.e. the factor extraction. The eigenvalues produced as a result of the principal component analysis is provided in Figure 1 below. As can be seen from this chart the total number of factors with eigenvalues equal to or higher than 1.00 is quite large. There are, in fact, 19 such factors. Factor 20 has an eigenvalue of 0.9304. Given that parsimony (i.e. the desirability of having a substantially smaller number of factors than original variables) is one of the main aims of factor analysis (Zeller & Carmines 1980:20) the retention of 19 factors for purposes of rotation seems to defeat the point.
As mentioned in §4.3.4 there is, however, an alternative test known as the scree-test, which is based on a simple examination of the relevant so-called scree graph or plot. The procedure is simply to ‘stop factoring at the point where the eigenvalues ... begin to level off forming a straight line with an almost horizontal slope’ (Kim & Mueller 1978b:44). If one looks carefully at the scree plot provided as Figure 1 one can easily see that the horizontal slope begins after 5 factors. Based on this method, therefore, it was decided to retain five factors for the next stage of the factor analysis i.e. the factor rotation. As further justification for the retention of only these five factors one need only look at the amount of variance accounted for by these five factors alone which is 41% of the variance in the data. Table 1 below provides data on the eigenvalues of each of the first five factors:
### Table 1: degree of variance explained by each factor (before rotation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>12.258</td>
<td>4.5486</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>2.7801</td>
<td>2.2552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional²</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative³</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step in any factor analysis is the rotation to a terminal solution. As mentioned in §4.3.4 the task of factor rotation is to determine which belief statements load significantly on each of the extracted factors. Appendix E provides the factor loadings for variables (i.e. belief statements) on each factor of the five factor solution⁴. The factor loadings can be interpreted as the degree to which the variable (or belief statement) is representative of any particular factor. "A factor loading is the correlation of an item with a factor" (Zeller & Carmines 1980:35). As in the case of standard correlation coefficients, the factor loadings cannot be greater than 1.00. The reader will notice that only those variables with a factor loading of greater than or equal to 0.3 or equal to or less than -0.3 have been retained (Comrey & Lee 1992:242-244). Negative values have been retained since such belief statements can also help determine the thematic continuity underlying the factor (Baxter 2001), i.e. they can tell us what disagreement with the belief statements implies.

In Appendix F the reader will find a list of the actual belief statements retained for each factor. The belief statements in Appendix F are provided in order of their strength of relatedness (i.e. in terms of their factor loadings). Together the data

---

2. This row indicates the percentage of variance accounted for by each factor.

3. The percentages provided in this row are cumulative, i.e. the figure provided for each factor (e.g. factor 2) is the sum of the percentage of variance explained by that factor and those preceding it (i.e. factor 1).

4. The term factor solution refers to the outcome of the factor extraction, i.e. if five factors are extracted using, for example, the scree-plot test, then we have a five-factor solution.
provided in Appendix E and F will, in the end, help to indicate whether these factors are actual dimensions. This entails an analysis of the belief statements in terms of the theory and the sociohistorical data. This task in taken up in §6.3.

In addition, Table 2 below provides the intercorrelations between the various factors of the solution. As pointed out in Zeller & Carmines (1980:44) ‘rotation allows factors to be correlated with one another; ... many of the phenomena in the real world are related to one another’. In other words, although the point of factor analysis is to uncover the separate dimensions underlying a range of variables, this does not mean that the dimensions themselves cannot be interrelated in some fashion. These intercorrelations will be used occasionally in §6.3 to support the analysis of which factors should be retained for final inclusion in the attitude scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values have been multiplied by 100 and rounded to the nearest integer.

5.2.5 The analysis of reliability

As stated in §4.3.5 the role of the analysis of reliability is to guide the item analysis (§6.4) in terms of determining which belief statements to retain in the final attitude scale. The results of such an analysis of reliability are contained in Appendix G. An item analysis does not depend solely, however, on statistical considerations. As outlined in §4.2.4 there are a range of issues that need to be dealt with during attitude scale construction. This task of construction is the topic of §6.4.
5.3 Conclusion

This chapter was dedicated to the presentation of the results of each of the research methods used in the research, i.e. the analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties, the individual interviews, the mini-survey, factor extraction and rotation and the analysis of reliability.

Further discussion and analysis remains to be conducted, however, before the research aims and goals outlined in §1.4 are met. First of all the application of a theoretical framework to the sociohistorical data provided in Chapter 3 needs to be conducted. This will guide the second form of analysis, i.e. the determination of which factors to retain after the factor rotation. The last form of analysis (the item analysis) is then based on the analysis of reliability provided in §5.2.5 above and the issues dealt with in §4.2.4, and relates directly to one of the main goals of the current research which is the construction of a viable attitude scale. These tasks are taken up in the next chapter.
Chapter 6

Discussion of results and instrument construction

6.1 Introduction

This chapter has two main aims, the discussion and analysis of results and the construction of the final attitude scale.

The chapter begins in §6.2 with an analysis of the sociohistorical data provided in Chapter 3 in terms of the theory provided in Chapter 2. Of particular relevance will be SIT (see §2.2.1 and §2.2.2), Giles et al.'s (1977) application of SIT to language attitudes (see §2.5.2) and Ryan et al.'s (1982) framework of language preference patterns (see §2.5.2)\(^1\). As mentioned in §4.2.1 this is in line with St. Clair’s (1982:164) requirement of providing more than simply a list of historical facts when attempting to describe the sociohistorical genesis of language attitudes: such an attempt requires the application of a theoretical framework. The results of the analysis contained in §6.2 belongs more properly to this chapter than Chapter 5 since these results will, in a direct fashion, guide the analysis contained in §6.3, which deals with the choice of factors to consider for inclusion in the final attitude scale. Given that §6.2 will be, in effect, a synthesis of theory and sociohistorical data it can be effectively employed to whether or not the belief statements representative of any factor in question concur with a dimension in the real world.

The next section (§6.4) then deals directly with an item analysis and the construction of the final attitude scale. Both statistical (i.e. the analysis of reliability contained in §5.2.5) and other methodological considerations (i.e. the issues dealt with in §4.2.4) are taken into account in the construction of the attitude scale. The final attitude scale is provided in §6.4.5.

\(^1\) Where concepts or theories from other sections of Chapter 2 are utilised, the relevant section will be specifically mentioned in the body of the text.
6.2 The analysis of the societal treatment of language varieties

As already pointed out in §3.5 the relatively high-status of English and the relatively low-status\^2 of the various African languages and the related attitudes towards these languages, both in the educational domain and in broader terms, cannot be explained in terms of the number of L1-speakers of these languages. From the demographic data provided in §3.2 we can see that speakers who have an African language as their L1 constituted approximately three-quarters of the South African population in 1996, whereas L1-English speakers constituted only 8.5% of the population. We might be tempted to explain the high-status of English in terms of its use as a lingua franca among L1-African language speakers, but it is worthwhile repeating Branford's (1996:43) observation that 'there are in South Africa substantial numbers of blacks whom English has barely reached or not reached at all'. It is also a moot point whether the use of English as a lingua franca among L1-African language speakers is a cause of its high-status, a result of its high-status or both. Suffice it to say that an explanation of the differential in status between English and the African languages needs to be explained in terms of other, non-demographic factors.

A better understanding of the mentioned differential is, I believe, to be gleaned from an attempt to explain the sociohistorical data provided in §3.3, in terms of the theory provided in Chapter 2. It should be noted here, before proceeding with the actual analysis, that what is provided can only be construed as a speculative reconstruction of events, based on the application of one theory. This reservation is especially applicable to the earlier historical periods under discussion given that no research was undertaken at the time to determine what the perceptions and attitudes of the individuals concerned might have been. It would be nice to assert that from the early 1970s onwards, however, we could supplement the reconstruction with evidence from language-attitude research conducted since this period, but as indicated in §3.4.5, a review of this research shows conflicting results.

---

2. I am using the term status here in the same way as Ryan, Giles & Sebastian (1982) and deliberately avoiding the term ethnolinguistic vitality since this term encompasses both status and vitality factors. It would, therefore, be premature (and probably wrong) to assert at this stage of the analysis that the ethnolinguistic groups related to the African languages have low ethnolinguistic vitality.
Beginning with the first two periods of colonisation in South Africa i.e. the Dutch (§3.3.1) and the British (§3.3.2), one can begin with the broad generalisation that the L1-African language speakers, with a few exceptions, generally formed the minority group in South Africa, whereas the colonists (be they Dutch or British) formed the majority (dominant) group\(^3\). Moreover, membership of any one of these groups was a relatively clear-cut affair, based as it was on an easily perceivable characteristic i.e. skin colour\(^4\); as such the societal division prevalent at the time could be classified as a caste system (see §2.2.3).

As mentioned in §2.2.2 members of minority groups often display a negative social identity, given that they often adopt the values and judgements of the majority group. In the South African context this refers to the so-called colonisation of the African mind which relates in general terms to the observation that many L1-African language speakers adopted negative attitudes towards their own cultures and languages while at the same time valorising the language and culture of the coloniser. People generally, however, are motivated to change their social identity into a positive one and much can be explained by considering the possible strategies employed by members of the indigenous minority group to initiate such a change. Note that I am referring here solely to those sectors of the indigenous population which had undergone full colonisation at any particular time. Especially during the earlier periods of colonisation there were, of course, many sectors of the indigenous population which only had marginal contact with the colonists or, in some cases, no contact at all. The framework of SIT simply does not apply to such cases, given that we are not dealing in such cases with the social dynamics within one society, but with contact between two or more different societies.

6.2.1 The Dutch period of colonisation

In the case of the Dutch period of colonisation it might be safely assumed that, except in the

\(3. \) Again, in the use of the terms minority and majority, we are not dealing here with relative numerical strength but with differences in power.

\(4. \) I am deliberately avoiding mention of the so-called coloured population here, given that they play no role in this research. Moreover, I do not wish to enter into discussion about the different ethnolinguistic groups comprising the black minority, given that it is a debatable point whether the individuals concerned did have a sense of ingroup membership based on the ethnic divisions (e.g. isiXhosa, Sesotho) extant today.
minority of cases, there was little belief in the possibility of individual social mobility, i.e. the boundaries between the minority and majority groups was not viewed as permeable. It would seem logical, therefore, to assume that those sectors of the early local population which had been subject to direct colonisation, would have adopted some form of social change belief structure. The reader is to be reminded here that the various strategies subsumed under the rubric social change do not only refer to strategies that involve direct competition with the majority group but that they also refer to strategies such as the discovery of new dimensions of comparison or a re-evaluation of a particular attribute (§2.2.2).

As mentioned in §2.2.2 the exact kind of strategy employed depends in part on whether members of the minority group believe the existing power structures to be stable and legitimate. No doubt various strategies were employed during the early periods of colonisation and any attempt to determine what these might have been at any given period of time, and for any particular sub-section of the indigenous population, would require an in-depth study of the events of the period. Furthermore, since this period of colonisation was characterised by a language shift from the indigenous languages to Dutch (Smit 1996:57) it is unlikely that the particular social change strategies employed related to attitudes towards the indigenous languages. This is because such strategies would, in all likelihood, entail the generation of positive attitudes and attachments to the indigenous languages; hardly a basis for language shift.

Given that there was probably very little opportunity for members of the minority group to engage in social mobility, one can conclude that the shift towards Dutch by members of the indigenous groups was, initially at least, mostly a matter of pure instrumentality, and was not indicative of an attempt to integrate themselves into the majority group. As emphasised in §2.2.5 it can be the case that a new language is adopted without any intention, or possibility, of using this language as a marker of majority group social identity. Moreover, as pointed out by Smit (1996:57), the language shift from the indigenous languages to Dutch was characterised by the development of a local variety of Dutch, i.e. Afrikaans, which served the instrumental function of facilitating communication between the coloniser and colonised. Given that the colonisation of the KhoiKhoi in particular went hand in hand with the death of the Khoe languages it seems certain that the social change strategies employed by this group were not directed towards the indigenous languages.
6.2.2 The British period of colonisation

With the advent of British colonialism and the missionary school system it appears that there was some opportunity for a small segment of the local population to engage in a form of social mobility. A small black middle-class came into existence and it was primarily this class that ‘adopted an elitist and patronising attitude towards the languages of the people’ (Alexander 1989:29). It would appear, therefore, that an explanation of the behaviour of this segment of the indigenous population fits neatly into the SIT schema. These individuals perceived group boundaries to be permeable and thus engaged in social mobility while at the same time adopting the various markers of majority-group social identity, one of which was fluency in English. It seems likely, therefore, that the attitudes of this elite group to English were positive, at least in the beginning, for both status and social identity reasons, i.e. pattern A in Ryan et al.’s (1982) framework of language pattern preferences - see §2.5.2. It seems unlikely, however, on reflection, that many of these individuals were recognised as fully-fledged members of the majority group, given that race was still a definitive basis of social categorisation. On the one hand there appears, as evidenced by the quote from Alexander (1989:29), to have been some identification with the majority group. On the other hand, many of these individuals were involved, in various ways, with the early resistance movement and with the development of African nationalism; an involvement based ostensibly on some form of identification with the large majority of the African population. This apparent contradiction could be resolved in a number of different ways, depending again on a close analysis of the events of the time. Firstly, it is feasible that the individuals in question attempted integration into the majority group based on a false perception of the permeability of group boundaries. On discovering that majority-group membership was unlikely, given the racial prejudices of the time, these individuals began, to varying degrees, to adopt a social change belief structure. This would explain the close connection between African nationalism and the black middle-class. Once this transition had taken place the cultural capital acquired during the prior attempt at integration was viewed in a purely instrumental light. English for one was viewed as a ‘vehicle of a wider African nationalism’ (Brown 1988/9:41), i.e. not as a marker of African identity, but as a practical means for improving the socioeconomic status of

---

5. In this regard the reader is referred back to §2.2.2 where it is argued that the majority group often has an interest in misrepresenting the possible likelihood of successful social mobility.
the majority of South Africans. Again, when assessing the possible attitudes of the majority of the indigenous population (i.e. those who were not middle-class) we can speculate that although there was some colonisation of the African mind, the use of English was generally for instrumental purposes and was not used as a marker of social group identity and that the indigenous languages were still important as markers of social identity i.e. pattern B in Ryan et al.'s (1982) framework of language preference patterns.

6.2.3 The Apartheid years

Turning now to the Apartheid years, generally speaking it would seem that the hope of the architects of Bantu Education was to tap into the various ethnic identities, real or imagined, of the African population. On the surface this appealed to notions of African nationalism, which explains the 'certain degree of hegemony on the question of the vernacular in education ... sustained as a result of an appeal to the real sentiment surrounding the vernacular' (Brown 1988/9:43). The real reasons, however, were to augment the status of Afrikaans vis-à-vis English and to prevent the dissolution of a pliable source of labour. This is not to say that all architects of Bantu Education were cynical enough to state the rationale of the system this bluntly. No doubt many were engaged in an idealistic rationalisation which appealed to the well-documented merits of mother-tongue education and to the principle of cultural and linguistic preservation.

The hegemony referred to was, however, not long-lasting. The ensuing resistance to Bantu Education would appear to be based on two broad considerations. Firstly, a belief in English as a means of individual socioeconomic advancement, as well as a perception of English as a language of African nationalism and liberation. Secondly, an aversion, based on common-sense, towards the use of both Afrikaans and English as LOLT, particularly when it meant writing examinations in both these languages 'at the end of one year's experience of using the dual medium approach' (Hartshorne 1987:95). At the same time it would appear that as a result of the association of mother-tongue education with Bantu Education, attitudes towards the use of these languages as LOLT became relatively negative, an analysis supported by the limited use of the African languages as LOLT in the Bantustans and by the fact that the Education Bill of 1979, as a result of immense public pressure, made provision for the use of English from Standard 3

---

6. Although presumably to only some sectors of this movement given that, as mentioned before, many in the movement saw English as a 'vehicle of a wider African nationalism' (Brown 1988/9:41).
upwards. Even though the African languages were seen in a negative light in terms of their use as LOLT it is unlikely, however, that these languages lost their importance as markers of social identity. English was generally, during this period, regarded favourably for instrumental reasons.

A different attitude towards English was, however, in the making, even during the Apartheid years. It has its roots in the writings of Joseph Nhlapo as well as in the support of the vernacular by the South African Communist Party in the 1930s and 1940s (see §3.3.2). It is also indirectly evident in the provisions of the Freedom Charter, drawn up in 1955, which 'called for equal language rights and the rights of all people to develop their cultures' (Marivate 1992:107). It is clear that by the late 1980s the status of English as a language of liberation was being questioned.

6.2.4 The New South Africa
The colonial status of English is directly alluded to, in decidedly negative terms, at a 1990 language workshop held in Harare (Marivate 1992:152). Although perhaps originally only a concern of the black intelligentsia, the perception of English as 'a vehicle for hegemony that may undermine participatory democracy' (Crawhall 1993:9) underlies many proclamations, policy statements and legislative provisions of the first few years of the New South Africa, not least of which is the Constitution, although one of the unstated rationales for the final form of the language provisions of the final Constitution was, in all likelihood, that by adopting all the main languages of South Africa as official languages, it avoided any ethnic conflict that might otherwise have arisen as a result of choosing a smaller number of indigenous languages.

Other important reflections of the emphasis on multilingualism and parity between the various languages of South Africa are the establishment of both the Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) and Language Plan Task Group (LANGTAG) in 1996 as well as various Department of Education (DOE) documents supporting multilingualism in education and the right of students to decide through which language they would like to be taught.

6.2.5 Conclusion
From the above analysis one can generate a number of generalisations regarding the nature of the language attitudes of L1-African language speakers as well as the possible concerns which underlie these attitudes. These generalisations are as follows:
1. Positive attitudes of L1-African language speakers towards English have, generally, from the beginning of the colonial period to the present day, been more a matter of instrumental orientation than indicative of a desire to employ English as a marker of social identity (i.e. integrative orientation) - this instrumental orientation to English comes in two forms. Firstly, as a means towards individual socioeconomic advancement. Secondly, English is viewed as vehicle of African liberation. In both cases the emphasis seems to be more on the utility of English for advancing the socioeconomic and political status of the African population, rather than as a resource for mass social mobility and integration into the majority so-called white group. Since the 1990s this instrumental orientation towards English has been supported by the status of English as an international language and the utility of English as a basis for cross-cultural communication.

2. For L1-African language speakers the African languages still play a very important role as markers of social group identity (i.e. the integrative orientation). This relates to concerns about the shift from the L1 to English and the existence and purity of the relevant African languages.

3. Negative attitudes towards the African languages among the L1-African language speakers have been most strong among the middle-class black elite but mostly only related to the perception that these languages are not useful for instrumental purposes.

4. Some negativity towards English as a colonial language was generated from the late 1980s onwards, particularly among the black intelligentsia. Related to this development was the gradual evolution of a belief in the principle of multilingualism, the equality of all languages and of cultural and linguistic rights, principles which were entrenched in the 1990s. Overt negative attitudes towards English are, however, likely to be overshadowed by the instrumental orientation mentioned in (1) above. Rather a positive attitude towards language rights, language equality and multilingualism seems to be the norm of expression.
5. Negative attitudes towards the use of African languages as LOLT and towards African ethnicity were at least to some degree generated by the association of mother-tongue education with Bantu Education. This seems to be related to concerns about lack of unity among the various African ethnolinguistic groups in South Africa. It would appear that it is in this light that English needs to be understood as a language of unity and as a carrier of sorts of African nationalism. There is also ample evidence to suggest that this positive perception of English is to be contrasted with a negative perception of Afrikaans, mainly in terms of its association with Bantu Education and the divide-and-rule tactics that were behind this system. Given the focus on cultural and linguistic rights outlined in (4) above, negative attitudes informed by the possible divisive consequences of using the L1s as LOLT, if in existence, are not likely to be expressed. It is likely that the focus on rights etc. has overshadowed such negative attitudes.

6. Attitudes towards the use of various languages as LOLT (both African languages and English) are often based on practical considerations specific to the domain in question (education in general or tertiary education in particular), the classical example being the difficulty of having two LOLT, both of which are not the L1, during the period of Bantu Education just preceding the Soweto Riots).

In conclusion, the above analysis has provided us with a rough idea of some of the concerns that might conceivably underlie the attitudes of L1-African language speakers and thus, possibly, L1-African language students at Unisa. More importantly this analysis has provided us with a basis on which to determine which factors to include in the final attitude scale. This will be the task of the next section. If the theme of any particular factor is supported by the analysis provided above then there is good reason to view the belief statements loading on this factor as referring to something in the real world i.e. that they relate to a dimension. Moreover, if there is a thematic link between the factor and the analysis provided above then there is equally good reason to include the factor in the final attitude scale.

7. Readers are referred back to §4.2.3 for an explanation of the distinction between a factor and a dimension.
6.3 The factor analysis results

6.3.1 Introduction

The analysis provided in the previous section has been generally impressionistic in nature, but it has provided us with a relatively grounded idea as to the possible issues which underlie the attitudes of the relevant respondents. This qualitative analysis will now be used to guide the final step in the factor analysis. This entails, as outlined in §4.3.4 and §5.2.4, deciding which factors to retain for final inclusion in the attitude scale. It will be recalled that the details of this step involve searching for some thematic continuity that exists between the various items that have loaded on any particular factor under consideration. If, in addition, this theme seems to be supported by theory and the sociohistorical data, then one can be relatively secure in one’s assertion that the factor refers to a de facto dimension. Lastly, once some of the factors have been confirmed as being related to some real dimension, it is then possible to use these confirmed factors to structure an attitude scale. The rest of this section will thus be dedicated to the provision of arguments, with reference to the data contained in Appendixes E and F, for either the retention or rejection of a particular factor for final inclusion in an attitude scale. The next section (§6.4) will then look at the results of the analysis of reliability provided in §5.2.5, which will, in combination with an application of the principles of attitude-scale construction outlined in §4.2.4, guide an item analysis and the construction of an attitude scale that can be usefully employed in future research at Unisa and other tertiary institutions in South Africa.

6.3.2 Factor 1

Beginning with factor 1 of the five-factor solution we note that almost all of the belief statements deal with practical issues relating to the possible use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa e.g.

- the practical advantages of using the African languages vis-à-vis the disadvantages of using only English (items 15, 28, 7, 5, 2, 31, 39, 17, 1, 61);
- problems relating to which African languages to use first (items 20, 6); and

---

8. Note that the analysis contained in the previous section is a synthesis of the theory contained in Chapter 2 and the sociohistorical data contained in Chapter 3. It is thus suitable for the task mentioned.

9. Readers will need to refer to Appendix F in particular in order to follow the discussion of each factor.
general practical issues (item 4)

Readers will recall that at the end of the previous section such practical issues were highlighted as one of the possible concerns underlying the attitudes of L1-African language speakers. The fact that the vast majority of the items seem to share this theme is evidence enough for an assertion that it relates to a de facto dimension and for the inclusion of this factor in a final attitude scale.

Some discussion, however, of the few items that seem to not belong to this factor (in terms of their theme) seem in order. The most important two items in this regard, since they both had relatively high factor loadings (67 and 60 respectively) are items 35 and 11. The inclusion of these items in this group is on the surface slightly problematic given that they appear to relate more to another issue, i.e. negative attitudes towards English as colonial language and the principle of language equality and language rights. One might argue, however, that their inclusion is understandable given that, like the other items, they relate to the domain in question (i.e. Unisa in particular or education in general) and that, indirectly at least, it deals with the effects of using the African languages, i.e. that using the African languages will be a fulfilment of students’ rights. The same consideration applies equally to item 40, although this item is less of a concern given that it only loads at 52 on the factor concerned. The other item of concern is item 19, which loads at 54 and which seems to relate more to concerns with the symbolic value of the African languages. The inclusion of this item is, indeed, difficult to account for but one might argue that its relatedness has to do with the fact that the exclusion of African languages as LOLT at tertiary and other educational levels is being recognized by these students as being instrumental in the perceived shift of the speakers of these languages towards English, i.e. towards the ‘killing of the African languages’. In other words, in a practical sense, one of the advantages of using the African languages as LOLT would be to reverse the mentioned shift.

10. See no. 6 in §6.2.5.
11. Readers are referred to Appendix E for the factor loadings of each belief statement or item.
12. See no. 4 in §6.2.5.
13. See no. 2 in §6.2.5.
It appears, therefore, that there is enough evidence of a common theme to the items loading on Factor 1 and that this theme is supported by the analysis contained in §6.2. It seems, therefore, that this factor relates to a real dimension and that this factor should be included in the final attitude scale. As a precautionary measure, however, those items that seem only peripherally related to the central theme (items 35, 11, 40 & 19) will be excluded from consideration when, in the next section, a decision will be taken as to which items to include in the attitude scale. As an aside, the belief items which loaded negatively on the factor (items 51 and 33) also provide some support for the analysis above i.e. it is intuitively satisfying that disagreement with the positive belief statements which loaded on this factor would imply agreement with the negative belief statements, i.e. a lack of belief in the utility of the African languages as LOLT implies a belief in the sole use of English as LOLT.

6.3.3 Factor 2

Moving on to factor 2 we note, firstly, that it does not relate unambiguously with any one of the issues dealt with at the end of the previous section, but rather with several. Thus item 16, 51, 60 and 57 relate to an instrumental orientation towards English\textsuperscript{14}. Items 12 and 54, on the other hand, relate to the idea of English as language of unity\textsuperscript{15}. As for the rest of the items that load on this factor we can see that they either have to do with the practical advantages of English as LOLT at Unisa vis-à-vis the African languages (items 52, 44 and 37) or with general statements about the role of English as LOLT at Unisa (items 36 and 43). But although this factor does not relate to any one of the concerns dealt with in §6.2.5 it is obvious enough that the belief statements together have some thematic uniformity i.e. they all focus to a large degree on the role of English. In general terms, what these results appear to be reflecting is that, historically, considerations relating to the instrumental utility of English have, in the mind of L1-African language speakers, become closely linked with notions of English as language of unity, a fact borne out I believe by the fact that the ability to use English as a lingua franca within South Africa has both instrumental value and is a channel of communication between the different African ethnolinguistic groups, i.e. it is viewed as a basis for South African unity. In specific terms (i.e. with reference to the Unisa students) this notion of English as both language of social

\textsuperscript{14} See no. 1 in §6.2.5.

\textsuperscript{15} See no. 5 in §6.2.5.
advancement and language of unity has in all likelihood combined with beliefs and opinions about its utility and role in tertiary education, to form an overarching factor which has English-in-general as its thematic focus. Future research will need to investigate the sub-factors of this overarching factor, but for the purposes of this research (i.e. for the construction of the attitude scale) I believe there to be enough reason for the use of this factor as a general indicator of attitudes towards English in its various roles.

More evidence for the retention of factor 2 is, I believe, also provided by the fact that the intercorrelation between factors 1 and 2 is -40 (see §5.2.4). This indicates that, to the degree mentioned, agreement with statements loading on factor 1 means disagreement with the items loading on factor 2, a tendency which makes intuitive sense given that one would expect a tendency in some respondents, who believed in the usefulness of the L1 in tertiary education, to be inclined to disagree with statements that paint English in a positive light. Of course the lack of complete correlation also means that there are likely to be students who have positive attitudes both towards English (with regard to the various issues subsumed under factor 2) and towards the practical advantages of using the African languages as LOLT (factor 1). This might be indicative of a desire for dual or multi-medium tuition. Lastly, looking at the item which loaded negatively on this factor (item 59) one can say that its presence is understandable, though largely uninteresting for the purposes of this research. It seems plausible that a negative attitude towards English might imply a more positive attitude towards the use of Afrikaans, given that a rejection of the Afrikaans language, historically-speaking, seems to go hand in hand with an acceptance of English as language of unity and social development (see §3.3.3).

6.3.4 Factor 3

Moving on to factor 3 we notice that in all cases, except one (item 34), the items can be seen to be related to issues of language rights, language equality etc. It could be argued that item 18 is just as much related to practical concerns, but at the same time one could view its inclusion in this factor as indicative of a perception of all languages as having equal expressive potentiality. Even if this interpretation is not accepted, however, its inclusion under this factor is not that

16. See no. 4 in §6.2.5.

17. See no. 6 in §6.2.5.
problematic given that the majority of items still share a common theme and, furthermore, given that this item has the lowest factor loading of all the items (i.e. 31) and is thus likely to be excluded from admission into the attitude scale. With regard to item 34, however, we need to be more perspicacious. This item has, after all, the highest loading on this factor (viz. 79) and seems to be related, contrary to the other items, to the symbolic, integrative value of the L1. The inclusion of item 34 in this factor should, however, not be construed as a problem, but rather as instructive and pointing to the close connection between an integrative orientation to a language (especially a minority one) and principles relating to linguistic and cultural equality and parity i.e. to a conflation of (2) and (4) in §6.2.5 into one overarching factor. I believe that the postulation of such an overarching factor is unproblematic given the intuitive connection between a social group having a language as a marker of social identity and this same group adopting beliefs relating to linguistic equality and rights. No doubt the entrenchment of these principles is seen as one step towards ensuring the continued maintenance of the relevant language of identity.

Of interest too is the positive correlation between factors 1 and 3 (i.e. 36 - see §5.2.4), which seems to indicate that for some respondents a belief in the practical utility of the African languages is related to some degree with principles of language equality etc. There is also some negative correlation between factors 2 and 3 (viz. -19), which might indicate some relatedness between a positive attitude towards English and a low concern with issues of language equality or, on the other hand, a negative attitude towards English and a high concern with such issues. Lastly, the items that loaded negatively on factor 3 appear to provide support for the above characterisation of this factor (i.e. items 54 and 3). It seems logical that a lack of integrative orientation towards the L1 as well as lack of support for language equality and language rights would go hand in hand with an acceptance of English as unifying factor and a rejection of the use of the African languages as LOLT as impractical.

6.3.5 Factor 4
At first glance many of the items included under Factor 4 seem to relate to an elitist adoption of

---

18. See no. 2 in §6.2.5.

19. The opposite is, of course, also applicable i.e. that a low evaluation of the African languages in practical terms relates to an unconcern with issues of cultural and linguistic equality.
negative attitudes towards the African languages i.e. in terms of their lack of instrumental value\textsuperscript{20}. This applies, in particular, to items 30, 45 and 57. The flip side of this appears to be an instrumental orientation towards English (factor 2) e.g. item 49. There does seem, therefore, to be some overlap between factor 2 and factor 4 (thus the positive correlation of 32 between these two factors - see §5.2.4). This can also be deduced from the fact that two of the belief statements that load for factor 4 also load for factor 2 (i.e. items 57 & 37). Furthermore, some of the items included under this factor relate to the practical disadvantages of using the African languages vis-à-vis the advantages of using English (i.e. items 38, 37, 10 and 41) as well as more general issues relating to the use of the African languages (i.e. items 13 and 6). Apart from indicating a lack of thematic continuity among the items loaded on this factor, based on the above it would appear that there is some overlap between factor 4 and factor 1 as well, and in fact one of the belief statements (i.e. item 6) loads on both of these factors. In both cases of overlap, however, the items involved are of the lowest in terms of their factor loadings when it comes to their loadings on factors 1 and 2. As such, the fact that such items load simultaneously on factors 4 and 1 as well as simultaneously on factors 4 and 2 does not detract from the utility of retaining factors 1 and 2 for inclusion in the final attitude scale. On the other hand, given the amount of overlapping with other factors that characterizes the items of factor 4 and given that the items of factor 4 do not in general have high loadings\textsuperscript{21} it is advisable not to include this factor in the final attitude scale.

6.3.6 Factor 5

Lastly, factor 5 seems to represent a rather peculiar combination of concerns relating to the practical disadvantages of using the African languages as LOLT at UNISA and issues relating to Afrikaans, two areas which appear largely unrelated. It might be argued that the items relate to no. 5 in §6.2.5, which deals with the rejection of Afrikaans, negative attitudes towards the African languages due to their association with Bantu Education and positive attitudes towards English as a result thereof, but I am not sure there is enough evidence for this. Even if we grant that this is a valid interpretation, the non-Afrikaans items (52, 44, and 55) all seem to be too closely related to the theme of other factors to warrant the retention of this factor for the attitude

\textsuperscript{20} See no.3 in §6.2.5.

\textsuperscript{21} One sees, for example, that with factors 1, 2 & 3 respectively the top factor loadings are 87, 74 and 79, whereas with factor 4 the top factor loading drops down to 56.
scale. In the light of this lack of thematic continuity between the items which loaded on this factor it seems best to leave this factor out of the final attitude scale. This move is also motivated by the low factor loadings of the items of this factor, i.e. the highest factor loading is 49.

6.3.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, therefore, and from the analysis produced in the preceding sections, I believe it possible, in fulfilment of the first aim set out in §1.4, to make a few generalisations about the dimensions underlying the attitudes of L1-African language students towards the use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa:

1. that domain-specific practical issues constitute the paramount factor in determining the attitudes of L1-African language students towards the use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa: most of these concerns relate specifically to the utility of the African languages for aiding understanding and ensuring higher performance;

2. that a generally positive or negative attitude towards English is also important; this general attitude seems to be a conglomerate one that includes considerations relating to the instrumental value of English, its role as language of unity and its practical value as LOLT at Unisa; and

3. that the presence or absence of an integrative orientation to the African languages (which is at the same time manifested in concerns with the equality of languages and issues of fairness) is also determinative.

It is therefore items relating to these three dimensions that will be retained for inclusion in the final attitude scale that will, hopefully, be suited for use at Unisa and other tertiary institutions in South Africa. Readers will recall from the discussion at the beginning of §4.3.5 that only those factors which have been confirmed by the theory and the sociohistorical data will be retained for final inclusion in the attitude scale.

---

22. It is possible to now call the retained factors (1,2 & 3) dimensions since they have been confirmed by the theoretical and sociohistorical data in the preceding sections. See §4.2.3 for a discussion on the difference between a factor and a dimension.  

23. In other words, only those factors which qualify as dimensions.
6.4 The item analysis and attitude scale construction

6.4.1 Introduction

The aim of this section is the construction of an attitude scale that might be used to conduct research on the attitudes of L1-African language students towards the use of the African languages as LOLT, both at Unisa and other tertiary institutions in South Africa. The point of this section is, by conducting an item analysis, to isolate those items that would best represent the three dimensions isolated in the previous section as worth retaining in a final attitude scale. The first step in this procedure was a conventional analysis of reliability as discussed in §5.2.5 and contained in Appendix G. The reader is referred back to §4.3.5 for an explanation of the significance of this sort of analysis. From the data contained in Appendix G one can immediately see that there are a number of items that can be immediately rejected from consideration.

Firstly, of course, all the items relating to factors 4 and 5 can be rejected, given that these factors have been rejected in the previous section (§6.3). Secondly, all those items can be rejected, the exclusion of which would increase the Cronbach Alpha of the factor scale concerned. In other words, those items the exclusion of which would increase the measure of internal consistency of the factor scale, should be rejected for inclusion in the final attitude scale. In the case of Factor 1 these are the two items that loaded negatively on the factor (i.e. items 33 and 51)\(^{24}\). The same applies to factor 2 (item 59) as well as factor 3 (items 54 and 3). The remaining task, therefore, is to decide which other items to exclude from the final attitude scale. This task will be carried on in light of the considerations outlined in §4.2.4 (which outlines some of the problems and issues involved in the construction of attitude scales). It was decided to only extend the item analysis for the three retained factors to the point where five items have been nominated for inclusion in the final attitude scale. This will ensure that each factor is represented by an equal number of belief statements.

6.4.2 Factor 1

Beginning with factor 1, the reader will recall that for the sake of unidimensionality it was decided in the discussion of this factor in §6.3.2 above that those items which only relate

\(^{24}\) Readers are referred to the most right-hand column of each factor scale in Appendix G as well as the Cronbach alpha score which is provided at the top of each factor scale.
peripherally to the central theme of the factor\textsuperscript{25} would be excluded, i.e. items 35, 11, 40 & 19. With the two negative items that have already been excluded from consideration this leaves us with 13 items to consider, i.e. items 15, 28, 20, 7, 5, 2, 31, 39, 17, 1, 4, 6 and 61.

Beginning with items 15 and 28 I believe that these two items should be included in the attitude scale given that they touch on an important issue, i.e. the notion that being taught in one’s L1 aids comprehension and academic performance. It should be noted too that these two items have the highest item-total correlation\textsuperscript{26}, i.e. 0.76 and 0.74 respectively (see §4.3.5 for an explanation of the meaning of these correlations). I believe that both items, however, need some rewording in order to render them more precise, i.e. I suggest that the wording of item 15 be changed to ‘if African languages were for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students would be able to understand courses better’, and item 28 be changed to ‘if African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then the pass rate would be higher’. This amendment to these belief statements will not be problematic given that any attempt to use this attitude scale for survey purposes at Unisa will have to be piloted first in order to ensure that the factors included in the scale apply to the whole of the Unisa population (i.e. it will have to be tested on a representative sample). In the case of extending the attitude scale for use at other tertiary institutions, it will of course be necessary again, for various reasons, to pilot the scale. This will ensure that the factors chosen are still relevant and that the factor scales are still internally consistent. Factor analysis will have to be employed in both cases. The matter of applying the attitude scale for survey purposes at Unisa and other tertiary institutions will be discussed later on in greater depth.

The item with the next highest item-total correlation, item 20, is somewhat problematic mainly because it is unclear whether agreement with this statement implies support for the use of the African languages as LOLT or not. Furthermore, it is a belief statement that will not be generalisable for use at other tertiary institutions where the majority of the student population might come from one ethnolinguistic groups, e.g. Rhodes University where the vast majority of L1-African language speakers are isiXhosa. It was decided therefore to not include this item in

\textsuperscript{25} Practical considerations relating to the use of the African languages as LOLT.

\textsuperscript{26} Readers are referred to the column labelled \textit{Item-Totl Correl.} in each factor scale in Appendix G.
the final attitude scale.

For the same reasons as were advanced for items 15 and 28, it seems logical to retain items 39, 7 and 5 in the scale. Note that item 5 does not deal directly with the advantages of using the African languages as LOLT, but rather with the flip-side of this consideration, i.e. that using English will disadvantage African students.

It seems necessary, however, to change the wording of items 39 and 7. Item 39 should be changed, in order to make it more precise, to ‘if African languages are used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students could express themselves better’. Item 7 needs to be changed for two reasons. Firstly, it should be rephrased to avoid the use of the negative and secondly it needs to be refined in order to reflect the fact that the students being spoken about are L1-African language speakers and that the problems mentioned relate to learning. So the question might be ‘if African languages were used for teaching and learning at UNISA then African students would have less problems with learning’.

Up till this point and with respect to factor 1, we have retained items 15, 28, 39, 7 and 5 for inclusion in the attitude scale. As a result of this item analysis we have managed to retain the five belief statements with the highest item-total correlations which also meet the requirements of attitude scale construction outlined in §4.3.4. The five items for factor 1 are therefore as follows:

- item 15 (if African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students would be able to understand courses better);
- item 28 (if African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then the pass rate would be higher);
- item 39 (if African languages are used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students could express themselves better);
- item 7 (if African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students would have less problems with learning); and
- item 5 (using only English for teaching and learning disadvantages African students)
Turning now to factor 2 we are immediately faced with a problem with respect to the item displaying the highest item-total correlation i.e. item 51, which has an item-total correlation of 0.64. The fact that it has this correlation is, of course, a strong motivation for its retention in the factor scale and its wording appears to be unproblematic. The fact is, however, that this item relates to a broad policy option (a preference) and not to specific considerations that might inform an attitude about such a policy option. It is likely, therefore, that in making their judgments students will draw upon the various dimensions which constitute and underlie the attitude concerned. Furthermore, some of these dimensions are potentially at odds with each other (e.g. positive instrumental attachment to English vis-à-vis the desirability of parity between languages). More importantly, given that a response to this question more than likely draws on considerations which relate more properly to other dimensions it seems that in order to ensure the unidimensionality of this factor, it will be necessary to not include this item, as tempting as it might be.

Unlike item 51, item 60 (which has an item-total correlation of 0.59) is less problematic. It remains true to the theme of the factor and the wording only needs to be slightly amended to make it suitable for inclusion i.e. ‘Using only English for teaching and learning at Unisa is a way of remaining competitive’. There seem to be no problems, however, with item 16 (item-total correlation of 0.59), item 12 (item-total correlation of 0.53), item 54 (item-total correlation of 0.53). Item 44 (item-total correlation of 0.51), however, is problematic given that it does not refer to English directly and is therefore rejected. Item 52 (item-total correlation of 0.49), on the other hand, seems suited for inclusion with a minor revision, i.e. ‘it will be cheaper to use only English for teaching and learning at Unisa’. Again, as with factor 1, only five items will be considered for inclusion in the final attitude scale. So, in conclusion, for factor 2 we have nominated the following five items:

- item 60 (using only English for teaching and learning at Unisa is a way of remaining competitive);
- item 16 (using English gives one a feeling of belonging to the world);
- item 12 (English is a language of unity);
- item 54 (South Africans will be united in education through using English); and
• item 52 (it will be cheaper to use only English for teaching and learning at Unisa)

6.4.4 Factor 3

Moving on to our final factor, factor 3, we begin with the two items with the highest item-total correlations both of which, I believe, qualify for inclusion in the final attitude scale. These are item 34 (item-total correlation of 0.52) and item 23 (item-total correlation of 0.46). Their inclusion is based on the fact that they represent the thematic core of the factor (integrative orientation towards the L1 and concern over language equality and language rights) and that the wording of the questions appears to be suitable, except for a small amendment to item 23: ‘Lecturers at Unisa must be made to learn African languages’. With regard to item 42, however, I believe the charge of being too general can be advanced. It is not clear who should be ‘giving the chance’ and what such a ‘chance’ would entail. Item 42 will, therefore, not be included in the factor scale. Item 21 will, in effect, take its place (item-total correlation of 0.39): this belief statement is more specific and the wording seems fine.

There also seem to be no problems as far as the inclusion of item 46 is concerned (item-total correlation of 0.38). With regard to item 32, however, which is ‘the African languages should be developed in the same way that Afrikaans was,’ the problem is that, especially with the younger students, there might not be any knowledge about the way that Afrikaans was developed in the past. Respondents would, as a consequence be unsure about how to respond to this statement. It has been decided to rather use item 14 (item-total correlation of 0.36) which seems to be well-phrased and related to the thematic core of the factor. With regard to factor 3, then, we are in a position to include the following five items in the final attitude scale:

• item 34 (your mother-tongue plays a big role in your sense of identity);
• item 23 (lecturers at Unisa must be made to learn African languages);
• item 21 (government should do more to help develop the African languages);
• item 46 (all languages are equal); and
• item 14 (in South Africa we need to recognise different cultures and languages)
6.4.5 The attitude scale

Having decided on the belief statements to include in the attitude scale the last task is to decide on the order in which these belief statements should be placed. As discussed in §4.2.4 the sequencing of belief statements in an attitude scale can be of importance given the fact that the contents of an item can have an effect on the response to the belief statement following it. Given that each item is attempting to elicit an unbiased response it is important to minimize as far as possible the effect of belief items on each other. This can be achieved by placing related belief statements as far away from each other as possible. In this context it means distributing the belief statements relating to each factor equally across the attitude scale, i.e. starting with a belief statement related to factor 1, then a belief statement related to factor 2, etc. If this procedure is followed, the following order is achieved:

1. If African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students would be able to understand courses better (item 15)
2. Using only English for teaching and learning at Unisa is a way of remaining competitive (item 60)
3. Your mother-tongue plays a big role in your sense of identity (item 34)
4. If African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then the pass rate would be higher (item 28)
5. Using English gives one a feeling of belonging to the world (item 16)
6. Lecturers at Unisa must be made to learn African languages (item 23)
7. If African languages are used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students could express themselves better (item 39)
8. English is a language of unity (item 12)
9. Government should do more to help develop the African languages (item 21)
10. If African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students would have less problems with learning (item 7)
11. South Africans will be united in education through using English (item 54)
12. All languages are equal (item 46)
13. Using only English for teaching and learning disadvantages African students (item 5)
14. It will be cheaper to use only English for teaching and learning at Unisa (item 52)
In South Africa we need to recognise different cultures and languages (item 14)

The first observation to make about this ordering is that a few of the belief statements related to factor 1 and factor 2 are perhaps too close in content. So for example items 1 and 2 as well as 13 and 14 on the above attitude scale. This problem can be resolved by swapping items 14 and 15 and making item 1 the fifth item. This seems to be the only ordering problem and, as such, the final attitude scale would, therefore, be as follows:

1. Using only English for teaching and learning at Unisa is a way of remaining competitive (item 60)
2. Your mother-tongue plays a big role in your sense of identity (item 34)
3. If African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then the pass rate would be higher (item 28)
4. Using English gives one a feeling of belonging to the world (item 16)
5. If African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students would be able to understand courses better (item 15)
6. Lecturers at Unisa must be made to learn African languages (item 23)
7. If African languages are used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students could express themselves better (item 39)
8. English is a language of unity (item 12)
9. Government should do more to help develop the African languages (item 21)
10. If African languages were used for teaching and learning at Unisa then African students would have less problems with learning (item 7)
11. South Africans will be united in education through using English (item 54)
12. All languages are equal (item 46)
13. Using only English for teaching and learning disadvantages African students (item 5)
14. In South Africa we need to recognise different cultures and languages (item 14)
15. It will be cheaper to use only English for teaching and learning at Unisa (item 52)

Because of the fact that some of the questions have been moved around, future researchers making use of this attitude scale should be careful to keep track of which belief statements relate to which factor. Suggestions and recommendations relating to the use of this attitude
scale for future research are presented in §7.3.

6.5 Summary
After a brief introduction this chapter began in §6.2 with an attempt to integrate the theory provided in Chapter 2 with the sociohistorical data collected in Chapter 3. The aim of this section was to gain an overall impression of the concerns that might underlie the attitudes of L1-African language students towards the LOLT issue at Unisa. More importantly, the generalisations produced as a result of this analysis were used to guide the analysis in §6.3, which was focused on determining which factors to retain for final inclusion in an attitude scale. This was performed on the basis of the thematic continuity of the belief statements loading on a particular factor as well as the confirmation of this theme in the analysis provided in §6.2. As a result it was decided to retain three factors for inclusion in the attitude scale. Generally stated these were:

- considerations relating to practical advantages of using the African languages as LOLT;
- attitudes towards English (dealing mostly with this language’s instrumental value and its role in generating unity); and
- an integrative orientation towards the African languages and a related concern for language equality and language rights.

In §6.4 the final step was taken in the construction of the attitude scale. Important in this section was a discussion relating to which items to include in each sub-scale (or factor scale) of the final attitude scale. Issues dealt with included the item-total correlation of the particular item as well as the wording of the belief statement, i.e. whether or not it had the potential to cause confusion in the mind of the respondent by, for example, not being specific enough in its meaning. As a result of this process 15 items were selected (5 items for each factor scale) for inclusion in the attitude scale. Some time was then spent discussing the issue of how to order the relevant items. Once a decision was made about the re-ordering of a few problematical belief statements, the final attitude scale was presented.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

7.1 Introduction
The task of this chapter is to review the major findings of this study as well as its contribution to language-attitude research. It also reviews the limitations of this study and examines a number of implications that this study has for future research.

7.2 Review
As stated in §1.4 this research had two main aims:

1. to determine the nature of the dimensions underlying the attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students towards the proposed use of African languages as LOLT at Unisa; and
2. to construct an attitude scale that will be of use in future research on attitudes of this kind.

In the next section the major findings and contributions of this study will be discussed with respect to the above-mentioned aims.

7.2.1 Summary of major findings
With regard to aim (1) mentioned in the previous section the study discovered that there were three main dimensions underlying the attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students towards the LOLT issue at Unisa. These are as follows:

1. domain-specific practical issues which constitute the paramount factor in determining the attitudes of L1-African language students; most of these concerns relate specifically to the utility of the African languages for aiding understanding and ensuring higher performance.

2. that a generally positive or negative attitude towards English is also important in determining the relevant attitude; this general dimension seems to be a
conglomerate one that includes considerations relating to the instrumental value of English, its role as language of unity and its practical value as LOLT at Unisa.

3. that the presence or absence of an integrative orientation to the African languages (which is at the same time manifested in concerns with the equality of languages and issues of parity) is also determinative.

As such, through the identification of those dimensions which substantially determine the attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students towards the LOLT issue at Unisa, the first main goal of this research has been achieved.

7.2.2 Contribution of the study
A number of contributions towards language-attitude research in South Africa were made by this study.

Firstly, the exploratory part of the study was able to determine that the language attitudes held by the respondents were indeed complex and multidimensional. This points to the fact that any intention to conduct research into the attitudes of L1-African language tertiary students towards the use of African languages as LOLT needs to take this multidimensional nature into consideration. If researchers wish to conduct more than just an opinion poll of preferences, but wish to instead actually gain a measure of understanding of the nature of the attitudes concerned, an instrument that incorporates this multidimensionality needs to be applied to the act of measurement.

Secondly, it was established that two of the dimensions underlying the relevant attitudes deal, respectively, with beliefs relating to the role played by English in socioeconomic advancement and the symbolic value of the African languages. A dimension which is, I believe, an interesting advancement in terms of our understanding of those consideration that students take into account when making decisions about LOLT policy options, was that of the practical aspects relating to the use of the African languages as LOLT at Unisa. The mere fact that this dimension was accorded prominent position in terms of the factor analysis results implies that, apart
from recognising the conflict between integrative allegiance to the L1 and an instrumental orientation towards English, the preferences of L1-African language speakers are substantially determined by their beliefs regarding the practical utility of using the African languages within the context of teaching and learning in tertiary education. Educators and language planners involved at this level of education need, therefore, to take this dimension into account when planning LOLT policy or language-attitude research.

Most importantly, however, the contribution of this research was the construction of an attitude scale that can be used to faithfully measure the attitudes of L1-African language tertiary-level students to the LOLT issue at South African universities. Essential in this regard is that the attitude scale accommodates the complex, multidimensional nature of language attitudes, in contradistinction to most language-attitude research that has been conducted in South Africa so far. It is hoped, moreover, that the application of attitude scales of this kind (i.e. which have been tested for reliability and validity) will be used extensively for research into the relevant attitudes and that, as a result, the data generated by such research can be meaningfully interpreted and be used with confidence in the planning of LOLT policy at any particular institution. As emphasised in the introductory chapter the importance of this study should not be obscured by the fact that no attempt has been made to assess, opinion-poll fashion, the preferences or attitudes of L1-African language Unisa students. This would, I believe, have generated a body of data with very little predictive or explanatory value and would have simply added to the confusion that appears to be currently endemic to most current language-attitude research in South Africa. Instead, researchers now have at their disposal a reliable instrument that they can apply, with confidence and a few adjustments\(^1\), at practically any tertiary institution in South Africa.

7.2.3 Limitations of the study

No research is devoid of limitations, whether they be theoretical, methodological or both. It is necessary, therefore, in any research, to provide a clear analysis of the relevant limitations involved. The following section is dedicated to this task.

\(^1\) These adjustments are discussed in more detail in §7.3.
On a theoretical level the main limitation of the research was a strong emphasis on SIT and other theoretical frameworks strongly influenced by social-psychological considerations. Although this hardly constitutes a substantive problem, given that this tradition is the dominant one in the field, it would appear to disregard some important issues relating to language attitudes. In particular, the notion of attitudes as discourse, could hardly find a place in a form of research emphasising traditional methods of language-attitude measurement, such as the attitude scale. The possible application of discourse-analytic techniques (as well as Critical Discourse Analysis) to future research into language attitudes is discussed in §7.3, which deals with recommendations for future research.

With regard to the limitations of the methodologies employed in the research the following limitations can be identified:

1. The sociohistorical analysis reported on in Chapter 3 and §6.2 was restricted in terms of the detail it was able to provide with respect to the attitudes prevalent during the various eras. With respect to the earlier stages of South African history (e.g. South Africa under the Dutch) this is the result of the fact that no language-attitude research had been conducted at the time to assist in confirming the sociohistorical trends identified. With respect to the latter periods (Apartheid years and the New South Africa) the lack of detail was the result of the fact that the language-attitude research reviewed did not provide conclusive results pertaining to the language attitudes under investigation. In fact, on occasion, the research results contradicted each other, and it is partly the existence of such divergence in the literature that prompted the use of factor analysis and other quantitative methods in this research.

2. The individual interviews reported on in §5.2.2 were conducted in English between an L1-English speaker and respondents who had African languages as their L1. There is, therefore, a case for suspecting that some of the data generated by these interviews was as a result of the demand characteristics of the interviews. Related to this is the fact that the interviews were conducted in the interviewer’s office (a relatively formal context) with the tape recorder in full view. There was
also potential for cross-cultural miscommunication between interviewer and interviewee. Added to this was the fact that two of the respondents had obvious problems with communicating in English. This limitation has, however, been mostly overcome through the use of other methods of data collection, in particular the analysis of sociohistorical factors. In most cases the attitudes expressed during the individual interviews were supported by this analysis.

3. The questionnaire was in English only. There is thus a possibility that a few respondents did not completely understand a belief statement or where the use of English, like with the interviews, created certain demand characteristics. There was, however, a good practical reason for the use of English which was the fact that the respondents came from a variety of linguistic backgrounds. It would have been impractical to provide translations of the questionnaire in all nine official African languages. Moreover the fact that the mini-survey results were subjected to both a factor analysis and an analysis of reliability, meant that the study was substantially refined to the extent that items creating confusion were exempt from consideration in terms of their possible inclusion in the final attitude scale. With regard to possible demand characteristics, the belief statements were drawn from the individual interviews, which as mentioned in point 2, were largely confirmed in their content by the sociohistorical analysis.

7.3 Implications for future research
The main implication of this study for future research is the use of the attitude scale, constructed as a result of this research, at Unisa and other tertiary institutions. The possible uses of the scale are manifold. One suggestion is to use the scale to assess the relationship between the various factors contained in the scale and the preferences of students. In other words, if a particular group of students indicate a preference towards, for example, the use of African languages as LOLT, the attitude scale could be employed to understand exactly why this preference exists, i.e. is it because of an integrative orientation to the L1 or because the students are focused on the practical utility of using their L1 for learning and teaching purposes? The attitude scale could also be employed for research into the differences in language attitudes between particular ethnolinguistic or other groups at any particular institution. Thus it would be possible to test whether gender has any influence on attitude or whether the
different ethnolinguistic groups at a University (e.g. Sesotho and isiZulu at Unisa) are significantly different in terms of their attitudes. An interesting option would be to see whether or not students engaged in different streams of study (e.g. Humanities vs. Science) displayed different language attitudes. Again the advantage of the attitude scale would be that it would allow the researcher to pinpoint exactly in what manner the attitudes of the relevant groups differ.

Another area for future research would be the application of alternative theoretical frameworks to language-attitude research, e.g. discourse analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. The application of discourse analysis will be interesting in terms of seeing how language attitudes are constructed through discourse. The fact that the emphasis in this approach is different to the one of viewing attitudes as constructs in the mind might produce results that extend our understanding of the nature and genesis of language attitudes. Furthermore, the application of Critical Discourse Analysis to this field would be interesting in terms of identifying the ideological basis of the development of language attitudes and perhaps even pinpointing relationships between particular socioeconomic conditions and the development of particular kinds of language attitudes.

There is much room for the use of African languages in interviews and surveys with L1-African language respondents when conducting language-attitude research, and a comparison of how the use of different languages and other factors influence the demand characteristics of such interviews and surveys and how they increase or reduce cross-cultural miscommunication.

One last word needs to be said about the use of the attitude scale provided in §6.4.5 for research purposes. If the intention is to make use of the scale at Unisa, then it should be sufficient to pilot test this attitude scale on a representative sample of the student population in order to ensure that the belief statements still load on the three factors (using factor analysis). An analysis of reliability (i.e. Cronbach's alpha) should also form part and parcel of this pilot test. Once the scale has been pilot tested it can then be used for research and survey purposes. With respect to its use at other tertiary institutions pilot testing is just as important, if not more so, given that the context will be different from that which prevails at Unisa. The other amendment will of course be
to change all references to Unisa to that of the tertiary institution concerned. Secondly, if the L1-African language student population is generally homogenous it will be possible to refer to the language rather than African languages in general. So, for example, item 23 (in the final attitude scale) would become 'Lecturers at Rhodes must be made to use the African languages'. Furthermore it might be possible to translate the items into one of the African languages (i.e. for each belief statement provide both the English and an equivalent in the particular African language, e.g. isiXhosa). It should be stressed, however, that these amendments must be made before the scale is piloted. Naturally, a similar procedure can be followed if the attitude scale is only being used to test the attitudes of one group of students at Unisa, i.e. a population of students the members of which belong to a particular ethnolinguistic group, e.g. Setswana.

Lastly, there is nothing preventing researchers from adding extra belief statements to the attitude scale if they believe that it accurately represents one of the factors included within it. In this way they could, if necessary, build up an attitude scale that more readily deals with contingencies peculiar to their institution. Again, however, it will be necessary to pilot the amended attitude scale and to take particular care in ensuring that the added belief statement(s) load(s) significantly on the relevant factor.

7.4 Conclusion
The first main aim of the research presented in this dissertation was aimed at conducting exploratory research in order to gain a better understanding of the dimensions underlying the attitudes of L1-African language students towards the use of the African languages as LOLT at Unisa. It set out to achieve this through the application of a range of different methodologies, both of a qualitative and quantitative nature. A theoretical understanding of language attitudes was also necessary in order to make sense of the data generated by these various methodologies. Qualitative methodologies employed included an analysis of the societal treatment of the language varieties in question, a review of relevant research on language attitudes in South Africa and individual interviews. The quantitative method used was that of a mini-survey, the results of which were subjected to a factor analysis and an analysis of reliability. The analysis of the societal treatment of the language varieties was then used to guide the selection of dimensions for final
inclusion in an attitude scale. In the process it was established that the attitudes of L1-
African language students towards the use of the African languages as LOLT at Unisa
are informed by three basic dimensions: practical considerations relating to the use of
the African languages as LOLT at Unisa, attitudes towards English as language of
socioeconomic advancement, education and unity and, finally, an integrative
orientation to the L1 in question.

The second main goal of the research was to construct an attitude scale that could be
usefully employed in future language-attitude research both at Unisa and other tertiary
institutions in South Africa. This was achieved by using the factor analysis conducted
on the results of the mini-survey to isolate three factors for final inclusion in the
attitude scale. The next step was to use the results of a analysis of the reliability of
each of the factor scales, along with general considerations relating to attitude scale
construction, in order to decide which items should be retained in the attitude scale.
The result was an attitude scale containing 15 belief statements which together relate
to the three dimensions identified as underlying the attitudes of L1-African language
Unisa students towards the LOLT issue at Unisa. Such an attitude scale will be useful
in allowing researchers to conduct language-attitude studies at any South African
tertiary institution, in a variety of ways, with the full knowledge that the instrument
that they are using is valid, reliable and takes into account the full complexity of the
language attitudes concerned. Research results generated by such an instrument can
then be used to confidently guide language-policy formulation and application.
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Appendix A

The Interview Schedule

1: What is your first name?
2: How old are you?
3: What is your direction of study at Unisa?
4: Which part of South Africa do you come from and where do you currently live?
5: What is your mother-tongue?

Then describe the purpose of the research and provide an outline of Unisa's new language policy

6: What do you think and feel about this policy?
7: Do you think that the African languages can be used to explain difficult English concepts?
8: Do you think that African languages should ever be used as languages of learning and teaching at Unisa?
9: Do you think that it is a person's right to be taught in her or his mother-tongue?
10: What role should African languages play in University education?
11: Which African languages should be used first as languages of learning and teaching at Unisa, if any?
12: What should the role of English be at Unisa with respect to learning and teaching?
Appendix B

The Survey Questionnaire

As you know South Africa has eleven official languages. UNISA now has a new language policy that will hopefully lead to the greater use of the official African languages. For example UNISA is beginning to think about using these African languages more in teaching. This could mean that, for example, African languages will be used in the study guides to explain difficult English ideas, or that students will even be able to study completely through an African language if they wanted to.

Before UNISA tries to use African languages as languages of teaching and learning it is important to find out what students feel about a number of things. By filling out the attached form you will be helping us to make better decisions for all UNISA students.

SECTION A: PERSONAL PARTICULARS

What is your sex? .................................................................

How old are you? .................................................................

What are you studying (BA, BCom etc.)? .........................

What is your mother-tongue? .............................................

SECTION B: YOUR FEELINGS

Please place your mark under the heading (strongly agree, agree etc.) that is closest to your feelings about each sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching with African languages at UNISA will show the intelligence of African students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is a good idea to use the African languages to explain difficult English words in guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching with African languages at UNISA will not be practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>People only need to get used to the idea of using African languages for teaching and learning for it to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Using only English for teaching and learning disadvantages African students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Only some of the African languages should be used at UNISA to teach in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>If African languages were used more for teaching at UNISA students would not have so many problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>It will take too long to replace English as the only language of learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Afrikaans is an African language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>African languages cannot be used to explain academic ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>It is a student’s human right to learn through his or her mother-tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>English is a language of unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>African languages should first be developed before they are used at universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>In South Africa we need to recognise different cultures and languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>If African languages were used more at UNISA students would be able to understand courses better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Using English gives one a feeling of belonging to the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>People need to express themselves in the language that best suits them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>It is always possible to explain English words in the African languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>English is busy killing the African languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>At UNISA the majority African languages should be used first to teach with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Government should do more to help develop the African languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is difficult for African students to write and read in their own languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lecturers must be made to learn African languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Afrikaans is a language of oppression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. English is a colonial language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. English is an international language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. It is not practical to translate from English into an African language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. If African languages were used more at UNISA the pass rate would be higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Many African students cannot use the official versions of the African languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. One will not be able to use the African languages in one’s career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. If African languages were used more to teach in at UNISA it would help students whose English is not good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The African languages should be developed in the same way that Afrikaans was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. English is the only language that we should use to teach in at schools and universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Your mother-tongue plays a big role in your sense of identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Using only English to teach in at UNISA would deny students their rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. English must come first at UNISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. One needs English to understand academic ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td><em>It would take too long to explain difficult English words in the African languages</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>If African languages were used more at UNISA to teach in students could express themselves better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Using the African languages to teach in at UNISA will be in line with the new Constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td><em>If African languages were used more at UNISA students would not use English enough</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>African languages need to be given a chance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td><em>English cannot be replaced by African languages</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Using African languages for teaching and learning at UNISA would cost too much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>You cannot use the African languages to get a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>All languages are equal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>English-speaking students at UNISA have an unfair advantage over African students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>UNISA should use Fanagalo for teaching and learning at UNISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td><em>English is the language for those who are ambitious</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>It will be impossible to use all the official African languages to teach in at UNISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>English should be the only language of teaching and learning at UNISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>It will be cheaper to use only English for teaching at UNISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>One needs English to make money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. South Africans will be united in education through using English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. There is a big difference between the spoken and written forms of the African languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. No language is worse than any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Using only English in teaching is a way of keeping the standards high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The speakers of the African languages are the ones who must develop these languages for teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Afrikaans should still be used for teaching and learning at UNISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Using only English for teaching is a way of remaining competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. It is difficult to learn things in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Using African languages for teaching is going to disadvantage UNISA students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any comments that you would like to give?


*A number of changes have been made to the original questionnaire presented to the subjects. These changes have been brought about for reasons of presentation. They include the addition of question numbers, an indication of whether scoring on the question should be reversed (italic text indicates a question requiring reversion), and a few other minor changes e.g. font size.*
Appendix C: Summary of the individual interviews

Interview 1: Sibusiso

The first respondent, Sibusiso, was 21 years at the time of the interview and was majoring in Geography and Environmental Science at Unisa. He lived in Tembisa but his family come from KwaZulu-Natal. His mother-tongue is isiZulu.

*Question 6:* He said there would be both advantages and disadvantages to such a policy. On the one hand, it could potentially disadvantage black students in terms of their ability to compete in the workplace, given that it might lead to a lack of English proficiency. On the other hand it would mean that black students would find it a lot easier to pass examinations.

*Question 7:* He said it was sometimes easier to understand concepts in English than in a mother-tongue African language. It might be beneficial in terms of studying for the exams but, on other hand, it might create an even greater burden. Perhaps it would be better to only concentrate on English because the written versions of the African languages were quite different from the spoken versions. He said, for example, that he knew many people in Tembisa who spoke Sotho as a mother-tongue but could neither read nor write it.

*Question 8:* He said yes they should be used as LOLT, but only at the grassroots (primary school) level. At the secondary level of education things should change to English, because, he said, everything outside is related to English, particularly the corporate world. On the other hand it was bad that some people forgot their own languages and cultures.

*Question 9:* He said it was a student’s right to be taught in her or his mother-tongue but that it would only be to the student’s advantage to learn through English. He then asked me to imagine if everybody insisted on speaking their own language. There would be a communication breakdown. It was wrong when people insisted on speaking their own languages no matter what.
Question 10: He said that we should encourage the University’s language departments to develop the African languages.

Question 11: He pointed out that isiZulu is the most widely spoken African language although he admitted to having an obvious bias towards this language. He said that even the Sothos in Gauteng understood Zulu.

In answer to a question about whether or not lecturers at Unisa should be made to learn an African language, he answered that it would only be to their advantage.

Question 12: He said that English should be advanced and developed at Unisa and that it was important that it should remain a neutral language.

Asked whether he regarded English as a colonial language he responded by saying that English is dominant over the African languages but that it is not really viewed negatively because its use had positive effects and because the English culture is easy to mix with.

He added that the issue of language should receive emphasis because people were divided and a solution to the language problem would bring people together. He said everybody has the right to use their own language but that there also needs to be a neutral language. He said that although English was in a sense killing off the African languages, the real fault lay with the parents who were not teaching their children the mother-tongues. He said that people must not loose their cultures or languages but that they must also acquire English. He said that one had to be cynical in the sense that one needed English to get ahead.

With respect to Afrikaans at Unisa he said that this language should only be available on request.
In conclusion he said that the pass rate at Unisa would be higher if they transformed the study material into other languages, but at the same time encouraged the development of English proficiency. He said that although he was aware of the costs that this would entail, the advantage would be that the pass rate would be dramatically boosted.

**Interview 2: Tebogo**

Tebogo, a mother-tongue Northern Sotho speaker from Mpumalanga, was 20 at the time of the interview. She was residing in Mamelodi, just outside Pretoria. At Unisa she was busy with an access course for BSc and her ambition was to study microbiology. Apart from Northern Sotho she said she also spoke isiZulu, isiNdebele, Afrikaans and, of course, English. She said she was learning Xitsonga. She said she had started learning English, on an informal basis, when about 4 or 5 years old.

**Question 6:** She said that Unisa's new language policy would work fine. She said that learning, for example, in isiZulu would work and would be better for the students. African students were in the habit of writing essays in isiZulu, etc. first and then translating them into English and she said this was wrong. She added that at township schools English is not known very well and that it would be good if African students could learn in the language of their choice. She said it would be nice to use a mix of languages, say one course in English, another in isiZulu or any other African language.

She answered Questions 7 and 8 with simple affirmatives and she agreed that it was every person's right to be taught in their mother tongue (Question 9). She wanted to know why only English and Afrikaans should be the languages of teaching and learning.
Question 11: She said none - they should all be developed and introduced simultaneously. She said it would be unfair on, for example, a Xitsonga student if the 'bigger' African languages like isiZulu or Northern Sotho were developed first. When asked about the rights of students whose mother-tongue was not an official language (the example used was Zimbabwean students who speak Shona) she said that they would have to learn in English - she added that 'when in Rome you must do what the Romans do'.

Question 12: She said that all students must learn English - and that this should begin in primary school. English was necessary because it is a general means of communication and an international language. She said that English is OK.

Then I asked her whether she thought English was a colonial language and she said no, but that Afrikaans was. She said in the past (she mentioned the Soweto Riots) everything had to be in Afrikaans. She believed it was time other languages got a chance.

Asked whether she thought English was killing the African languages she said no. She said that as human beings it was our responsibility to learn other languages and about other cultures. Asked about the difference between the spoken and written forms of the African languages and the possible difficulties relating to this difference, she said that it was the same as the difference between English slang and the Standard English used in textbooks. She did not view the difference as a problem.

I then sketched her a hypothetical scenario in which she had learned microbiology through Northern Sotho, and asked her whether she thought she would get a job based on such a qualification. She said she should get a job because she would know what to do. She admitted that one problem might be communicating her knowledge to other people. Ultimately though, she said, they had no right to discriminate against her in terms of the language she preferred to study in.
She added that she believes that the language question is an important one and that people must learn different languages. She re-stated the idea of taking a variety of courses in a variety of languages.

Asked whether she thought the lecturers at Unisa should be made to learn an African language, she said no, they should not be forced and that learning another language should be up to the person concerned.

**Interview 3: Moses**

At the time of the interview Moses was studying for a BA degree through Unisa. Moses was busy with second-year linguistics at the time, which might account for the relative complexity of his arguments. He comes from the Pietersburg area in the Northern Province and has Northern Sotho as his mother-tongue.

**Question 6:** He agreed that it was an interesting one and, he thought, a good one since it is in line with the provisions of the new Constitution and because it would give students the opportunity to learn through the language they knew best. He continued by saying that although it would be difficult at first to have people studying, for example, Physics in an African language, it was not impossible because no language is intrinsically inferior. He said that the African languages need to be given a chance.

**Question 7:** He said that the development of African language vocabulary was not an impossible task. He said one only needs to look at the history of Afrikaans - all one required was the political will. He said that if enough time and resources were devoted to the development of the African languages a similar scenario as the development of Afrikaans would occur. In theory it was possible to find a suitable word in Northern Sotho for any English word.

**Question 11:** He said the issue should be based on the principle of majority-rule. He said that isiZulu, given that it is the most widely spoken language, should be developed first.
I then asked Moses what he thought about the concept of English being a language of unification as opposed to attempts to use the African languages in education, which might be viewed by many as tantamount to perpetuating division, as was the case in Apartheid South Africa. Moses agreed that English was an international and important language but insisted that South Africa needs to acknowledge the diversity of its cultures and languages. He added that in some countries where the majority of people were mother-tongue English speakers the introduction of an English-only policy might be effective but not in a country like South Africa. He said that English should remain the central language but that other languages also need to be given a chance.

I then asked Moses about the potential problems related to finding a job if one were to study through an African language. Moses said that he agreed that there would be problems but insisted that there needed to be a shift in the way people thought about this issue. He said that with the new policy there should also be a new way of thinking. He said that it would be slow in the beginning but that people would eventually get used to the idea of using the African languages. He then provided the example of Japan - he said they had succeeded in building everything up around their own language and he didn’t know why we could not do something similar.

On questioning him about the concept of English as a colonial language he said that in a sense it was a colonial language, given the Anglicization policies of the distant South African past. But more important was the fact that English was never enforced during the Apartheid era, unlike Afrikaans, and thus attitudes towards it were markedly more positive than those towards Afrikaans.

I then asked Moses what would happen if the present Government introduced a blanket English-only policy i.e. enforced English. He said he thought there would be an uproar. He said that people have begun to develop a sense of themselves and that many would disagree with such a policy.
I asked him why the students at Unisa had not caused a similar uproar at Unisa given the current non-implementation of African languages as LOLT. He replied that students were convinced that using English would ensure the maintenance of standards and that they would remain competitive. On the other hand, he said, if the government did not prioritise the African language problem it would constitute an absolute denial of the rights and values of the majority of the people in South Africa. He said that thousands of African students have dropped out of school simply because they couldn't cope with the language problem (i.e. English).

I then asked Moses about the position of Afrikaans at Unisa. He replied with the observation that many Universities were currently closing their Afrikaans Departments. He added that this should serve as an indication of the fact that Afrikaans was fast losing status and that people wanted other languages to be advanced.

I then asked him whether he considered Afrikaans to be an African language. He said it was not, because it was not indigenous to the African continent. He said although the first colonialists did not speak Afrikaans, but Dutch, Afrikaans was a development of Dutch.

I then enquired about his general feelings towards Northern Sotho and English respectively. He replied that Northern Sotho gave him a sense of identity but that English was a bridge to other cultures and a means by which to be admitted to a University and go overseas. He said that one would be an outcast without English. I then asked him if using the English language made him identify with English people. He said not really, what English did was give him a sense of belonging to a multicultural, cosmopolitan world where there is a mix of different cultures and languages. He added that when there is a communication breakdown between different cultures, English has the ability to become an unifying factor.

I then asked him whether he thought English was killing languages like Northern Sotho. He said no, languages like Northern Sotho were committing suicide and that it was the
responsibility of the speakers of these languages to cultivate their own language, from
generation to generation.

I then asked him about the differences between the written and spoken forms of the
African languages and the possible problems this might create for the use of these
languages in education. He said the point was valid: people in the past used to gather
at night and the old grandfathers used to tell tales - which enriched the vocabulary of
the language and kept it pure. But not any more. With the introduction of Western
education, Africans had been more and more exposed to Western terms and ideas and
the spoken version of the language had become ‘diluted’. He said that it would indeed
be difficult to overcome this problem but that the minds of the people needed to be
conscientised and that the process would be slow but sure. He again reiterated the
opinion that the African languages have been denied the chance of entering the
mainstream of the education system and that the time was now ripe for this to change.
He said that the introduction of the African languages into the education system
would slowly expose the intelligence of the African. Many poets and many talents
would come to the fore.

Interview 4: Maria
The next student, Maria, was 19 at the time of the interview and busy with 1st year
BCom (Informatics). She was born in Tembisa and her parents are siSwati, though
she sees isiZulu as her mother-tongue.

Question 6: She said that the new Unisa policy sounded like a good idea but that we
should retain English as the primary language of education. She said all the students
needed to know English well because everybody communicates in this language. She
added that most countries overseas speak English and so in order to communicate in
overseas countries one needs English. She also added that many students would not
know the African languages (used in a study guide) better than English. She admitted
that African students learn to read and write Zulu, for example, at school but insisted
that we proceed in English given that things like computers were all based on
English. She said that Afrikaans should also be known by all students.
Question 7: She initially said that she liked the idea of using African languages to explain difficult English concepts, but then said that it would be difficult to explain difficult terms simply because the appropriate words did not exist in the African languages.

Question 8: She said that it would be possible to have lectures and study guides in isiZulu, for example, but that the textbooks should remain in English.

I then asked her about the difference between the spoken and written forms of the African languages and if this would constitute a problem. She said it would not. She said she, for example, spoke 'proper' isiZulu at home and only spoke the modern version with her friends. In addition she pointed out that the African students were taught the proper form of the African languages in school.

Question 9: She said it was every student's right to be taught in her or his mother-tongue but that in practice one would need to go with the majority in determining which languages would be developed first as a LOLT. She said that she thought that Northern Sotho and isiZulu could be the first African languages used. She admitted that this would be a problem in the sense that it might cause anger among the other African ethnolinguistic groups. Other languages should therefore also be considered.

Question 10: She said that lectures could be in the African languages and difficult terms could be explained in these languages. With regard to having study guides written completely in the African languages she said this would be difficult but if Unisa had access to people who could do it, it should go ahead.

She agreed that lecturers should learn an African language and that, in addition, all Africans should know both English and Afrikaans. This would bring people together and end prejudice.
Question 12: She said that English was important because most countries used it. There were, for example, no computer terms in the African languages.

She added that everybody should learn to speak and write their mother-tongue properly. She emphasised that everybody has the right to learn through their own language and that students should be given a choice as to which language to learn through. Study guides in the African languages should therefore be made available. On the matter of assignments she said these would probably have to remain in English given that very few of the lecturers could handle an African language.

Interview 5: Michael

Michael was a 3\textsuperscript{rd} year Law student at the time of the interview and his mother-tongue is Northern Sotho.

Question 6: He said that the proposed new Unisa language policy would be good in some ways but not so good in other ways. In terms of its benefits, he said it would help students understand courses better. They would not encounter so many problems and the pass rate would be so much higher. On the other hand it would have some problematic aspects. It might make students rely too much on their mother-tongues, which would disadvantage them in the workplace. In his own case it would not be possible for him to rely on Northern Sotho to express himself in a court of law. He added that if everybody relied too much on their mother-tongues, there would be a communication breakdown.

Question 7: He said that this would be a good idea, although it should be up to the student to decide whether she or he requires explanations in her or his mother-tongue. He said he would personally enjoy being able to learn in English together with Northern Sotho.

I then asked him if there was a difference between the spoken and written versions of Northern Sotho and if this would cause problems. He said yes, there were differences and there were many different varieties of Northern Sotho, some of which were quite unlike the official written version. But he said that all L1-Northern Sotho speakers grew up learning the difference between the official Northern Sotho spoken at school and that spoken at home. He emphasised that the official version should be used in any attempts to incorporate Northern Sotho into the Unisa syllabus.
Question 11: He replied that this was a problematic issue. He first of all said that the best way would be to focus on those languages that had the majority of speakers. At Unisa these would be Tshivenda, Northern Sotho and isiZulu. He then said that even this would be a problem since some students would have an advantage over the others and this would be unfair given that all students would be paying the same fees. The students speaking minority languages would be angry. He said that the other languages would have to be taken into consideration and that all the languages would have to be developed together.

Question 12: He said that English must stay and that it was not unfair on students to expect them to learn in English. It is a medium of instruction and an international language. Northern Sotho, for example, he said, is just a language spoken in its own community.

He said that Unisa’s policy might end up causing more problems that solutions, but there could perhaps be a way of making it beneficial to those students who struggle to use English. He added that it would not be fine for him to study Law in Northern Sotho. He wanted to know how he would become a lawyer using this language. I then asked him about more community-orientated careers like nursing and he replied that even in these cases English would be required at some stage, since there would be some interaction with white people.

With regard to lectures he said that English must be the language of preference. Unisa lecturers cannot use the African languages. He said it should not be made compulsory for these lecturers to learn an African language. He said that it was firstly up to the person her- or himself to decide whether they wanted to learn a language. Secondly he said that once one was an adult it was exceedingly difficult to pick up another language.

On asking him about the notion of English as a colonial language he said that that was history and one needed to forget the past. He said that he and others had grown up knowing English as a good language. He said that in any case it would take generations to replace English with an African language. Another disadvantage of using an African language is that it would only be used by a part of the population whereas English didn’t belong to any particular group. He said that it was not difficult to do things in English and
that it should remain a medium of instruction. He concluded by saying that he would like to learn 90% in English and 10% in Northern Sotho.

**Interview 6: Patrick**

Patrick, a L1- Setswana speaker, was busy with his BCompt at the time of the interview.

*Question 6:* He said that it sounded like a good idea, but only if one wanted to remain within the boundaries of South Africa. If, on the other hand, one wanted to go international, it would be more advantageous to be able to use foreign languages like English. For personal reasons, therefore, Patrick said that he did not really favour the idea.

*Question 7:* He said that, for example, if one was studying software engineering the jargon involved would be as difficult for an English mother-tongue speaker as for a Setswana mother-tongue speaker. He said that the African languages could be reserved for those who are not ambitious and adventurous and who ‘are homesick’.

I asked him about the concept of English as a colonial language and he replied that that is only a matter of history. The fact remains that English has done much good in the sense that it has been a unifying factor. In addition, it helps people from different cultures to communicate. He said that he had no negative feelings towards English. He claimed that he even wanted to be proficient in Afrikaans and would, in general, like to know as many languages as possible. He said that he did not view languages in terms of history and oppression. He added that if things were running well at an institution like Unisa then the whole language issue would take a back seat - it was not really such a major thing.

On asking him whether he thought an English-only policy should be adopted at Unisa he replied that perhaps Unisa could hold a referendum. He stressed, however, that the
English-only option should always remain for ambitious students. He said that one of the main problems relating to the introduction of African languages would be that of finance. He then added that the main problem of Unisa was not the formulation of a language policy but rather reducing the costs of its courses so that the disadvantaged communities could afford tertiary education.

I then asked Question 7 in a reformulated fashion and he replied that it would be unwieldy - he said that explaining a technical term in an African language could take up to three paragraphs. This would make manuals far too bulky.

*Question 11*: He said that market forces need to be the determining factor - the majority languages should be catered for first and then the others slowly introduced. He said that this would not be a problem since many African people are multilingual. On asking him whether he thought such a state of affairs would cause resentment among the minority groups, he replied that he did not think there would be too much. He justified his opinion by pointing out that African magazines like Bona were only written in the majority African languages and there was very little resentment about this.

Patrick carried on to say that language should be seen in a practical light - one should learn languages that one needs. He added that even if study material was presented to them in their mother-tongue, the incompetent would remain incompetent. He said it was all about one’s attitude and willingness to learn.

He then said that if people wanted the African languages to be used in education they would first have to be developed - only in this way could they eventually be used as LOLT. He stressed however that focus should remain on English proficiency in order to remain competitive with overseas nations. He said that creativity and ambition were far more important that being taught through one’s mother-tongue.

On asking him what he thought of his own language, Setswana, he said that it dismayed him to see people not being able to use their own mother-tongue properly - he said many used a mixed kind of language, ‘a Fanagalo’.
I then asked him whether he thought English was killing Setswana. He replied by asserting that Setswana would remain in use for certain purposes. He said that the Setswana population was over 5 million and as such did not see it ever dying.

I then asked him whether he thought L1-English speakers had an unfair advantage over the African students. He said that there was some truth to this but that if one was committed one could easily catch up. He then said that the use of African languages for those who are incompetent was a fair idea. He said, however, that the real issue was not which language the term is explained in but rather that the person have a clear idea of what the term is referring to. In this sense, he said, the use of many languages would help. But he said that, personally, he wished to forge ahead and that it would simply be too time-consuming to learn something in an African language.

He concluded by saying that although Unisa should cater for the Rainbow Nation it should also cater for those who want to concentrate on English. In addition, he said that the use of the African languages as LOLT would rely heavily on funding and ultimately how committed the government was to the development of these languages.

**Interview 7: Vuyokazi**

At the time of the interview Vuyokazi was 21 years old and studying for a BASS, with the intention of majoring in Psychology and Social Work. She comes from the Transkei and her mother-tongue is isiXhosa but at the time of the interview she was resident in Tembisa, just north of Johannesburg. She is also proficient in Northern Sotho. It should be noted that there was a discernable lack of English proficiency on the respondent’s part which made communication quite difficult on occasion.

**Question 6:** Vuyokazi said that it was a good idea because to use English is difficult and many students don’t really understand the language. Whites do not learn the African languages so why should Africans learn English.

**Question 8:** She said this would be a good idea because everybody is proud of their own language. When I asked her about getting a job with a degree taught through
isiXhosa she replied that this depended on whether one's employer was white or black.

*Question 12:* She said that this would depend on the mother-tongue of the student. If the student has English as a mother-tongue she or he should be taught through English. On the other hand, if the student had isiXhosa as a mother-tongue she or he should be taught through isiXhosa. She asked why everything should only be in English - 'what about the other languages?'

She said that with English it was like the Apartheid system was still in operation. She said that English was both a good and a bad language. She said it was good in the sense that one should not only know one's own language, but that it was bad because it was being imposed upon the African students.

*Question 11:* She said she was not sure, because if one only chose the majority African languages the other ethnolinguistic groups would be upset. She said it would be necessary to develop all the African languages at the same time.

She concluded by saying that if students used their own languages, things would be that much easier - at present they were struggling because they did not know English well.

**Interview 8: Agnes**

Agnes was 20 at the time of the interview and was busy with an access course. She hails from Mpumalanga and has isiNdebele as her mother tongue. She also claims to be proficient in Nothern Sotho, isiZulu, Xitsonga, Afrikaans and English and can understand siSwati. Like Vuyokazi (interview 7) her lack of English proficiency caused communication problems during the course of the interview.

*Question 7:* Agnes said that it was a fine idea to explain English words in the African languages because some of the English words are rather difficult.
Question 8: She said this would be rather difficult because many of the Africans could not really use the written versions of the African languages. She agreed that there was quite a difference between the spoken and written versions of these languages.

Question 11: She replied that they should start with Northern Sotho and isiZulu because these languages have the most speakers. On asking whether she thought the isiXhosa students, for example, would be upset if isiZulu was chosen above their language she said that they would be and revised her opinion by saying that perhaps all the languages should be developed at the same time.

Question 9: She said that one has to try to learn other languages.

When I asked her about the role of English in education, she said it was an important language. When I asked her why she said because most books were written in this language.

I asked her what the difference between Afrikaans and English was. She replied that the difference was that most people did not like Afrikaans, but said she did not know why, because she liked both English and Afrikaans.
Appendix D: Mini-survey results

Question 1: Teaching with African languages at UNISA will show the intelligence of African students

![Chart for Question 1]

M=3.54 SD=1.34

Question 2: It is a good idea to use the African languages to explain difficult English words in guides

![Chart for Question 2]

M=3.61 SD=1.41

Question 3: Teaching with African languages at UNISA will not be practical

![Chart for Question 3]

M=3.04 SD=1.36
Question 4: People only need to get used to the idea of using African languages for teaching and learning for it to work

M=3.27 SD=1.20

Question 5: Using only English for teaching and learning disadvantages African students

M=3.03 SD=1.49

Question 6: Only some of the African languages should be used at UNISA to teach in

M=3.16 SD=1.42
Question 7: If African languages were used more for teaching at UNISA students would not have so many problems

Question 8: *It will take too long to replace English as the only language of learning and teaching*

Question 9: Afrikaans is an African language
Question 10: *African languages cannot be used to explain academic ideas*  

![Bar chart for Question 10](chart.png)

M = 3.43  
SD = 1.25

Question 11: *It is a student's human right to learn through his or her mother-tongue*  

![Bar chart for Question 11](chart.png)

M = 3.86  
SD = 1.26

Question 12: *English is a language of unity*  

![Bar chart for Question 12](chart.png)

M = 1.56  
SD = 0.81
Question 13: African languages should first be developed before they are used at universities

Question 14: In South Africa we need to recognise different cultures and languages

Question 15: If African languages were used more at UNISA students would be able to understand courses better
Question 16: Using English gives one a feeling of belonging to the world

M=2.11 SD=1.06

Question 17: People need to express themselves in the language that best suits them

M=4.38 SD=0.89

Question 18: It is always possible to explain English words in the African languages

M=3.41 SD=1.28
Question 19: English is busy killing the African languages

M=2.97 SD=1.51

Question 20: At UNISA the majority African languages should be used first to teach with

M=2.98 SD=1.13

Question 21: Government should do more to help develop the African languages

M=4.28 SD=0.87
Question 22: It is difficult for African students to write and read in their own languages

![Bar Chart for Question 22]

- M = 4.16
- SD = 1.21

Question 23: Lecturers must be made to learn African languages

![Bar Chart for Question 23]

- M = 3.87
- SD = 1.25

Question 24: Afrikaans is a language of oppression

![Bar Chart for Question 24]

- M = 3.04
- SD = 1.43
Question 25: English is a colonial language

Question 26: *English is an international language*

Question 27: *It is not practical to translate from English into an African language*
Question 28: If African languages were used more at UNISA the pass rate would be higher

![Bar Chart]

M=3.55 SD=1.26

Question 29: Many African students cannot use the official versions of the African languages

![Bar Chart]

M=2.98 SD=1.01

Question 30: One will not be able to use the African languages in one's career

![Bar Chart]

M=3.11 SD=1.21
Question 31: If African languages were used more to teach in at UNISA it would help students whose English is not good.

M=3.48 SD=1.22

Question 32: The African languages should be developed in the same way that Afrikaans was.

M=3.92 SD=1.23

Question 33: *English is the only language that we should use to teach in at schools and universities.*

M=2.87 SD=1.58
Question 34: Your mother-tongue plays a big role in your sense of identity

Question 35: Using only English to teach in at UNISA would deny students their rights

Question 36: English must come first at UNISA
Question 37: *One needs English to understand academic ideas*

![Graph showing M=2.44 SD=1.23](image)

Question 38: *It would take too long to explain difficult English words in the African languages*

![Graph showing M=2.94 SD=1.43](image)

Question 39: *If African languages were used more at UNISA to teach, students could express themselves better*

![Graph showing M=3.64 SD=1.24](image)
Question 40: Using the African languages to teach in at UNISA will be in line with the new Constitution

![Bar chart]

M=3.80 SD=1.13

---

Question 41: *If* African languages were used more at UNISA *students would not* use English enough

![Bar chart]

M=2.61 SD=1.15

---

Question 42: African languages need to be given a chance

![Bar chart]

M=4.09 SD=1.05

236
Question 43: English cannot be replaced by African languages

Question 44: Using African languages for teaching and learning at UNISA would cost too much

Question 45: You cannot use the African languages to get a job
Question 46: All languages are equal

Question 47: English-speaking students at UNISA have an unfair advantage over African students.

Question 48: UNISA should use Fanagalo for teaching and learning at UNISA
Question 49: English is the language for those who are ambitious

\[ M = 3.83 \quad SD = 1.13 \]

Question 50: It will be impossible to use all the official African languages to teach in at UNISA

\[ M = 2.47 \quad SD = 1.43 \]

Question 51: English should be the only language of teaching and learning at UNISA

\[ M = 2.70 \quad SD = 1.47 \]
Question 52: It will be cheaper to use only English for teaching at UNISA

Question 53: One needs English to make money

Question 54: South Africans will be united in education through using English
Question 55: There is a big difference between the spoken and written forms of the African languages.

Question 56: No language is worse than any other.

Question 57: Using only English in teaching is a way of keeping the standards high.
Question 58: The speakers of the African languages are the ones who must develop these languages for teaching

![Bar chart](image1)

M=2.61 SD=1.33

Question 59: Afrikaans should still be used for teaching and learning at UNISA

![Bar chart](image2)

M=2.55 SD=1.45

Question 60: Using only English for teaching is a way of remaining competitive

![Bar chart](image3)

M=2.56 SD=1.27
Question 61: It is difficult to learn things in English

M = 2.12
SD = 1.12

Question 62: Using African languages for teaching is going to disadvantage UNISA students

M = 3.05
SD = 1.45
Appendix E

The five-factor solution

Five-factor promax rotated factor pattern (factor loadings)(n=100)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values have been multiplied by a hundred and rounded to the nearest integer.
Only values greater than or equal to 0.3 or less than or equal to -0.3 have been retained.
Appendix F: Factors and their belief statements

The belief statements have been ranked in order of their factor loading scores i.e. the item with the highest factor loading is first, the item with the second highest factor loading is second, etc. Note too that the items in italics are those that loaded negatively on the factor under consideration.

Factor 1

Item 15: If African languages were used more at UNISA students would be able to understand courses better
Item 28: If African languages were used more at UNISA the pass rate would be higher
Item 20: At UNISA the majority African languages should be used first to teach with
Item 7: If African languages were used more for teaching at UNISA students would not have so many problems
Item 35: Using only English at UNISA would deny students their rights
Item 5: Using only English for teaching and learning disadvantages African students
Item 11: It is a student’s human right to learn through his or her mother-tongue
Item 2: It is a good idea to use the African languages to explain difficult English words in guides
Item 31: If African languages were used more to teach in at UNISA it would help students whose English is not good
Item 39: If African languages were used more at UNISA to teach in students could express themselves better
Item 19: English is busy killing the African languages
Item 17: People need to express themselves in the language that best suits them
Item 40: Using the African languages to teach in at UNISA will be in line with the new Constitution
Item 1: Teaching with African languages at UNISA will show the intelligence of African students
Item 4: People only need to get used to the idea of using African languages for teaching and learning for it to work
Item 6: Only some of the African languages should be used at UNISA to teach in
Item 61: It is difficult to learn things in English
Item 51: *English should be the only language of teaching and learning at UNISA*
Item 33: *English is the only language that we should use to teach in at schools and universities*

Factor 2

Item 52: It will be cheaper to use only English for teaching at UNISA
Item 12: English is a language of unity
Item 16: Using English gives one a feeling of belonging to the world
Item 51: English should be the only language of learning and teaching at UNISA
Item 54: South Africans will be united in education through using English
Item 60: Using only English for teaching is a way of remaining competitive
Item 36: English must come first at UNISA
Item 44: Using African languages for teaching and learning at UNISA would cost too much
Item 43: English cannot be replaced by African languages
Item 37: One needs English to understand academic ideas
Item 57: Using only English in teaching is a way of keeping the standards high
Item 59: Afrikaans should still be used for teaching and learning at UNISA

Factor 3

Item 34: Your mother-tongue plays a big role in your sense of identity
Item 14: In South Africa we need to recognise different cultures and languages
Item 42: African languages need to be given a chance
Item 21: Government should do more to help develop the African languages
Item 56: No language is worse than any other
Item 23: Lecturers must be made to learn African languages
Item 46: All languages are equal
Item 32: The African languages should be developed in the same way that Afrikaans was
Item 18: It is always possible to explain English words in the African languages
Item 54: South Africans will be united in education through using English
Item 3: Teaching with African languages at UNISA will not be practical

Factor 4

Item 30: One will not be able to use the African languages in one’s career
Item 38: It would take too long to explain difficult English words in the African languages
Item 49: English is the language for those who are ambitious
Item 45: You cannot use the African languages to get a job
Item 57: Using only English in teaching is a way of keeping the standards high
Item 37: One needs English to understand academic ideas
Item 10: African languages cannot be used to explain academic ideas
Item 13: African languages should first be developed before they are used at universities
Item 41: If African languages were used more at UNISA students would not use English enough
Item 6: Only some of the African languages should be used at UNISA to teach in
Factor 5

Item 52: It will be cheaper to use only English for teaching at UNISA
Item 55: There is a big difference between the spoken and written forms of the African languages
Item 44: Using African languages for learning and teaching at UNISA would cost too much
Item 59: Afrikaans should still be used for teaching and learning at UNISA
Item 9: Afrikaans is an African language
Item 18: It is always possible to explain English words in the African languages
Item 24: Afrikaans is language of oppression
Appendix G: Analysis of reliability data

Scale or factor 1.

Summary for scale: Mean=63.4800 Std.Dv.=12.1891 Valid n:100
Cronbach alpha: .822352 Standardized alpha: .841751
Average inter-item corr.: .230197

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean if deleted</th>
<th>Var. if deleted</th>
<th>StDv. if deleted</th>
<th>Itm-Totl Correl.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR15</td>
<td>59.95000</td>
<td>123.2275</td>
<td>11.10079</td>
<td>.763247</td>
<td>.794286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR28</td>
<td>59.93000</td>
<td>124.7051</td>
<td>11.16714</td>
<td>.744462</td>
<td>.796218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR20</td>
<td>60.46000</td>
<td>129.2084</td>
<td>11.36699</td>
<td>.651450</td>
<td>.802847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR7</td>
<td>60.16000</td>
<td>126.7744</td>
<td>11.25941</td>
<td>.597526</td>
<td>.803094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR35</td>
<td>60.39000</td>
<td>125.3579</td>
<td>11.19633</td>
<td>.626493</td>
<td>.801086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR5</td>
<td>60.45000</td>
<td>126.5275</td>
<td>11.24844</td>
<td>.548879</td>
<td>.805369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR11</td>
<td>59.62000</td>
<td>130.3356</td>
<td>11.41646</td>
<td>.532698</td>
<td>.807505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR2</td>
<td>59.87000</td>
<td>127.9131</td>
<td>11.30987</td>
<td>.540634</td>
<td>.806201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR31</td>
<td>60.00000</td>
<td>130.8000</td>
<td>11.43678</td>
<td>.534459</td>
<td>.807662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR39</td>
<td>59.84000</td>
<td>128.2544</td>
<td>11.32495</td>
<td>.617587</td>
<td>.803179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR19</td>
<td>60.51000</td>
<td>126.9099</td>
<td>11.26543</td>
<td>.527722</td>
<td>.806634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR17</td>
<td>59.10000</td>
<td>137.7900</td>
<td>11.73840</td>
<td>.412274</td>
<td>.815071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR40</td>
<td>59.68000</td>
<td>130.8576</td>
<td>11.43930</td>
<td>.582995</td>
<td>.806077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR1</td>
<td>59.94000</td>
<td>129.0964</td>
<td>11.36206</td>
<td>.536911</td>
<td>.806798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR4</td>
<td>60.21000</td>
<td>132.1459</td>
<td>11.49547</td>
<td>.490056</td>
<td>.809960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR6</td>
<td>60.64000</td>
<td>131.2704</td>
<td>11.45733</td>
<td>.427208</td>
<td>.812795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR61</td>
<td>61.36000</td>
<td>136.1304</td>
<td>11.66749</td>
<td>.372978</td>
<td>.815754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR33</td>
<td>60.35000</td>
<td>169.9275</td>
<td>13.03562</td>
<td>-.617343</td>
<td>.871747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR51</td>
<td>60.18000</td>
<td>165.7876</td>
<td>12.87585</td>
<td>-.554181</td>
<td>.864885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor or scale 2

Summary for scale: Mean=42.4500 Std.Dv.=8.36343 Valid N:100
Cronbach alpha: .778403 Standardized alpha: .795099
Average inter-item corr.: .253386

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean if deleted</th>
<th>Var. if deleted</th>
<th>StDv. if deleted</th>
<th>Itm-Totl Correl.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR52</td>
<td>38.84000</td>
<td>56.85440</td>
<td>7.540185</td>
<td>.491081</td>
<td>.754470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR12</td>
<td>38.01000</td>
<td>61.86990</td>
<td>7.865742</td>
<td>.532197</td>
<td>.758807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR16</td>
<td>38.56000</td>
<td>58.56640</td>
<td>7.652869</td>
<td>.590946</td>
<td>.748418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR51</td>
<td>39.15000</td>
<td>53.48750</td>
<td>7.313515</td>
<td>.638484</td>
<td>.735848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR54</td>
<td>38.81000</td>
<td>57.29390</td>
<td>7.569273</td>
<td>.525574</td>
<td>.751217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR60</td>
<td>39.01000</td>
<td>56.46990</td>
<td>7.514646</td>
<td>.591196</td>
<td>.744491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR36</td>
<td>38.64000</td>
<td>58.05040</td>
<td>7.619081</td>
<td>.479174</td>
<td>.756207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR44</td>
<td>39.28000</td>
<td>56.94160</td>
<td>7.545966</td>
<td>.514812</td>
<td>.751970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR43</td>
<td>38.92000</td>
<td>58.99360</td>
<td>7.680729</td>
<td>.439889</td>
<td>.760496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR59</td>
<td>39.90000</td>
<td>77.38999</td>
<td>8.797158</td>
<td>-0.402430</td>
<td>.847715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR57</td>
<td>38.94000</td>
<td>57.57640</td>
<td>7.587912</td>
<td>0.455461</td>
<td>.758650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR37</td>
<td>38.89000</td>
<td>58.81790</td>
<td>7.669283</td>
<td>.473986</td>
<td>.757187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor or scale 3**

Summary for scale: Mean=43.4400 Std.Dv.=5.21908 Valid N:100  
Cronbach alpha:.538350 Standardized alpha: .623907  
Average inter-item corr.: .139499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean if deleted</th>
<th>Var. if deleted</th>
<th>StDv. if deleted</th>
<th>Itm-Totl Correl.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR54</td>
<td>39.80000</td>
<td>27.90000</td>
<td>5.282045</td>
<td>-.190721</td>
<td>.629295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR34</td>
<td>38.87000</td>
<td>22.75310</td>
<td>4.770021</td>
<td>.520792</td>
<td>.465353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR14</td>
<td>38.84000</td>
<td>24.17440</td>
<td>4.916747</td>
<td>.360581</td>
<td>.498489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR42</td>
<td>39.35000</td>
<td>21.52750</td>
<td>4.639774</td>
<td>.451406</td>
<td>.456295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR21</td>
<td>39.16000</td>
<td>22.99440</td>
<td>4.795248</td>
<td>.391138</td>
<td>.481624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR56</td>
<td>39.20000</td>
<td>22.94000</td>
<td>4.789572</td>
<td>.331642</td>
<td>.489858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR23</td>
<td>39.57000</td>
<td>20.26510</td>
<td>4.501678</td>
<td>.458829</td>
<td>.441339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR46</td>
<td>39.58000</td>
<td>20.42360</td>
<td>4.519248</td>
<td>.383502</td>
<td>.462167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR3</td>
<td>40.48000</td>
<td>30.22960</td>
<td>5.498145</td>
<td>-.342169</td>
<td>.672601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR18</td>
<td>40.03000</td>
<td>22.08910</td>
<td>4.699904</td>
<td>.271940</td>
<td>.500106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor or scale 4**

Summary for scale: Mean=30.7800 Std.Dv.=7.29824 Valid N:100  
Cronbach alpha: .752798 Standardized alpha: .757591  
Average inter-item corr.: .242597

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean if deleted</th>
<th>Var. if deleted</th>
<th>StDv. if deleted</th>
<th>Itm-Totl Correl.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR6</td>
<td>27.94000</td>
<td>48.89640</td>
<td>6.992596</td>
<td>.093203</td>
<td>.779639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR30</td>
<td>27.89000</td>
<td>42.93790</td>
<td>6.552702</td>
<td>.526785</td>
<td>.717656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR38</td>
<td>27.72000</td>
<td>41.78160</td>
<td>6.463869</td>
<td>.486649</td>
<td>.721421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR49</td>
<td>28.61000</td>
<td>45.95790</td>
<td>6.779226</td>
<td>.362053</td>
<td>.739606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR45</td>
<td>27.49000</td>
<td>41.92990</td>
<td>6.475330</td>
<td>.490203</td>
<td>.720957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR57</td>
<td>27.27000</td>
<td>41.37710</td>
<td>6.432503</td>
<td>.519737</td>
<td>.716211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR37</td>
<td>27.22000</td>
<td>42.77160</td>
<td>6.540000</td>
<td>.526579</td>
<td>.717348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR10</td>
<td>28.21000</td>
<td>43.96590</td>
<td>6.630679</td>
<td>.438033</td>
<td>.729412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR13</td>
<td>27.28000</td>
<td>44.52160</td>
<td>6.672451</td>
<td>.330406</td>
<td>.745591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR41</td>
<td>27.39000</td>
<td>44.71790</td>
<td>6.687144</td>
<td>.436104</td>
<td>.730348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor or scale 5

Summary for scale: Mean=22.5600 Std.Dv.=3.54287 Valid N:100
Cronbach alpha: -.04043 Standardized alpha: ---
Average inter-item corr.: -.00007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean if deleted</th>
<th>Var. if deleted</th>
<th>StdDv. if deleted</th>
<th>Itm-Totl Correl.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR52</td>
<td>18.95000</td>
<td>9.08750</td>
<td>3.014548</td>
<td>.160511</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR44</td>
<td>19.39000</td>
<td>8.77790</td>
<td>2.962752</td>
<td>.228529</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR59</td>
<td>20.01000</td>
<td>12.50990</td>
<td>3.536934</td>
<td>-.212417</td>
<td>.166946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR55</td>
<td>18.73000</td>
<td>9.77710</td>
<td>3.126835</td>
<td>.216026</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR9</td>
<td>19.53000</td>
<td>8.52910</td>
<td>2.920462</td>
<td>.207468</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR18</td>
<td>19.15000</td>
<td>13.10750</td>
<td>3.620428</td>
<td>-.249742</td>
<td>.171419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR24</td>
<td>19.60000</td>
<td>13.20000</td>
<td>3.633180</td>
<td>-.271053</td>
<td>.216491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>