

**Midlands State  
University**



**FACULTY OF ARTS**

**PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES OF STANDARDISATION OF KALANGA  
ORTHOGRAPHY**

**BY**

**NDHLOVU HLALANI**

**R168651X**

**A dissertation submitted to the department of African Languages and Culture of the  
Midlands State University in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Master of  
Arts African Languages and Culture**

**SUPERVISOR: DR. R. NHONGO**

**OCTOBER 2017**

**APPROVAL FORM**

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommended to the Midlands State University for acceptance of the dissertation entitled **‘Prospects and Challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography’** submitted by Hlalani Ndhlovu in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in African Languages and Culture. I authorise the Midlands State University to lend this dissertation to other institutions and individuals for the purpose of scholarly research only.

Supervisor 

22 October 2017

Internal marker:.....

External Marker:.....

Date:.....

## DECLARATION

I Ndhlovu Hlalani declare that **Prospects and Challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography** is my work and that the sources used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

Ndhlovu Hlalani

Signature:..... Date: .....

## **ABSTRACT**

The study is in the area of language planning and policy. It investigated on prospects and challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography as specifically obtained in Bulilima and Mangwe districts. The study identified and assessed the challenges and prospects of standardisation of Kalanga orthography with particular reference to language practices and choices in the districts. The research was premised on the fact that all languages with a dialect bias or a variety need to be standardised for it to develop a writing system. Kalanga is a dialectal language and is new in the field of nationally recognised languages hence developing a new language orthography is a dilemma. Unifying the dialects to come up with a standard with typically similar characteristics is therefore conceived as a major challenge. The process is seen as downgrading and killing other dialects. On the other hand an accepted writing norm presents the common language with numerous advantages specifically for community and national functions. The study is qualitative in nature where a case study research design was employed. Through qualitative data collection instruments, questionnaires, interview and documentary analysis were used to solicit data from purposively selected educationists, local leaders and Kalanga language experts. Based on the fact that Language need to be managed and developed, the language management theory as propounded by Mwaniki (2004) was implored as guideline to the research. The major findings of the study reiterated on the views of both scholars and respondents that challenges associated with dialectal variations, language purism and non-linguistic factors militated against language use and language choices. The extended findings on prospects of standardisation built largely on the facts that the orthography develops a uniform writing system which in turn enhances literature production. Language management indeed sustained and improved the growth of language and this began with a standardised orthography. For the Kalanga orthography therefore harmonising the three dialects within the same orthography where no dialect is consumed by the other was proposed the greatest prospect in the pipeline.

## **DEDICATION**

To my children Simphiwe Luthabiso and Ntabiso Makabongwe.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Firstly, I would like to give thanks to the Almighty God for sustaining me throughout the research despite numerous hurdles that I stumbled on along the path. I express my profound gratitude to Dr. R. Nhongo my dissertation supervisor for the challenging but highly motivating professional guidance. Thank you Sir for availing yourself to my needs. I also extend my gratitude to the dissertation coordinator Dr. T. Gijimah for her spontaneous support she rendered when needed. I also feel greatly indebted to my class colleagues who tirelessly offered moral, emotional and material support throughout the study.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank Bulilima and Mangwe District Education Officers, school heads of selected schools from both districts for their invaluable information, the local community leaders from both districts for willingly availing themselves to my research and also to the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association executive members consulted for their expertise in data collected.

Lastly, I appreciate the support and encouragement that my family unconditionally imparted to me as and when needed. God bless you all.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| APPROVAL FORM .....                                   | i         |
| DECLARATION .....                                     | ii        |
| ABSTRACT.....   | iii       |
| DEDICATION.....                                       | iv        |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....                                | v         |
| <b>CHAPTER ONE</b> .....                              | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>GENERAL INTRODUCTION</b> .....                     | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Area of investigation.....                        | 1         |
| 1.2 Background of the study .....                     | 1         |
| 1.3 Statement of the problem .....                    | 3         |
| 1.4 Research Aim and Objectives .....                 | 4         |
| 1.4.1 Research Questions .....                        | 4         |
| 1.5 Justification of the study .....                  | 5         |
| 1.6 Theoretical Framework.....                        | 5         |
| 1.7 Methodology.....                                  | 7         |
| 1.7.1 Target population.....                          | 7         |
| 1.7.2 Sample and Sampling Techniques.....             | 7         |
| 1.7.3 Data Collection instruments .....               | 8         |
| 1.7.3.1 Interviews .....                              | 8         |
| 1.7.3.2 Questionnaire.....                            | 9         |
| 1.7.3.3 Documentary analysis.....                     | 9         |
| 1.7.4 Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion..... | 10        |
| 1.8 Literature Review.....                            | 10        |
| 1.9 Ethical considerations .....                      | 12        |
| 1.10 Delimitations of the Study.....                  | 12        |
| 1.11 Limitations of the Study.....                    | 13        |
| 1.12 Definition of terms .....                        | 13        |
| 1.13 Dissertation layout.....                         | 15        |
| <b>CHAPTER TWO</b> .....                              | <b>16</b> |
| <b>THE CONCEPT OF LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION</b> .....  | <b>16</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction.....                                 | 16        |
| 2.2 Defining the concept standardisation.....         | 16        |
| 2.2.1 What is a dialect?.....                         | 16        |

|  |   |                                     |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 2.2.2  | What is a standard variety?.....                                    | 17                                  |
| 2.2.3  | What is standardisation?.....                                       | 18                                  |
| 2.2.4  | Language standardisation .....                                      | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| 2.3  | Principles of Standardisation of a language.....                    | 19                                  |
| 2.4  | Influence of standardisation on language choices .....              | 21                                  |
| 2.5  | Steps taken in the standardisation of a language .....              | 22                                  |
| 2.5.1  | Norm Selection .....  | 23                                  |
| 2.5.2  | Norm Codification.....  | 23                                  |
| 2.5.3  | Norm implementation.....  | 23                                  |
| 2.5.4  | Norm elaboration.....   | 24                                  |
| 2.6  | Characteristics of a standardised language .....                    | 24                                  |
| 2.7  | Standardising Orthography .....                                     | 25                                  |
| 2.8  | Conclusion .....  | 26                                  |
| <b>CHAPTER THREE</b> .....   |   | 27                                  |
| <b>THE EXISTING KALANGA ORTHOGRAPHY AND ITS INADEQUACIES</b> .....   |   | 27                                  |
| 3.1  | Introduction.....   | 27                                  |
| 3.2  | Dialectal variation in Kalanga .....                                | 27                                  |
| 3.3  | Management and development of the Kalanga orthography .....         | 28                                  |
| 3.3.1  | Factors influencing standardisation of the Kalanga orthography..... | 31                                  |
| 3.3.1.1  | Sociological factors .....  | 31                                  |
| 3.3.1.2  | Political factors .....   | 32                                  |
| 3.3.1.3  | Economic and Technological factors .....                            | 33                                  |
| 3.4  | Existing Kalanga Orthography.....                                   | 34                                  |
| 3.5  | Kalanga Orthographic Reforms .....                                  | 36                                  |
| 3.6  | Inadequacies in the current Kalanga Orthography.....                | 37                                  |
| 3.6.1  | Inadequacies presented by translation .....                         | 37                                  |
| 3.6.2  | Inadequacies presented by omission.....                             | 38                                  |
| 3.6.3  | Inadequacies presented by spelling errors .....                     | 39                                  |
| 3.7  | Conclusion .....  | 40                                  |
| <b>CHAPTER FOUR</b> .....  |   | 42                                  |
| <b>AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS IN THE<br/>STANDARDISATION OF KALANGA ORTHOGRAPHY</b> ..... |   | 42                                  |
| 4.1  | Introduction.....   | 42                                  |
| 4.2  | Challenges in the standardisation of Kalanga orthography .....      | 42                                  |
| 4.2.1  | Dialectal variation.....  | 42                                  |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 4.2.2 Language purism .....  | 46         |
| 4.2.3 Non-linguistic factors .....   | 46         |
| 4.3 Conceptualising the prospects in standardisation of Kalanga orthography .....  | 49         |
| 4.4 Prospects as seen in language development in a multilingual context .....      | 50         |
| 4.5 Prospects as seen in language practices .....                                  | 52         |
| 4.5.1 Prospects in literature production .....                                     | 52         |
| 4.5.2 Prospects relating to language used in varied public community domains ..... | 54         |
| 4.6 Conclusion .....   | 57         |
| <b>CHAPTER FIVE .....</b>  | <b>58</b>  |
| <b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>                              | <b>588</b> |
| 5.1 Introduction.....  | 588        |
| 5.2 Summary .....  | 588        |
| 5.3 Conclusions.....   | 59         |
| 5.4 Recommendations.....   | 60         |
| 5.4.1 Recommendations to the KLCDA.....  | 600        |
| 5.4.2 Recommendations to the Ministry of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture ..... | 611        |
| 5.4.3 Recommendations for further study .....                                      | 611        |
| <b>REFERENCES.....</b>   | <b>622</b> |
| <b>APPENDICES .....</b>  | <b>69</b>  |

## CHAPTER ONE

### GENERAL INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Area of investigation

The study is in the area of language planning and policy particularly focusing on the corpus and status paradigms of Kalanga orthography. The study interrogated the challenges as seen affecting standardisation of Kalanga orthography. The study also assessed the extent to which prospects of standardisation of Kalanga orthography can be realised. Standardisation of a language results in a standard language and orthography therefore is a symbol of standardisation (Trudgill, 2006). A standard language is determined by the way the language variety is used by a population for public purposes. The study therefore explored how effectively the current Kalanga orthography is used in the public domains of Bulilima and Mangwe districts and in all the Kalanga speaking areas in general. Alberts (2006) argues that standard language or variety is usually associated with prestige whilst Magwa (2007) referring to the Shona language argues that vocabulary forming it adopted, was selected using the principle of what was deemed to be pronunciation of the majority of the dialects. TjiKalanga orthography though standardised has no final linguistic independence. The dialects might be mutually intelligible and the orthography might have been discussed and agreed upon but the fact that there are emerging writing systems used that have different spellings and word divisions depicts challenges in standardisation. The study therefore critically examined the challenges militating against standardisation of TjiKalanga orthography. It further explored the prospects of this standardisation with reference to its varied uses mainly in the two districts.

#### 1.2 Background of the study

Indigenous languages in Zimbabwe and throughout Africa have through history endured marginalisation in terms of functional status throughout public domains of society. Bamgbose (1991) traces back this marginalisation to the colonial inheritance situation. Kalanga is one of the recently and officially recognised languages as per Section 6 in the 2013 Constitution. The language has been marginalised since the introduction of indigenous languages in the public domains of society in the colonial

era. According to Mazarire (2003) Doke in 1931 frustrated Kalanga by failing to make it an official language. Kalanga language thus remained as an appendage of Ndebele and never developed its own orthography. All Kalanga speakers sought accommodation within the nationalist and official identity of being Ndebele. The language they largely used for passing of written information was Ndebele. Given this development of official recognition in the national constitution in 2013, it therefore meant that the language needed to grow beyond the spoken aspect. It also meant that the language needed to gain linguistic independence both in its spoken and written form. Kalanga as a dialectal language needed to be standardised to allow for a flow of literary works and thus allow for this growth.

Kalanga has a dialectal variation between its Botswana and Zimbabwe varieties. The varieties found in Botswana largely affect the Kalanga spoken in some Zimbabwean areas due to extensive contact between the speakers of both countries. The changing environment largely due to economic factors also influences on the standard varieties found in Zimbabwe particularly in Plumtree. The main dialects of Kalanga as per Wentzel (1981)'s findings include TjiLozwi which is also called Tjindondondo or TjiKalanga ntja however, commonly called the Kalanga-proper, TjiLilima and TjiTalawunda. These form the major dialects of Bulilima and Mangwe hence historically form the Kalanga language found in Plumtree. TjiKalanga-proper dominantly feature in Bulilima and in some parts of Mangwe whilst TjiLilima is a dialect spoken by the people found along the physical border of Zimbabwe shared with Botswana. TjiTalawunda as a dialect however has been mainly used as a totem more than as a spoken dialect in Zimbabwe though a large section of Kalanga people in Mangwe adhere to the spoken tone of TjiTalawunda. A few variations of pronunciation can be realised from TjiTalawunda and TjiKalanga ntja. These three dialects though are mutually intelligible amongst speakers of Kalanga, the literature part of it differ extensively. There are varied deficiencies where writers are not allowed to write the way they speak. Standardisation of Kalanga orthography is one source used to guard against the basic skills of writing in TjiKalanga. This process however is neither an easy task nor always welcomed by the dialects or languages involved.

Standardisation of a language orthography in this regard is one dialectal dilemma faced in an area where varieties feel left out or forced to extinct. The study therefore

interrogated these issues in a situation where dialectal challenges seem inexorable. Referring to standardisation of a language Phillipson (1992) argues that due to linguistic imperialism some languages came to be used more than others. Similarly with dialects Chimhundu (1992) speaking about Shona, holds that the representative dialects forming it depend on the number of speakers and not that these are mutually intelligible. This basically reveals that there are challenges in standardisation of an orthography in the presence of a multiplicity of dialects. The dialect with a sizeable number regarded enough gains an upper hand over the others and thus becomes the dominant dialect. In all these problems Magwa (2011) relating to Shona argues that writing the Shona language which is highly dialectal in a harmonised system is important for the future development of the language. This study therefore, to address the prospects realised from standardisation of the Kalanga orthography.

Establishing well standardised, efficient and practical spelling and orthography rules is also viewed by Alberts (2006) as a crucial basis for developing a modern literacy tradition. This view agrees with the researcher's topic when she considers that standardisation of a language orthography can yield prospects for the language involved. The study is thus premised on the observation that contrary to the inevitable challenges present in standardisation of a language orthography, chances of success are also high. Owing to what has been discussed above, the researcher found it necessary to carry out this investigation which exposes the challenges faced in standardisation of the Kalanga orthography and simultaneously explores the prospects obtained from the same process.

### **1.3 Statement of the problem**

A language orthography is designed so that it can be well articulated in both its written and sign form. The development of a new language orthography which has never been in existence before is pregnant with a lot of challenges. These challenges are immense especially for a language with varieties. Kalanga is one such language with dialects hence prone to challenges when standardising its orthography. For the dialects to come to a consensus and pass a sound correct for wider use is regarded as a compromise or an allowed pass. The researcher then subscribes to that standardisation of Kalanga orthography has challenges born from the state of the language and its use in public domains. Meanwhile the researcher regards harmonisation of multiple dialects as a

prospect particularly for the writing industry. The researcher in this study therefore examined the challenges and explored the prospects of standardisation of the Kalanga orthography.

#### **1.4 Research Aim and Objectives**

The aim of this study was to:

- Investigate on the challenges and prospects of standardisation of the Kalanga orthography.

To address this aim the study achieved the following objectives:

- To identify and assess the challenges and prospects of standardisation of Kalanga orthography.
- To critically examine these challenges in relation to language choices and development in Bulilima and Mangwe districts.
- To explore the prospects of standardisation of Kalanga orthography with reference to its varied uses.

##### **1.4.1 Research Questions**

The study answered the following research questions:

- What is standardisation of language orthography?
- What are the major contributions of standardisation of Kalanga orthography with reference to language choices and language practices in Bulilima and Mangwe?
- Which major challenges of standardisation influence the development of Kalanga orthography in Bulilima and Mangwe?
- What future prospects can be realised from standardisation of Kalanga orthography?
- How can language practices in public domains foster language development in the context of multi-language varieties?

## **1.5 Justification of the study**

The study is justified on the grounds that by assessing decisions that revolve around standardisation of Kalanga orthography the study makes a great contribution to the Kalanga communities of Bulilima and Mangwe. If greater challenges of standardisation are minimised and greater prospects of the process are explored more Kalanga people can claim their identity and display their creativity especially in the writing industry. To substantiate this view, the study focused on Trudgill (2006)'s ideas that the chosen variety after standardising the orthography becomes the norm for writing, which can be used in broadcasting and for official purposes at wider society.

The critical examination of challenges and the exploration of future prospects of the standardisation of a language orthography were therefore central in this study. The study specifically analysed these challenges in order to recommend language practices that promote the development and successes of the language since Simpson (2007) argues that language is among the basic attributes of national identity.

The study is also an important addition to the existing body of information in standardisation of an African language orthography. It looked specifically at the orthography of the newly recognised official language Kalanga whose orthography is also a new phenomenon in the field of languages. In this way, the study assists one to understand the challenges prevalent in standardisation of the major dialects forming the Kalanga orthography. The study was also worth carrying out since it extended further to cover the gaps between challenges of the process of standardisation of Kalanga orthography and the positive gains obtained from the process as well.

## **1.6 Theoretical Framework**

In view of observation that where dialects forming a language are multiple, standardisation of the dialects is desired for creation of a uniform writing norm, the theoretical framework for this research thus emerges from the concept of language management. Language needs to be managed to account for multilingualism. This study was therefore informed by the Language Management Theory. The theory according to Mwaniki (2011) is a collection of theoretical precepts that seek to account for the multiplicity of variables in language management circumstances. Various principles and rules are set governing the language varieties such that an area of convergence is

sought. The Kalanga language has multiple varieties that require standardisation. Therefore, the theory informed the study because within it the systems theory represents this multiplicity looking at linguistic, political and social attributes of the language varieties.

Mwaniki (2004) representing the most ambitious and comprehensive attempts at constructing a language management approach, view the theory as representative of all language theories dealing with African languages. In fact he argues that not all theories of language are susceptible with the multiplicity of languages. In this regard having attested this approach in South Africa where eleven languages were harmonised. The study foresees the theory suitable for standardisation of Kalanga orthography where a lesser number of varieties of the language are evident. The two tenets of the Language Management Theory as specified by Webb (2002) are also applicable in the standardisation process of the Kalanga orthography. The strategic analysis stage where identification and definition of the major dialect problem which need to be resolved is highlighted is a similar stage to use when establishing the dialects in question that need to be harmonised in the Kalanga language. This is the stage where also general and specific language goals are set for the language in question. This means that the theory allows for justification of actions taken when some Kalanga varieties are chosen over others in the creation of the orthography.

Meanwhile the strategic planning stage which specifically describes the specific plan of implementation of the language policy and plan can also be fruitfully used to describe how the standardised Kalanga orthography can benefit the BaKalanga communities of Bulilima and Mangwe. Mwaniki (2004) further states that the issue of discipline within the language management theory preoccupies itself with questions that seek to gain answers for what accounts for language choices and how language can be harnessed for a holistic development of society. The main aim of study is to address the challenges and prospects of standardisation of the Kalanga orthography therefore these could be interrogated by addressing these questions stated by the theory. All what the theory does as its method is to draw from multiple disciplines in order to define language-related problems. Similarly, all what this study does is to address standardisation of the Kalanga orthography from the varieties forming it hence identify and assess the

challenges. From the holistic aspect of the multiple disciplines of Kalanga the study similarly explores the prospects obtained from standardisation.

## **1.7 Methodology**

This study adopted a qualitative research design because it is largely narrative and descriptive. This qualitative research design was in the form of a case study. The case study is an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context (Yin, 1984). Data collection was through interviewing purposively selected research participants in Bulilima and Mangwe districts. This is also where the standard Kalanga orthography emerges from. The respondents were from varied sectors so as to form a source triangulation.

### **1.7.1 Target population**

The population of this study comprised Bulilima and Mangwe educationists, the local leadership of the communities and the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association board. The selected people were chosen because of their direct involvement in the growth of TjiKalanga in the districts.

### **1.7.2 Sample and Sampling Techniques**

A sample is defined by Kothari (2004) as a selection of elements from a larger population. The research targeted educationist for their valuable theoretical data on standardisation of a language or variety, challenges and prospects determined by standard language orthography. Their information was augmented by knowledge from the local leadership who act as the custodian of culture and language in particular in the districts. The research also targeted the language experts of TjiKalanga who are currently members of the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association (KLCDA). There will be three key categories of informants.

On sampling techniques all respondents were purposively selected where expertise in the subject or topic is key to who becomes the participant. Respondents were equally balanced between the two districts so that a representative sample is obtained. Two (2) District Inspectors, two (2) district local language coordinators and eight (8) school heads formed the academia section. Four (4) chiefs, two from each district were of

paramount importance in the study as active users of the language to the general widespread public of both districts. Meanwhile, the KLCDA executive was handy for information to do with language expertise, perfection and also on the dialectal challenges.

### **1.7.3 Data Collection instruments**

The researcher used various techniques in the collection of data. Primary sources in the form of interviews and questionnaires were used. Direct descriptions of the study given by the respondents were expected from these. On the other hand, secondary sources unveiled through documentary analysis were relevant in this study where reference and comparable data is solicited.

#### **1.7.3.1 Interviews**

Structured interviews were also used to solicit data from the educationists, chiefs and the language experts. Cohen and Manion (2007) generally defines an interview as a conversation between two people for a specific purpose of obtaining study-relevant information. The structured interview therefore refers to clearly prepared questions that solicit information from respondents in a direct conversation. The number of participants in each category other than the school heads demanded that face-to-face interactions be made. This research made use of interviews in collecting data as they allow clarification on information. Interviews were chiefly convenient for attaining the tale behind an interviewee's experience. They were conducted mainly targeting respondents selected because of their certain expertise on the use and standardisation of Kalanga orthography in Bulilima and Mangwe districts. Both face-to-face and telephone interviews were used in interviewing the selected respondents. The face-to-face interviews helped the researcher to get first hand and some background information as to when and how the interviewees view the research questions. These helped one to gather both verbal and non-verbal data. Telephone interviews targeted to obtain data from local chiefs and school heads who were not all easily reachable and also to reduce transport costs. The information gathered from the academics benefitted the researcher in acquiring comprehensive data concerning the study being carried out.

### **1.7.3.2 Questionnaire**

The questionnaire as a quick method of data gathering from targeted population was used by the researcher. The study was conducted using the questionnaire method particularly for the school heads. Leedy and Ormrod (2010) note that questionnaires provide a relatively cheap, fast and efficient method of collecting data. This research instrument consists of a chain of questions and other prompts for the determination of collecting data from respondents (Cohen and Manion, 2007). The study gathered much information from the respondents directly involved with the use of the Kalanga orthography and the Kalanga people in general. The questionnaires were self-administered to the eight school heads. The strength of the questionnaire method as advanced by Taylor, Sinha & Taposh (2006) lie in gathering large amounts of data from a relatively large number of participants. However, the challenges met in this method were that of the return rate. Some questionnaires sent to the heads of schools failed to return. Despite this limitation the study sought the use of questionnaires since they were handy for the school heads who stayed in varied and not close to each other places just as the heads of schools do. In this regard to cater for more responses the telephone interview was used for those school heads who were reluctant to send in their completed questionnaires. The method also allowed for the same period to be used for gathering data from the various respondents.

### **1.7.3.3 Documentary analysis**

Documented texts often carry history and the facts about the problem under investigation. An analysis of relevant documents basically on language standardisation, perfection and dialectal challenges was done specifically on the Kalanga orthography. This method enabled the researcher to explore documents and to get knowledge of past and present information based on matching the challenges and prospects of standardisation the Kalanga orthography. One of the greatest advantage of documentary analysis that the researcher targets through the use of this method is that documents are not affected by the nature of the research's inquiry and are therefore non-obstructive and non-reactive. Documentary analysis especially from the educationists and the current Kalanga orthography were used to solicit data pertaining to standardisation of Kalanga orthography.

#### **1.7.4 Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion**

Since the study is qualitative, descriptive data analysis tools were used. Various data interpretation and analysis procedures were employed. The content analysis of qualitative data was employed for most of the interview transcripts. This is a procedure for the categorisation of verbal or behavioural data for classification, summarisation and tabulation (Litosseliti, 2010).

Discourse analysis was also used. Discourse can be defined as a communication in speech or piece of writing about a particular subject. The discourse analysis method according to Georgaca and Avdi (2007) sets to examine language in terms of how certain issues are constructed in people's accounts and the variability in these accounts. One can learn about a person's perceptions, attitudes and feelings about something by noticing the words they use to express themselves. Even though discourse analysis is reproached of being subjective its power is that it permits the investigator who uses it to understand works without being subjected to conditions in which the works are created. It was thus applicable for the analysis in this study.

The hermeneutics of interpretation was also applied in the study. According to Ncube (2011) this is where in order to understand a small part one has to understand it from the broaden part and in order to understand the whole part one needs to understand the part (Mpofu, 2013). Historical information on TjiKalanga is a genuine way of understanding the challenges associated with standardisation of the orthography. The information was also handy in exploring prospects emanating from the same. The descriptions where necessary were augmented by use of tables.

### **1.8 Literature Review**

This section reviews existing literature on challenges and prospects of standardisation of Kalanga orthography. This is so because there is need for the study to contribute to the existing information rather than be its copycat. A number of authorities have written on the concept standardisation of a language orthography but not necessarily on Kalanga which is the major focus of this study.

Use of a language especially for wider communication in bilingual and/or multilingual societies depends on which language or dialect has an upper hand. A standard language

according to Swann (2004) is often regarded as a relatively uniform variety of a language designed for a wide range of communicative functions. It is in this language where regional or local variations are negated. In this regard, Suarez (2002) notes that linguistic hegemony is achieved when dominant groups create a consensus by convincing others to accept their language norms and usage as standard or pragmatic. The citation explains that in a language we speak also of power domination and usually language gained its power from its official status. The citation further explains one of the principles of standardisation of a language or a variety as shall be explained in the theoretical framework. These views in this study assisted the researcher to interrogate the major dialects and their contribution in the standardisation of the Kalanga orthography. The study also profited from the views of Suarez (2002) since in standardisation of languages or varieties for one to come up with a standard variety issues of language or dialect power are central.

Culturally and linguistically diverse students in the classrooms need to meet somewhere. Mallison and Huddley (2011) denotes an orthography as the meeting point. Finegan (2007) reveals that a fixed orthography is created for writing the variety. An orthography is therefore a key resultant of standardisation of a language. This is the key factor in this study since it demonstrated that in standardisation, the resultant orthography can legitimise certain language choices and practices in the writing system.

Basing on the above ideas, Hadebe (2002) maintains that language standardisation is part of language planning usually sanctioned by government departments or similarly authorised boards. The issues of marginalisation of Kalanga among other indigenous languages are feelings that are undoubtedly present in the standardisation of a language orthography. This observation was thus quite pertinent in this study since some challenges can be as a result of imposition and/or relegation by powerful groups rather than the inadequacies of the process. The research subscribed to most of the author's ideas, however, what distinguished it is that whereas Hadebe (2002) based on the Ndebele language which had an existing orthography this study specifically related to Kalanga whose orthography is real new and still developing. The Kalanga dialects are not fully and proportionally featuring in the current orthography in use. In fact one can undoubtedly allude to that TjiLozwi (Kalanga-proper) predominates. TjiLilima was outrightly neglected in literary productions whilst TjiTalawunda remains in names of

objects and completely neglected in grammar. This situation directly revealed the existence of challenges whereas further harmonising the dialects in speech patterns can be an enhancement of vocabulary thus a prospect.

## **1.9 Ethical considerations**

This study is not conducted in a social vacuum. All appropriate ethical consideration relating to legal, cultural and social aspects should be followed. Chiromo (2006) defines ethics as principles of right and wrong which guide researchers when conducting their research. Violating the rights of respondents whilst carrying out a research is an academic offence and was avoided by the researcher. The researcher observed the following ethical considerations in this study; informed consent, confidentiality and avoiding plagiarism.

The researcher constructed the interview guide and the questionnaires with the introductory part clearly stating the ethical considerations recognised so that respondents could respond to the questionnaires and interviews well informed of the demands and expectations of the study. Respondents were also notified of confidentiality issues so that they attend to questions asked without reservations. Plagiarism is an academic offence therefore the research acknowledged source of information as given by the respondents.

## **1.10 Delimitations of the Study**

The study was conducted with participants selected as defined in Section 1.5.2 in Bulilima and Mangwe districts. Confining this study to the chosen participants was pre-planned manageability and the proximity of the researcher. It therefore solely earmarked Bulilima and Mangwe because those are the two areas mainly congested with the Kalanga tribe where standardisation of dialectal variations are paramount. The study also confined itself within the language management theory as explained by Webb (2002), Mwaniki (2004) and (2011). The study also adopted the use of questionnaires, interviews and document analysis as research instruments because of their suitability in the research paradigm.

## **1.11 Limitations of the Study**

Miller (1986) emphasises that research goes with so many constraints. In this study the following limitations were met:

- A comprehensive research study covering a number of respondents in Bulilima and Mangwe districts was desirable, however financial and material resources to be used in such a magnitude of study was costly for the researcher. To curb this limitation, the researcher resorted to social media in the form of voice recordings and cellphone interviews for the furthest areas.
- The researcher is a full member of KLCDA such that some challenges can be preconceived however, by bringing on board varied and necessary respondents, the researcher cleared the assumptions that the board has been building as projected challenges for acceptance of written TjiKalanga materials. The information therefore deleted preconceived ideas and replaced them with reality facts surrounding the standardisation of Kalanga orthography.

## **1.12 Definition of terms**

### **Orthography**

This is a set of conventions for writing a language. It includes norms of spelling, hyphenation, capitalisation, word breaks, emphasis and punctuation (Trudgill, 2006). The study adopts the same definition and thus sees orthography as a symbol of standardisation embracing the study of correct spelling.

### **Standardisation**

Crystal (1985) defines standardisation as a natural development of a standard language in a speech community or an attempt by a community to impose one dialect as a standard. The study will use the same definition.

### **Standard language/standard variety**

This is a language or variety used by a population for public purposes or as a variety that has undergone standardisation (Ammon, 2004). This is done by elevating a single language/variety such as the local variety of a centre of government or culture. This study also adopts this definition.

### **Challenge**

This is something new and difficult which requires great effort and determination ([www.collinsdictionary.com](http://www.collinsdictionary.com)). In this study challenges refer to the impossibilities that militate against a harmonious standardisation of Kalanga orthography.

### **Prospects**

These are chances of success especially in the job or career ([www.macmillandictionary.com](http://www.macmillandictionary.com)). In this study the meaning is adopted however is linked to the successes obtained from standardisation of the Kalanga orthography.

### **Linguistic hegemony**

Linguistic hegemony is the process by which dominant groups create a consensus by convincing others to accept their language norms and usage as standard or pragmatic (Suarez, 2002). The term will be used to mean the same in this study.

### **Linguistic imperialism**

Phillipson (1992) defines it as a process whereby some languages came to be used more than others. The study will adopt this definition throughout the study.

### **Language planning**

Weinstein (1983) defines language planning as government authorised, long term sustained conscious effort to alter a language itself or to change the language's function in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems. The study will use the term as understood in this manner.

### **Language policy**

Prator in Markee (1986) refers to language policy as the process of making decisions that concern teaching and the use of language and their careful formulations by those empowered to do so or for the guidance of others. This study will extend the definition by stating that language policy is the formal implementation of language planning.

### **1.13 Dissertation layout**

The study comprised of five chapters. Chapter one was the introductory chapter which explains the research problem through the area of investigation, background of the study and statement of the problem. In this chapter the researcher outlined the research aims and objectives, research questions, the rationale of the study. The study also described the theoretical framework which inform it. Literature that set pace to the research was reviewed and gaps that distinguishes the study identified. It also set the boundaries and noted the limitations met. Definitions of unique terms of the study were given to make it reader-friendly. Chapter two reviewed extended literature. In this chapter literature reviewed focused on the concept standardisation of a language orthography. Of particular focus were the principles of standardisation, the influence of standardisation on language choices, steps taken in the standardisation of a language. Typical characteristics of a standardised language and standardising orthography was also discussed on. Chapter three looked into the existing Kalanga orthography, highlighted the orthographic reforms and presented the inadequacies posed by the current orthography. Scholarly views and those from the respondents enriched this chapter. Chapter four presented the challenges and explored the prospects of standardisation of Kalanga orthography. It discussed the challenges as basically presented by dialectal variation, language purism and non-linguistic factors. The chapter also explored the prospects in relation to language choices and practices in Bulilima and Mangwe districts and as specified by the respondents. Lastly, Chapter five summarises and concludes the study. It gives recommendations to the study and for further research especially considering the fact that the Kalanga language is very new and no significant researches have been done on it as yet.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE CONCEPT OF LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION

#### 2.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter was the study's general introduction. It articulated the problem under study, established the methodology employed and also justified the undertaking of the study. All other aspects forming the base of the whole study were discussed in the chapter. This chapter defines the term standardisation. The concept language standardisation was dealt with in detail. The research outlines the principles behind the concept of language standardisation and explains how these set out language choices especially for the Kalanga in Bulilima and Mangwe. The research further discusses the status of Kalanga in Bulilima and Mangwe. These statuses would basically discuss language practices in public domains in both districts.

#### 2.2 Defining the concept standardisation

Most African countries are recorded by most scholars including Roy-Campbell (2006) as either bilingual or multilingual. Zimbabwe is also a multilingual nation and most of its languages have varieties where standardisation is a necessary concept. Roy-Campbell (2006) argues that the multiplicity of African languages is one context that desires standardisation. This therefore means that standardisation is a term used mainly in a multilingual context. In this study it refers to a context where more than one dialect of Kalanga are found in the various Kalanga places. This therefore implies that Kalanga as a dialectal language also demands the use of standardisation to make the language functional in various public domains of the affected districts. Before giving the definition of standardisation it is important to highlight what a dialect is and also what a language variety is since these terms feature most in explaining the concept of standardisation.

##### 2.2.1 What is a dialect?

One important term to understand in the concept of standardisation is dialect. Trudgill (1983) views the term dialect as referring to any language variety that is grammatically different from any other especially looking at its vocabulary or its word pronunciation.

This can be related to a language version of those who speak differently from the local or native speakers of the language. A similar definition was given by Petyt (1980) when he argues that a dialect is that part of a language which is distinguished from the other varieties of the same language by phonological, grammatical and vocabulary features. Francis (1983) views dialects as varieties of a language used by groups smaller than the total community of speakers of the language. From the definitions, one can also deduce that a dialect can affect a smaller portion of the community.

Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) gives another dimension to the definition of dialect when he looks at language functionality. In his definition he thus says that linguistically a dialect is a variety. To him it is just a natural term for any form of a language considered for some purpose as a single entity. In this line of thought it would appear a language variety becomes a dialect only in respect of the purpose the version of the language serves in the community. The more respected the variety is and the more widely used the variety is makes all other varieties with less important uses dialects of the more used version. In this way one can conclude that a dialect is no more than a local non-prestigious and powerless variety of the real language. Dialect and variety in the above paragraphs have been freely used interchangeably. This therefore reflects that the two terms though may sound different, in linguistic situations a dialect is simply a language variety. The commonly used language variety becomes a standard variety. In this study it was also impossible to distinguish between the use of the term dialect and language.

### **2.2.2 What is a standard variety?**

A standard variety or a standard language is regarded by Lafon and Webb (2008) as a relatively uniform variety of a language which does not show regional variation. This implies that when the standard variety is created it closes the gap among the speakers of these various dialects. Differences could be in terminology or spellings used by the different sections of the community. These could now be referred using the same language and at the same time words can be spelt the same way across the dialects. The scholars further relate to a standard language as the one that is used in a wide range of communicative functions. Meanwhile Swann (2004) notes that standard varieties tend to observe the prescriptive and written norms which are codified in grammar and dictionaries. The above sentiment put it clearly that standardisation is a deliberate creation so that it can pave way for the standard variety whose functions are aimed at

the study of language and the production of literature. For language to be fully understood some consistency is desired in how spellings are organised, in how vocabulary is created and in the grammatical aspects of the language. In this regard standardisation of the Kalanga orthography is a deliberate endeavour to accord the chosen variety the necessary functions of the growth of the language in terms of literature production and language use in various contexts of the Kalanga community.

### **2.2.3 What is standardisation?**

The process of standardisation therefore is an attempt to create a standard variety from the various dialects a language might have. From the above observation, Crystal (1985) defines standardisation as a natural development of a standard language in a speech community or an attempt by a community to impose one dialect as a standard. Pei and Gaynor in Mahlangu (2015) understand standardisation as a process by which a dialect of a language gains literacy and cultural supremacy over the other dialects. This dialect becomes a norm for writing and is accepted by the speakers of the other dialects as the most proper form of that language. The above citations reflect on standardisation as a legal form that legitimises one of the dialects chosen. The concept gives the dialect power and functions that leaves it as a common or dialect proper of the speakers of the language. Expanding on this line of thought Wolff (2000) argues that standardisation is part of corpus planning. The end result of standardisation therefore is that one language variety should take precedence over other social and regional dialects and be widely accepted by the majority of the speakers as the best form. From the definition it is also clear that one core feature of standardisation is seen in the use of a language. Once the language variety has gained power then its uses in the community become vivid. For example, Trudgill (1998) writes that standardisation is necessary in order to make communication among speakers possible.

The process of standardisation in languages is used being synonymous to the processes of unification and harmonisation. Msimang (1998) notes that unification seeks to construct a common language for a dialect-group whereas in harmonisation a number of dialects belonging to the same language are unified in an attempt to produce one language. Looking at the above definitions there is a direct link to standardisation since in actual fact by harmonising or unifying a language one is actually standardising. In this regard one can safely say that harmonisation or unification relate to merging of

various language varieties belonging to the same group to form one standard variety. This is exactly what the process of standardisation does. Standardisation of Kalanga orthography is an attempt to have this standard variety for the writing industry.

It has already been alluded to the fact that standardisation involves creating a common norm which should be regarded as the best especially in literacy circles. Basing on this fact, language standardisation describes a process which a dialect changes its status, its functions, its form and thus becomes the standard form of the local language. Paulston (1984) concurs with Neustupny (1983) that language standardisation goes with language cultivation (Bassey, 2000). This implies that in the process of language standardisation a language is refined for correctness, decisions on how to develop language choices are passed and also the development of literature is expected. Nforbi (2001) and Mashiyane (2002) both agree that language standardisation and development must involve a language committee. In this study therefore for one to understand the standardisation of the Kalanga the involvement of the Kalanga language coordinators and the involvement of the Kalanga language and cultural development association (KLCDA) is of paramount importance.

### **2.3 Principles of Standardisation of a language**

Language standardisation is part of language planning usually sanctioned by government departments or similarly by authorised boards (Hadebe, 2002). In this regard this implies that this process is not haphazardly done but planned for. In this vein it therefore follows some laid down principles in an attempt to make the standardised version to be acceptable to the users of the language. Standardisation hence is necessary in a language with varieties for a number of reasons, for example:

- to facilitate communication that is to ensure exact communication amongst specialists themselves, between subject specialists and between laypeople;
- to provide a uniform form for learning material and dictionaries;
- to establish an agreed orthography and spellings rules (Alberts, 2006).

The above uses of standardisation of a language can be possible only if the process is done following some form of laid down rules. The following are some of the rules the language boards follow in standardising languages as indicated by Qinsheng (1992).

- **The phonemic system of the dialect spoken in the standard pronunciation region is used as the basis of the standard spelling**

This principle reveals that the speech sounds taken for the standard spelling is derived from the core dialect spoken in fact from the variety regarded as the proper language of the region. Usually this dialect naturally occurs. Yule (1985) explains that the dialect which come to be used for standard spellings is the one that has usually been the socially prestigious dialect. He further argues that natural occurrence is originally connected with a political or cultural centre. The citation also explains on linguistic domination, where through political influences some dialects or languages just find themselves used more than others depending on who is ruling. Magwa (2007) relating to the lexical and phonological considerations in standardisation of the Shona orthography, notes that vocabulary forms were adopted using the principle of what was deemed to be the pronunciation of the majority dialects. So how this dominant dialect pronounces its words form the basis for the standard spelling.

- **The standard spelling is based on the phonemic system of a dialect spoken in the standard pronunciation allowing for certain additions and deletions**

The principle implies that the standard spelling adopted from the dialect widely spoken and that which is socially prestigious takes it upon itself to allow for additions from other varieties. It also has the precedence to delete those other sounds regarded as coming from the minor dialects. This means that the phonemic system of the spoken dialect acts as a sieve for any language impurities. Qinsheng (1992) however despite the two principles presented as essential for standardisation of a language talks of language equity. By this, it implies that any language variety can be developed to the extent that it becomes standard. This also explains that the process of standardisation is not an inborn trait however, is learnt and artificially imposed based on political and cultural influence. To this end Qinsheng (1992) concurs with Msimang (1998) & Sager (1990) that standardisation results of direct and of deliberate intervention by the

community. In this result therefore standard dialects are created by conscious and deliberate planning. This therefore leads us to another principle of standardisation.

- **Standardisation is carefully planned.**

This principle ensures that the process of standardisation does not marginalise other dialects. The question therefore is that if standard phonemic sounds forming the standard language are representing one dialect which is widely spoken then how it harmonises the other dialects. More details on this will be discussed as the study progresses. Talking about languages, Bamgbose (2011) explains that in language reviving in a multilingual setting it is ideal that all languages are taken on board and after standardisation they acquire definite statuses and specified roles. Likewise this principle holds that no dialect should be left to extinct however, each should be recognised and given a specific function in the society.

#### **2.4 Influence of standardisation on choice of a language variety**

Languages formally used by various communities are largely a resultant of standardisation. Mahlangu (2015) reveals that in standardisation the standard forms of a language are established. He elaborates that forms or varieties which were not standard were simply non-standard hence may not be chosen. In this view it means that the standard form became the chosen language or dialect. Meanwhile Bartsch (1985) views standardisation as selection of one form or variety from a number of existing language varieties or forms. Given this point, it reflects that standardisation enabled the choice of a language variety or it involves a construction of a standard form from different chosen variants. This simply means that the process allowed a choice of a dialect registered as best taking into cognisance the sociocultural issues involved in language choices.

Mahlangu (2015) further states that the process of standardisation can also be a mechanism employed to minimise several different varieties of a product to a single one in order to allow the exchange of this product. In this citation one can infer that it is through the process of standardisation that the choice of the best form is chosen. One way of choosing a standard is determined by the number of people speaking the dialect whilst the most influential one being the status of the dialect in sociolinguistic circles. Relating to the same factor of choosing the best form Milroy and Milroy (1999) regards

standardisation as motivated by varied social, political and commercial needs. Who is the current person in power and which dialect he/she speaks counts in the standardisation process according to the scholars' views. On the other hand Lafon and Webb (2008) note that the standard language must be accepted as the most proper and most appropriate target in first language study. This implies that even though the choice of the language might be done by influential people, the rest of the society must accept the chosen dialect so that it can be used well amongst the varied speakers of the language.

One other valid reason for language choice is for language study purposes. Language is easier studied from one variation whilst other varieties enhance the vocabulary and speech patterns. The standard variety attained through standardisation is the form therefore used by language purists. Canagarajah (2006) states that language purists are directly after language competence and/or linguistic correctness. In a way the process of standardisation leaves the chosen variety with the status of linguistic accuracy allowing the form to be the point of reference for correcting spellings and grammar. Language choice is also a fundamental aspect in this research. It is also believed that the process of standardisation affects language choices for varied societal uses in Bulilima and Mangwe.

Literature of a language is well designed from a standard variety. Lexicographers and terminologists want to work with a standard language. Joseph (1987) argues that not every person is able to use a standard variety therefore through studying a person acquires the standard language. Based on this realisation therefore writers of literature choose a standard norm that is more stable, precise and consistent in spelling, grammar and pronunciation. A norm that when used cuts across regional differences of the language. Hadebe (2002) also concurs with Joseph (1987) when he says that writers, translators and media workers among others all need to work with a standard language with a standard vocabulary. The choice being determined by the desire for a uniform way of presentation.

## **2.5 Steps taken in the standardisation of a language**

This section basically focuses on the principle that standardisation is carefully planned. In this regard Haugen's (1966) model of language planning presents the process of

standardisation in four stages. These stages however as spelt by Haugen (1972) should not be thought of as chronological. This implies that they are not fixed entities but can freely overlap. The steps are as follows:

### **2.5.1 Norm Selection**

It is in this stage that the norm is selected. According to Haugen (1972) the dialect that need to be elevated is picked from the other varieties. The selection process he indicates follows social, political, religious, cultural, historical and other forces in society. In other words the choice of this variety is not dependent upon linguistic competencies only but is influenced by varied factors. Selection of the norm can be monocentric where choosing of an archaic dialect is done or it can be polycentric where a composite variety is created from several existing varieties (Swann 2004). This also explains that the standard dialect can be solely composed from one variety or it can be built from several varieties.

### **2.5.2 Norm Codification**

In this stage according to Haugen (1972) the norm selected is codified that is rules of grammar are set. How norms should be represented in the written form are set. It is the stage where all reference books for use in the language should be created. This is the stage where orthographies are created following the dialect chosen. This can be a stage for graphisation as alluded to by Wolff (2000) where the main aim is to develop and modify scripts and orthographic conventions for a language. In simpler terms this is where the writing system is established.

### **2.5.3 Norm implementation**

What has been selected and codified is in this stage is accepted for use by the speakers to whom the standard dialect is created for. This means that various institutions come in to assist in the gradual diffusion and acceptance of the newly created norm. Haugen (1972) argues that in this stage the standard variety come to be regarded not just as a form of language but as the language itself. In other words all the non-standard varieties becomes invalid. There are consumed and let to die by the selected norm.

#### **2.5.4 Norm elaboration**

This is also a stage that Wolff (2000) calls modernisation. In this stage the expectations heavily weigh on extending the functional reach of the standard variety. The standard variety ensures that changes are effected that makes and allows the standard variety to meet the demands of modern life and technology (Haugen, 1972). The stage takes after the belief that language is not static hence it should always be modified to suit the constant changes of science and technology. If policies of education changes it is in this stage that a language shift is made to meet with the challenges lest it becomes obsolete. It is through the attributes of this stage that Haugen (1972) therefore describes a standard language as possessing maximal variation in function and minimal variation in form. This implies that minimal errors relating to language impurity should be found in standard languages since the variety is designed for higher and prestigious functions of society.

#### **2.6 Characteristics of a standardised language**

As already alluded to earlier in this chapter standard languages arise when a certain dialect begins to be used in written form normally throughout a broader area than that of a dialect itself. This implies that a standard language typically has a writing system which is designed for education. In this vein, Hadebe (2002) talks of one characteristics based on the dictionary, he holds that standardised language must have an authoritative dictionary which records the vocabulary of the language. This means that points of reference for standard language should be genuine and authentic. Furthermore, he mentions that this language must have authoritative grammar which records the forms, rules and structures of the language. Such authoritative grammar will also enable a more stable and recognised standard of pronunciation. In other words consistency based on terminology, grammatical rules and phonological issues is highly pronounced in a standard language. This can also lead us to say that a standard language as alluded to by Lafon and Webb (2008) is overseen by an authoritative language body. The standards in this case may be set by school teachers, dictionaries and publishers who are usually stakeholders of this body.

A standard language is also regarded as having a body of literary texts. Trudgill (2006) talks of the standard language becoming the norm for writing. Meanwhile Alberts

(2006) argues that a standard variety provides a unified means of communication which can also be referred to as an institutionalised norm which can be used in the economic sector, mass media, education and science and technology. In other terms he means that formal instruction of and research into the language and its literature becomes significant especially in higher institutions of education based on the necessary fields and needs of human endeavour. It is also at this point that one can be compelled to say that all languages designed for formal use begin in the schools where the necessary groundwork for language use in various contexts is laid down.

A standard language according to Hall (2005) should have national recognition. In other words this means that mention of the language should be found in legal documents such as the constitution. The use of the language throughout public life is determined by this national recognition. For example, it can prescribe the language for use by government, media, schools and for international communication solely because of the support it obtains from the legal documents. The power the standard language gains from legal documents give rise to its other characteristic of social prestige. Finegan (2007) notes that social prestige is attached to speech of the richest and the most powerful and also to the highly educated in society. In this way the language of the most powerful is regarded the most chosen dialect for standard.

## **2.7 Standardising Orthography**

Orthography as already described by Mallison and Hudley (2011) is a meeting point for culturally and linguistically diverse students. It is a resultant of the standardisation process. Trudgill (2006) defines the term orthography as a set of conventions for writing the language. It is in orthography that a norm of spellings, hyphenation, capitalisation, word breaks, emphasis and punctuation is spelt out (Trudgill, 2006). It is thus explicit that orthography largely concerns itself with matters of spelling with particular reference to the relationship between phonemes and graphemes in a language. To elaborate on this Seidenberg (1992) wrote that orthography describes the set of symbols in writing a language and the rules on how to use the symbols. Therefore from the above definitions it can be noted that in standardising orthography the fundamental issue is designing the writing norm. It is a crucial way of formalising the language and distinguishing it from the oral form. It is in standardising orthography that

establishment of spelling and grammatical rules crucial for modern literacy tradition is done.

## **2.8 Conclusion**

This chapter has been largely centred on the concept standardisation of language. It further discussed this concept highlighting the principles of standardisation of a language and its influence on language choices. Steps considered for standardising a language was also discussed hence leading to the characteristics that makes a standardised language. The functions of a standardised language those that largely form the characteristics are derived from national recognition and the legal support accorded to the language. Explanations based on standardising orthography also attempted to explicitly explain the events whereby one claims he now has an orthography. The established writing system is the standardised orthography. The next chapter explores the existing orthography for its strengths and inadequacies.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE EXISTING KALANGA ORTHOGRAPHY AND ITS INADEQUACIES

#### 3.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter explicitly explained the concept of standardisation. By outlining the characteristics of a standardised language the preceding chapter laid a foundation for understanding the principles involved in standardisation. By sticking to these principles this chapter henceforth discusses the existing Kalanga orthography and how it was developed. It extends the discussion to explain the shortfalls that are present in standard Kalanga. Through scholarly views and responses from research participants this chapter brings to light some of these inadequacies. The chapter also highlights how the orthography is managed.

#### 3.2 Dialectal variation in Kalanga

This section established the variations that build Kalanga language as realised in the two districts. Wentzel (1981) gives a guideline on the Kalanga dialectal variation between its Botswana and Zimbabwe varieties. From the guidelines, Kalanga spoken in Zimbabwe comprises largely the following dialects, TjiLozwi or Tjindondo commonly known as Kalanga-proper, TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima. The two districts have been impacted on by these three dialects differently due to varied historical events. Two dialects are mainly found in Bulilima West and these are the Kalanga-proper and TjiLilima. The influence of Botswana in areas bordering the two countries has affected speakers mainly along the rivers Ramakgwebana and Maitengwe. Bulilima East is predominantly Kalanga-proper only in sections where Kalanga is prevalent.

Mangwe on the other hand covers the whole southern part of Plumtree. At the arrival of the Ndebele kingdom, Kalangas were dispersed. They settled in the furthest areas of Mangwe such as Tjingababili, Nguwanyana, Bango, Brunapeg, Makorokoro among the others. TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima are the major dialect clusters in these areas. IKalanga also takes some areas along the Ramakgwebana and Matsilotsi border post. The accent of Kalanga for TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima, the pronunciation and the spellings of some terminologies are totally different from the majority speakers of Kalanga. One object can be called by various names depending on area where one is

coming from. With all these differences in phonemes and in word morphology, standardisation of the Kalanga orthography is necessary if a uniform writing system is deemed necessary for the language.

### **3.3 Management and development of the Kalanga orthography**

This section examines how the Kalanga orthography was developed. Following what Mwaniki (2004) presented in his theory of language management, it enlists the processes of standardisation for this orthography to be used. In the precolonial era, history has it that TjiKalanga was the predominant language found in Bulilima. The leaders in Bulilima were of Kalanga dominance (Lushanduko, 2013). These included figures like Tjibundule, Chief Ndumba, Chief Masendu and Chief Madlambudzi among others. Meanwhile for Mangwe, it had dominant chiefs over the years such as Chief Tshitshi, Chief Bango and/or Chief Sangulube amongst others. The Kalanga language spoken in these areas was not diluted until the invasion of the Ndebele through King Mzilikazi (Moyo, 2012). However, Kalanga was also immersed and assimilated within the Ndebele language. This then left some places with what is termed the Kalanga proper, some areas termed Ndebele and some areas called Talawunda and Lilima because of Tswana being more pronounced in those areas.

In the colonial era, Kalanga language once again lost its identity to Ndebele because of language regionalisation which the Europeans enforced through Professor Doke in 1931 (Mazarire, 2003). Kalanga as a language was overridden by Ndebele. All Kalanga speakers were forced to use Ndebele as a language of wider use in public domains such as education, District Administrators' offices and again in churches. One can say that Ndebele was created to unite the different languages found in Matabeleland. By so doing Kalanga laid dormant, the writing system totally excluded it. A little literature was found in Dombodema through the Ndebele writing system which was taught to the people by the London Missionary Society. Kalanga people therefore imitated those sounds that were similar to Kalanga hence wrote TjiKalanga using the Ndebele phonemes. For example sounds such as *tshi*, for *tshinkwa* instead of *tj*, *ngo* for *ngombe* instead of *n'o*. These sounds were directly influenced by the Ndebele orthography which was written and used first by the Kalanga speaking group.

In post-colonial period, however the government realised that the inherited curriculum at independence still marginalised the country's indigenous languages. The 1987 Education Act worked on redressing the system (Gatawa, 1998). As a follow-up of the Nziramasanga Commission's findings in 1999 indigenous languages further received official recognition in the New Constitution of 2013. In this regard, Zimbabwe Kalanga through the language board started developing and pushed for the production of its first orthography in 2006. This was the first attempt of Kalanga to attain national government recognition and position in relation to other languages which can be termed status planning by Kloss (1969). It was also taking after Mwaniki's theory of language management as already alluded to. The first Kalanga textbooks (*Zwidiye TjiKalanga series*) were written using the orthography in 2008. This became the first official work to revive the Kalanga language. Various factors henceforth considered in development of language orthography are discussed below since these were also the backbone of developing the Kalanga orthography.

In the development process, the study has already outlined that Kalanga has three major dialects with one already called Kalanga-proper. From merely its name the likelihood of it being the favoured dialect over TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima is very high despite that research has it that, all dialect clusters of the Kalanga language had representatives in the construction of the orthography. According to Bartsch (1985), management and development of any language orthography and terminology are processes that require people who are on language boards. The processes require total adherence of linguistic principles hence the best people who can understand these are those on language boards. This section thus largely relies on information given by the chairperson of KLCDA.

Concerning the composition of the gathering that partook of orthography development, the following was captured during the conversation:

*We had Kalanga speaking people in these areas other than Plumtree, Kezi and Tsholotsho, beyond the borders we have Botswana. Representatives from these areas were in the group forming the orthography. We also had representatives from the different dialectal groups found in Zimbabwe, people from Mangwe, Brunapeg and Makorokoro areas largely infested with BaTalawunda, people from Nswazi, Mphoengs and Patse who mainly speak TjiLilima. We also had people from Bulilima, Madlambudzi, Tokwana, Masendu, these are regarded as the Kalanga-proper areas. We had one local chief from Bulilima.*

*Representations from the Ministry of Education-Curriculum Development Unit also formed the quorum for the development of TjiKalanga orthography.*

From this composition the researcher felt that Kalanga language dialects were appropriately represented. However, speaking of the chiefs to have just one out of ten chiefs as custodians of the language their representation was inadequate. Non availability of Mangwe chiefs was questionable since this again is the area with most of these dialects of Kalanga prevalent.

The adopted mode of orthography development followed largely the principle that the phonemic system of the dialect largely spoken in the standard pronunciation becomes the basis of the standard spelling. Symbols fitted well in technology advancement. However, as specified by the then KLCDA chairperson Lilima dialect had two sounds included in the earlier version of the orthography but removed in the complementary version. Of interest to note from his deliberations is that as sounds were built some members of the delegation were quick to say ‘this is not proper Kalanga?’ or this word is from Ndebele or this word is Shona or this word is more of IKalanga Botswana than Zimbabwe Kalanga.

Reference books used to correct the language were largely the Ndebo Mbuya a new testament Bible written by the London Missionary Society (LMS), the LMS Kalanga hymn book. From these two however, it was discovered that spelling largely followed IKalanga which already had written novels and a dictionary. Available also was the earlier Kalanga Zimbabwe textbooks Grade 1-3 ‘Atibaleni and **Tshinyunyi Babili**’ which were largely condemned because of the influence of Ndebele spellings in most Kalanga sounds as experienced in **Tshi** instead of **Tji**, **ngo** instead of **n’o**. It is from this experience that the group thought some sounds could be built from for example following the voice sound and then answering to the question ‘Which letter sounds did you hear?’ One example explicitly taken on board with the researcher was **pfu** where one responds by saying; I hear the **p**, then the **f**, lastly the **u**.

In his explanations he touched on discarding of letter sounds such as **mm**, **nn**. No such sounds were in the Kalanga alphabet created. For example **nn** was left as **nh** – a sound which was earlier on rejected as Shona. He spoke of the delegation trying to be pure Zimbabwean Kalanga as possible. Kalanga people from Kezi were bunched with people from Mangwe Bango, Makorokoro areas who are more of BaTalawunda than Kalanga

proper whilst on the other hand Kalanga speaking people from Tsholotsho were addressed as having their Kalanga a Ndebele influence. In this regard the dialect Kalanga-proper found itself dominating the other dialects regarded as taking from IKalanga. In fact it became the central dialect whom other scholars relate to as the dialect in power. In this regard it found itself being the standard used to correct most of the sounds in the developed orthography.

Management of the developed the Kalanga orthography is still the sole duty of the language board. Boards according to Mwaniki (2004) concurrently develop theoretical and practical advances in language management within the African reality. This means that each language board advances governing principles of language management which captures and fits well within their contexts. Resuscitation of the language is also planned within the degree of marginalisation. The Kalanga language board guards against TjiKalanga in the face of politics of language that usually function to legitimise political and social changes proposed by national ideologies (Kamusella, 2009). When Mwaniki (2011) talks of the language politics he indicates that language management in Africa guards African languages from aped alien national theories and practices that do not capture the African reality.

### **3.3.1 Factors influencing standardisation of the Kalanga orthography**

This subsection highlights some of the basic factors standardisation of the Kalanga orthography followed most. According to Hinton and Hale (2001), the creation of symbols to encode a spoken language is one of the preconditions for any literacy in that language. In this manner therefore, it is also one of the important aspects of orthography development. Recognition that beyond purely linguistic considerations there are factors aligned to social, psychological, economic and political cannot be ignored (Hall, 2005). This implies that where linguists want to guide standardisation using pure linguistic standardisation principles the existence of the stakeholders has a great influence in language standardisation and eventually a developed orthography.

#### **3.3.1.1 Sociological factors**

The local leaders who form the basis of a historical and religious background of any society or community cannot be ignored in any orthographic development. Regardless of pure linguistic demands and how linguistically conscious the native speakers of the

language are, their views must be integrally incorporated in the development of an orthography. Bamgbose (1991) and Mtenje (2002) concur that by taking on board the native speakers, designers do not get tempted to design orthography largely for second language speakers or formally for educated African elites. By this they mean that standardised orthography should cater for the needs of both levels of literacy of the community hence how the native speakers use their language should be considered. Kalanga standardisation must have Kalanga speakers which ensures originality of Kalanga vocabulary. Hinton and Hale (2001) argues that the creation of the writing system by an outside linguist or by a single community member acting independently and ignoring local input and feedback can easily lead to a failed orthography. Looked from a different angle development of orthography should willingly involve the local people since they are considered markers of identity. The choices made for development of the orthography reflect the need of the group to distinguish itself from the surrounding groups which Kristiansen and Coupland (2011) call ‘democratisation’ of linguistic debate. In this way standardisation of the Kalanga orthography distinguishes the Kalanga writing system and thus makes it unique and as identity distinctive as possible.

### **3.3.1.2 Political factors**

In each and every community there are familial or clan heads, there are local chiefs and even religious leaders. All these have a great influence in standardisation of a language orthography. In fact some of their views have in the long run taken as standing principles for standardisation. Haugen (1966) when he talks of ways of choosing the norm and when Mwaniki (2004) speaks of managing the language, he places the fundamental base on high-order functions amongst other considerations. Political leaders determine the functions of the language hence become very vocal in choosing the dialect or language variety depending on how it ventures into the political arena.

Based on functionality of the language or language variety orthographers in standardisation consider how national regulations and laws influence orthographic choices (Gordon, 1986). This implies that the standardisation process of any language is governed by the country’s laws. For TjiKalanga to be accepted as a language standardisation of Kalanga orthography should follow the prescribed steps designed for national languages as alluded to by Haugen (1972) and Ouane (1991). Language

unification, standardisation and corpus development indicate a refined national effort. This denotes that for a standardised orthography to be ideal, it should not only appeal to the members of the local community however, should also be acceptable to speakers of the language elsewhere. The acceptance of the unifying dialect should be in such a way that the standard can be comparable with other national languages in phonological, morphological and lexical areas (Kurgatt, 2017). This bridges the gap of uniformity. Rules of indigenous languages are almost similar, hence following similar rules creates uniform standards hence the nation can be assured of literature that can be used for development in a similar way across languages.

Depending on who is in power during orthography development, standardisation can be also a sure way of which dialect outstands. In view of this, Gordon (1986) maintains that various groups invested in culture and language of local community may have competing motivations for representing a language in a given way. The study agrees that all this need to be taken into cognisance in orthography development.

### **3.3.1.3 Economic and Technological factors**

In modern day economic and technological factors shape any innovation endeavoured. The choice of a written form given to a language should be suitable to the technological gadgets in use. Hinton and Hale (2001) talking about computer, they argue that these may prohibit the symbols that can be employed. This implies that symbols developed to represent the writing system should be versatile with modern technologies. People should be able to recreate it on widely available technologies hence integrating literacy into a formal cultural domain (Gordon, 1986).

The Kalanga language at the moment has neither its language form in computers nor used in the economic world. The language is still a preserve of the grassroots leading to varied Kalanga communities shunning its use in public. In this way standardisation of Kalanga orthography cannot be corrected using technological gadgets. Kalanga researches cannot also be done and accurately recorded using the technological gadgets because of these inadequacies. It is only the Kalanga who is conversant with the correct standard variety who can use a computer to type in that variety since no auto correction can be done by the computer system in cases of grammar and spelling.

### 3.4 Existing Kalanga orthography

This section explores the existing which is also the current Kalanga orthography in use. The Kalanga orthography debates started early in 2006. Section 3 alluded to the people consulted in the creation of this orthography. The widespread consultant area aimed at building a representative orthography that can be widely accepted by all dialects. The orthography thus approved was put to action in 2008. For reference and better comprehension extracts from the orthography were taken.

The Kalanga alphabet includes:

The earlier version had 26 letters of the alphabet as follows;

{a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h, 'h,i,j,k,l,m,n,n',o,p,r,s,t,u,vw,y,z} (Kalanga orthography, 2008a).

Meanwhile the latter version had 25 letters of the alphabet as follows;

{a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,j,k,l,m,n,n',o,p,r,s,t,u,vw,y,z} (Kalanga Orthography, 2008b).

Two letters 'h and n' are qualified with an apostrophe in the earlier version to form a second letter sound different from the ordinary h and n. The latter alphabet however removed 'h hence remained with 25 letters. From these alphabets the missing letters when compared with the English or Ndebele orthography is q and x. This means that the letter sounds of the two letters are not identified with the Kalanga language.

The five vowels of Kalanga language also take up after most of the languages {a,e,i,o,u}. These vowels can be doubled to make long sounds and singled to make short sounds such as:

**Table 2.1: Use of vowels in Kalanga sounds**

| Short vowel sounds                         | Long vowel sounds  |
|--|--------------------|
| a- pala (scrap), tala (draw), bhika (cook) | aa- etjiyaa, woyaa |
| e- pela (be finished), leba (say it)       | ee- yewee, ee      |
| i- pila (worship), dila (pour)             | ii- tii            |
| o- pola (cool down), tola (take)           | oo- yetjoo         |
| u- pula (thrush), tula (put load down)     | uu- duu, mhuu      |

*Taken from the Kalanga orthography*

### **Single consonants**

The single consonants take up after the displayed alphabet. These just add the vowels to bring out the sound desired. For example;

b- banga (wound), behha (carving)

g- gala (sit) go (wasp), gudo (baboon)

n'- n'ombe (cattle) n'an'aba (a facial expression of one who is about to cry)

w- wana (find), wayenda (he went), wila (fall in)

z- zebe (ear), zina (name), zomola (nip forcefully)

Single consonants are most common sounds that are often present throughout all the Kalanga dialects. Their sounds are the same and words built using these are read the same way and more often mean the same.

### **Consonant combinations**

Consonant combinations however start from double blends such as, *nd, ch, bh, ns, th, dl...* The orthography writes these as follows:

nd-nda (farm)

bh- bhabha (carry with your back), bhoma (smear), mabhubhu (immature grain at harvest)

ns- nsetje (sand), nsi (day/day of rest/Sabbath)

th-thama (do), thikili (bundle of thatching grass), thaka (peer)

dl- dla (eat), dlisa (feed/overeat), pedlo (near), fodlo (tobacco)

These consonant blends are also most common with all dialects.

The orthography also has treble blends such as, *tsh, bgw, dzw, ngw, mbv...* with expansion words such as:

bgw- bgwe (stone), bgwila (licking), bgwisa (mealie-meal), gambgwa (shell)

dzw-dzwala (sow)

mbv-mbvana (middle aged woman), mbvumbi (continuous light rain)

ngw-ngwena (crocodile), ngwa (war), ngwenu (now), ngwe (leopard)

tsh-tshambani (step on), tsheduka (move a bit), tshibama (give birth)

These are also some of the consonant blends that have similar sounds across dialects. The orthography also notes consonant sounds up to four letter combinations. These are only three and are, *mbgw*, *tshw*, *nkhw*. The word usage as per orthography illustrations are as follows:

mbgw-mbgwa (dog), mbgwimbgwi (gums), mbgweti (type of a tree)

nkhw-nkhwe (crack), **nkhwa** (slave)

tshw-dzwatshwatshwa (beetle like insect), tshwenya (bypass), tshwa (new)

The Kalanga orthography has as its last illustrations a five letter consonant combination of such sound as *ntshw*.

The single given word example for this sound is *ntshwayilo*- (grass broom). No other suggestions are given probably to mean that terms with such terms are minimal in the Kalanga language.

### 3.5 Kalanga Orthographic Reforms

Minimal orthographic reforms have been done in TjiKalanga. The orthography published in 2008a has its complementary copy constructed in the same year 2008b. These two are the main documents used in current education practices and in literature production. Looking at these two, the researcher discovered that whilst the earlier version included the TjiLilima dialect of sounds *sh* and *zh* it outrightly regarded them as Botswana Kalanga and not as dialectal differences present in Zimbabwe Kalanga. This then warranted for the complementary version that threw away the *sh* and *zh*. The orthography explicitly states that */sh/* has an equivalent of */’h/* in Kalanga (zim) and */zh/* has an equivalent of */hh/* in Kalanga (zim) respectively (Orthography 2008a). One can

thus say that this can be the reason why the complementary version opted for the Zimbabwe equivalents only and left the said Botswana IKalanga (Orthography, 2008b).

The standardisation process might have been the one that chose to do away with these sounds. Abdulaziz in Alberts (2006) argues that an efficient and practical spelling and orthography is a direct function which allows educational, cultural, administrative and mass media systems. Mahlangu (2015) discusses standardisation also as a concept that necessitate development of a written official language. He further states that it is in this concept that regulation of language grammar and/or orthography or spelling is done. This largely takes also after Neustupny's (1983) model of language treatment where he writes that the emphasis in language cultivation (development) is on linguistic varieties and their distribution. He further characterises his concept cultivation approach as fulfilling degrees of correctness and efficiency. All these he aimed for standardisation that attains high acceptability style. This therefore makes the researcher say that by deliberately leaving out some dialects in the orthography in use, the Kalanga language board was adhering to the standardisation rules for appropriateness, consistency and/or linguistic levels towards specialised functions. Rubin also notes that standardisation rules are regarded as second to written law (Alberts, 2006).

### **3.6 Inadequacies in the current Kalanga Orthography**

These largely emanate from deliberate omissions and typographical errors present in the orthography. Webb and Kembo-Sure (2000) spells out that the process of standardisation is one by which an authoritative language body prescribes how a language must be written, how words must be spelt. They further state that the process ensures which words to be accepted and what appropriate grammatical constructions of the language must be said to be accurate. Basing on the above citation, it reveals that standardisation is valued as a process for linguistic accuracy. Hence language users expect appropriate language spellings, language usage and grammatical rules after the process. The following however has been noted as inadequacies presented by the orthography in use.

#### **3.6.1 Inadequacies presented by translation**

Both orthographies present the following in the single consonant section:

w- wana (find), wayenda (he went), wila (fall in)

Taking *wayenda* into analysis however due to lack of intonation patterns, the English translation is inadequate since reading the word in another tone might literally mean ‘someone has gone’. In this regard without acknowledging knowledge expansion the learner of TjiKalanga might be blinkered on the meaning of the word. Such analysis speaks on challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography, especially on the accuracy of the end result of the process.

For double consonants, in this example of th-thama (do), **thikili (bundle of thatching grass)**, thaka (peer), the highlighted example and English translation is controversial. Also as way of analysis *thikili* does not literally refer to a bundle of thatching grass in Kalanga, in reality it means the thatching grass that has been prepared using sisal or thatching thread and ready to be taken up to the person thatching the hut. Left in the context as explained in the orthography it would mean even the bundle of thatching grass one comes with from the forest is *ithikili*.

tshw-dzwatshwatshwa (beetle like insect), **tshwenya (bypass)**, tshwa (new)

To bypass also as a literal translation for the word *tshwenya* is inaccurate. The word is commonly used to mean to trouble. It is largely a TjiLilima word and hence synonymous with *dzidza or manikanya* in Kalanga-proper.

### 3.6.2 Inadequacies presented by omission

The double consonant sounds are also common across all Kalanga dialects even though there are some double sounds that do apply to all dialects. Some of the double consonants in TjiTalawunda are single consonants in Kalanga-proper. Some examples of such are that of *dla* as *ja*. This Kalanga version affects the Lilima and Talawunda dailects. The Kalanga proper assumes the use of *dla* and not *ja*. The orthography thus is silent about the use of these other dialects in addressing of the same concept.

mbgw-mbgwa (dog), mbgwimbgwi (gums), **mbgweti (type of a tree)**

nkhw-nkhwe (crack), **nkhwa (slave)**

In these orthography illustrations, one dialect will not agree that *nkhwa* is a slave. In fact the word *nkhwa* as explained by one of the KLCDA executive member is taken from the name of the bushman in Kalanga (*Bakhwa*). The name emanated from their nomadic behaviour and the fact that the quality of saving is not theirs, instead they want to eat and finish as per meal. So *nkhwa* cannot relate to slave. Instead Kalanga-proper dialect calls a slave *nlanda*.

The other word *mbgweti* referring to a certain tree is not well representative. In fact those in the Kalanga proper zone will call it *tshwiri* whilst the BaTalawunda will stand by *mbgweti*. The orthography therefore is also silent on this common Bulilima term *tshwiri*. However, the KLCDA executive member revealed that this was a term chosen from these other dialects to run away from using *tshwiri* which they felt was more of IsiNdebele. The below words in italics is what came out as response of the word usage enquiry from KLCDA.

*The Ndebeles call the tree 'umtshwiri' therefore 'mbgweti' was more appropriate for the illustration since it is unique to the Kalanga language. Again since the term is also Kalanga and matches well with the syllable it was appropriate for the illustration.*

### 3.6.3 Inadequacies presented by spelling errors

In presenting the vowels the 2008b version presents *a-pala*, *e-pela*, *i-pila*, **o pola** and *u-pula*. Failure to have a hyphen between *o* and how it is used can lead to one learner reading the illustration as one word *opola*. In fact one printed version found in one of the schools had the illustration as one word *opola*. This caught on the researcher because the word and the English meaning now contradicted.

The treble consonants present the following phoneme.

bgw- bgwe (stone), bgwila (licking), bgwisa (mealie-meal), **gambgwa** (shell)

In compiling the orthography though, *gambgwa* in the example given is misplaced. The word does not have a treble consonant blend but falls in those with four letter combinations *mbgw*. A learner of language who has been introduced to the sound *bgw* might not notice the difference however, might read the word 'gambgwa' wrongly.

mbgw- mbgwa (dog), **mbgwibgwi** (gums) mbgweti (a type of tree)

mpf-**mfudze** (manure), mpfula (amarula tree)

nl-nlisi (**shepard**), nlume (man) nlapwa (patient)

The words illustrated in bold are wrongly spelt, *mbgwibgwi* instead it should be written as **mbgwimbgwi**, *mfudze* as **mpfudze** and **shepherd** for the English translation. It can thus be possible for a learner of TjiKalanga to learn the wrong terminology taking into cognisance that the orthography in use is the first official document presented to the native speakers by the BaKalanga themselves. It is thus held with high prestige considered as real standard.

There is also a misrepresentation of sounds leading to a wrong spelling of words. The following illustration if followed phonetically leads to the result given by the researcher.

nd-nda (farm), ndebo (news), ndilo (plate)

*ndh- ndhale (beer for sale) ndhazula (a traditional dance done after drinking beer)*

**ndl-ndlana (September), ndlovu (surname)**

The bolded strip in this *ndl* sound is misrepresented instead *ndhl* should be the correct sound as illustrated in the second italicised strip. The *nd* sound has a very parallel sound to end up building soft sound for *ndlovu*. The *ndlovu* sound as written here is also too soft for the loudly spoken *ndhlovu* in TjiKalanga. In this way the study regards a spelling error in the *ndl* in fact it takes it as non-existent in TjiKalanga to maintain accuracy and consistency in speech and literacy production.

### 3.7 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the Kalanga orthography as obtained from the existing and current orthography in use. It highlighted on the dialectal variations that gave birth to the desire to standardise Kalanga language. The research established that the complementary Kalanga orthography mainly was created to remove the *sh* and *zh* sounds that were regarded IKalanga rather than Kalanga. Factors that influenced the gathering that acted on developing the Kalanga orthography were also discussed.

Inadequacies looked at include those emanating from typographical or spelling errors, translation and omission. Various examples taken from the orthography were used as reference and to explain the intentions of the researcher. The chapter also revealed that management and development of Kalanga orthography as processes are spearheaded by the Kalanga language board since national regulations govern all language standardisation. In this light, the prescriptions can easily be understood by the board and it is also easy for the board to set linguistic constitutions than any other lay person. The next chapter presents an analysis of the challenges and prospects in the standardisation of Kalanga orthography.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS IN THE STANDARDISATION OF KALANGA ORTHOGRAPHY**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

The previous chapter focused on the Kalanga orthography in use, its development, management and inadequacies. This chapter demonstrates the presence of challenges and that of prospects in standardisation of Kalanga orthography. It therefore gave an analysis of these challenges and prospects in the standardisation of Kalanga orthography. Basically it analysed views of varied respondents concerning the concept standardisation. In a way this chapter gave the impact of Kalanga language orthography in use to the language choices and practices experienced in the two districts. Comparative analysis of source information and geographical location of dialect added richness to the understanding of these concepts under study.

#### **4.2 Challenges in the standardisation of Kalanga orthography**

Standardisation of a language variety in a multilingual context is bound to have challenges. It is viewed in this way because standardisation concerns itself with a one-size-fits-all principle as alluded to by Mazuruse (2013). Different dialects are expected to unify and adopt one for public use at the expense of their own dialects of origin. By so doing therefore, various challenges were obtained from the various sources used in data collection. The responses were grouped to form some themes. Comparative analysis of each challenge given was done so that discussion could be expanded.

##### **4.2.1 Dialectal variation**

When a language is first written down in a multi dialectal society, it is important to realise that not all speakers pronounce the same words the same way. Inflexible decisions about linguistic forms are introduced with the written form, however the original speakers of the language tend to have fewer fixed notions of precision before a language is written. This implies as Muhlhausler (1996) and Mazuruse (2013) puts it, that linguistic choices are perceived as authoritative. This is one challenge that standardisation of Kalanga orthography came across. Even though the dialects are

recorded mutually intelligible how the speakers term various objects is just not the same, how they pronounce certain similar concepts is just but different. Writing about the Shona Magwa (2007) notes that the writing system designed for the Shona disallowed speakers to write the language the way they speak. Similarly for Kalanga standardisation, the choice of one dialect over the other disempowered the speakers of the dialects when it came to expressing their feelings on paper. For example speakers and writers from the BaLilima are forced to write <hangu> instead of <shangu> for shoes. On the other hand the BaTalawunda are compelled to write <nhu> instead of <nthru> for person. The absence of /sh/ and /nthr/ on the standard alphabet oblige speakers of the two dialects to write what they do not speak. In this regard even compiled lexicographical work uses mostly the chosen dialect. This discussion therefore noted that the omissions of these dialects' sounds were deliberate interventions since even the Kalanga language board executives talked of excluding the sounds that the gathering thought foreign. This means that in the creation of the orthography all that which they considered either Tswana (*sh* and *zh* sounds) or Shona (*r* sound) was removed. This can also be explained by the creation of a complementary orthography (2008b) that did away with /sh/, /zh/ sounds. What the gathering failed to accept was that Kalanga spoken in the Zimbabwe had a dialect that deliberated using these sounds on a daily basis.

In addition, Elkarte (2010) argues that if a specific variety of the language were chosen as the standard the speakers of other varieties would develop hang ups because of failure to master it fully. By this he implies that speakers of non-standard dialects would have difficulties leading to under-achievement in learners. The learners lack proficiency in the dominant dialect therefore they are silenced and spend most of their time listening rather than participating in classroom discussions. This was also an observation that Mallison and Huddley (2011) made that students who speak non-standardised varieties of a given language might face linguistic hurdles at school. All research participants used acknowledged the varied dialects in their areas and that these were more pronounced in schools. One of the the school heads consulted had this to say concerning dialectal variation and standardisation of the Kalanga orthography:

*Most of the learners speak different languages (dialects) at home. So which criteria was used to standardise using the Lozwi dialect. Orthography closed some learners out of language enhancement.*

The above sentiments also tap on what Elkarte (2010) noted when he said that it is very difficult for a language to survive unless it is used in education, cultural transmission, mass media and the public. Cook in Lafon and Webb (2008) in her article titled ‘*Do language policies in South Africa symbolically erase multilingualism?*’ wrote that the forceful imposition of Setswana through the school system as a standard variety that differs markedly from people’s own and diverse practices leads to an erasure of their identities. The citation extends the views of the respondents that the dialects instead of being enhanced by the opportunity of learning Kalanga are forced to extinct. In a way the speakers’ and writers’ identities are lost. This therefore confirms the argument that standardisation contributes to the loss of linguistic diversity as alluded to by most scholars (Gordon, 1986; Schiffman, 1998; Magwa, 2007; Bamgbose, 2011). Instead of reviving TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima and creating a voluminous corpus of Kalanga vocabulary, vocabulary creation is left to one dialect. The following is how one of the language coordinators talking of Mangwe district articulated the above view:

*There is a multilingual challenge in most areas in Mangwe therefore failure by the orthography to supply a glossary for spelling and word meanings illustrated it diminishes different terminology used by the different Kalanga speakers.*

All the research participants in education thus posited that a gap between home and school is created in learners. Learners perceived there was language for the home and language for the school instead of connecting and extending home knowledge to school knowledge. This situation has remarkably reduced the Talawunda and Lilima dialects to inferior yet the desire to resuscitate indigenous languages in the new curriculum counterattacks foreign languages in learners’ learning. This was a comment given by one of the educationists. In this way standardisation of Kalanga orthography impoverishes the learners of TjiKalanga from the non-standard dialects since the rich variety existing in the language especially in spelling and pronunciation would be lost. Mazuruse (2013) talking about the Shona dialects acknowledges this challenge when he notes that marginalisation of dialects has also taken place in the primary school where teachers often rejected correct answers given by children who are speakers of ‘minority dialects’. For example the Lilima child writing ‘*shingo*’ would be marked wrong for the standardised ‘*n’hingo*’ for work.

The study noted that the three main Kalanga dialects are mutually intelligible. This is a fact that all the respondents concurred with. That is a scene of three people from each

dialect can sit together and converse intelligent thoughts without interpretation. However, Roy-Campbell (2006) observed as the respondents did that mutual intelligibility broke down significantly as one moved from the spoken to written forms. One fact noted as a learner challenge by one of the school heads was quoted as follows:

*Talawunda and Lilima learners become passive when it comes to reading lessons of TjiKalanga. At times even the most fluent reader reads without comprehension. For example a Lilima learner met with the following sentences that differ in wording from the usual spoken at home.*

TjiLilima (spoken): *Atitoduma kuti tate banowuduma dumbu.*

Kalanga-proper (written): *Atitobona kuti tate banowubvuma tjose.*

(I don't see my father accepting her)

However, if the TjiLilima spoken sentence were to be written and read from a Kalanga-proper version it means quite a different thing altogether. *Duma* means making a moving sound. Whilst the TjiLilima learner reading the sentence from the Kalanga-proper version can never equate the same meaning to what he/she usually says as they speak, '*Atitoduma kuti tate banowuduma dumbu*'.

The other method of standardisation taken on board during standardisation of Kalanga orthography became a challenge by itself. For example, it was found that following set principles of language standardisation that is sound-symbol correspondence, some of the sounds in TjiKalanga forego this principle. According to the language board orthographies based on phonemic representation just like the Kalanga orthography should have phonemes and morphemes represented consistently. However, Kalanga standardisation had relentless challenges in the sounds *w* versus the *h* sounds especially for words such as *woku*, *hoku* (for this), *wolu*, *holu* (for hall). These sounds are not distinctly well pronounced, one may hear a *w* sound in an *h* sound and vice-versa. This also affected the /*h*/ and /'h/ -the earlier version of the orthography had /'h/ for such words as '*hama* (open your mouth) but the complementary one discarded the alphabet and just adopted *h-hama*. Written this way the word now presents an inconsistency in the word form and sound for *hama*-(open your mouth) and *hama*-(relative). Whilst the word form is the same the pronunciation is apparently different. Hadebe (2002) speaking of Ndebele and Zulu standardisation writes that orthographies that are

phonemically-based are more stable. This however is noted and found only in closely related dialects. Hadebe also markedly states that one phoneme and one grapheme by the Africa alphabet is not feasible. TjiKalanga-proper, TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima though are mutually intelligible, this is more prevalent only in the speech form than in the written form. There is again no way that one alphabet letter can solely represent one sound.

#### **4.2.2 Language purism**

In a quest for cleaning or purifying the language, standardisation of a language orthography can result in stigmatisation (Alberts, 2006). This implies that by keeping the language clean and pure through sifting inferior and impure elements from the dialects regarded non-standard these tend to lose their confidence as standalone dialects. Haugen (1966) also contends to the fact that in codification and elaboration minimal variation and stability in linguistic form must be achieved. Responses from the education sector and KLCDA also took note of this language purism in the form of literature production. The standardised Kalanga orthography is the standard set for all books written in TjiKalanga, examinations set in the language hence acts as a limitation for language growth in the other dialects. Certain TjiTalawunda lexical items from a Kalanga-proper standard are considered obscene and uncouth. This thus allows speakers from the Kalanga proper to be quick to say 'this is not proper Kalanga'. By so doing this implies that the dialect is not fit for use outside the homes where it is predominant. This is also a realisation that Canagarajah (2006) commented on when he said that purist ideals disempower vernacular forms spoken in everyday contexts, making a purified language less suitable for contemporary purpose. The everyday dialect that the learner uses becomes uncouth when modernity as spelt out by the school system comes into existence.

#### **4.2.3 Non-linguistic factors**

Standardisation of a language orthography is intertwined with the politics of the nation-state, Kamusella (2009) reveals that the elite monopolised the ability to write and used one or several languages for administration and governance. Basing on this citation, it is of interest to note that some challenges of standardisation of a language orthography most of the times emanate from non-linguistic factors. The presence of non-linguistic

stakeholders in developing an orthography can instead of harmonising the process, pose challenges particularly on political nationalism. Who is in power forms the standard dialect to prove that standard varieties or languages are associated with power, prestige and a greater functional importance as alluded to by most scholars in the like of Ammon (2004), Alberts (2006) and Finegan (2007). The scholars also agree to the fact that political and civil leaders have vested interests in the language of administration and usually these take up after their own native languages. Yule (1985) also observes that the variety which develops as the standard language has usually been the socially prestigious dialect originally connected with a political or cultural centre. In a case where there is a preferred foreign language Bamgbose (2011) avers that elites would vow for education in the imported language for their children. In this case standardisation of the local language orthography can never be a fundamental matter to them. Unfortunately for Kalanga language both Bulilima and Mangwe have portions of their areas predominantly foreign languages such as Tswana and Ndebele because of the local chiefs and their acclaimed origins. Viewed from this context the local leaders who partook of the research commented that such leaders cannot fully apply themselves to the rules of standardisation of a language where the results disadvantage them and their positions.

The study has also acknowledged a minimal involvement of local leaders in the standardisation of Kalanga orthography. In fact non-representation from Mangwe was experienced. It is also in data collection that the researcher experienced a lot of ignorance on dialect knowledge, standardisation process and also on the domains that use TjiKalanga in the areas where the chiefs cared for. As analysis therefore, the study saw lack of control and desire to actively revive Kalanga and its dialects under this governance. Failing to know which dialects form their chiefdom was treated as merely unrelenting care for which language their subjects spoke and wrote. This in turn makes the local people lose their identity in both oral and literacy form. Qualifying the issue of attitude as a prohibition for standardisation of a language Bamgbose (2011) states that the question of attitudes solely lies within the power of those who own the language. This implies that one would expect speakers of TjiKalanga clamouring for more language practices in their communities, rather than choosing foreign languages to publicly address gatherings and as media of instruction for education of their children.

Some attitudinal challenges identified by the three sets of research participants lie heavily on some catchment communities. Communities in these geographical areas denied to accept they were Kalanga and disallowed their children to partake of the Kalanga learning. In this way it was difficult to assess whether the challenge was posed by the standardisation process or was a matter of the top-down approach usually used for innovations in the education sector. TjiKalanga has not been a language for instruction since time immemorial therefore communities have their usual lifestyle. Adopting the Kalanga orthography is seen as unusual thus a threat to their 'normal' lives and worse for dialect clusters, a different dialect altogether overriding theirs is problematic. Coupland & Kristiansen (2011) note that the prescriptive top-down standardisation efforts hamper and weaken the chances of reaching a consensus. However, they consider that the crucial factor is willingness as well as a degree of autonomy of the authorities. They further state that if this political willingness is missing or this degree of autonomy is low implementation of the standard variety can be dismissed. Adding to the attitude puzzles Marungudzi, Chiweve & Mhute (2014) note that speakers of the language themselves who should be lobbying for the promotion of the language also share this negative attitude. People have lost this interest probably due to the nature of the national language guidelines and policies that deliberately sideline the indigenous languages in day to day activities. For example, for most professional jobs the needed subjects are five O'levels including Maths, English and Science, no mention of any vernacular language is noted thus rendering them less important. In this regard one of the educationist's response read:

*The local community apparently see TjiKalanga useless as their children's language to be learnt. Noted were the following;*

- *After writing Grade seven there is no continuity.*
- *The secondary schools doing TjiKalanga are day scholars, they do not want their children to go day schools. These schools have no teaching material. Boarding schools are teaching IsiNdebele.*
- *Their children will have difficulties in uniting with the outside world in a vernacular language if they are confined to TjiKalanga.*
- *If TjiKalanga was taught alongside IsiNdebele it will better in that their children will learn TjiKalanga for communication purposes and write IsiNdebele for learning continuity after Grade 7.*

These are indeed negative attitudes that once marginalised languages are facing. This can also act as inference that the research reached after noting various communities

anti-Kalanga in both districts. The assessment done also by the study also take after Marungudzi et al's (2014) view that a language marginalised at some point in history is likely never to recuperate fully unless drastic intervention is taken. A drastic action is indeed here needed to work out the attitudes of the communities whose ancestry is Kalanga.

The concept of standardisation is essentially driven by nationalism rather than linguistic factors. The desire for a national, regional and community symbol creates a standard variety. Some communities thus find themselves in what Joseph (1987) terms an arguably 'neutral' standard which does not belong to them. As conclusion therefore, the study views standard varieties as sites of struggle of unity rather than as linguistic competencies. Whilst languages are mere social phenomenon and do not have social interests Hall (2005) holds that people do. It is in these vested interests by people that attitudes develop and override the goals of standardisation.

#### **4.3 Conceptualising the prospects in standardisation of Kalanga orthography**

A prospect is defined as an apparent probability of advancement, success or profit ([www.dictionary.com/browse-prospect](http://www.dictionary.com/browse-prospect)). This means that when one talks of a prospect of something there is some progressive development noted based on the presence of the concept. Pauuw (2009) speaks of prospects of the Indonesian language based on the present work the language has achieved for the nation. It is from this notion that one can also say prospects relate to achievement. The Meriam-Webster dictionary also define prospect as implying expectation or development of definite interest or concern. From the above definition it is clearly stated that one talks of prospect after realising an expected outcome or after the development of an interest flourish the concept. A prospect is therefore the possibility of future success.

It is in standardisation of a language that one can experience prospects based on the standard language versus the community or nation the language serves. Standardisation of Kalanga orthography has prospects. Varied ideas came out from the participants that aid this understanding. The ideas were also linked to scholarly views thereby explicitly ironing out the prospects as experienced in standardisation of the Kalanga orthography. Hadebe (2002) echoes that prospects of a standard language can only be realised against the limitations of a non-standard language. This implies that for one to talk of a prospect

of standardisation of Kalanga orthography it has to be comparable with employing a non-standard Kalanga language. Language development, language practices, literature production and language use are fundamental aspects that determine whether the Kalanga orthography is successful or not and whether it stands to see the new day or not.

#### **4.4 Prospects as seen in language development in a multilingual context**

The multilingual context in Bulilima and Mangwe begin with the three Kalanga dialects and adds on Ndebele, English and SeTswana as foreign languages. Mhute (2016) views language as a system of words or signs that people use in thought and feelings expression. From this view it means that any language need to be developed so that people can then be accorded a chance to share their thoughts and their feelings with others. All the respondents from the varied categories stood by political legitimacy. One scholar, Vandel (2004) concurs with the fact that a language that is developing is the one that is government-sanctioned. By this she implies that it is through the government that innovations about a language can be sustained. Kalanga needed an increase in political and cultural consciousness beyond Section 6 of the New Constitution (2013). It is at this juncture that they talked of the standardised Kalanga orthography as part of the educational reforms on indigenous languages. One cited response is that Kalanga is also enjoying post-elementary education particularly in higher and tertiary education that is, in teachers colleges and universities. It is a higher move taking after some schools have declared 'No to foreign indigenous language' teaching in favour of the new Kalanga in a standardised Kalanga orthography.

A comparative prospect analysis was also done based on the other Kalanga dialects, it was discovered that the created Kalanga orthography improves communication and enhances comprehension as alluded to by Hadebe (2002). Looking at the young reader in school, adopting the standardised Kalanga spellings and vocabulary opens avenues for comprehension and expansion of a core vocabulary especially for Talawunda and Lilima where the speakers have other varieties as their mother tongue. The standard language aims at unifying the three dialects and go against the variation and inconsistency in spelling. Such a move makes reading and writing of the language easier. Language coordinators indicated that from a standard language it is also easier to develop specialised technical languages for various specialised language situations.

The need for word formation rules such as building words from verbs, derivations and inflection become possible as also alluded to by Hadebe (2002) in his thesis '*The Standardisation of the Ndebele Language through Dictionary making.*' Elkartea (2010) sees language standardisation as language revitalisation hence the effort entails creation of a written form of the language. This concurs with the postulation that Hadebe (2002) made that a standardised language enables writers, researchers, teachers, translators, editors, publishers and media workers with a standard vocabulary. This therefore is in line with the research findings that the standardised Kalanga orthography has provided the community with a reference point in fact a starting point for a renaissance of the Kalanga language.

One obvious comparison of a standard variety over a non-standard variety is their status. Having a standard orthography as affirmed by Adegbiga (1993) can increase its status within the community and thus reinforces the community values. The status talked about here includes the highly prestigious functions that the language can have as shall be discussed in section 4.5 below. Schiffman (1998) also concurring with Adegbiga's affirmation holds that a standard vocabulary in a multilingual context becomes the language that enable a group to gain recognition and official status thereby further enhancing a sense of identity and pride. From the citations therefore it means that a chosen dialect amongst the varied varieties gains authority recognition and is thus developed according to the set standards of national languages. A standard Kalanga orthography in this regard enable the Kalanga group official government recognition in the country as a whole.

The Kalanga language board also highlighted its moves to overcome the major challenge that the Centre for Advanced Studies of African Studies (CASAS) did in trying to harmonise Kalanga with Shona. In this quest for language independence the standardised Kalanga orthography is working tirelessly with other similar language associations in the country to retain the national goals of a standard language. In this way Kalanga is a member of Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA) an association that sees to resuscitation of Zimbabwean indigenisation languages, an association that also seeks through the cultural fund to finance the basic works that indigenous languages engage in as language development agencies.

The study also established from KLCDA that as way of prospect the Kalanga language board has sought entry into the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation to gain media coverage in both electronic and print media. National FM, the Sunday News and Umthunywa were highlighted as media that agreed to slot in Kalanga in a move to reach out to the native speakers of the language and thus develop the indigenous language that has been overtaken by foreign languages.

#### **4.5 Prospects as seen in language practices**

This purpose is pursued by analysing the practices basically on literature production in respective community public activities. There is a strong belief held by various scholars including Joseph (1987), Bamgbose (2011) & Mahlangu (2015) that standardisation comprises a whole world of activities in various spheres of life. These activities assist in creation of benefits and sustainability for everyone in the global society. The study exposes that one benefit the local leaders talked about closely follows after this belief.

Activities done in TjiKalanga follow the existing Kalanga orthography. This means that Kalanga is definitely recognised as one of the national languages. Therefore even if TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima want to be part of the standardised Kalanga orthography, this can be easily done as amendments to the existing document rather than where there was nothing to lean on.

##### **4.5.1 Prospects in literature production**

African language use as media of instruction is seen by Bamgbose (2011) as bringing to the fore the question of intellectualisation of these languages. It is in this forum that extending language activities in domains where it was previously not used is the resulting prestige they acquire this intellectualisation Bamgbose is talking about. Literature production is one prospect talked about by the language board and educationist as resulting from the standardised Kalanga orthography. Writers were invited to translate the indigenous language syllabuses to kick start the learning of TjiKalanga based on this Kalanga orthography. Furthermore, it came out that the first TjiKalanga primary school textbook series based on the standardised Kalanga orthography is the sole resource that base all teaching and learning of the language in the education system. The examining process is also based on this textbook. In other means the production of the textbook is an excellent move to language sustainability.

Mwaniki (2011) advances the language management theory as one principle of resuscitating and guarding of African languages from foreign domination and competition. Literature production therefore is one way of language maintenance and guarding against its corruption and language death. Trudgill (1998) argues that preservation of language is important for the preservation of cultures. It is through literature production that the respondents felt there was source of consistent information for the language which can be passed down from one generation to the other without pollution.

Literature production by the native speakers of the language in TjiKalanga was also highlighted as a practice necessitated by the presence of the standardised Kalanga orthography. Quite a number of reference books on proverbs, Kalanga history, poetry and on totemic relevance were cited as productions realised after the standardisation process. Of interest to note again the standardisation of Kalanga orthography came with an economic benefit to the nation. The creation of Kwalani Publishing House solely for Kalanga literature was born. The publishing house is guided by the nation's requirements for book publications hence a benefit to the country. It can also be used as a resource for revised edition awareness and new editions premised on the development of TjiKalanga.

It was also in the practice of literature production that the issue of language reviewers and language translators as directly guided by the standardised Kalanga orthography was noted. The language coordinators also indicated that a second series of the school textbook that was not necessarily spearheaded by the board was launched and availed to the schools. For the book to pass through the Ministry of Primary and Secondary school standards, the language board explained how the reviewers and the editors guided by the standard orthography saw it through. The language board also explained on the production of tertiary modules, a University of Zimbabwe Department of Teacher Education project as literature production prospect meant to sustain the language at higher levels of education. Literature production is indeed an invaluable asset in education where instructors need some way of guiding their students in making choices when writing (Schiffman, 1998).

The first bilingual language dictionary was reported by KLCDA as having been launched on the 6<sup>th</sup> of October 2017. This was regarded as a very important asset in the

Kalanga language. The English-Kalanga dictionary also follows the Kalanga standardised orthography for spellings. It also uses the Kalanga-proper dialect as a measure of standard for terminology used. This also means that the language still predominantly rural would now transform even to those Kalanga speakers in urban circles who have taken English as their major language. Those interested in the language can easily learn the language through translations and explanations the dictionary offers. This prospect realised from the language dictionary takes up after what Kurgatt (2017) observed about standardisation. He stated that standardisation need to focus on phonological, morphological and lexical areas since this enables literature that can be used for language development in a uniform way. Relating to the same issue Alberts (2006) records that terminographers and lexicographers document the vocabulary of a standard language. In a way he implies that they adhere to the spelling and orthography rules of the standard dialect of a language when compiling the dictionary. Sarwar (2017) writing about functions of dictionaries confirms that the standard language requires one or more than one inter-lingual and intra-lingual dictionary that must retain the lexical and orthographic recognition of that language. The bilingual Kalanga dictionary is therefore a prospect for the beginning language to be managed and sustained. This also can mean that dictionaries ensure a similar, consistent and accurate way of writing and using terms which are desirable for all languages to prosper.

Prospects realised in literature production was also discussed at local leaders' level, where a revelation was made that indeed the language is achieving popularity. One of the Bulilima chiefs announced that the local Methodist church in Zimbabwe which predominantly takes a larger area in Bulilima East and North was involved in a translation project of church doctrines that include the service books and the hymnal for use by local Kalanga congregants. This is a positive move to enable local people to understand their belief in their own languages. The Kalanga orthography in use is a standard by which editors edit these songs and services. The spelling and grammar rules match the orthographic rules defined by the standardised orthography.

#### **4.5.2 Prospects relating to language used in varied public community domains**

Standardisation of a language is a central feature of the use of a language (Mahlangu, 2015). Whilst Sager (1990) perceives standardisation as a process that embraces users

reaching public agreement to adopt given terms for use in specific circumstances. Analysing the above citations, one can say that the strength of a language is depicted in its use precisely in its public domains.

From the local leaders the research observed that communal courts in the largely Kalanga infested areas are conducted in Kalanga-proper. One of the chiefs in Bulilima reported that in the Lilima area, he allows the respondents to respond in their own dialect since the dialects are mutually intelligible. In another interview with one of the Mangwe chiefs who is a Ndebele speaker it was discovered that in areas primarily Kalanga, the subjects are allowed to use their Kalanga though he himself will pose questions and deliver the verdict in IsiNdebele. Despite that the local leader was not Kalanga speaking it was good to note that Kalanga was allowed to survive within the geographical areas of the language.

In addition, the local leaders revealed that the sub-registry offices especially those situated in the local communities the dominant language used was Kalanga in its registered varieties. This means that the language Kalanga is used even in these areas despite that the rules of standardisation cannot feature most here. The lay people are not linguistically aware of these. By allowing TjiKalanga to be a working language, these offices can thus be said are part of language development. Hence this becomes an important initiative of empowering African languages. This was primarily noted by Bamgbose (2011) when he said that the outcome of such working languages when fully realised can be empowerment of concerned languages as well as an affirmation that African languages can also function in domains once dominated by foreign languages. TjiKalanga can also serve people in the Ministry of Home Affairs in Bulilima and Mangwe. Likewise the District Administrators' offices for both Mangwe and Bulilima, the rural council offices for the two districts were construed as being other public offices where Kalanga language is dominantly used, even though it was noted that the majority of assistants in these four offices were non-Kalanga speakers. The local leaders reported that despite the staff deployment issues beyond their control, someone visiting these offices can be served using TjiKalanga.

The education sector was also one noted public domain that used Kalanga more than any other areas. All the sources of respondents used pointed at the sector as where major prospects of standardisation of the Kalanga orthography were realised. The language

coordinators talked of schools that have taken the language as the only indigenous language taught in the schools. They also talked of schools having created Kalanga language committees to assist the teachers who cannot teach TjiKalanga. They also highlighted that some of the schools have begun teaching the subject though Grade seven public examinations have not yet been conducted in TjiKalanga in those schools. All these moves are pointers to the success of standardisation of the Kalanga orthography. Alongside the teaching of TjiKalanga all respondents in the education sector talked of traditional dance as compulsory in the schools. Below is one response obtained from the educationist in verbatim:

*This is one section where besides teaching of the spellings and language usage in everyday life, children learn to appreciate their culture as BaKalanga. For the children to learn and appreciate TjiKalanga they need to gain confidence and pride in their language.*

The response shows that TjiKalanga music is revived as a way of making learners accept their language. This was also seen as a way of motivating learners to want to learn their language. One of the language coordinators also noted that children learn to identify with their true identities through these dances. This is also indicated by Vandel (2004) when she writes that maintenance of the language is involved in numerous literacy and educational activities. It is in these educational activities that TjiKalanga language is managed. One tenet obtained from Mwaniki's (2004) theory spells out that language management can also be a practice where critical and creative development methodologies and strategies are deployed in addressing language-related challenges in society. Traditional dance is therefore one of the attempted creativity strategies that education embarks on in an attempt to revive the once neglected language.

According to Elkarte (2010), the objective of schools in indigenous language learning is to help young pupils to broaden and deepen their understanding of the language, improve their vocabulary and their grammar and teaches them to read and write. This is one prospect shared by the educationists since if the learners are educated in their own language they come to think more highly of it. In a way they learn to understand their environment and the world better where the mind is not troubled by the translation process.

The Kalanga language board also talked of their annual Kalanga cultural festivals that can be held either at Luswingo or at Domboshaba in Botswana at an alternative range

agreed upon. The festivals are open to the public where cultural seminars, workshops, dances, poetry and food are the day's activities. All these are lessons that aim to make Kalanga people aware of themselves as a unique group. All deliberations are done in Kalanga and based on the themes set by the Kalanga language association in a bid to let the language live. The Luswingo Cultural festival theme for the 2017 edition read '*Lulimi gwedu, Milenje yedu, Buhe gwedu*' literally translated as 'Our language, our culture, our heritage'. In one analytical statement one can derive a useful meaning in language resuscitation as that our heritage is rooted in our language and in culture preservation. That is, Kalanga people can gain their heritage through reviving their language and living within their culture demands.

#### **4.6 Conclusion**

Indigenous languages play a pivotal role in culture, economics and politics. In this regard they need promotion and preservation. The written form is one way the indigenous languages can be preserved. Standardisation of the Kalanga language orthography is a sure way of promoting and increasing the use of TjiKalanga in Bulilima and Mangwe districts. Through interviews, questionnaires and documentary analysis views of the respondents either confirmed what the scholars used said about the weaknesses and strengths of standardisation or highlighted something unique to the Kalanga orthography. This chapter thus revealed the challenges and prospects of standardisation of the Kalanga orthography. Language development as observed from the responses was largely cemented by language use. The next chapter presents the summary of the study, conclusion made from the findings and recommendations to the study and for further research.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter analysed the challenges and prospects as realised from standardisation of the Kalanga orthography. This chapter intends to highlight the essence of the whole study. It therefore gives the summary, draws conclusions from the major findings and suggest recommendations basically meant for the study and for further research.

#### 5.2 Summary

The study was mainly concerned with investigating the challenges and prospects of standardisation of Kalanga orthography in Bulilima and Mangwe districts. Chapter one articulated the problem under study. It clearly stated the area of investigation, highlighted the background of the study and stated the statement of the problem. It explicitly stated that standardising a language orthography basing it on national rules and regulations is bound to be a challenge for a new language on board. Kalanga has never had an orthography before besides the current one. The research aim, objectives and questions upon which the study was premised were also shared in this chapter. The chapter also set parameters of the investigation so that a thorough research can be done with the purposively targeted respondents. The theoretical framework was also discussed. The study used the language management theory taking basically from the following tenets, the strategic analysis stage which allows for identification and definition of the major dialect problem, the strategic planning stage which describes the specific plan of implementation and the issue of discipline where special emphasis is placed on what accounts for language choices. Chapter two unpacked the concept standardisation. It set to define the various concepts surrounding the standardisation process such as standard language or standard variety, dialect and orthography. All these were done so that the reader gets to understand the linkages of these concepts with the broader concept under study. In chapter three the researcher outlined the existing Kalanga orthography which seem to be the current orthography as well. How it was developed and how it is managed were also central features of this chapter. Presenting the orthography and highlighting its inadequacies also acted as a foundation for Chapter

four which centred on analysing the challenges and prospects. Like all processes standardisation has strengths and weaknesses. It was thus in this chapter that views and comments collected from research participants through interviews and questionnaires were fused together to form comprehensive challenges and fruitful prospects. From the findings that centred mainly on challenges derived from dialectal variations affecting spelling and terminology, the desire to purify languages affecting how the speakers of the so called 'non-standard dialects' write their language and from non-linguistic factors which included simple negative attitudes, the study gave its conclusions. The conclusions were inferred taken from a balance struck between the challenges and prospects analysed. Prospects shared were basically on the use of the standardised language in public domains. To what extent does the Kalanga language publicly feature in a multilingual context was discussed giving practical examples where necessary. These language practices aimed for the Kalanga language development in general.

### **5.3 Conclusions**

The study received great participation from the selected participants. Through interviews and questionnaires the responses pointed that the last and crucial stage after standardisation is acceptance. However, from the major findings obtained, the study concluded that writing is a written representation of the spoken word for which each language community must establish its own agreement and set of convention. In this regard if a system of writing is adopted each language community should be in a position to choose its system without being subordinated to neighbouring or dominant languages because writing is just an extension of the spoken form of the same language. This can also be stated as that appreciation for terminology should begin with the users themselves rather than be an imposition. This was after a realisation that most respondents of the other so called 'non-standard dialects' vowed that no one can never succeed by forcing terminology, a language or a language variety onto its speakers. An observation that was also noted by most scholars used in the study such as Ferguson (2007), Elkarte (2010), Bamgbose (2011) & Mahlangu (2015). In standardisation of a language orthography all varieties of a language as alluded to by Mhute (2016) are appropriate in particular contexts, in particular situations and in particular social groups during the performance. Hence, the issue of standardisation of African languages over the whole African continent should have as its central quest the development of these

languages as modern vehicles of science, technology, education, administration and literacy expansion. The standardised Kalanga orthography has inadequacies largely on dialectal variation and this strongly affects learning of Tjikalanga in Mangwe. Kalanga language standardisation should therefore aim for developing the language as a whole and not a part of it. TjiKalanga ntja, TjiTalawunda and TjiLilima should be developed the same so that one can talk of a non-discriminatory standardised Kalanga orthography meant for the whole BaKalanga tribe. The study also established that the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association was the sole custodian of Kalanga language in both academic and social circles. Whereas the body spearheaded the creation of the orthography it was also the body lobbying for the rejuvenation and use of Kalanga in various segments of the community regardless of funding challenges.

## **5.4 Recommendations**

Recommendations made from the obtained conclusions cater basically for two categories that is those directed to the study and those aimed to compel for further research.

### **5.4.1 Recommendations to the KLCDA**

The pursuit for a standardised Kalanga orthography demands harmonisation and unification of dialects. Ngugi WaThiong'o (1981) argues that language is a carrier of culture. It is recommended to the Kalanga language board therefore that:

- Merging of a number of dialects to form a single common language should be done in a way that the dialects considered less important are not consumed. Each dialect embraces the culture of its native speakers and thus has the potential to become standard.
- A monolingual dictionary is recommended for harmonising spellings and orthographies, scientific and specific terms. Intra-lingual dialect-based translations can assist in the harmonisation process.
- Modernisation as spelt out by Alberts (2006) supports revision of spelling orthography rules on a regular basis. KLCDA is also encouraged to do the same for the current orthography. In fact it has overstayed with the inadequacies it has. An amendment is called for.

- KLCDA is encouraged to form a more formal representative linguistic committee responsible for creating a language corpus. A group that can be easily available for linguistic competence challenges.

#### **5.4.2 Recommendations to the Ministry of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture**

A standard language is governed by nation rules. Therefore, self-government by a nationality even on a regional level implies a political legitimacy that is not afforded to an ethnic group as alluded to by Vandell (2004). Such a situation closes political advancement of the language. The research thus recommends to the Ministry of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture to extend funds as once done through the culture fund so that Kalanga can grow and meet the nation's expected standards always.

#### **5.4.3 Recommendations for further study**

The harmonisation and unification of Kalanga dialects can be done if a deeper understanding of these other dialects is reached. It is therefore recommended that extensive research be done so that a more comprehensive Kalanga orthography is obtained based on phonology and terminology variations.

## REFERENCES

- Adegbiga, E. (1993) The graphisation of small-group language: A case study of Iko. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 102. 153-173.
- Alberts, M. (2006) *The Role of Terminology Standardisation and Harmonisation in SADC countries*. Pan South African Language Board, Pretoria.
- Ammon, U. (2004) 'Standard Variety' in Ammon, U., Dittman, N., Mattheier, K.J. and Trudgill, P. *Sociolinguistics 1*. Walter de Gruyter pp 273-283.
- Bamgbose, A. (1991) *Language and the Nation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bamgbose, A. (2011) 'African Languages Today: The Challenge of and Prospects for Empowerment under Globalization'. *Selected Proceedings of the 40<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. E.G. Bokamba, R.K. Shosted & B.T. Ayalew. 1-14. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Bartsch, R. (1985) The Influence of the Language Standardisation of Linguistic Norms. *Studia-Lingua* 39 (1): 23-50.
- Bassey, E.A (2000) *Terminology and Language Planning: An alternative framework of practice and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2006) 'Negotiating the local English as lingua franca'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26. 197-218.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No.20) Act 2013, Harare: Fidelity Printers and Refiners.
- Crystal, D. (1985) *A First Dictionary of Linguistics*. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd.
- Elkartea, G. (2010) *Language Standardisation: Basque Recover II*. Eskoriata: Gipuzkoa.
- Finegan, E. (2007) *Language: Its Structure and Use*. (5<sup>th</sup> ed) Boston: M.A: Thomson Wadsworth.

- Francis, W.N. (1983) *Dialectology: An Introduction*. London: Longman.
- Gatawa, B.S.M. (1998) *Quality-Quantity Dilemma in Education*, Gweru: College Press.
- Georgaca, E. and Avdi, E. (2007) Discourse Analysis and Psychotherapy: A Critical Review. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling*, 9 (2), 157-176.
- Gordon, R.G. (1986) Some psycholinguistic consideration in practical orthography design. Notes on literacy, *Special Issue 1*. 66-84
- Hadebe, S. (2002) *The Standardisation of the Ndebele Language through Dictionary-Making*. Harare: ALLEX Project.
- Hall, G. (2005) 'Where do Standard Languages come from? Power, Print and Nations. *IATEFL GISIG Newsletter*, Vol, XVII.
- Haugen, E. (1966) *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1972) 'Dialect, Language, Nation' reprinted in Pride and Holmes, J. (eds) *Sociolinguistics (Harmondsworth: Penguin)*, pp.97-111. London: Penguin.
- Hinton, L. and Hale, K. (2001) (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalisation in Practice. Language Arts and Discipline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, J.E. (1987) *Eloquence and Power: The rise of language standards and standard languages*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Kamusella, T. (2009) *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern central Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kloss, H. (1969) *Research possibilities on group bilingualism*. A Report Quebec: Centre International.
- Kothari, C.R. (2004) *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). New Delhi: Wiley Eastern.
- Kristiansen, T. and Coupland, N. (Eds) (2011) *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus.

- Kurgatt, K. (2017) *Challenges facing the harmonisation and standardisation of the Kalenjin Language*. Available at [www.academia.edu/2044992](http://www.academia.edu/2044992). (Accessed on 09.10.17).
- Lafon, M. and Webb, V. (2008) (Eds) *The Standardisation of African Languages: language Political Realities*. Prepared for CentrePol Workshop, University of Pretoria.
- Leedy, P.D. and Ormrod, J.E. (2010) *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Litosseliti, L. (2010) *Research Methods in Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Lushanduko, (2013) *'The Relationship between BuKalanga and the Shona: Are we really a Shona People?'*
- Magwa, W. (2007) 'Language Harmonisation in Southern Africa: Toward a Standard Unified Shona Orthography (SUSO) for Botswana, Mozambique and Zimbabwe' *The Dyke, Vol.3.2 pp58-64*. Midlands State University.
- Mahlangu, K.S. (2015) *The Growth and Development of IsiNdebele Orthography and Spelling (1921-2010)*. Masters Thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Mallison, C. and Hudley, A.H.C. (2011) *Language Variation in the Classroom*. Baltimore.
- Markee, N. (1986) *Prospects in Applied Linguistics*. UCLA.
- Marungudzi, T., Chiwewe, P. and Mhute, I. (2014) 'Harnessing Digital Technology in the Revitalisation of the Linguistic Heritage of Zimbabwe: Possibilities and Challenges' *Greener Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology Research. ISSN: 2276-7835 ICV 2012:5.62*
- Mashiyane, Z. (2002) *Some Sociolinguistics aspects of Southern Ndebele as spoken in South Africa*. MA Dissertation, KwaDlangezwa, University of Zululand.
- Mazarire, G.C. (2003) 'Who are the Ndebele and the Kalanga in Zimbabwe?' *A paper prepared for Konrad Ademer Foundation Project on 'Ethnicity in Zimbabwe' November, 2003.*
- Mazuruse, M. (2013) 'The Challenges faced in teaching of African Languages with a dialect bias and the solutions to these challenges'. *A paper presented to the National Primary*

*African Languages Syllabus Panel Workshop*. Educational Development Services Division.

Mhute, I. (2016) 'Standardisation a considerable force behind Language death: A case of Shona' *Journal of Education and Practice* Vol. 7, No. 9, ISSN 2222-2288X

Miller, F. (1986) *Use, Praise and Research: A Case Study of Social History*. London: Sage Publications.

Milroy, J. and Milroy, L. (1991) *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Standardisation and Prescription*. London: Routledge.

Moyo, N.E. (2012) *The Rebirth of BuKalanga: A manifesto for the Liberation of a Great People with a Proud History Part 1*. Maphungubgwe News Corporation.

Mpofu, P. (2013) *Multilingualism, localism and the nation: Identity politics in the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation*. Doctoral Thesis: University of South Africa.

Msimang, C.T. (1989) *Some phonological aspects of the Tekela Nguni Dialects*. D. LLtet Phil thesis. Pretoria: UNISA.

Mtenje, A. (2002) *The Role of language in National Development. A case for local language. Inaugural lecture*. Great hall, Zomba, University of Malawi.

Muhlhausler, P. (1996) *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. London: Routledge.

Mwaniki, M. (2004) *Language Planning in South Africa: Towards a Language Management Approach*. PHD Thesis, University of Free State.

Mwaniki, M. (2011) 'Language Management in Africa: The dialects of Theory and Practice.' *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 29:3, 243-257.

Nforbi, E. (2001) The challenges of the basic standardisation process of minority African Languages. A case study of Selee-(Volta Region of Ghana) and Mfumte (North West Province of Cameroon) *African Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2:51-65.

- Ouane, A. (1991) 'Language Standardisation in Mali' *Standardisation of National Languages Symposium on Language Standardisation, 2-3 February 1991*. UNESCO Institute for Education.
- Pauuw, S. (2009) One land one nation, one language: An analysis of Indonesia's national language policy. In H. Lehnert-LeHoulier and A.B. Fine (eds) *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Language Sciences, 5 (1)*, 2-16.
- Petyt, K.M. (1980) *The study of dialect: An Introduction to Dialectology*. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Qinsheng, Z. (1992) Aspects of Chinese Ethnolinguistic Studies. A report on the Literature. *International Journal of Social Languages* 1992:59-73.
- Roy-Campbell, Z.M. (2006) *The State of African Languages and the Global Language Politics: Empowering African Languages in the Era of Globalization*. Selected Proceedings of the 36<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on African Linguistics, ed. O.F. Arasanyin & M.A. Pemberton, 1-13. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Sager, J.C. (1990) *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sarwa, F. (2017) *Noakhali Dialect: Its prospect of standardisation*. Available at [www.streetdirectory.com](http://www.streetdirectory.com) (Accessed on 09.10.17).
- Seidenberg, M.S. (1992) 'Beyond Orthographic Depth in Reading: Equitable Division of Labor' In R. Frost & L. Katz (eds) *Orthography, Phonology, Morphology & Meaning*, pp.85-118. Amsterdam: Elsevier, p.93.
- Schiffman, H. (1998) *Standardization or restandardization: The Case for "standard" spoken Tamil Language in Society*. 27. 359-385.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000) *Linguistic genocide in education-or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Suarez, D. 2002. The Paradox of Linguistic Hegemony and the Maintenance of Spanish. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(6), 512-530.
- Swann, J. (2004) *A dictionary of Sociolinguistics*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Taylor, B., Sinha, G. and Taposh, G. (2006) *Research Methodology: A Guide for Researchers in Management and Social Sciences*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Trudgill, P. (1983) *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Gateshead: Northumberland Press.
- Trudgill, P. (1998) *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2006) 'Standard and Dialect Vocabulary' in Brown, K. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics 12 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) Elsevier pp 119-121*.
- Vandel, P.S. (2004) 'Prospects for an Endangered Language: The Effects of Stigmatisation, Group Sentiment and Standardisation Movements on the future of the Kashubian Language'. *A senior essay in Linguistics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Wa Thiong'o, N. (1981) *Decolonising the Mind. Harare: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House.
- Webb, V. (2002) *Language in South Africa: The role of Language in national transformation, reconstruction and development*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Webb, V. and Kembo-Sure, J. (2000) 'Languages in Competition'. In V. Webb and Kembo-Sure (Eds) *African Voices: An Introduction to the Languages and Linguistics of Africa*, pp.109-132.
- Weinstein, B. (1983). *The Civic Tongue: Political Consequences of Language Choice*, New York: Longman MG.
- Wentzel, P.J. (1981) *The Relationship between Venda and Western Shona*, PHD Thesis. UNISA
- Wolff, H. (2000) Language and Society: In Nurse, D. and Bernd, H. *African Languages, An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R.K. (1984) *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Newbury: Sage.

Yule, G. (1985) *The study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[www.dictionary.com/browse-prospect](http://www.dictionary.com/browse-prospect)

[www.collinsdictionary.com](http://www.collinsdictionary.com)

[www.macmillandictionary.com](http://www.macmillandictionary.com)

[www.meriam-websterdictionary.com](http://www.meriam-websterdictionary.com)

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX I

#### Questionnaire for School Heads

I, Hlalani Ndhlovu am a student at Midlands State University. I am studying for the Master of Arts African Languages and Culture. In partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree I am carrying out a research on Prospects and Challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography. The topic critically assesses the challenges and explores the prospects obtained from standardisation of Kalanga orthography. Please kindly respond to the questions truthfully. The data you give will be highly appreciated and treated with utmost confidentiality. Data collected will also be used for academic purposes only.

#### Section A

1. Does your school teach TjiKalanga? .....
2. Which Kalanga dialect dominates your catchment area of pupils? .....
3. Who specifically teaches the indigenous language?  
.....
4. What special qualification qualifies the teacher to the teaching of TjiKalanga?  
.....
5. Are there any obscene challenges between teacher-pupil learning and pupil-resource learning?  
.....  
.....
6. Does your school have copies of the Kalanga orthography in use? .....

#### Section B.

7. What do you understand about the term language standardisation?  
.....  
.....
- 8 (a) Do you think the Kalanga orthography in use passed through a standardisation process?

.....  
(b) Explain your response

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

9 (a). Are there any major challenges that come with language standardisation in a multi dialectal context?

.....

(b) Explain your response focusing on Kalanga dialects and the orthography in use

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

9. How does standardisation of language orthography contribute to language choice and/or language practice?

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

10 (a) Do you think standardisation of a language orthography benefit a language in a multi-dialectal context?

.....

(b) Explain your response basing it on Kalanga language

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

Thank you

## **APPENDIX II**

### **INTERVIEW GUIDES**

#### **Interview Guide for District Schools Inspectors and District Language Coordinators**

I, Hlalani Ndhlovu am a student at Midlands State University. I am studying for the Master of Arts African Languages and Culture. In partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree I am carrying out a research on Prospects and Challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography. The topic critically assesses the challenges and explores the prospects obtained from standardisation of Kalanga orthography. Please kindly respond to the questions truthfully. The data you give will be highly appreciated and treated with utmost confidentiality. Data collected will also be used for academic purposes only.

1. How many schools in your district teaches TjiKalanga?
2. Which Kalanga dialects are prominent in your area?
3. What made this choice, that other schools exempt themselves from teaching of Kalanga?
4. Do you think these schools or areas that do not teach Kalanga are justified as far as the teaching of indigenous languages is concerned?
5. Basing your response on the concept standardisation of a language orthography do you think the Kalanga orthography was standardised?
6. What challenges do you think were met by those who standardised and produced the Kalanga orthography?
7. Which major challenges still militate against this language choice in your district?
8. Do you think the Kalanga orthography serves any purpose for the multi-dialects found in your area? If yes- How? If no- Why?
9. How does use of Kalanga language in schools foster development of Kalanga language in your district?

Thank you!!!

## **Interview Guide for the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association chairperson**

I, Hlalani Ndhlovu am a student at Midlands State University. I am studying for the Master of Arts African Languages and Culture. In partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree I am carrying out a research on Prospects and Challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography. The topic critically assesses the challenges and explores the prospects obtained from standardisation of Kalanga orthography. Please kindly respond to the questions truthfully. The data you give will be highly appreciated and treated with utmost confidentiality. Data collected will also be used for academic purposes only.

1. As custodians of the Kalanga literature, do you find production of Kalanga orthography a challenge or a prospect?
2. What challenges surround production of Kalanga orthography?
3. a) How many dialects form the current orthography in use?  
b) How were these dialects chosen?
4. What are your major intentions concerning this standardisation process?
5. Do you think non-teaching of TjiKalanga done by some schools and non-use of TjiKalanga by various public domains in the two districts emanate from the standardisation process? If yes-Why? If No, what then contributes to this negation?
6. Since the standardisation of Kalanga orthography for use mainly in schools, what major contributions has it made to the two communities?
7. In relation to literature production, are there any major developmental steps realised by the standardisation of Kalanga orthography so far?
8. What do you think can be done to minimise the challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography?

Thank you!!!

### **Interview Guide for local chiefs**

I, Hlalani Ndhlovu am a student at Midlands State University. I am studying for the Master of Arts African Languages and Culture. In partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree I am carrying out a research on Prospects and Challenges of standardisation of Kalanga orthography. The topic critically assesses the challenges and explores the prospects obtained from standardisation of Kalanga orthography. Please kindly respond to the questions truthfully. The data you give will be highly appreciated and treated with utmost confidentiality. Data collected will also be used for academic purposes only.

1. How many communities in your area speak or use Kalanga?
2. Which Kalanga dialects are basically found in those areas?
3. What do you think is the problem of those areas that do not speak and use Kalanga in various societal contexts?
4. Which public domains in your area uses Kalanga besides schools in their day to day deliberations?
5. What factors influence these language choices?
6. Is the Kalanga orthography in use for schools and for literature production satisfactory for all language practices in your area?
7. Do you think the development of Kalanga orthography is representative of all dialects in your area? If Yes –explain the estimated weighting of these dialects found in the orthography? If No, suggest how these could be harmonised?
8. How do Kalanga language practices develop Kalanga language in general?

Thank you!!!