

Corpus Planning, with Specific Reference to the Use of Standard isiZulu in Media

Nobuhle Ndimande-Hlongwa

Abstract

This article focuses on standardisation, an aspect of corpus planning which is one of the categories of language planning. Corpus planning refers to activities such as coining new terms, reforming spelling, and adopting a new script. It refers, in short, to the creation of new forms, the modification of old ones, or the selection from alternative forms in a spoken or written code. The argument in the article is that whilst the three isiZulu newspapers, namely, *Ilanga*, *Isolezwe*, and *UMAFRIKA* are doing a great job in promoting the use of isiZulu in the media, there are inconsistencies in the way they apply isiZulu orthographical rules. The data used in this article was collected from the three isiZulu newspapers. The words selected in the three newspapers were spelt differently in the different newspapers. The article argues that the three isiZulu newspapers are inconsistent in the application of orthographic rules in isiZulu which can cause problems for the intellectualisation process, which is a strategy for accelerating the growth and development of languages.

Keywords: language planning, corpus planning, standardisation, media, orthography, intellectualisation

Introduction and Background

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) recognizes eleven official languages namely: isiZulu, isiXhosa, Afrikaans, Sepedi, English,

seTswana, seSotho, xiTsonga, isiSwati, tshiVenda and isiNdebele. All these languages should be used and developed as per the government's policy framework on language. South Africa is in the process of developing the indigenous languages through the Pan South African Languages Board and other government structures. One of the requirements for developing any language is the planning of its corpus. This refers to the standardisation and also intellectualisation of a language. According to Batibo (2009b) the intellectualisation process is a strategy for accelerating the growth and development of languages. A corpus may be written or spoken. For example, the media is a source of language data and creates a written corpus. Olohan (2004:1) defines a corpus as

a collection of texts, selected and compiled according to a specific criterion. The texts are held in electronic format, i.e. as computer files, so that various kinds of corpus tools, i.e. software, can be used to carry out analysis of them.

This article explores the inconsistencies with regard to the interpretation and application of orthographical rules by three isiZulu newspapers representing the print media. The inconsistencies in the application of orthographical rules is also observed in the isiZulu news programme of the South African Broadcasting Corporation 1 (SABC1).

The argument in the article is that the three isiZulu newspapers namely, *Ilanga*, *Isolezwe*, and *UMAFRIKA* are inconsistent in the application of some of the orthographic rules in isiZulu which is a concern for the author because isiZulu is a standard language and standard languages have notions of what is 'correct' and 'incorrect' according to the isiZulu National Language Board (NLB). The problem that has been identified is that there is a cohort of isiZulu editors in both print and electronic media that are not acquainted with the standard orthography and other rules and their usage of written isiZulu. These problems are prevalent in the writing style of isiZulu writers especially the journalists and editors of isiZulu newspapers. These include, among other things, spelling which deals with many linguistic issues such as writing conventions in isiZulu, old versus new isiZulu orthography, and notations. The expression 'old versus new' is used to indicate that the isiZulu orthography has changed over the years,

‘old’ in this case referring to the orthography that used to be applied and ‘new’ referring to the current standard orthography. Masubelele (2007:129) confirms that Colenso had begun to use the agglutinative system (‘new’) of writing as early as 1855, but the writing of isiZulu in the conjunctive manner began in 1959. It was introduced by the Bantu Education Section of the Department of Native Affairs and became compulsory in schools in the Union of South Africa (Doke 1958: xii).

Fourteen years after the publication of the report on the standard and non-standard African language varieties in the urban areas of South Africa (STANON) research programme (Calteaux 1996) with its recommendations, there still exist inconsistencies in the application of standard isiZulu orthography. The STANON programme was a collaborative research project between the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), African Language Association of Southern Africa (ALASA) and the then Department of Education and Training (DET). The aims of the research programme were: to describe the differences between the nine standard African languages (i.e. isiZulu, isiXhosa, isiSwazi, isiNdebele, Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, seTswana, Venda and Tsonga) and their non-standard varieties in selected areas of South Africa; to describe the influence of the non-standard varieties on the standard language in selected areas, and to make recommendations for language planning and language education. The long term objectives of the STANON programme were to promote research in the nine African languages spoken in South Africa as well as the development of these languages. Another objective was to involve mother tongue speakers in a country-wide scientific research programme and also make a valuable contribution to the teaching of the African languages in schools.

Conceptual Framework

This article is conceptualized within the broader field of language planning. It has been through macro planning (Ngcobo 2009) that South African indigenous languages have been given official status. Language planning occurs for several reasons, one of which is to solve language problems, which may exist in society. The government is involved in language planning because it has the power to legislate on language. Language

planning as a concept is very complex, and it has been defined in different ways by different scholars (cf. Kaplan & Baldauf 1997; Eastman 1983; Haugen 1983; Cooper 1989). Neustupný (1994:50) claims that 'any act of language planning should start with the consideration of language problems as they appear in discourse, and the planning should not be considered complete until the removal of the problems is implemented in discourse'. Calteaux (1996), Webb (2002), Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) see language planning as a process. They choose to define this process by referring to Haugen's (1983) model. According to this model (1983:275) language planning is a process that can be viewed from a societal focus or a language focus. The societal focus deals with issues of status planning and the language focus forms part of corpus planning. Cooper (1989) chooses to categorize language planning into three areas, namely status planning, corpus planning and acquisition planning. Status planning refers only to those aspects which reflect social issues and concerns. Two of the issues which make up a language plan are the selection of languages for particular functions and the implementation of those languages for those functions (Kaplan & Baldauf 1997:30). Corpus planning, on the other hand, can be defined as those aspects which are primarily linguistic and hence internal to language, like orthographic innovation of language material (Kaplan & Baldauf 1997:38). Scholars such as Neustupný (1974) and Gonzalez (1993) use the term 'language cultivation' in place of 'language elaboration' to refer to corpus planning. Implementation of the status planning decisions frequently demands corpus planning, particularly when a language or language variety is chosen for a communicative function which it has not previously served. As an example, the University of KwaZulu-Natal took a status planning decision to create a language policy that promotes the use of English and isiZulu as languages of administration, tuition and research. In this example, isiZulu as an indigenous language is now serving a new function. This is an opportunity to intellectualise isiZulu as an academic language through corpus planning. Various Schools at the University of KwaZulu-Natal have already begun to develop new terminology for use in professional programmes with the long term goal of using isiZulu as an alternative medium of instruction Ndimande-Hlongwa *et al.* (2010). Acquisition planning refers to organised efforts to promote the learning of a language. Corpus planning is the focus of this article.

Cooper (1989:125) chose to categorize corpus planning into graphisation, standardisation, modernisation and renovation. Standardisation is the main focus of this article. Standardisation is the process of deliberate choice and promotion of one variety of a language to become the standard variety (Batibo 2009a:1). The idea is meant to ensure that one variety is used in the school curriculum, in publishing, in the media, in teaching the language to foreigners and in official settings. According to Hall (2005) language standardisation is the process by which a vernacular in a community becomes the standard language (SL) form. This carries implicit elements of prestige (whereby the SL vernacular is valued more highly than others), stability, and common usage. There are various models for standardisation, but the author would like to highlight only three significant models namely Haugen's model (1966), Crystal's model (1993) and Garvin's model (1993). Haugen's model has four stages and is probably the best and most widely used model. It is very comprehensive and includes the selection of a norm, codification of form, elaboration of function and acceptance by the community. Crystal's model (1993) has four stages as well, namely selecting the norm, codification, modernization and implementation. Garvin (1993) bases his model on the following three questions: What is a standard language? How does a standard language serve its users? And lastly, what are the conditions required for the development of a standard language? The three models are all relevant in this article, but the author will work with Garvin's model (1993). The reason for doing this is because Garvin goes further than the other models by identifying two properties of standardisation, namely, flexible codification and intellectualisation. Codification not only refers to the written code but also implies that rules of correctness are codified in documents which are accessible to the speech community such as grammars and dictionaries. Yet, this codification also has to be flexible in order to accommodate changes in the language (Garvin 1993:41). The intellectualisation property deals with the capacity of language to develop more accurate means of expression in, for instance, technology, higher education and politics. Garvin (1993:45-48) proposes five functions of a standard language, these being the unifying, separatist, prestige and participatory functions, which are all symbolic, and the objective frame-of reference function. Garvin links the five functions to different language attitudes as follows:

- The unifying and separatist functions are linked to the attitude of loyalty. The unifying function concerns the loyalty of a speech community to the standard language. The separatist function concerns the loyalty of a speech community to its own standard language, and not to any other variety.
- The prestige function links up with the pride of a speech community to possess a ‘real’ language and not just a dialectal variety.
- The participatory function links up with a desire to take part in modern life through intellectualisation in the field of technology and science, for instance.
- The frame-of-reference function links up with an awareness of norm. Members of a speech community are aware of a model that they can follow for matters of language correctness, for instance.

This article is informed by Garvin’s (1993) five functions of a standard language and the different attitudes attached to these. The focus of the article is on the inconsistencies in the usage of an already codified language (i.e. isiZulu). According to Haugen (1966) and Holmes (2001) codifying a language can vary from case to case and depends on the stage of standardisation that already exists. It typically means developing a writing system, setting up official rules for grammar, orthography, pronunciation, syntax, and vocabulary as well as publishing grammar books, dictionaries and similar guidelines. If there are several variants for a certain aspect, e.g. different ways of spelling a word, decisions on which variant is going to be the standard one has to be made. According to Haugen (1966) and Garvin (1993) this stage is also commonly known as graphisation.

Cooper (1989:125) differentiates graphisation from codification. For him, graphisation entails the process of reducing a language to writing. Codification, for Cooper (1989:145) refers to the written form of a standard language evidenced by the existence of published dictionaries, grammars, spellers and manuals. The author will now provide a little historical background to the codification of African languages, isiZulu in particular. According to Makoni and Meinhof (2003:4) from the late 18th century and

throughout the 19th and much more of the 20th, missionary imperatives led to grammar and spelling systems being ‘developed’ for African languages. That kind of work is currently being continued under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) in different parts of Africa. In South Africa, this work is currently under the auspices of the National Language Boards (NLBs) which are structures of the Pan South African Languages Board (PanSALB). Makoni and Meinhof (2003:4) say that even if those involved in the codification and production of writing systems might not have defined what they were doing as applied linguistics, retrospectively they argue that the production of the writing systems constituted applied linguistic activities of major significance in shaping sociolinguistic images of the African landscape. The production of writing systems for different languages was not a simple matter of writing down a language. It involved a process of investing ‘simplified’ or standardised versions of African speech forms, mediating between a range of dialects, and losing vocabulary and social significance in the process. Masubelele (2007:145) says that what we see today as written isiZulu is a culmination of years of trials that stretched over a period of almost one hundred and fifty years. When European explorers who came into contact with the Zulu people recorded isiZulu words in their journals, they did this by using the alphabet of the languages they spoke. The first evidence of written isiZulu in 1844 was the work of Adulphe Delegorgue, as cited in Davey and Koopman (2000:134). He compiled a vocabulary of the language which he called ‘*la Langue Zoulouse*’. Other important written contributions came from the early missionaries of the American Board in Natal, Bryant and Grout. In 1848 Bryant wrote the first isiZulu grammar book. In isiZulu language, graphisation was characterized by changes in spelling due to language development.

Orthographic Changes in isiZulu

The orthography of a language specifies the correct way of using a specific writing system to write the language. Orthography is defined by Richards, Platt and Platt (1993:259-260) as an accepted way of writing and using words of an official language. According to van Hyssteen (2003) this term in African languages does not only include spelling but also terminology.

Orthography is defined by Webster (1954:367) as ‘the art of spelling and writing words correctly’. All the languages in South Africa use the roman script. The development of African languages led to changes in the orthography as reflected in the examples from the isiZulu language.

Old versus New isiZulu Orthography

The old isiZulu orthography refers to the orthography that was used in the earliest period of writing isiZulu and the new refers to the current standard orthography. The old spelling rules are no longer in use today, but it is important that all the concerned people in all the educational and public domains be aware of them since such spelling is still occurring in surnames because people did not want to change them. Often people went to register their children’s birth names and the clerks recording the names wrote them down incorrectly. Many people do not report such mistakes and so they are never rectified. There are place names as well that are still written in the old spelling.

Old	New
<i>Dhlomo</i>	<i>Dlomo</i> (surname)
<i>Mapumulo</i>	<i>Maphumulo</i> (place name)
Kumalo	Khumalo (surname)

The following examples are common orthographical changes in the earliest isiZulu orthography. In the earliest grammars, no distinction was made between **hl** and **dl**. For example the word –**hlala** was used to mean ‘stay’ and ‘play’ (Döhne 1857:29). In the case of the **h**, which is a voiced glottal fricative, it was replaced by **hh** because **it** was inconsistent and varied for many years which caused confusion. The voiceless fricative remained a single **h**.

Old	New	Examples
dhl e.g. idhla	dl ,	idla (eat)
h e.g. iholo	hh ,	ihholo (hall)

In the next example, **h** is an aspirated plosive and must always follow the plosives **p**, **k** and **t** which was not the case in the earliest orthographies, e.g.

Old	New	Examples
-p	-ph	phila (alive)
-k	-kh	khala (cry)
-t	-th	thatha (take)

Language change takes place at a number of levels, namely phonological, morphological, semantic, and syntactic. These changes are the result of a number of varied factors for example: the proximity, influence and prestige of other languages; social, political and economic changes; the influence of education and literacy; technological advances; cultural changes; the influence of the media, both written and electronic; the influence of the church: early missionary societies, the preaching of Christianity and the translation of the Bible by early missionary societies, translation of the Bible and other religious texts, etc. Calteaux (1996:8)). The following discussion is on the issue of writing disjunctively or conjunctively in isiZulu orthography.

Writing Disjunctively or Conjunctively

The disjunctive method of writing means that linguistic units are written separately from one another e.g. *ngi-ya-dla* (I am eating) in isiZulu, while the conjunctive method requires morphemes to be glued together e.g. *ngiyadla*. IsiZulu is known to be an agglutinative language because it glues morphemes together in word formation. The disjunctive method of writing occurs generally in the Sotho languages. However it also occurs in isiZulu especially in writing the demonstrative pronouns, although isiZulu uses mainly conjunctive writing (van Hyssten 2003:68). The disjunctive manner of writing was used by early isiZulu grammarians like Döhne (1857) and Roberts (1899). The conjunctive method of writing was used by isiZulu grammarians such as Bryant (1905), Colenso (1905), Samuelson (1925) and Doke (1945). The rationale for the change from a disjunctive to a

conjunctive writing system was due to inconsistency on the part of the authors themselves. The missionaries who started the codification of isiZulu wrote it from a western perspective, based on their own language systems. Makoni and Meinhof (2003:4) argue that the missionaries often used a very small part of the stylistic range, partly because they had to capture it in writing prematurely after they had learned only enough to get across certain quite basic messages. In other words, they did not have access to the full, elaborate code. They were also people of the age of ‘progress’, often impatient of the associative discourse so characteristic of oral cultures, and favouring linear reasoning styles (Makoni and Meinhof, 2003:4). Grammarians like Doke, Bryant and Colenso also felt that the conjunctive method of writing was not complicated, so, as a result of all the above factors, standard isiZulu today employs the conjunctive method. Bryant (1905), cited by van Hyssten (2003:69), explains why the conjunctive approach is preferable: ‘... in the word *wahamba*, the particle *wa-* on its own, would be meaningless and unintelligible to the Native mind’. Samuelson (1925:17) regards this method as correct since the ‘isiZulu word’ constitutes in the Zulu mind ‘... a complete thought under one controlling accent and enunciation conveying one undivided meaning’. As mentioned in the introduction the conjunctive method of writing began in 1959 and this decision was recorded in the isiZulu terminology and orthography of 1962 (Masubelele 2007:152). In order to further explain the writing system in isiZulu, the author will look specifically at the manner of writing the demonstrative pronoun and the hyphen in order to indicate the inconsistencies in the three isiZulu newspapers.

Demonstrative Pronoun (rule 9 according to PanSALB 2005)

The manner of writing the demonstrative pronoun in the isiZulu language is the most disputed orthographic issue. The problem emanates from the orthographic rules formulated by the isiZulu language boards over the years which concerned the demonstrative pronoun. These rules varied from disjunctive to conjunctive and back to disjunctive, thus causing inconsistencies in application by the writers of the language. Comparisons could be made from the orthography rules published in 1957, 1962, 1976, 1993 and 2005. Although isiZulu is following the conjunctive method of

writing there are exceptions in the rules of writing a demonstrative. In isiZulu the current rule requires that the demonstrative pronoun be written as separate words, e.g. *lo mfundi*, *lowo muntu*, *leziya zingane*, etc. Currently all the three isiZulu newspapers are aware of the latest orthographic rule, but do not adhere to the rule that the demonstrative pronoun be written disjunctively in certain cases. The inconsistencies that were identified were extracted from page 2 of *Ilanga* newspaper of June 12-14 2006, *UMAFRIKA* June 30-July 6 2006 and *Isolezwe* of 3 October 2008. These examples are supposed to be written disjunctively.

<u>Conjunctive Writing</u>	<u>Disjunctive Writing</u>
<i>lelikhonsathi</i>	<i>leli khonsathi</i> (this concert)
<i>lezizingwazi</i>	<i>lezi zingwazi</i> (these heroes)
<i>kulomgubho</i>	<i>kulo mgubho</i> (in this festival)
<i>lesisizinda</i>	<i>lesi sizinda</i> (this domain)
<i>loluhlelo</i>	<i>lolu hlelo</i> (this programme)
<i>kulendawo</i>	<i>kule ndawo</i> (in this area)
<i>lomcimbi</i>	<i>lo mcimbi</i> (this function)
<i>kulomkhakha</i>	<i>Kulo mkhakha</i> (in this field)

The above examples show that there are some inconsistencies in the way the demonstrative pronoun is written. Even in the isiZulu bible all the demonstratives are written together with nouns, which could be the reason for the continued confusion in the manner of writing the demonstrative in the newspapers. The role of media in promoting the use of isiZulu is recommended and Alexander (2005:11) is of the opinion that the promotion of print and electronic media in African languages on a large scale, as it happens in some West and East African countries, is urgently necessary. At this level of popular modernisation of the languages, the culture of reading can be effectively established and thus the basis for the intellectual modernisation of the relevant languages. Whilst we promote the use of African languages in media, especially isiZulu in KwaZulu-Natal, it is essential that we avoid the inconsistencies identified above.

The Use of Hyphen (rule 6)

In isiZulu orthography the hyphen is used when a numeral is preceded by an inflected prefix to join concords to Arabic numerals, e.g. *ngehora le-10* (10 o'clock). It is also used to separate two vowels, e.g. *i-Afrika* (Africa). It is used with enclitics, e.g. *kodwa-ke* (but then). It is inserted between the initial vowel prefix and the acronym e.g. *i-HIV* (human immuno deficiency virus). The hyphen is also used with words which are directly taken from other languages e.g. *lokhu sekuyi*-status quo (this is now the status quo). The words from the other languages should be written in italics. It is also used with certain place names as well as with double-barrel surnames or hyphenated surnames (PanSALB 2005:15). The two isiZulu newspapers show inconsistencies in using the hyphen rule when joining concords to Arabic numerals. For example, page 14 of *Ilanga* newspaper of June 12-14 2006, *Isolezwe* of October 3 and 23 2008 and *Isolezwe* of 15 June 2010 wrote numbers in such a way that they are read in English language, whereas according the standard isiZulu orthography numbers should be written in such a way that they are read in isiZulu, e.g.

Examples from newspapers	The standard orthography
<i>ngomzuliswano ka-6</i>	<i>ngomzuliswano wesi-6</i> (round 6)
<i>ngomzuliswano ka-7</i>	<i>ngomzuliswano wesi-7</i> (round 7)
<i>ngoMgqibelo ngo-8</i>	<i>ngoMgqibelo ngehora lesi-8</i> (Saturday at 8 o'clock)
<i>Mhlaka- 05</i>	<i>ngamhla zi-5</i> (on the 5 th)
<i>ukusukela ngo- 10</i>	<i>ukusukela ngehora le-10</i> (from 10 o'clock)
<i>abavukuzi abangu-57</i>	<i>abavukuzi abangama-57(57 miners)</i>
<i>washona nabantu abangu-12</i>	<i>washona nabantu abayi-12</i> (s/he died with 12 people)

In writing the years as well, there are major problems in the three isiZulu newspapers in adhering to the standard isiZulu orthography rule. The following are some of the examples found in *Isolezwe* of 14 October 2008, UMAFRIKA June 30-July 6 2006 and *Ilanga* of 7-9 August 2006:

Examples from newspapers	The standard orthography
<i>Le nhlangotho yaqala ukufika ngo-2006.</i>	<i>Le nhlangotho yaqala ukufika ngonyaka wezi-2006.</i> (This organization came for the first time in 2006)
<i>ngo-1967 futhi waba nguthisha</i>	<i>ngonyaka we-1967 futhi waba nguthisha.</i> (In 1967 s/he then became an educator)
<i>Indebe yoMhlaba ka-2010.</i>	<i>Indebe yoMhlaba yonyaka wezi-2010.</i> (2010 World Cup)
<i>ilayisense yokuvula iTavern ngo-2002</i>	<i>ilayisense yokuvula iTavern ngonyaka wezi-2002.</i> (License for opening a Tavern in 2002)
<i>waqashwa kwaMuhle ngo1984.</i>	<i>waqashwa kwaMuhle ngonyaka we-1984.</i> (was employed at kwaMuhle in 1984)

In the above examples extracted from the newspapers the years are read in English even though the sentences are written in isiZulu. The hyphen rule does not allow numbers and years to be read in other languages except in isiZulu. UMAFRICA does not use the hyphen at all when writing numbers and years. In relation to Garvin's functions of the standard language the newspapers are not loyal to the standard isiZulu language. The use of the hyphen as punctuation mark according to van Hyssteen (2003:75) can be regarded as part of the conjunctive writing system, since it prevents lexical items from being separated entirely.

It should be noted that some of the inconsistencies found in the three isiZulu newspapers were paid adverts from government departments, for example, KwaZulu-Natal Legislature, Office of the Premier, Arts and Culture, KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Government, eThekweni municipality, Department of Education etc. These constituencies have language services departments within their structures but the adverts that are written in isiZulu and published in these three isiZulu newspapers leave much to be desired. It is important that some mechanism be put in place to address these

inconsistencies in writing standard isiZulu in the newspapers especially since the editorial policy does not allow the editors to edit the adverts. Alexander (2005:12) was impressed with the project led by Professor Kwesi Prah of the Centre for the Advanced Study of African Societies (CASAS) at Rondebosch, Cape Town that addresses issues of orthography. Their excellent work culminated in a monograph titled *A Unified Standard Orthography for South-Central African Languages with Specific Reference to Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia*. In consultation with PanSALB, the author recommends that the nine National Language Boards of South Africa should also move in this direction instead of having many separate booklets for each language.

Language users need guidance to be linguistically accurate and consistent, when dealing with orthographical issues. Calteaux (1996:165) states that the media plays a significant role in the language activities of the community. Not only do they form a barometer for measuring language changes and acceptability of changes in the speech community, but they also serve as role models for standardised and conventionally acceptable language use. If newsreaders, editors and commentators are not taught how to use correct orthography the whole community will not learn the standard convention. Such practices eventually lead to language impurity/creolisation and even language corruption. Ongstad (2002:82) is of the view that standardisation as a process is inevitable. However, there is an unanswered question: 'at which point is it functional for a country's population to stop expecting greater conformity to a given standard, and instead start adapting to a range of new forms?' This is an important question that requires attention by relevant bodies and language planning organizations.

It is vital that National Language Boards, as well as Provincial Language Services, Provincial Language Committees, PANSALB, isiZulu newspapers and the African languages in higher education institutions come together and address issues of orthography in order to fast track the intellectualisation process which is a strategy of accelerating the growth and development of languages. The standard language forms were seen as representing the authentic voice and spirit of the people (Ongstad 2002).

Recommendations and Conclusion

This article has looked at corpus planning as a category of language planning and the focus was on standardisation. It has also touched on the three models of language standardisation i.e. Haugen's model (1966), Crystal's model (1993) and Garvin's model (1993). The three isiZulu newspapers *iLanga*, *Isolezwe* and *UMAFRIKA*, were used to show the extent of the problems in isiZulu orthography. It is important that orthographical inconsistencies be attended to since they can prevent language practitioners, terminologists and language editors from effectively fulfilling their task of intellectualising isiZulu as an African language. The three isiZulu newspapers should be commended for intellectualising isiZulu in media. People have access to information in their language of choice. At the same time the issue of orthography is a serious one because there are teachers who are using isiZulu newspapers as resources for teaching. It is recommended that all stakeholders involved in language issues such as government departments and institutions of higher learning come together to address issues of orthography. It is also recommended that place names with the old orthography should be changed in order to conform to the new orthography. In KwaZulu-Natal this is the responsibility of the Provincial Geographical Names Committee. Newspapers should do their level best to follow the correct orthography rules when writing their stories. This is because the media is an official fora, which should at all times use the standard form. The IsiZulu National Language Board (IsiZulu NLB) together with PANSALB should meet with all relevant stakeholders in the education and public sector, especially media, to talk about the changes and the new trends in isiZulu orthography. There should be strategies in place to evaluate the process.

References

- Alexander, N (ed) 2005. *The Intellectualisation of African Languages*. Cape Town: Praesa/University of Cape Town.
- Batibo, HM 2009a. *Challenges of Term Standardization, Dissemination and Acceptance*. Unpublished keynote address delivered at the Rhodes University - SANTED Terminology Development Workshop. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

- Batibo, HM 2009b. *Motivation, Principles and Strategies in Terminology Development: The Tanzanian Experience*. Unpublished keynote address delivered at the Rhodes University - SANTED Terminology Development Workshop. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Bryant, AT 1905. *A Zulu-English Dictionary*. Pinetown: Marianhill Mission Press.
- Calteaux, K 1996. *Standard and Non-Standard African Language, Varieties in the Urban Areas of South Africa - Main Report for the STANON Research Programme*. Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.
- Colenso, JW 1905. *Zulu-English Dictionary*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter & Shooter.
- Cooper, R 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Crystal, D 1993. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davey, A & A Koopman 2000. Adulphe Delegorgue's *Vocabulaire de la Langue Zoulouse*. *South African Journal of African Languages* 20,2:134-147.
- Döhne, JL 1857. *Zulu-Kafir Dictionary*. Cape Town: G.J. Pike's Machine Printing Office.
- Doke, CM 1945. *Text-book of Zulu Grammar*. Johannesburg: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Doke, CM 1958. Scripture Translation into Bantu Languages. *Africa Studies* 17,2: 82-99.
- Eastman, CM 1983. *Language Planning*. San Francisco: Chandler & Sharp.
- Garvin, PL 1993. A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Language Standardization. *International Journal for the Study of the Sociology of Language* 100-101,1: 37-54.
- Giles, H & N Coupland 1991. *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Gonzalez, A 1993. An Overview of Language and Development. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 14,1/2: 5-23.
- Hall, G 2005. Where do Standard Languages come from? Power, Print and Nations. *IATEFL GISIG Newsletter XVIII*.
- Haugen, E 1966. Language Standardisation. In Coupland, N & A Jaworski (eds) 1977. *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook*. London: Mcmillan Press Ltd.

- Haugen, E 1983. The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice. In Cobarrubias, Juan & Joshua A Fishman (eds): *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Holmes, J 2001. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 2nd Edition. London: Longman.
- Kaplan, RB & JR Baldauf 1997. *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Makoni, S & UH Meinhof 2003. Introducing Applied Linguistics in Africa. In Makoni, S & UH Meinhof. *Africa and Applied Linguistics*. *AILA Review* 16: 1-12.
- Masubelele, MR 2007. The Role of the Bible Translation in the Development of Written Zulu: A Corpus-based Study. Phd Thesis, University of South Africa.
- Ndimande-Hlongwa, Nobuhle, Robert Balfour, Nhlanhla Mkhize & Charlotte Engelbrecht 2010. Progress and Challenges for Language Policy Implementation at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. *Language Learning Journal* 38.3, 347-357.
- Neustupný, J 1974. Basic Types of Treatment of Language Problems. In Fishman, JA (ed): *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Neustupný, J 1994. Problems of English Contact Discourse and Language Planning. In Kandeh, T & J Kwan-Terry (eds): *English and Language Planning*. Singapore: Academic.
- Ngcobo, MN 2009. A Strategic Promotion of Language Use in Multilingual South Africa: Information and Communication. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 27,1: 113-120
- Olohan, M 2004. *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Ongstad, S 2002. Standard Language Education in Transition. In Borne, J & E Reid (eds): *Language Education*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- PanSALB 2005. *Spelling and Orthography Rules: isiZulu*. A publication of the isiZulu National Language Board and the Pan South African Language Board.
- Richards, CJ, H Platt & J Platt 1993. *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. United Kingdom: Longman.

Nobuhle Ndimande-Hlongwa

Roberts, C 1899. *The Zulu Kafir Language*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996). South Africa: Constituent Assembly.

Samuelson, RC 1925. *Zulu Grammar*. Durban: Knox.

Van Hyssteen, L 2003. A Practical Approach for the Standardisation and Elaboration of Zulu as a Technical Language. DLitt et Phil thesis: University of South Africa.

Webb, V 2002. *Language in South Africa. The Role of Language in National Transformation, Reconstruction and Development*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Webster, N 1954. *Webster's Comprehensive Reference Dictionary and Encyclopedia*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company.

Newspapers

ILanga

Isolezwe

UMAFRIKA

Nobuhle Ndimande-Hlongwa
University of KwaZulu-Natal
School of IsiZulu Studies
hlongwan1@ukzn.ac.za