Bilingualism at the University of KwaZulu-Natal: Staff and Student Preferences

Dianna Moodley

Abstract

This discussion provides an overview of the perceptions and preferences of students and staff regarding language use at UKZN and argues that attitude towards language is the key factor in determining the success of any language policy. Results elicited from a questionnaire survey completed by staff and students are provided. Despite UKZN's language policy of additive bilingualism, the data goes on to show a preference that the institution should remain a monolingual environment. The discussion ends with a strong call for interventions which could address the problem of the disjuncture between the policy direction and the views of students and staff.

Keywords: Bilingualism, Higher Education, isiZulu, Language Policy

Introduction

This discussion situates itself within the context of impending tensions about multilingual policy implementation in South African Higher Education (Mutasa 2003; Owino 2002; Van Huyssteen 2002). Recent mergers in Higher Education have resulted in a number of 'new' universities, many of whom have been forced to undergo a rather complex alteration in their language policies as a result of revised education legislation that has been amended to synchronise with the 1996 democratic Constitution of the country (Du Plessis 2006).

Most recent language policy recognises English and Afrikaans as

languages of instruction in Higher Education (Department of Education 2002) but encourages institutions to develop strategies to promote bi/multilingualism. In the Department of Education documents, the emphasis appears to be on developing bilingualism within a framework of multilingualism. A very broad and inclusive definition of *bilingual* views it as a common human condition that makes it possible for an individual to function, at some level, in more than one language (Baker 1988). *Multilingualism* is the ability to use a variety of languages; and for South Africa, multilingualism is characterized by equal status of all eleven languages listed as '*official*' in the country's most recent Constitution (1996). These are: Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, isiNdebele, isiXhosa and isiZulu.

This discussion revolves around the latest developments regarding the University of KwaZulu-Natal's (UKZN's) deliberate move to revamp their language policy in line with latest education initiatives. A bi/multilingual language policy was approved by the UKZN Council in January 2006 (UKZN 2006). It essentially proposes a bilingual (English-isiZulu) medium of education, supporting the functional use of isiZulu alongside English, not only for instruction, but also for University-wide communication. The policy is designed according to certain principles that may be perceived as broad ideals central to the development of a democratic language policy and proposes that:

- English will continue to be used as the primary academic language.
- The university will begin actively the development and use of isiZulu as an additional medium of instruction.
- The languages of administration will be English and isiZulu.
- University emblems, public signs and notices and, where appropriate, public ceremonies such as graduation, inaugural lectures and other public functions will be in English and isiZulu.
- To enhance the knowledge of existing academic and administrative staff, the University will provide language courses for staff who do not have English or isiZulu communication skills.

The University intends to develop bilingualism in two phases. The first will

span 2006 to 2018. In this phase, isiZulu will be introduced in course materials and terminology. Here, the University plans to introduce translation services. In addition, the University's web pages, curriculum, syllabuses and contracts of employment will appear in both English and isiZulu as soon as possible. Upon completion of this phase, faculty boards will determine the choice of languages in which lectures will be conducted. It would appear that the trend here is for the UKZN to become dual medium in order to enhance the status of isiZulu while at the same time maintaining English. However, now that the policy is in place, questions arise regarding its actual implementation.

Background

UKZN was formed in January 2004 as a result of the merger between the University of Durban-Westville and the University of Natal. It is one of the largest universities in the country, much more demographically representative than any other South African university (UKZN 2009). The institution is characterized by a mix of racial and cultural diversity, with African, Indian, Coloured and White influences. In spite of the efforts made by the then leadership of both former universities, the periods just before, during, and just after the merger were fraught with controversies, suspicions, tensions, accusations of nepotism, even corruption, owing to the completely different, and often conflicting socio-economic and political histories of each institution. Consequently, a high degree of uncertainty both from staff and students prevailed (Department of Education 2008). This was the historical context within which the bilingualism policy was implemented.

Understandably, language is an '*extremely emotive issue*' in a country like South Africa, with such an ethnically mixed population so affected by a colonial past (Thorpe 2002: 1, Banda 2003). In fact, apartheid has caused 'hardened attitudes' against African languages, which have been severely marginalized throughout South Africa's history (Owino 2002: 208). These attitudes, Owino states, still continue to prevail right into the post-apartheid era.

From a conceptual standpoint, language policy implementation is crucially impacted by the attitudes of its users. According to Lewis:

> Any policy for language, especially in the system of education, has to take account of the attitude of those likely to be affected**.** In the long run, no policy will succeed which does not use one of three things: conform to the expressed attitudes of those involved; persuade those who express negative attitudes about the rightness of the policy; or seek to remove the causes of disagreement (Lewis 1981: 262).

If one has to retrace the history of South African language policies from the post-colonial era, it is evident that government's attitude affected policy implementation. As far back as 1652, government put a particular language into practice to meet their own economic needs (Maartens 1998). In fact, foreign languages were imposed on people without a choice. Maartens (1998: 25) records the policy of '*free association*' as being adopted for reasons of '*trade*' and later for '*missionary-consciousness*'.

Within about forty years of the formulation of the first language policy in South Africa, an early form of Dutch, which evolved into Afrikaans, became the South African lingua franca. The government's reason for imposing Afrikaans on immigrant slaves and the Khoikhoi inhabitants was again for economic reasons, in that these people had entered the employ of the white settlers and had to communicate with each other as well as with their employers if business had to succeed (Maartens 1998).

With regard to English, notice the vigorous manner (special emphasis on words in bold) in which it gained ground within the next forty years or so:

> That the British authorities saw the importance of language is apparent from the steps periodically taken to **compel** the public use of English. They **applied pressure** first in the schools; they **extended** it by proclamation in the courts from the late 1820's onwards; in 1853 they **made** English the exclusive language of Parliament; and by [1870] they appeared to be triumphing on all fronts (Maartens 1998: 26).

The ardent attitude of government further made it compulsory for Bantu Mother Tongue, as well as English and Afrikaans as second and even third languages, to be taught at schools. Government's reason was simply because

they were official languages and because they met with learners' cultural needs. Not only was the government persuasive, but society found a need for that particular language; hence the language gained momentum.

So attitude is fundamental to the '*growth or decay, restoration or destruction ...*' of a language, as conveyed by Baker (1988:112). He states that attitudes are pivotal to language policy and attitudes can predict the success or failure of policy, and adds that individual attitudes have a profound effect on communal or societal behaviour towards languages. For him, '*attitude ... impinges in an important way on the reality of language life*' (Baker 1988: 112).

Building more on the crux of this argument, Baker perceives attitude as an '*end product*', involving both input (causal) variables as well as output (outcome) variables. He uses Welsh lessons provided in school as an example illustrating how it could yield '*greater facility in the language*' as well as '*positive attitude to the language*'. For him, watching Welsh language programmes on television may have twofold results too: '*enculturation and positive attitude to Welsh cultural forms*'. He continues to clarify this idea in explaining how examination success, while it may be seen as the most important outcome of schooling, may result in mere 'short-lived' knowledge, whereas if accompanied by positive attitude, may yield a more 'enduring' outcome (1988: 113).

Baker adds another important dimension to his argument on attitudes. He alludes to the notion that attitudes and behaviour can be incongruent; this too resulting in the failure of policy. In other words, for him, '*A person may have positive thoughts about a language, yet behave in a negative way*' (1988: 113). He makes reference to Triandis's (1971) theory of attitudes encompassing three parts: cognitive, affective and active. In language, cognitive attitude may be exhibited by effective transmission of words and symbols, affective attitude may refer to feelings and emotions, and active attitude relates to '*readiness for action*'. Baker suggests that while there may be '*consonance*' between these three factors, there may also be '*dissonance*' (1988: 113). He recommends that if language policy seeks to be successful, all three of these aspects should work concurrently.

Concerning languages in education in South Africa, tensions revolve around potential conflict between the resuscitation of previously disadvantaged languages on the one hand, and maintaining the already

established 'high status' languages on the other (Balfour 2006). Further, there are challenges from affirmative action for African languages. It is in many ways unsurprising that language policy remains such an emotive issue, where complexities and difficulties exist in implementing multilingualism policy in the context of a country that has just emerged from political and racial inequalities in education.

The Problem

In its preliminary stage, UKZN's bilingualism policy plan provoked criticism and controversy from many sides (Moodley 2009). For some, the policy plan appeared to encompass a top-down orientation, creating the impression of 'imposing' a particular language on the University community and seeming to neglect the consideration and input of its constituents, viz. the students and staff. Discrepancy stemmed from a noticeable absence of evidence of either the needs or opinions of the University community that had formally been addressed in the formulation of such a document. For others, the tone adopted by the authors of the policy plan was,

> ... overwhelmingly prescriptive, as if they had been given a mandate to impose their policies upon the University as a whole without debate or discussion ... endlessly authoritarian (and hence anti-academic) (Wade 2005: 1).

According to a University academic,

> ... the introduction of Zulu as a teaching medium will achieve precisely what the Apartheid government was trying to achieve—an ethnic institution (Moodley 2009: 72).

Amidst such sentiments, facts and trends needed to be more closely examined in order to gauge the nature and scope of the University constituents' feelings towards the use of bilingualism for education. Such careful interrogation could ultimately assist in driving the move towards multingualism forward. It was envisaged that it would better serve scholarship to get beneath the skin of resident attitudes about language use

by investigating their inclinations about the proposed bilingualism policy. So, rather than regarding the University population as inflexible racists or cultural conservatives, a study was undertaken, addressing the following areas of concern:

- Does the proposed new language policy conform to the expressed preferences of those involved?
- Is there any notion of negativity exhibited by the University community towards the use of isiZulu alongside English for education?
- Is there any notion of positive sentiments exhibited by the University community towards the use of isiZulu alongside English for education?

Investigating Language Preferences at UKZN

A University-wide study was conducted, assessing the sentiments of UKZN's staff and students towards the use of isiZulu alongside English as medium of education (Moodley 2009). The investigation hypothesized inherent dissonance between policy and practice at UKZN; that language preferences of UKZN's community were largely at odds with proposed language policy.

The research methodology fell within a quantitative design, using an effective instrument consistent with the quantitative method – the survey questionnaire (Neuman 2007). Two separate instruments were developed for staff and students (see Appendix A). Each questionnaire was presented in both English and isiZulu. Respondents were required to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with a variety of statements pertaining to their language use. Some questions took on a multiple-choice format. Response options were arranged in a Likert Scale, utilizing the anchor of 'strongly disagree'; 'disagree'; 'neither disagree nor agree'; 'agree' and 'strongly agree'.

The first part of the questionnaire asked for factual information, such as age, gender, race, occupation, home-province, length of residence and home language. Some questions asked for language background. Others required information about degree of daily use of isiZulu and degree of

contact and association with Zulu language speakers on campus. Additional questions required attitudinal responses to the status and use of English and isiZulu for education at UKZN.

The target population for this study was the University community, comprising more than 35 000 students and over 6 700 staff (UKZN 2007). The technique of probability sampling was used, facilitating random sampling on a large scale and stratified random sampling on a smaller scale (Vogt 2006). The purpose of choosing this type of procedure was to ensure representation of two strata: staff and students. Table 1 (see Appendix B) clarifies how the sample was represented.

The survey was administered via the University's Intranet Web system over a nine-month period, beginning October 2006. The analysis drew on both descriptive and inferential statistics working hand-in-hand for retrieval of the results. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) programme (version 11) provided these statistics. Raw data derived from the questionnaire were converted to Tables and Charts. Reliability was assessed using Cronbrach's Coefficient Alpha (Salkind 2005). The resultant coefficient alpha was 0.734 for the staff questionnaire and 0.921 for the student questionnaire, indicating that the study was highly reliable and had a high degree of consistency among the items in the questionnaire.

Results of the Study
Respondent Demographics
Staff and students across all listed age-groups on the questionnaire responded to the survey. The majority of staff (70%) was above 35 years old, presumably having experienced significant changes in language interaction in education both during apartheid and also through a transformative period regarding the country's language policies. As for students, the majority (74%) was below 25 years old.

Although staff members comprised equal numbers of males and females currently employed at UKZN, the number of female respondents (67%) more than doubled the number of male respondents. This supports the notion, which many researchers advocate, that females may be more 'language sensitive' than males, and might thus display relatively more

eagerness to participate in a survey of this nature. However, the student participants comprised equal proportions of males and females.

From the standpoint of educational qualifications, the majority of staff (87%) had acquired post-graduate qualifications, viz. Postgraduate Diploma, Honours, Masters and PhD or equivalent; adding to the credibility of their opinions on educational issues. The majority of students (60%) were undergraduates.

Most staff and student respondents (29% and 45% respectively) hailed from the Faculty of Human, Development and Social Sciences. The supposition is that the issue under study posed a higher degree of salience for these sectors, since language studies fall under this Faculty. It was also noted that the survey elicited significant responses from the Faculty of Science and Agriculture. The majority of staff was based at the Howard College (38%) and Pietermaritzburg (38%) campuses. Most students (52%) attended lectures at the Howard College campus, followed by the Pietermaritzburg campus (34%); the subject under scrutiny perhaps being more salient to these clusters since the study of Humanities is offered on these campuses.

Most staff (60%) belonged to the academic subdivision when looking at their personnel capacity. By implication, it could be that these academics interact in actual teaching and therefore expressed more interest in the issue at hand. The number of years of experience of staff respondents provided balanced perceptions, spanning those who have worked partly through the apartheid era, transitioning into democracy; and those who have experienced working under a democratic system of government only, more or less within the last decade. Concerning students' duration of study, results indicated that most participants (74%) were in their first three years of study.

Most staff and students (77% and 89% respectively) listed KwaZulu-Natal as their home province, placing both sets of respondents in a credible position to comment on the two predominantly used languages in KZN – English and isiZulu. A possible inference is that these representations of staff and students may demonstrate a greater degree of sensitivity to the most predominant regional languages spoken by the majority in KZN, particularly English and isiZulu.

English featured as First Language amongst most staff (71%), while most spoke Afrikaans as 'other' language (45%). This is likely a direct result of having been compulsorily schooled in these two official languages during

apartheid. The majority of students (44%) indicated isiZulu as their first language, followed closely by those who spoke English as first language (41%). These statistics correlate with student enrolment figures that show isiZulu first language speakers in the majority. Furthermore, the majority of students (38%) spoke English as 'other language', while 31% spoke Afrikaans as 'other language'. It is possible that respondents were compulsorily schooled in English and Afrikaans.

isiZulu Competency

Respondents' self-reported proficiency in isiZulu was charted. The data revealed considerably poor isiZulu overall competency among staff (Appendix B, Table 2). On average, only 9% indicated 'excellent' ability in isiZulu and 3% reported as 'good'. Although the majority of students indicated 'excellent' to 'average' ability in isiZulu (see Table 3), a large proportion also revealed 'poor' or 'non-existent' proficiency.

The majority of staff (80%) responded negatively to the question as to whether they had studied isiZulu. A possible reason for this state of affairs could be that that many may have missed the opportunity to study the language at school, when only English and Afrikaans were offered during the apartheid era. As far as student participants were concerned, the majority (69%) responded affirmatively to the question about whether or not they had studied isiZulu. The presumption here is that most schools began offering isiZulu as a subject of learning since the onset of democracy in the country.

For those staff and students who studied isiZulu, the reasons they gave for studying the language were varied. Most wanted to learn about Zulu culture and needed it as a requirement for their studies (see Tables 4 and 5). However, the greater proportion of staff may have missed the opportunity of studying isiZulu at school-level, since it has only recently become part of the national school curriculum.

The question of why staff and students did not undertake isiZulu study at tertiary level was scrutinized. The results (see Table 6) revealed that most staff did not have the time to study isiZulu and a significant proportion pointed to isiZulu not being required as an academic requirement. Only recently have some Faculties included isiZulu (basic or communicative) as a core requirement in some of their programmes of study. Concerning the

reasons why students did not study isiZulu at University, most expressed that it was not an academic requirement (see Table 7). Interestingly, almost all staff and students (99% each) agreed that the language is necessary to know in KZN.

Language Preference for Education

The majority of staff and students indicated that they never used isiZulu for any purpose on campus (see Tables 8 and 9). However, there was some indication that a greater percentage of students used isiZulu for social, religious, cultural and formal events as well as for interaction with peers than staff did.

Although the survey was offered in two versions; isiZulu and English, only two staff members and 4 students chose to use the isiZulu version. The majority of staff and students preferred English as medium for most purposes on campus (see Tables 10 and 11). A small number of staff and around a third of students showed preference for bilingual (isiZulu and English) medium for specific purposes on campus. Nevertheless, there is a slightly higher indication of preference for the bilingual medium for small-group and peer interaction for academic purposes, as well as for non-academic purposes on campus (banking, socializing, and religious/cultural/formal events).

Awareness of Language Policy in Higher Education

The majority of staff and students (77% and 83% respectively) indicated they were either 'not familiar' or somewhat familiar' with language policy. The rest conveyed that they were 'sufficiently' to 'very' familiar with current policy. While the majority of staff and students agreed that 'All South Africans must know at least one indigenous African language', more than a third, on average, disagreed on this issue (see Tables 12 and 13). Regarding the notion that 'All official languages of South Africa carry equal status', the majority of staff and students agreed.

In addition, the majority of staff and students claimed that they were 'never' or 'rarely' consulted (91% and 89% respectively), informed (69% and 85% respectively) or involved (98% and 99% respectively) in language

policy issues. Furthermore, the following question was presented to staff and students: Do you think it is necessary for the following University affiliates to be involved in language policy decision-making for the University? The majority supported the notion that all identifiable groups that constitute the University should be involved in negotiation about language policy (see Tables 14 and 15).

Discussion

A distinguishing feature of the findings was the collective notion of unpopularity for isiZulu and a distinct support of an 'English only' status quo expressed by the majority of respondents. The study revealed that the majority of staff and students never, or at best rarely, used isiZulu as medium on campus. Nevertheless, students revealed some isiZulu usage for non-academic purposes on campus, like socializing and religious events. There was a slight hint too, that students who studied the language took initiative to learn about Zulu culture and to make new friends. Of note is that almost all staff and students agreed that it was necessary to know the language although they claimed that they were mostly unaware of Language Policy in Higher Education.

One of many possible reasons for the lack of isiZulu use for academic purposes may be linked to low levels of proficiency in the language among staff, stemming from lack of isiZulu study either at school or university level. Respondents' reasons for not studying the language were largely because it was not an academic requirement and due to insufficient time to study it. There were also indications that isiZulu was not a job requirement for staff members and was therefore not studied.

The study exposes a personnel problem with regard to the level of under-preparedness and unpreparedness to teach in a bilingual system. Regardless of attitudes to and awareness of the policy, there is the very real problem of proficiency. Most existing academics are not proficient in the language, compounded by the fact that they are not pedagogically trained to teach in an African language. Academics may feel stifled by their lack of knowledge of isiZulu and may also feel that it is time-consuming to learn yet another language.

An additional finding was that the majority of staff and students exhibited inadequate awareness of language policy for Higher Education. The majority of staff and students claimed that they were never formally consulted or informed about language policy issues. They supported the notion that all identifiable groups that constitute the University should be involved in negotiation about policy. There is seemingly a lack of formal negotiation between University 'policy-makers' and the University community in policy development.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The hegemony of English as a medium of instruction at UKZN cannot simply be overturned, because successful implementation of language shifts is dependent on and entwined with user-preferences. Persuading the University community to actually use a dual medium in a predominantly English-speaking environment may be a real challenge.

First and foremost, developing a cultural ethos on campus could be one way of influencing people – use of bilingual posters, emblems and signage could prove to be useful. In addition, the University could be used as a primary platform to launch motivational talks, workshops, seminars and presentations on the benefits of being isiZulu-literate. The academia could be a leading role-model in this respect, enhancing the use of isiZulu at cultural, religious, social and formal events. Their role-modeling could overtly and repeatedly demonstrate belief in the capacity of isiZulu to fulfill all functions of a language in all domains of life.

Campus and community wide campaigning for isiZulu proficiency could be launched, whereby for example, students and staff could be offered substantial perks in electing isiZulu as a course of study. Otherwise, acquisition and use of isiZulu will continue to be regarded as not worth the effort. Attractive incentives could be provided in the form of grants, scholarships, credit-bearing courses and certification in isiZulu. Incentives should be achievable, tangible, clearly stipulated and widely exposed to the University community. There could be promotion of isiZulu in competitions to produce books, articles, poems, essays etc. Students could be encouraged to pursue careers in isiZulu journalism, translation, interpreting, communication studies, performing arts, entertainment and script-writing for stage, radio and television.

Another recommendation arising from the findings of this study is that legislating on the learning of isiZulu by staff and students from the University senate is critical to fast-tracking language change. In this sense, making the learning of isiZulu compulsory as a course requirement for all students and a compulsory job requirement for staff would go a long way towards implementing and sustaining bilingualism. International studies have underscored the need to pressure change during the implementation phase of educational change. With regard to the underpreparedness of teaching personnel in using isiZulu, a quicker solution to the problem would be to recruit graduate students as teaching assistants and tutors. These could be derived from those who are pursuing or planning to pursue African language teaching as a profession.

Bearing in mind that the University community needs no motivation for retaining English, for they are already convinced of its value, immediate and rigorous campaigns could be launched, motivating for the importance of adding isiZulu literacy to constituents' repertoire. It could be stressed upon the University community that vying for bilingualism does not mean that English should be abandoned; rather a dual medium is more favourable, especially since the majority of its constituents see the need to know the language in KZN. The advantages of bilingualism may need to be spelt out to all constituents if they are to see the individual benefits beyond the broader political ones.

Moreover, the bilingual policy may need to ensure that English proficiency is equally developed. If not, this might give rise to suspicions of a reversion to mother tongue education, which, in South Africa's history, was linked to limited access to economic and academic opportunity for non-English language speakers. Bilingualism needs to have benefits for all groups on campus and they need to be assured of this.

The University community should be kept informed of language policy, especially in terms of Higher Education. Students, as well as staff, could be more widely exposed to language policy, their rights spelled out, and informed about latest trends in policy, before being presented with written versions of it.

It may be crucial that before embarking on any future course of action, the wishes of the University's constituents should be considered by means of a participatory approach to planning. This could lead to a better

understanding of the needs of the constituencies the institution serves. Fair representations of the multiple identities of all sectors of the University should be involved in decision–making so as to ensure that the process is not authoritarian. Otherwise the use of isiZulu as a medium of instruction may divide people instead of uniting them, bearing in mind that the inclusion of dual medium education at UKZN has already been criticized as contradicting the very essence of democracy and reverting to South Africa's old policy of apartheid.

In conclusion, the climate within which the new policy has been introduced is not conducive to the implementation of bilingual usage. If the policy is to be implemented successfully in its current form, the institution will need to address language preferences of students and staff in a meaningfully engaged way. Although the results of this study contribute towards highlighting the preferences of staff and students in respect of bilingual education for UKZN, it would be beneficial to conduct a more in-depth examination of attitudes, beliefs and opinions through a thorough qualitative study involving interviews. Ongoing empirical research must be encouraged, to test updated modifications of the language status quo at UKZN. Policy implementation must then adapt constantly to the changing needs of society.

The bottom line is that the attitudes of UKZN's constituency are at odds with proposed policy, and policy is at odds with popular demand for the language of power (English). Suffice to say, a covert policy of *de facto* monolingualism/ unilingualism is here to stay unless the entire community can be convinced of the benefits of bilingualism. There is very little hope that bilingual policy at UKZN will result in practical implementation in the near future if it does not involve perseverance and a collective commitment from all its stake-holders.

References

Baker, C 1988. *Key Issues in Bilingualism and Bilingual Education.* England: Clevedon.

Balfour, R 2006. University Language Policies, Internationalism, Multilingualism, and Language Development in South Africa and the United Kingdom. Paper presented at the LSSA/SAALA Conference, University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Banda, F 2003. Literacy Practices in Black and Coloured Communities in South Africa. Paper presented at the LSSA/SAALA Conference, Rand Afrikaans University, South Africa.

Department of Education 2002. Language Policy for Higher Education. Retrieved from http://education.pwv.gov.za/content/documents/67.pdf [Accessed 20/05/05].

Department of Education 2008. Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation and Social Cohesion and the Elimination of Discrimination in Public Higher Education Institutions.

Retrieved from http://www.pmg.org.za/briefing/20090610-report-ministerial-committee-transformation-social-cohesion-higher- [Accessed 20/05/10].

Du Plessis, T 2006. From Monolingual to Bilingual Higher Education: The Repositioning of Historically Afrikaans-medium Universities in South Africa. *Language Policy* 5: 87 -113.

Lewis, EG 1981. *Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Maartens, J 1998. Multilingualism and Language Policy in South Africa. In Extra, G & J Maartens (eds.): *Multilingualism in a Multicultural Context*. *Case Study on South Africa and Western Europe.* Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Moodley, DL 2009. *A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Attitudes of Staff and Students of the University of KwaZulu-Natal, towards a Bilingual (English/ isiZulu) Medium of Education.* PhD thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal. Unpublished.

Mutasa, Elias 2003: *The Language Policy of South Africa: What do People Say?* PhD Thesis, University of South Africa. Unpublished.

Neuman, Lawrence W 2007. *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Second Edition. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Owino, FR (ed) 2002. *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development.* Cape Town: CASAS.

Salkind, Neil J 2005. *Statistics for People Who Hate Statistics.* Second Edition. California, USA: Sage Publications.

South Africa, 1996. *Constitution of South Africa.* Pretoria: Government Printer.

Thorpe, K 2002. Multilingualism and Minority Languages in South Africa – A discussion paper. 1-4. Retrieved from http://www.inst.at/trans/13Nr/thorpe13.htm [Accessed 7/9/2004].

Triandis, HC 1971. *Attitude and Attitude Change*. New York: Wiley.

UKZN 2006. Language Policy of the University of KwaZulu-Natal. Retrieved from http://registrar.ukzn.ac.za/University4839.aspx. [Accessed 12/10/2007].

UKZN 2007. Management Information, Retrieved from http://www.ukzn.ac.za/dmi/ukznstats [Accessed 4/26/2007].

UKZN 2009. Governance and Academic Freedom Committee Report. Retrieved from https://intranet.ukzn.ac.za/ViewDocument.aspx?ID=606 [Accessed 15/07/2009].

Van Huyssten, A 2002. Multilingualism: An Asset. In Owino, FR (ed): *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development.* CapeTown: CASAS.

Vogt, Paul W 2006. *Quantitative Research Methods for Professionals.* USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Wade, J 2005. African Languages Promotion and a University in KwaZulu-Natal. A position paper. Unpublished.

Appendix A: Excerpt from Staff Questionnaire

8. Home Province?
8.1.____ Eastern Cape
8.2.____ Free-State
8.3.____ Gauteng
8.4.____ KwaZulu-Natal
8.5.____ Limpopo
8.6.____ Mpumalanga
8.7.____ North-West
8.8.____ Northern Cape
8.9.____ Western Cape
8.10.____ Other (Please specify)_____

10. Other languages spoken?
10.1. _____ English
10.2. _____ Afrikaans
10.3. _____ isiZulu
10.4. _____ isiXhosa
10.5. _____ isiNdebele
10.6. _____ Sepedi
10.7. _____ Sesotho
10.8. _____ Setswana
10.9. _____ siSwati
10.10. _____ Tshivenda
10.11. _____ Xitsonga
10.12. _____ Other (Please specify)

9. First language/Home language?
9.1.____ English
9.2.____ Afrikaans
9.3.____ isiZulu
9.4.____ isiXhosa
9.5.____ isiNdebele
9.6.____ Sepedi
9.7.____ Sesostho
9.10.____ Setswana
9.11.____ siSwati
9.13____ Tshivenda
9.14____ Xitsonga
9.15____ Other (Please specify)_____

11. Did you study isiZulu at school?
11.1.____ Yes
11.2**.** ____ No

12. Did/do you study isiZulu at university?
12.1.____ Yes
12.2.____ No

13. Did/do you study isiZulu at another university?
13.1.____ No
13.2.____Yes (please specify)_____

14. Did/do you study isiZulu mostly by taking:
14.1.____ Full-time classes
14.2.____ Part-time classes
14.3.____ Self-study
14.4.____ Never studied it

15. Rate your SPEAKING ability in:

	A. Non-existent	B. Poor	C. Average	D. Good	E. Excellent
15.1 English					
15.2 isiZulu					
15.3 Other Please specify					

---

16. Rate your READING ability in:

	A. Non-existent	B. Poor	C. Average	D. Good	E. Excellent
16.1 English					
16.2 isiZulu					
16.3 Other Please specify					

---

17. Rate your WRITING ability in:

	A. Non-existent	B. Poor	C. Average	D. Good	E. Excellent
17.1 English					
17.2 isiZulu					
17.3 Other Please specify					

---

18. Rate your UNDERSTANDING of:

	A. Non-existent	B. Poor	C. Average	D. Good	E. Excellent
18.1 English					
18.2 isiZulu					
18.3 Other Please specify					

---

19. If you studied/are studying isiZulu, what were/are your main reasons for doing so?
19.1. _____ Academic/course requirement.
19.2. _____ Enjoyment of learning new languages.
19.3. _____ Necessity of knowing it in KZN.
19.4. _____ IsiZulu necessary for my job.
19.5. _____ IsiZulu necessary for my career.
19.6. _____ To enable me to make new friends.
19.7. _____ IsiZulu needed for day-to-day life.
19.8. _____ To learn more about the Zulu culture.
19.9. _____ Not studying/never studied it.
19.10 _____ Other reason/s (Please specify)

---

20. If you DID NOT study/are not studying isiZulu what were/are your main reasons for NOT doing so?
20.1. _____ Not part of my academic/course requirement.
20.2. _____ I resent having to learn isiZulu.
20.3. _____ I do not have the time to learn isiZulu.
20.4. _____ I think isiZulu is difficult to study.
20.5. _____ I do not think it is necessary to know isiZulu.
20.6. _____ I do not have the funds to study isiZulu.
20.7. _____ I am studying it presently.
20.8. _____ Other reason/s (Please specify)

---

21. How often do you use isiZulu as a medium on campus:					
	A. Never	B. Rarely	C. Sometimes	D. Often	E. Always
21.1. For lectures?					
21.2. For tutorials?					
21.3. For practicals?					
21.4. For seminars/conferences?					
21.5. For group work?					
21.6. For written work?					
21.7. For tests and examination papers?					
21.8. For learning materials?					
21.9. For consultations with staff/ students?					
21.10. For consultation/interaction with peers?					
21.11. For administrative procedures?					
21.12. For financial matters?					
21.13. For interviews, meetings?					
21.14. For social/ religious/ cultural/ formal events?					
21.15. Other? (Please specify) _____					

22. If you had a choice, which language/s would you prefer as a medium:				
	A. English	B. isiZulu	C. Both English and isiZulu	D. Other (please specify)
22.1. For lectures?				
22.2. For tutorials?				
22.3. For practicals?				
22.4. For seminars, conferences, etc.				

22.5. For group work?				
22.6.For written work?				
22.7. For learning materials?				
22.8. For consultations with staff/students?				
22.9. For consultation/interaction with peers?				
22.10. For administrative procedures?				
22.11. For financial matters?				
22.12. For interviews, meetings?				
22.13. For social/religious/ cultural/formal events?				
22.14.Other? (Please specify) _____				

23. Which language do you use most often for the following situations outside campus:				
	A. English	B. isiZulu	C. Both English and isiZulu	D. Other (please specify)
23.1. For interaction with family?				
23.2. For interaction with friends?				
23.3. For interaction with neighbours?				
23.4. For business transactions?				
23.5. For official transactions?				
23.6. For watching TV programmes?				
23.7. For listening to the radio?				
23.8. For reading the newspaper?				

24. How familiar are you, with present language policies in Higher Education?				
	A. English	B. isiZulu	C. Both English and isiZulu	D. Other (please specify)
24.1. _____ Not familiar				
24.2. _____ Some-what familiar				
24.3. _____ Sufficiently familiar				
24.4. _____ Very familiar				

25. Do you agree with the following statements:		
	A. Yes	B. No
25.1. All South Africans must know English and Afrikaans only.		
25.2. All South Africans must know African languages only.		
25.3. All South Africans must know at least one indigenous African language.		
25.4. All official languages of South Africa carry equal status.		

26. How often are you officially CONSULTED about language policy issues at the University?
26.1. _____ Never
26.2. _____ Rarely
26.3. _____ Sometimes
26.4. _____ Often
26.5. _____ Always

27. How often are you officially INFORMED about language policy issues at the University?
27.1. _____ Never
27.2. _____ Rarely
27.3. _____ Sometimes
27.4. _____ Often
27.5. _____ Always

28. How INVOLVED are you in language policy decision-making at the University?
28.1. _____ Never involved
28.2. _____ Some-what involved
28.3. _____ Sufficiently involved
24.4. _____ Very involved

29. Do you think it is necessary for the following university affiliates to be involved in language policy decision-making at the University?		
	A. Yes	B. No
29.1. Students		
29.2. Parent/s of students		
29.3. Academic staff		
29.4. Support staff		
29.5. Executive staff		
29.6. Administrative staff		
29.7. University unions, organisations, etc.		
29.8. None of the above		

Dianna Moodley

Appendix B: Tables

Table 1: Sample Representation

Staff	Students
Age	Age
Gender	Gender
Highest educational qualification	Highest educational qualification
Faculty working in	Faculty registered at
Position held	Programme of study
Number of years of service at UKZN	Level of study at UKZN
Campus location	Campus location
Home residency	Home residency
Linguistic background	Linguistic background
Linguistic competence	Linguistic competence

Table 2: isiZulu Proficiency (Staff)

| RATING | CATEGORIES OF PROFICIENCY | | | |
	SPEAKING	READING	WRITING	UNDERSTANDING
Non-existent	45%	63%	65%	36%
Poor	36%	18%	15%	42%
Average	6%	7%	9%	9%
Good	3%	3%	2%	3%
Excellent	9%	9%	9%	10%
Missing	1%	-	-	-
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Table 3: isiZulu Proficiency (Students)

| RATING | CATEGORIES OF PROFICIENCY | | | |
	SPEAKING	READING	WRITING	UNDERSTANDING
Non-existent	20%	27%	28%	18%
Poor	19%	13%	15%	21%
Average	8%	8%	5%	8%
Good	8%	15%	13%	18%
Excellent	45%	37%	39%	35%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Table 4: Reasons for studying isiZulu (Staff)

- Necessity of knowing it in KZN	26%
- Academic/course requirement	16%
- Enjoyment of learning new languages	16%
- To learn more about the Zulu culture	11%
- isiZulu is necessary for my job	5%
- isiZulu needed for day-to-day life	5%
- Other reasons	5%
- Missing	5%
TOTAL	**100%**

Table 5: Reasons for studying isiZulu (Students)

- To learn more about the Zulu culture	21%
- Course/ school requirement	20%
- To enable me to make new friends	12%
- isiZulu needed for my day-to-day life	5%
- isiZulu necessary for my job	4%
- Necessity of knowing it in KZN	3%
- Enjoyment of learning new languages	1%
- Combination of above-listed reasons	34%
TOTAL	**100%**

Table 6: Reasons for not studying isiZulu (Staff)

- I do not have the time to learn isiZulu	25%
- Not part of my academic/course requirement	14%
- I do not have the funds to study isiZulu	5%
- I think isiZulu is difficult to study	4%
- I do not think it is necessary to know isiZulu	1%
- Combination of above-listed reasons	32%
- Other reasons	19%
TOTAL	**100%**

Table 7: Reasons for not studying isiZulu (Students)

- Not part of my academic/course requirement	36%
- I think isiZulu is difficult to study	8%
- I resent having to learn isiZulu	7%
- I do not have the time to learn isiZulu	4%
- I do not have the funds to study isiZulu.	3%
- I do not think it is necessary to know in KZN	1%
- My parents do not want me to learn isiZulu	1%
- Combination of above listed reasons	38%
- Missing	2%
TOTAL	**100%**

Table 8: isiZulu usage on campus (Staff)

PURPOSE	FREQUENCY OF USE						TOTAL
	Never	**Rarely**	**Some-times**	**Often**	**Always**	**Mis-sing**	
-lectures	88%	3%	4%	3%	1%	1%	**100%**
-tutorials	82%	8%	6%	3%	1%	-	**100%**
-practical work	92%	4%	2%	2%	-	-	**100%**
-seminars/conferences	92%	5%	3%	-	-	-	**100%**
-group-work	82%	6%	4%	7%	1%	-	**100%**
-written work	93%	2%	3%	2%	-	-	**100%**
-tests and examination papers	98%	-	-	2%	-	-	**100%**
-learning materials	92%	3%	3%	2%	-	-	**100%**

-consultations with staff/students	74%	13%	5%	6%	1%	1%	**100%**
-consultation/interaction with peers	75%	11%	7%	6%	1%	-	**100%**
-administrative procedures	90%	7%	1%	2%	-	-	**100%**
-financial matters	95%	3%	1%	1%	-	-	**100%**
-interviews, meetings	87%	6%	5%	2%	-	-	**100%**
-social/ religious/ cultural/ formal events	68%	15%	10%	5%	2%	-	**100%**

Table 9: isiZulu usage on campus (Students)

PURPOSE	FREQUENCY					TOTAL
	Never	Rarely	Some-times	Often	Always	
-lectures	71%	15%	9%	5%	-	100%
-tutorials	73%	15%	5%	7%	-	100%
-practical	70%	16%	5%	7%	2%	100%
-seminars/ conferences/etc.	72%	19%	6%	3%	-	100%
-group-work	52%	9%	18%	21%	-	100%
-written work	89%	8%	1%	2%	-	100%
-tests and examination papers	91%	3%	4%	2%	-	100%
-learning materials	87%	6%	4%	2%	1%	100%
-consultations with staff/students	58%	14%	15%	12%	1%	100%
-consultation/interaction with peers	45%	9%	13%	18%	15%	100%
-administrative procedures	61%	17%	15%	5%	2%	100%
-financial matters	64%	12%	11%	10%	3%	100%
-housing/residential matters	61%	13%	15%	8%	3%	100%
-interviews, meetings	74%	13%	8%	3%	2%	100%
-social/religious/ cultural/formal events	50%	11%	16%	17%	6%	100%

Table 10: Language preference for education (Staff)

PURPOSE	PREFERENCE				TOTAL
	English	isiZulu	Both languages	Missing	
-lectures	84%	1%	14%	1%	**100%**
-tutorials	75%	4%	20%	1%	**100%**
-practical work	79%	3%	16%	2%	**100%**
-seminars, conferences, etc.	85%	2%	13%	-	**100%**
-group-work	77%	2%	20%	1%	**100%**
-written work	85%	2%	13%	-	**100%**
-learning materials	83%	2%	15%	-	**100%**
-consultation with staff/students	74%	1%	25%	-	**100%**
-consultation/interaction with peers	75%	1%	24%	-	**100%**
-administrative procedures	81%	2%	17%	-	**100%**
-financial matters	81%	2%	17%	-	**100%**
-interviews, meetings	81%	2%	16%	1%	**100%**

-social/religious/cultural/formal events	67%	3%	30%	-	**100%**

Table 11: Language preference for education (Students)

PURPOSE	PREFERENCE				
	English	**isiZulu**	**Both**	**Missing**	**TOTAL**
-lectures	64%	7%	28%	1%	**100%**
-tutorials	53%	14%	33%	-	**100%**
-practical work	50%	15%	34%	1%	**100%**
-seminars, conferences, etc.	56%	13%	29%	2%	**100%**
-group-work	49%	15%	33%	3%	**100%**
-written work	66%	9%	23%	2%	**100%**
-test & examination papers	67%	8%	24%	1%	**100%**
-learning materials	62%	6%	32%	-	**100%**
-consultation with staff/students	49%	19%	31%	1%	**100%**
-consultation/interaction with peers	50%	14%	34%	2%	**100%**
-administrative procedures	52%	14%	34%	-	**100%**
-financial matters	49%	17%	33%	1%	**100%**
- housing/residential matters	49%	18%	32%	1%	**100%**
-interviews, meetings	55%	15%	29%	15	**100%**

Table 12: Views on issues within Language Policy (Staff)

Do you agree with the following statements:	Yes	No	TOTAL
All South Africans must know English and Afrikaans only?	2%	98%	**100%**
All South Africans must know African languages only?	-	99%	**100%**
All South Africans must know at least one indigenous African language?	65%	35%	**100%**
All official languages of South Africa carry equal status?	47%	53%	**100%**

Table 13: Views on issues within Language Policy (Students)

Do you agree with the following statements:	Yes	No	TOTAL
All South Africans must know English and Afrikaans only?	2%	98%	**100%**
All South Africans must know African languages only?	6%	94%	**100%**
All South Africans must know at least one indigenous African language?	72%	28%	**100%**
All official languages of South Africa carry equal status?	65%	35%	**100%**

Table 14: Necessary Involvement in Language Policy Decision-Making (Staff)

UNIVERSITY AFFILIATES	Yes	No	TOTAL
Students	86%	14%	**100%**
Parent/s of students	62%	38%	**100%**
Academic staff	99%	1%	**100%**
Support staff	88%	12%	**100%**
Executive staff	92%	8%	**100%**
Administrative staff	90%	10%	**100%**
University unions, organisations, etc.	88%	12%	**100%**

Table 15: Necessary Involvement in Language Policy Decision-Making (Students)

UNIVERSITY AFFILIATES	Yes	No	TOTAL
Students	96%	4%	**100%**
Parents of students	64%	36%	**100%**
Academic staff	98%	2%	**100%**
Support staff	73%	27%	**100%**
Executive staff	90%	10%	**100%**
Administrative staff	89%	11%	**100%**
University unions, organisations, etc.	79%	21%	**100%**

Dianna Moodley
School of Management Studies (Education Unit)
University of KwaZulu-Natal
moodleydi@ukzn.ac.za