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ABSTRACT

The study looks at the attitudes of students towards the use of their source languages at the Turfloop campus, University of Limpopo. The study is aimed at finding out the reasons why students have attitudes towards their source languages, whether these attitudes are negative or positive.

More specifically, the research focuses on, among other things, the students’ attitudes towards their mother tongue as compared to English and their options and beliefs about the use of importance of English is outlined. The survey methods used are questionnaire survey as well as follow-up interview, supplemented by on campus observation. The results are first analysed as a whole, and then split into different according to as set of background variables (gender, year of study, subject studied etc).

This analysis indicates that, while English is recognised as the dominant language in South Africa and, more specifically, in the domain of education, some categories of respondents acknowledge the usefulness of their source languages. This is part of a growing set of surveys on the attitudes of university students towards the use of African languages in education, and can be fruitfully compared with similar research at other institutions. Moreover, the results of the present research can be used to inform future decisions regarding language policy in the University of Limpopo.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The present study looked at the attitudes of students towards the use of their source languages at the Turfloop campus, University of Limpopo. This campus is multilingual. The languages spoken are: Xitsonga, Tshivenda, Sepedi, IsiSwati, IsiZulu and IsiXhosa. The focus of the study will be on the usability of these source languages, looking at how students make use of these languages in their day-to-day social interactions on campus.

1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

First language speakers at the Turfloop campus do not use their source languages. They shun their languages, preferring English languages instead. This happens because they hold negative attitudes towards their source languages.

Similar studies have been conducted inside and outside Limpopo Province to find out why students have negative attitude towards their source languages.

Dyers (2005), Lorenzo (2004) and Langa (2005) are examples of studies which will be dealt with in detail under the literature review, to provide direction and understanding of the phenomenon under study.
All three researchers used interviews, questionnaires and observations as tools for their research. The outcomes of their research prompted me to conduct the present investigation. This study will however, be different from the afore-mentioned research in that it is going to concentrate on the attitudes of students in more than four source languages. This will determine the prevalence of attitudes amongst source language speakers.

1.3 THE AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of the study is to find out why students prefer to use the English language in context where they can make use of their mother tongue. In other words, the study seeks to find out why these students hold negative attitudes towards their languages.

1.3.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

In order to realise this aim, the researcher will follow the steps below:

(a) Determine the language spoken by respondent.

(b) Talk to respondent on various issues concerning language use.

(c) Talk to lecturers on students’ attitudes on using source languages.

1.3.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to realise the aim of this study, the following questions will be asked:

(a) Which language would you use to communicate with your friends or when in class?

(b) Which language would you choose to communicate with your lecturers?

(c) What are the lecturers’ views on students’ attitudes towards the use of source languages?
What other views are there on students’ use of their source languages?

1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study will be conducted at the Turfloop Campus, University of Limpopo, where the African languages mentioned earlier are spoken.

1.5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.5.1 METHODS

Qualitative data will be collected through the use of question and answer method, i.e. the researcher will raise questions with the respondents, expecting them to respond accordingly.

1.5.2 TOOLS/TECHNIQUES

The following tools will be used: questionnaires and observation.

Questionnaires: Questionnaires will contain bibliographic details where the numbers of respondents, their gender, study directions and their level of study will be required. Communication with administrative staff on official as well as unofficial matters. The respondent’s language while talking about academic issues such as marks inquiry and inquiry on availability of lecturers. The language they use with fellow students outside and inside lecture halls i.e. during discussions on academic work, during political meetings, during religious meetings, the respondent’s source language and how often this is used.

Observations: Participant observer will be used whereby a supervisor will be observing and making sure that the respondents answer the questionnaire accordingly.
1.5.3 LOCALITY

The research was conducted at the University of Limpopo, Turfloop Campus where the respondents are students. The student population at the institution is about 15 000, and they all speak different source languages.

1.5.4 SAMPLING

The researcher sent out a number of questionnaires to the respondents, who had to answer the questions outlined in the questionnaire.

1.5.5 TECHNIQUES

Data were collected in the form of a questionnaire where respondents had answer all the questions stipulated on the questionnaire under the researcher’s supervision.

In this research, 45 questionnaires were distributed on the Turfloop campus of the University of Limpopo. The questionnaire used was developed by reflecting on the relevant literature and by looking at questionnaires used in similar studies. The questionnaire was prepared in English.

The complete questionnaire was a 38-item questionnaire. It took approximately 20 minutes to fill in. It contained a brief description of the purpose of the questionnaire, a space for the students to provide their details.

Approximately 45 questionnaires were distributed in the Student Centre, in the library and in the residences by volunteers and members of the Student Representative Council (SRC), and in class by some students. Students were asked to return the completed questionnaires to the researcher or through the person they got the questionnaire from. Overall, 18 forms were returned.
1.5.6 RESEARCH DESIGN

Leedy (2001: 91) defines a research design as a complete strategy of attack on the central research problem. In simpler terms, research design is planning. It involves the process of planning what and how data will be collected (Kathari, in Duplooy 1997: 88).

Here, the researcher discusses the different approaches used to collect data and the procedure of data gathering.

1.5.7 RESEARCH POPULATION

From within the large body of the University of Limpopo students, only a few respondents answered the questions stipulated on the questionnaire. The population consisted of 8 males and 10 female students.

1.5.8 RESEARCH APPROACH

Research approach informs the reader how data were collected and explains the method that was used to process it. (Leedy, 2001: 94). In this study the researcher made use of a quantitative (Questionnaires) research approach. Eighteen students took part in the completion of the questionnaire. All the students who participated in the completion of questionnaire were randomly selected.

1.5.8.1 Quantitative research approach

This research approach is also referred to as an experiment approach. It is used to answer questions about relationships among measured variables with the purpose of explaining, predicting and controlling the phenomena (Leedy, 2001: 101).
1.5.8.2 Questionnaire Design

Quantitative data were collected by the use of questionnaires. Questionnaires are data gathering instruments which respondents answer questions or respond to statement in writing, (Best and Kahn, 1993: 229-230). A questionnaire administered personally to groups or individuals gives a researcher the opportunity to establish rapport, and explain the meaning of an item that may not be clear.

1.6 QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENT

The researcher divided the questions into different topics in order to determine the students’ attitudes towards the use of source languages in the University.

1.7 DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

(i) Attitudes

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, and internet dictionary defines attitude as hypothetical construct that represents an individual's like or dislike for an item. Attitudes are positive, negative or neutral views of an attitude object. The relevance of this definition to the present study is that source language speakers may either choose to speak their languages or choose not to.

(ii) Source Language

The American Heritage Dictionary defines source language as the language from which a translation is to be made or from which a word is borrowed. The relevance of this term in my study is that source language refers to the respondent’s first language.
(iii) **Respondent**

*The American Heritage Desk Dictionary* defines respondent as a person who responds, which means answering to something. It is relevant to the study because source language speakers will be answering the questionnaires.

(iv) **Multilingualism**

*Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, and internet dictionary* defines multilingualism as the phenomena regarding an individual speaker who uses two or more languages, a community of speakers where two or more languages are used, or between speakers of different languages. The term is relevant to my study because it refers to respondents’ knowledge of using more than one language.

(v) **Target language**

*Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, internet dictionary* defines the term target language as the language used in translation to refer to the language a source text is being translated into. The relevance of this term to my study is that it refers to the respondents’ second language.

(vi) **Case study**

*Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, and internet dictionary* defines case study as one of several ways of doing social science research. Other ways include experiments, surveys, multiple histories, and analysis of archival information. In this study it refers to how respondents are going to be involved in the outcomes of this research study.
1.8 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter one serves as an introductory chapter to the study, the researcher has to give clear reasons why he conducted the research. The aim, the rationale and the significance of the study were clearly outlined.

Chapter two focuses on the literature reviewed prior to conducting the study. In this chapter relevant theories and arguments by different authors are explored.

Chapter three presents and analyses the data gathered.

Chapter four focuses on the interpretation of the data.

Chapter five presents a summary of findings, recommendations and make conclusions.
CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to review the literature which deals with attitudes of speakers to African languages. This study will rely on the work of the following scholars:

2.2 DYERS (2005, 2008)

Dyers’ study deals with language, identity and nationhood, amongst Rhodes University students. He concentrated on the speakers of isiXhosa. Speakers of IsiXhosa, according to Statistics South Africa 2000, form the second largest speech community in South Africa (17.9% of the total population), second only to speakers of Zulu (22.9% of the total population).

Dyers’ thesis presents a study of the patterns of language attitudes and use with which IsiXhosa students enter the university, as well as patterns of change in language attitudes. The longitudinal part of the study tracked 20 students for three years, which is the minimum period to complete a degree. He used questionnaires where students were asked which language they preferred using during their spare time, how they felt about the use of English in the university, and which language they used outside the university.
In another study Dyers (1998) explores the attitudes of first and second year isiXhosa speaking students attending the foundation course she lectured at the University of the Western Cape (UWC).

This study indicates that IsiXhosa students identified strongly with their language because they thought it would help them get a job and they did not believe a complete language shift (presumably to English) would ever take place (in spite of the limited attention that they felt the government was paying to isiXhosa). Surprisingly, students preferred “purer” varieties and disliked code-mixing with other languages (especially isiZulu with which isiXhosa has a history of rivalry).

They were also favourable to the development of African languages for use at tertiary level. English was seen as the dominant language in education and the preferred medium of instruction. At the second year level, students’ self assessed English proficiency increased while positive attitudes towards English as the only medium of instruction at university decreased.

Students felt that using their mother tongue, especially in tutorials would help them, but it would create tensions and make speakers of other languages uncomfortable. Using English as a *lingua franca* was seen as the only “politically correct” option.
2.3 LORENZO (2004)

His study deals with a similar situation as that of Dyers (2005, 2008). The only difference is that Lorenzo’s study was conducted amongst the isiXhosa-speaking students at the University of Fort Hare and the emphasis was on the use of isiXhosa as a language of teaching (LOLT). This article presents and discusses the results of a survey of a sample of isiXhosa-speaking students at the University of Fort Hare regarding their attitudes towards the possible introduction of isiXhosa as a medium of instruction at this institution.

The research takes into account, among other things, the students’ attitudes towards English and isiXhosa and their opinions and beliefs about the introduction of dual-mediumship and its possible consequences. The survey was conducted with questionnaires and interviews and the results were first analysed as a whole, and then split into different categories according to gender, year of study and subject studied.

This analysis indicates that, while English is recognized as the dominant language in South Africa and, more specifically, in the domain of education, some categories of respondents acknowledge the usefulness of isiXhosa as an additional medium of instruction.

This survey clearly shows that it would make little sense to present isiXhosa-speaking students at Fort Hare with a rigid choice between the existing English-medium and a dual-medium (English
and isiXhosa) policy and that more nuanced options would need to be offered. For example, respondents seem to consider the use of isiXhosa as a medium of instruction more appropriate in the first years of study, for selected subjects and in some domains within the academic context rather than others.

### 2.4 Langa (2005)

Langa has conducted a research study which deals with the learners’ attitudes towards the use of Northern Sotho in the Capricorn High School, Limpopo Province. The study concentrated on how learners felt about their source languages as compared to English as a medium of instruction. The study concentrated on the learners’ use of Northern Sotho in the class, during the learning process and when communicating with friends.

The study found that learners believed that they would gain more knowledge if they did their studies in English instead of their source language. The findings were that these learners felt more comfortable when using English rather than their source language. Langa’s study also recommends that South African government should take a number of steps in ensuring the recognition of all languages in South Africa, and it should also make an effort of elevating African languages to the same level as English (Langa 2005).

The study is relevant to this study because the circumstances under which this research is to be conducted are similar to those observed by Langa.
2.5 BARKHUIZEN (2001)

Barkhuizen has undertaken study on learners of isiXhosa as a first language in Western and Eastern Cape secondary schools. The study confirms that there are positive attitudes towards English and a tendency to consider isiXhosa as an inferior language. In spite of this, the majority of the learners thought that it was important to study isiXhosa, mainly for integrative reasons.

Barkhuizen (2001) also notes that two factors may undermine the support for IsiXhosa as a school subject: the way IsiXhosa is taught as a subject and the difference between the variety studied in school (“deep” IsiXhosa) and the one students speak. Although English was preferred as a medium of instruction for almost all subjects, there was no clear orientation towards an English-only policy and space was left for the definition of a possible role for isiXhosa as an additional language of teaching.

2.6 DE KLERK (1996)

De Klerk offers an overview of the use of and attitudes to English among speakers of other languages at Rhodes University. Attitudes towards English were generally positive and a desire to improve competence in English or a positive orientation to it (especially as an international language) were some of the reasons for students choosing Rhodes (together with some practical
reasons such as availability of bursaries, residence in Grahamstown or non-existence of a university with the students’ mother tongue as a medium of instruction).

What it means is that students at Rhodes University prefer using English as compared to the use of their indigenous African language. It is clear that they find English to be more interesting than their mother tongue.

De Klek (1996) went on to say that among African students, isiXhosa speakers had a relatively less favourable orientation to English and was the only group using its own language more than English on campus. In spite of this, the majority of isiXhosa speakers preferred to use English as the sole medium of instruction. This means that isiXhosa speaking students understand the importance of their own language; hence they see a need to use it in their communication than English.

The study argues that levels of self-assessed English proficiency were worse for students who encountered English late in their study career, and seemed to decrease as students moved through their university studies. This means that, while exposure to English before coming to university enhanced students’ confidence, the reality of the linguistic standards required at university undermined it. However, this study reveals that low levels of self-assessed proficiency did not appear to affect students’ positive attitudes towards English.
2.7 MADADZHE AND SEPOTA (2007)

Their research paper concentrates on the status of African languages in higher education in South Africa, revitalization or stagnation. Their viewpoint was that African languages as a study field has been experiencing challenges in the past ten years in South Africa. This is attested to, among others, by the ever-dwindling numbers of students taking African languages as a study field, retrenchment, and threats of more retrenchments of staff in African languages and the lack of the creation of posts in the field at various universities.

This problem of students not taking African languages will continue, especially in the institutions of higher learning if students are not encouraged or made to see the importance of using these languages. This is where various departments and language boards involved in promoting African languages should come in. Instead of promoting languages theoretically, some practical input should be evident. Just like other departments which are providing students with bursaries at tertiary levels, the language departments should make it a point that they provide bursaries for African languages as well. This might assist somewhat and would see students enrolling for African language studies.

They went on to point that the problem seems to be more complex these days as the number of learners studying indigenous languages in high schools is also decreasing. The poor state in
which African languages find themselves in South African higher education is not only a concern to academics and structures such as ALASA, but to the government as well.

They also looked at attitudes to languages where they mentioned that negative attitudes towards African languages play a major role in their unpopularity. Their article shows that African languages are mainly associated with backwardness, poverty, and inferiority. It is, therefore, not surprising to hear Ngugi wa Thion’o (1986: 11) commenting on this issue as it applied to the Kenya of the 1950s:

Thus one of the most humiliating experiences was to be caught speaking Gikuyu in the vicinity of the school. The culprit was given corporal punishment- three to five strokes of the cane on bare buttocks – or was made to carry a metal plate around the neck with inscriptions such as I AM STUPID or I AM A DONKEY.

Madadzhe and Sepota (2007: 152) comment: “Although this quotation refers to an old situation, it is still pertinent to present-day South Africa. There are some schools in the country that still discourage students from speaking African languages. Some of the schools do not even offer any African language as a subject. This is despite the fact that majority of the students in such schools are African.”

From this quotation one may suggest that the departments of African languages should revisit their curriculum and should make sure that they play a role as far as making sure that African languages continue being offered at schools and universities. Principals, teachers and lecturers should also make sure that they make students or pupils to see the importance of using African languages in their daily life.
Many parents who are teachers and lecturers do not enroll their children in schools where African languages are taught hence students or pupils themselves develop negative attitudes to these languages. Parents do not encourage their children to speak their language at home, and the surprising part is that you find that some of these parents teach African languages in their various schools. So it remains everyone’s responsibility to make sure that African languages are not looked down and that there are tangible efforts to promote and develop.

On the other hand, the attitude towards English is quite the opposite. “English has become the measure of intelligence and ability in the arts, the sciences, and all the other branches of learning” (Ngugi wa Thiong’o, 1986:12).

The consequences of neglecting African languages are dire. Madadzhe and Sepota (2007: 153) warn:

The demise of African languages would be too ghastly to contemplate. It would, among others, entail the following: the likelihood of the disappearance of ethnic groups and their cultures as we know them; radio and TV stations that broadcast in African languages are likely to close down, departments of African languages at various universities might be phased out; and publishers that specialize in African languages will cease to exist. In order to avoid this, the use of African languages in the home and at schools must be encouraged.

Madadzhe and Sepota (2007: 153) write further: “This will of course not be easy as many African parents and their children will have already imbibed the idea that African languages are
useless. Intensive education campaigns will have to be undertaken whereby parents and children will have to be convinced that their indigenous languages are not inferior to any other language”.

Madadzhe and Sepota (2007) also note that on the other hand, the negative attitude towards African languages might be attributed to the current changes within South Africa. At the moment, due to the dynamics of globalization, South Africa and the corporate world in particular, are emphasizing courses that will ensure competitive advantage in the global business context. It is, therefore, not surprising that more attention is given to courses that are seen to yield immediate financial benefits. According to this viewpoint, African languages are definitely not some of these courses. In a wider context, it is undeniable that African languages should be beneficial to their speakers, but they are nevertheless perceived to be of no value. This leads to negative attitude amongst both students and parents.

Lastly, Madadzhe and Sepota propose that while they see a need that African languages must continue to be offered at universities, their paper did not deny the importance of English. They suggest however that the emphasis on the teaching of English should not be done at the expense of African languages.

2.8 WEBB (1992)

Webb provides a useful summary of language attitude studies conducted prior to 1992, the year in which the shift in politics was reflected in the broadening of the field of South African linguistics.
Webb identifies some indicators of language attitudes in South Africa namely, language behaviour, social judgements, policy preference and institutional support. Language behaviour is revealed by respondents’ knowledge of South African languages, language preferences, code mixing and language shift.

In this analysis, Webb reveals that Afrikaans displays a far larger degree of code-mixing as well as borrowing than English. Webb feels that this mainly one-directional mixing of Afrikaans with English is another indication of the social relationship between the languages concerned, and therefore of language attitudes.

While Webb has no information about language shift among black communities, he reveals a strong shift towards English in the coloured communities, even among those with wholly monolingual parents. However, other studies with black respondents have revealed evidence of a language shift towards English.

This can only mean that most African are not proud of their languages; hence the shift towards English.

2.9 CHICK AND WADE (1997)

These authors reveal a significant swing towards English among IsiZulu-speaking school-leavers and first year university students. Many studies are cited in their work. The views of
these scholars will also be reflected in this section. The greater access to previously white-only schools had also, according to Schlebush (1994:98), led to at least partial language shift among the black pupils she investigated at one of these schools, a finding supported by the research of De Klerk (1996b).

Social judgements, according to Webb, are revealed by stereotypes, language evaluation and sociocultural identity. Black perspective of Afrikaans and English speaking white South Africans were first examined by Vorster and Proctor (1975) using the matched guise technique with first year students at the University of Fort Hare.

The study reveals that respondents regarded Afrikaans speaking whites as strict, authoritarian and unsympathetic, whereas English speakers of English were seen as friendly and sympathetic.

The study carried out in the Eastern Cape by Bosch and De Klerk (1994) with Afrikaans, English and Xhosa respondents largely confirmed this stereotypical attitude which African (Xhosa) respondents have towards Afrikaans and English speakers. The language evaluation information gives Webb further evidence of the high ranking English has in the African community as opposed to their own language.

Webb gives no information on the role of the socio-cultural identities of Africans in expressing their language attitudes, but the research of Chick and Wade (1997:276) reveal that IsiZulu learners turn to code-switching ‘to index an English identity while still retaining a Zulu identity’.
In other words, they speak a type of English which still clearly identifies them as Zulu, in the same way many Cape Coloured speakers signal their identity in the way they speak English.

In 1992, English was preferred as the (interim) sole official language, also emerging as the preferred medium of instructions (MOI) in African and coloured schools. As a school subject, English was also regarded to be of greater value than Afrikaans by African pupils.

Institutional support from the government and cultural institutions as well as the media, are also according to Webb, indicative of the status of language in a community. In the same year (i.e. 1992), English and Afrikaans were favoured languages of government. Afrikaans enjoyed strong support from cultural organizations in the Afrikaans community, but the African languages had “relatively” little cultural backing, these being restricted to government controlled language boards that concern themselves with standardizing these languages and with vocabulary development (Webb 1992:447).


He gives various examples of this apparently inexorable trend: the fact that almost all parliamentary business is conducted in English, that parastatal bodies like the Post Office, the telecommunication firm Telkom, the South African Broadcasting Corporation and South African
Airways either use English exclusively or show a strong bias towards English, and that English continues to grow in the private sector.

As a medium of instruction, English continues to be the preference of most learners and parents in most provinces - a factor also revealed by the research of Mawasha (1996) and Barkhuizen (1996). Against English, all the other South African languages continue to be undervalued in the African and coloured communities, although pressure for improving the status and usage of these languages is beginning to come from some sectors of the English-educated elite.

2.10 MABILA (2007)

Mabila reviews a case of some learners and their attitudes towards the use of mother tongue. He states that in an interview by the Sunday Times, a 16 year-old Fortunate Mokgele said: “We don’t find our mother tongue that important. You don’t make overseas calls in your mother tongue; you don’t use it in everyday life. It’s not useful” (22 July 2001).

From the above, this is evidence that many children do not see the importance of African languages in their lives; English to them is the only language which has a positive impact in their lives. Mabila (2007: 29) went on to note that “what is interesting is that it is not only the learners who project negative attitudes towards learning mother tongue.

Some black parents want English for their children and are vocally opposed to the introduction of African languages. A case in point is the Capricorn High School in Polokwane, Limpopo, where language policy implementation ‘ruffled feathers’ (City Press, 29 February 2006) leading
to the principal of the school facing “misconduct charges over the issue of language policy at schools (City Press, 29 February 2006).”

This information is confirmed by the empirical evidence from De Klek (2001: 34) about Afrikaans-speaking parents in the Eastern Cape moving their children to English medium schools and Kwamwangamalu’s (2003: 68) observation of the trend towards unilingualism (use of English only in urban African families).

What is further fascinating is the fact that the parents do not also want the teaching of English second language to their children, but expect the schools to teach their children English first language. In response to what he called “imperialism” Limpopo MEC for sports, arts and culture, Mr Joe Maswanganyi, criticized supporters of the events which took place at the Capricorn High school. Mabila (2007) quoted the MEC of Arts and Culture, Joe Maswanganyi:

The recent discussions about African languages in schools are an attempt to undermine the achievements of our revolutionary democracy. In the process, the same victims of imperialism and colonization are being brainwashed into believing that perfecting English must be at the expense of African languages…Those who are undermining our African languages have become irrelevant to our cause of building a new society, (Northern Review, 31 March 2006)

In support of the MEC’s view, Mpe Mabuse, the political education officer of the Congress of South Africa (COSAC) in Limpopo said, “The organization will fight to ensure that the policy advocated by Maswanganyi is implemented throughout the province” (Capricorn Voice, 2006).
2.11 BAKER (1993: 175)

Baker feels that learners in some forms of second language education do not suffer worse attitude and adjustment problems than their peers, but this seems to be the result of their parents’ values and beliefs. His view can best be summarized by one parent’s comment.

Nico Prinsloo remarked:

What the MEC for sports and all of us (including Cosas) must however keep in mind, is that none of the indigenous languages makes us competitive in the global village…although we support patriotism amongst our children, it is a fact of life that patriotic children who cannot communicate with the rest of society have little chance of being successful in a competitive world…what we must also keep in mind is that learners and parents who criticized the language policy, did not sell out their birthright (Northern Media, 31 March 2006).

Prinsloo’s viewpoint can be criticized because he bases his argument on the fact that the African learners concerned “can already speak an indigenous language” (Northern Media, 31 March 2006), which connotes that he sees no significance in learning to read and write an indigenous African language.
2.12 GUMEDE (1996)

Gumede deals with the attitudes of high School pupils towards the use of African languages as languages of learning and teaching. Her focus was on three different types of schools-namely, Model C, rural and township schools. Her question of interest was whether the new dispensation had cast a positive view towards African languages or consolidated former attitudes.

She established a complex situation in which Model C school pupils were more positive towards African languages than their counterparts in the rural areas. This is definitely contrary to the expectations of the majority of the researchers which makes the whole question of attitudes a complex phenomenon to deal with. Her findings reveal that the rural pupils regard African languages as useless and hence, they should be done away with. It is ironical that pupils who use African languages more often than not do not value their languages.

Her research indicates that in spite of linguistic ingenuity and resilience the speakers of African languages display, African languages will always be a few steps behind. In this regard, equality of languages cannot be achieved. The only way to achieve language equality is to view all languages equally, and then speakers should treat them equally and hold positive attitudes towards them.

Should the negative attitudes towards African languages continue, we might end up having a society which lacks a sense of belonging, and identity. The only way for a person to identify who he or she is, is through a language he or she speaks.
2.13 RIMA VESELY (2000)

Vesely conducted a similar study which focuses on how English impacted on the Xhosa speaking students of Cape Town. Vesely established that the change to democracy after the demise of apartheid was cherished by the students but unfortunately, the students did not exude similar sentiments with respect to African languages and/or mother tongue education.

Vesely (2000: 71) contends that, “the more…accessible African languages are in the public environment, the higher their status will become, and the negative impact of hegemony of English will be minimized.”

She is of the view that, “…only when a commitment towards language inclusiveness is made, will attitudes change and policy manifests, will education and employment become accessible to African language speakers, and transformation truly will be underway”

Thus, Vesely, like Alexander, is an exponent of mother tongue and the use of African language in more important domains, which would certainly benefit the majority of speakers of African languages.
2.14 DE WET, NIEMANN AND MATSELA (2001)

These scholars look at the attitudes of students against those of lecturers. They established that the majority of learners rejected the use of African languages as languages of learning and teaching. On the contrary, university and college lecturers were positive about the use of African languages as languages of teaching and learning, their reasons being pedagogical in nature.

The majority of the students investigated “…see the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice as the right to receive education through the medium of English” (de Wet, et al., 2001:55)

2.15 PHASWANA (1994)

Phaswana restricts his research to the University of Venda’s language policies, and has observed that students preferred English to African languages as medium of instruction because it is perceived as a language of success in the economy, politics and education. He confirms that African languages continue to be marginalized. “They will only serve as subjects that the students choose for completion of their curricula” (Phaswana, 1994, 44).

Phaswana (1994:44) advocates that indigenous African languages should be promoted as official languages of government, economy and education in the true sense of the word. To Phaswana, “without such affirmative action, the new language policy will fail to achieve its goal of ensuring the equality and democratization of all languages” (Phaswana, 1994: 45). It is not a matter of
promoting languages; it also has to do with encouraging people to speak them, and to see the significance of using them in all aspects of life.

2.16 MASEKO (1995)

In contrast to the studies that recommend the use of African languages at all levels, Maseko’s study advocates that the official language of South Africa should be English. He argues that by adopting English as the official language, there would be more advantages than disadvantages in terms of economic gains. To him, the growing demand for English over Swahili in Tanzania serves as indicators. He concurs with Heine who regards countries with languages policies such as South Africa as “problematic cases” (Heine in Maseko (1995:68).

To Maseko, the choice of eleven official languages is political in the sense that the government wanted to avert confrontation which erupts if some languages belonging to Great Traditions are left out.

2.17 ALEXANDER (2000)

Alexander acknowledges the dominance of English as a language and medium of instruction. He proposes that in multilingual South Africa, the country “…must adopt an additive bilingualism approach, as the new language policy in education prescribes” (Alexander, 2000: 23). Alexander contends that if such a strategy is implemented systematically and flexibly, it will ensure high levels of literacy in an African language and at least some fluency in English.
2.18 MAKORI (2005)

Makori researches on decolonization on culture through language where he looked at African languages in informal education. Reasons given for support of the use of African languages in education include the belief that learning will be made easier if experienced through the use of one’s local language, since this is likely to be an individual’s mother tongue.

What Makori (2005) states can only be achieved if speakers of African languages felt so strong about their languages. One can imagine a situation where a student or a pupil had to learn, speak and write in their own languages. The resulting performance, as far as language is concerned would be of a high standard, because they would be using the language they know and understand. We would end up avoiding a situation whereby we have a high failure rate in high schools and the through put would be a lot better in the universities if the use of African languages was promoted and speakers were proud of their languages.

Such pride can be influential as in the case of Jomo Kenyata, a trained anthropologist and Kenyan’s first president, who saw the value of a national African language in forging national culture. As a result, he instituted the compulsory teaching of Kiswahili in pre-university education as he was wary that an imperial language may deepen the country’s cultural dependence on the west (Mazrui, 1995:84).
Fears such as these show the importance of maintaining the use of African languages but more attention is needed on the language of instruction in schools and higher institutions of learning. The choice of a particular language as the medium of instruction corresponds to the enrichment of that language which ensures its relevance, growth and vitality for years to come.

One of the biggest challenges to policies of promoting African language-medium education is linguistic diversity. Another challenge has been the overall attitude towards African languages. Those in favour of the use of European languages claim that they are ‘neutral’ and would therefore unify ethnic communities with potentially conflicting language demands.

2.1.19 MUKHUBA (2005)

Makhuba has conducted a study on bilingualism, language attitudes, language policy and language planning. He point out that a group in a society usually distinguishes itself by its language, and its cultural norms and values are transmitted through language. The identity and pride in a culture of a group is expressed through its language. An example that readily comes to mind here is that of the Zulus of South Africa. The Zulus are very proud of their culture and language so much that they have developed a negative attitude towards other South African languages. They are so uncompromising in their attitude towards other languages that the need for jobs has not changed their perspective of second language acquisition. In fact, in most cases, an employer would have to learn their language in order to communicate with most of them in the job environment.
2.1.20 HOLMES (1992)

Holmes’ study deals with three levels of attitudes towards a social or ethnic group. The first level is that of attitudes towards a social or ethnic group. The second level is that of attitudes towards the language of that group and the third is attitude towards individual speakers of that language.

People generally do not hold opinions about languages in a vacuum. They develop attitudes towards language which reflect their views about those who speak the language, and the contents and functions with which they are associated. Holmes points out that the underlying assumption is that in a society, social or ethnic groups have certain attitudes towards each other, relating to their differing positions.

She goes on to state that it has been suggested that intelligibility is also affected by attitudes, so people find it easier to understand languages and dialects spoken by people they like or admire. A closely related point, at least for majority group members, is that people are more highly motivated and consequently often more successful in acquiring a second language when they feel positive towards those who use it (1992:345). Therefore, attitudes to language reflect attitude to the users and the uses of that language.

Attitudes are also strongly influenced by social and political factors. Wherever they are, the English almost always ignore other languages and simply express themselves in English.
They assume that "everyone" they come into contact understands English. Perhaps this attitude stems from historical factors. The English-speaking section of South Africans, acquire Afrikaans as a second language for various reasons of necessity. First; because Afrikaans is legislated as an official language and second; for economic reasons.

The Afrikaner usually has a negative attitude towards English because of political reasons. The memory of the Anglo-Boer war is still fresh in the Afrikaner's mind. Africans on the other hand, have a negative attitude towards Afrikaans, and a positive attitude towards English. This is largely because they associated the Afrikaans language with oppression, as it was the language of the dominant, oppressive group. However, most Africans acquire both English and Afrikaans for political and economic reasons despite their resentment of Afrikaans.

On the education front, students of non-Western countries generally have to learn a Western language as that language opens educational, political and economic doors. In most cases English is such a language. Although English was at first an imposed language, it gradually became an acceptable common "international" language. People in Africa and almost everywhere in the world acquired not only the language itself, but also its traditions.
Palazzo reinforces point by that when students acquire a second language, they acquire a second culture, and thus an alternative tradition of thought and expression; a tradition which usually proves very useful.

It is fair to surmise here that by acquiring a second language's values and traditions, one's perspective of life changes to some degree because one acquires the native user's whole logical system. This viewpoint is vehemently opposed by Ngugi wa Thiongo who decries the loss of our "Africanness" through second language usage. He asks: "by our continuing to write in foreign languages, paying homage to them, are we not on the cultural level continuing that neo-colonial slavish and cringing spirit?" (Ngugi wa Thiongo, cited in Palazzo, 1990:143).

Our accent and our speech generally show what part of the country we come from and what background we have. We may even give some indications of certain of our ideas and attitudes, and all this information can be used by people we are speaking with, to help them formulate an opinion about us" (1974:14).

The user's attitude towards the language he is using depends on whether he identifies with the language or not. So his/her attitude is usually inward-centered. The learner's attitude is formulated when he hears utterances spelled out and how they are spelled out. Spolsky (1971) pointed out that it is important to distinguish between languages as a reason for discrimination.
There are cases in which language is used as an excuse, like race, or skin colour or for not hiring someone. No amount of language training will change this, for discrimination exists in the hearer, not the speaker (cited in Tosi 1984:30).

3. CONCLUSION

What has been discussed in this literature review are opinions which are indicators to problems that exist with regard to language issues in South Africa and Africa as a whole. The research paid more attention to the attitudes that students have towards the use of the African languages, whereas less was said about the parents’ attitudes towards the use of these languages.

Apart from students and lecturers, research has to be conducted among parents, teachers and the general public to get their views on the use of African or source languages in their daily life. As for a possible solution to the ongoing attitude problem towards the use of African languages, it was proposed that it is important to show the cultural worth of using indigenous African languages and demystify the false notion that there is some inherent incapacity within African languages. African languages need to be promoted and elevated to a higher level in all spheres: political, social, economic, cultural and educational. This can only happen if people’s attitudes are favourable and that they use their languages with pride in their daily interactions.
CHAPTER THREE

3. ANALYSIS OF DATA

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The analysis of data is based on the results of the questionnaire on quantitative data. The research was conducted at the University of Limpopo, Turfloop Campus. The languages that appear on the questionnaire are those languages spoken at the university, that is the respondents’ source languages.

Babbie (2001: 397) states that the simplest form of quantitative analysis involves describing a case in terms of a single variable, specifically the distribution of attributes that comprise it. However, the researcher first has to determine the students’ place of origin before proceeding to the next questions and this was done by the questions on the questionnaire.

3.2 ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

3.2.1. Places of origin

The respondents come from various districts of the Limpopo Province namely Vhembe, Sekhukhune, and Capricorn districts. Under Vhembe district such as Ntlhaveni, Ndzelele,
Maphophe, and Tshisahulu, Sekhukhune District Acornhoek, and Capricorn District: Marble Hall, Lebowakgomo, Moletji, and Mokopane.

The maps show the areas where the respondents are coming from.
3.2.2. Number of respondents

18 of the respondents completed the questionnaires.

3.2.3. Languages respondents speak

The respondents who come from Ntlhaveni, Acornhoek, and Maphophe speak Xitsonga. The respondents who come from Lebowakgomo, Moletji, Marble Hall, and Mokopane speak Sepedi. The respondents who come from Nzhelele and Tshisahulu speak Tshivenda. The respondents who come from Malelane speak isiSwati.

3.2.4. Distribution of languages

The languages spoken are Xitsonga which is used by respondents who come from Ntlhaveni, Acornhoek, and Maphophe, Sepedi which is used by respondents who come from Lebowakgomo, Moletji, Marble Hall, and Mokopane, Tshivenda which is used by people who come from Nzhelele and Tshisahulu and Isiswati which is used by those coming from Malelane. Those respondents coming from Ntlhaveni and Maphophe speak a dialect called Xiluleke different from those coming from Acornhoek who speak a dialect called Xihlangano. Respondents coming from Nzhelele speak a dialect called Tshiphani different from those coming from Tshisahulu who speak a dialect called Tshimbedzi.
3.2.5 Communication with Administrative Staff

(a) Official matters on communication with Admin Staff

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents use English while communicating with the administrative staff on official matters whereas 22% prefer using their source languages.

(b) Non-Official matter on communication with Admin Staff

On non-official matters, 34% of the respondents prefer to use Sepedi and 66% prefer English.

3.2.6 Academic issues

(a) Inquiry of marks

Seventy-eight of the respondents prefer to use English and 22% prefer using Sepedi.

(b) Inquiry on availability of lecturers

All respondents prefer using English when enquiring about the availability of lecturers.
3.2.7 Communication with Academic Staff

(a) Inside lecture halls

All respondents use English while communicating with academic staff inside the lecture halls.

(b) Outside lecture halls

Fifty-six of the respondents speak English outside lecture halls, 17 % prefer Sepedi and 17 % speak Xitsonga.

3.2.8 Communication with fellow students

3.2.8.1 Inside lecture halls

Seventeen percent of the respondents indicated that they use Xitsonga, 28 % use Sepedi, 11 % use Tshivenda and 11 % indicated they use isiSwati while 34 % prefer using English inside lecture halls.

(a) During discussions on academic work

Seventy-eight prefer using English while discussing academic work, while 22 % use Sepedi.
(b) During political meetings

All of the respondents said they prefer using English during political meetings.

(c) During religious meetings

Thirty four of the respondents prefer using Xitsonga, 22% prefer Sepedi, 34 prefer English and 11% prefer using Tshivenda.

3.2.8.2 Outside lecture halls

(a) During discussions on academic work

Sixty seven percent of the respondents prefer using English while discussing academic work, 17% prefer using Sepedi, and 11% prefer using Xitsonga while 11% of the respondents prefer using Tshivenda.

(b) During political meetings

All respondents said they prefer using English during political meetings.
(c) **During religious meetings**

Thirty-four percent of the respondents prefer using Xitsonga, 22 % prefer Sepedi, 34 prefer English and 11 % prefer using Tshivenda.

**3.2.9 Languages used in general**

Forty-four percent of the respondents use English, 22 % use Sepedi, 11 % use Xitsonga, 11 % use Tshivenda while 11% use isiSwati.

**3.2.10. Source languages**

Thirty-three percent of the respondents speak Xitsonga, 33 % Sepedi, 22 % speak Tshivenda, while 12 % speak IsiSwati.

**3.2.11 Languages used outside lecture halls**

Twenty-eight of the respondents say they prefer using English all the time outside lecture halls, 28 % use Xitsonga, 22 % prefer Sepedi, 11 % prefer Tshivenda, while 11 % use isiSwati.
3.2.12 Languages used with friends

Twenty-two percent the respondents prefer using English while communicating with their friends, 28 % speak Xitsonga and 28 % use Sepedi, 11 % prefers Tshivenda, while 11 % prefer isiSwati.

3.2.13 Languages during extra-mural activities

(a) Playing cards

Twenty-one percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing cards, 33 % use Sepedi, 33% of Xitsonga, while 13 % use Tshivenda.

(b) Playing tennis

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing tennis, while 22 % use Sepedi

(c) Playing soccer

Twenty-percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing soccer, 33 % prefer Sepedi, 33 % use Xitsonga, while 11 % use Tshivenda.
(d) Playing rugby

Fifty-six percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing rugby and 44% prefer Sepedi.

(e) Playing cricket

Sixty-Seven percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing cricket and 33% use Sepedi.

(f) Playing basketball

Sixty-seven percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing basketball, 22% use Sepedi, while 11% of the respondents prefer using isiSwati.

3.2.13 Availability of a newspaper in your language

Thirty-three percent of the respondents say there is a newspaper in Sepedi and 33% of the respondents say there is newspaper in Xitsonga. All respondents prefer reading an English language newspaper.
3.3 CONCLUSION

This analysis shows that although 44% of the respondents prefer using English than their source languages, this, however, does not mean that they do not recognise the importance of their source languages. Hence 22% of the respondents prefer Sepedi, and Xitsonga, 11% use Tshivenda while another 11% use isiSwati. This is proof that English still plays a role when it comes to the respondents’ daily communication.
CHAPTER FOUR

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4. INTRODUCTION

From the presentation in the analysis of data, it is apparent that respondents have varied perception about their source language as compared to English. This chapter will therefore focus on the interpretation of data. In other words, the chapter presents the interpretation of the responses from the questionnaire. The interpretation of data is carried out in a way, which is based on the results of the questionnaire. The research was conducted at the University of Limpopo, Turfloop Campus. The languages that appear on the questionnaire are those languages used at the university as the respondents’ source languages.

4.2 INTERPRETATION OF DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

4.2.1. Places of origin

The researcher did not choose a certain group of respondents but the questionnaire was circulated around the campus. Respondents completed the questionnaires which, when analysed, yielded the said regions and places.
4.2.2. Number of respondents

In this research, 45 questionnaires were distributed on the Turfloop Campus of the University of Limpopo. The questionnaire used was developed by reflecting on the relevant literature and by looking at questionnaires used in similar studies. English language was used in designing the items.

4.2.3. Languages they speak

The respondents speak Xitsonga, Sepedi, Tshivenda and Isiswati. The researcher did not choose the respondents from these languages; this was reflected in the questionnaires after the respondents had completed them.

4.2.4 Distribution of languages

The languages spoken are Xitsonga which is spoken by respondents who come from Ntlhaveni, Acornhoek, and Maphophe; Sepedi which is spoken by respondents who come from Lebowakgomo, Moletji, Marble Hall, and Mokopane; Tshivenda which is used by those from Ndzhelele and Tshisahulu, and Isiswati which is used by those coming from Malelane. Since the research was conducted at the university only.
4.2.5. Communication with Administrative Staff

(a) Official matter on communication with Administrative Staff

Based on the results from the question on the communication with admin staff, 78% of the respondents use English while communicating with admin staff on official matters, and 22% preferred using their source languages. These results show that these respondents prefer English to their use of source languages. It also shows that English still plays an important role when it comes to communication.

(b) Non-Official on communication with Admin Staff

On non-official matters, 34% of the respondents prefer to use Sepedi mainly because they believe it understood by most people who work at the university. They feel more comfortable using Sepedi on non-official matters. Sixty six percent of the respondents say they would rather use English, as it is the medium of instruction.
4.2.6 Academic issues

(a) Inquiry of marks

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents say they prefer to use English when it comes to inquiring of their marks mainly because it is very easy for them to understand each other with the people they are communicating with since these people speak different source languages. Twenty-two percent of the respondents preferred using Sepedi claiming that most people understand this language and they find it natural to use it.

(b) Inquiry on availability of lecturers

All the respondents who answered this questionnaire showed that they were more comfortable when using English, claiming it was easier to communicate in English rather than in their source languages.

4.2.7 Communication with Academic Staff

(a) Inside lecture halls

The results show that all the respondents say they use English while communicating with academic staff inside lecture halls. They also state that they do not see a need for someone to use
their source languages inside lecture halls. That practice would exclude people from other ethnic groups.

(b) Outside lecture halls

Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they normally speak English rather than their source languages outside lecture halls, 17 % opt for Sepedi when they interact with their peers and 17 % indicated that they speak Xitsonga, saying that they feel more comfortable using these source languages than using English.

4.2.8 Communication with fellow students

4.2.8.1 Inside lecture halls

The results shows that 17 % of the respondents indicated that they use Xitsonga, 28 % of the respondents indicated that they prefer using Sepedi, 11 % of the respondents answered by saying that they prefer using Tshivenda and 11 % indicated that they normally use Isiswati rather than using English during lectures. Thirty-percent of the respondents indicated that they prefer using English inside lecture halls, claiming that they are able to communicate better.
(a) During discussions on academic work

The results show that 78% of the respondents confirmed that they prefer using English while discussing academic work, because they are able to understand each other better than when using their source languages. Twenty-two percent of the respondents prefer using Sepedi because they feel more comfortable using that language than using English.

(b) During political meetings

The results on this question show that 100% of the respondents said they prefer using English during political meetings mainly because English seems to be the only medium which allow them to express themselves better as far as sending messages to fellow students is concerned. As for the source languages, they see it to be a total waste of time. Also there are different source language speakers in such gatherings.

(c) During religious meetings

The results of this question show that 34% of the respondents said they prefer using Xitsonga since they can understand each other in religious meetings, 22% of the respondents prefer using Sepedi, 34 prefer English and 11% of the respondents prefer using Tshivenda. These results indicate that the respondents see a need for using their source languages as far as religious meetings are concerned.
4.2.8.2 Outside lecture halls

(a) During discussions on academic work

This question shows that 67% of the respondents confirmed that they prefer using English while discussing academic work, because they are able to understand each other better than when they use their source languages. Seventeen percent of the respondents say they prefer using Sepedi because they feel more comfortable and that most of their peers understand this source language. Eleven percent of the respondents prefer using Xitsonga, and another 11% of the respondents prefer using Tshivenda.

(b) During political meetings

The results show that all the respondents said they preferred using English during political meetings mainly because English was the only medium where one expressed oneself better as far as sending messages to fellow students. As for use of source languages, it was felt that it was not a good idea since different source language speakers attend these political meetings.

(c) During religious meetings

The results show that 56% of the respondents said they preferred using English, in religious meetings, 11% of the respondents preferred using Sepedi, and 34% of the respondents preferred using Xitsonga. The fact that some respondents preferred their source languages over English
shows that they see the importance of using these languages, in intimate moments, such as moments with God. This means that source languages are, as a matter of fact treasured.

4.2.9 Languages used in general

The results show that 44% of the respondents use English, saying they do so because English makes feel more superior to others. Eleven percent of the respondents preferred using Xitsonga, 22% of the respondents preferred using Sepedi, 11% of the respondents preferred using Tshivenda and 11% of the respondents prefer using Isiswati. They preferred using these source languages because they felt more comfortable in using them. The fact that a high number of respondents who preferred English over their source languages is an indication that indeed the students have an attitude towards the use of their source languages.

4.2.10 Source languages

The results from the questionnaire show that 33% of the respondents speak Xitsonga, 33% of the respondents speak Sepedi, 22% of the respondents speak Tshivenda and 11% of the respondents speak Isiswati.

4.2.11 Languages are used outside lecture halls

The results show that 28% of the respondents said they feel good about using English all the time outside lecture halls, 28% preferred using Xitsonga since it is their source language, 22%
said they are proud of speaking Sepedi, 11 % preferred using Tshivenda and 11 % prefers using IsiSwati. These results point to the fact that the majority of the respondents use their source languages quite often. As reflected in the questionnaire there are those who do not see a need of speaking their source languages.

4.2.12 Languages used with friends

The results show that 22 % of the respondents preferred using English when communicating with their friends, stating that people with whom they speak appreciate it and recognize them when they speak English. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents indicate that they speak Xitsonga and 28 % of the respondents feel more comfortable when speaking Sepedi, 11 % preferred using Tshivenda and 11 % prefer speaking IsiSwati. This indicates that the majority of respondents use their source languages with their friends and those who seldom use their source languages are those who find English a superior language compared to their source languages.

4.2.13. Languages on during extra-mural activities

(a) Playing cards

Twenty-one percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing cards, 33 % use Sepedi, 34% use Xitsonga, while 13 % use Tshivenda.
(b) Playing tennis

When playing tennis, 79% of the respondents preferred to use English while 21% prefer to use Sepedi.

(c) Playing soccer

When playing soccer, 22% prefer using English, 33% prefer Sepedi, 33% use Xitsonga, and 11% use Tshivenda.

(d) Playing rugby

Fifty-six percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing rugby and 44% prefer Sepedi.

(e) Playing cricket

Sixty-seven percent of the respondents prefer using English when playing cricket and 33% use Sepedi.

(f) Playing basketball

When playing basketball, 67% of the respondents use English, 22% use Sepedi, and 11% of the respondents prefer using isiSwati.
The results from the above show that English is used more often when it comes to languages used during extra-mural activities. The results again show that some respondents prefer using Sepedi and saying that this is the language that most students at the university understand and know better as compared to other source languages at the university. The fact that other source languages have lower percentage is a proof that a lot still needs to be done to make sure that respondents see their source languages as equal as the other source languages.

4.2.14 Availability of a newspaper in your language

Thirty-three percent of the respondents say there is a newspaper in Sepedi and 33% of the respondents say there is newspaper in Xitsonga. All respondents prefer reading an English language newspaper.

4.3 CONCLUSION

The fact that the majority of the respondents prefer using English shows that this language is so entrenched in people’s minds. This is not surprising as English is a prestigious language, as has been already mentioned. However, efforts have been made by all African, especially young ones to speak their mother tongue.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The researcher has already presented, analysed and interpreted data in previous chapters. This chapter is going to present the recommendations and conclusion drawn from the results of the analysis of the questionnaire and make further recommendations in connection with the study for further research.

5.2 RESTATEMENT OF MOTIVATION OF THE STUDY

The researcher was interested in studying the attitudes the students have towards the use of their source languages with special reference to the University of Limpopo (Turfloop Campus). The negative attitudes towards the use of source languages seem to be the problem that is affecting many students in different universities in South Africa. Even though that is the case there are students who see the need of using their source languages in their lives.

5.3 RESTATEMENT OF AIM OF THE STUDY

The main aim of conducting this study was to research on the attitudes students have on their source languages. The researcher had to answer some of the following research questions:

(a) Which language(s) do students feel comfortable when communicating with their friends or when in class?

(b) Which language do they prefer when communicating with their lecturers?

(c) What are the lecturers’ views on students’ attitudes towards the use of source languages?
5.4 HOW THE STUDY WAS UNDERTAKEN

The researcher used questionnaires. These were distributed randomly and respondents had to fill in the questions outlined. All the important aspects that the researcher wanted to investigate were outlined in the questionnaire.

5.5 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

It has been discovered by the researcher that the majority of students are aware of the effect English language has on them as university students and on their lives as future productive individuals. Based on the results from the questionnaire, the majority of respondents stated that they were satisfied with English as a medium of communication in the university. They were also comfortable when the courses were taught in English. This proves also the point that most source language speakers have a negative attitude towards the use of their source language; hence most of them preferred using English rather than their source languages.

Even though the majority felt using English was the way forward, there were respondents who felt strongly about using their source languages, pointing out that they were more comfortable when using their source languages. Most of them agreed that English was a useful language but it should not take over their source languages. They called for a balance between the two. These students are also aware that language is culture and, therefore, when one loses his or her language, culture is also lost. Some suggested that their source languages should be promoted and used concurrently with English.

5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Speakers of English may not be the majority, but the language is the most widely spoken language in the world. The majority of people speaking English are those who speak it as their second language.
It is important that source languages are developed. These languages carry the historical and cultural roots of the people. In trying to develop these languages, challenges will most certainly surface, but these should encourage us even more to continue with the project of elevating out languages. Collective efforts are needed from all spheres, especially from the social front.

The researcher therefore recommends further research be undertaken in the area of developing the use of African languages in elementary education as well as in institutions of higher learning.

5.7 CONCLUSION

Even though source languages speakers prefer using English, they should also be proud of using their source languages. The majority of students have a negative attitude when it comes to using their source language as compared to English. As these attitudes are negative, they contribute making them to completely turn away from using their source languages. For these negative attitudes to be done away with, students should start taking their source languages seriously and start using them wherever they are.

South African source language speakers appreciate and love to be South Africans. They also love the languages they speak as their first language, but they are so much longing for being proficient in English. To study at least one source language in the University would go a long way in ensuring that source languages (African languages in this case) do not become extinct.
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**Students’ Questionnaire**

Please feel free to complete this questionnaire. It is for the research study on the “Students attitudes towards the use of their source languages”. The information provided will be kept anonymous.

1. Bibliographic Details: ____________________________________________
   
   No of respondent: ________________________________________________
   
   Gender: __________________________________________________________
   
   Study Directions BSC etc: __________________________________________
   
   Level of study: ____________________________________________________
   
2. Communication with Admin Staff ____________________________________
   
   2.1. Official/Non official___________________________________________
   
       (a) On official matters___________________________________________
   
       (b) Not official__________________________________________________
   
   2.2. Academic Issues_______________________________________________
   
       (a) Inquiry on marks_____________________________________________
   
       (b) Inquiry on availability of lecturers_____________________________
   
3. Communication with Academic Staff
   
   (a) Inside Lecture halls_____________________________________________
   
   (b) Outside Lecture halls____________________________________________
   
4. Communication with fellow-students
   
   4.1 (a) Inside Lecture halls__________________________________________
   
   (b) During discussions on academic work______________________________
   
   (c) During political meetings_______________________________________
(d) During religious meetings________________________________________________

4.2 Outside Lecture halls

(a) During discussions on academic work____________________________________

(b) During discussions on political meetings__________________________________

(c) During discussions on religious meetings__________________________________

(d) In general______________________________________________________________

5. What is your Source Language?___________________________________________

(a) How often do you use it?__________________________________________________

(i) All the time outside Lecture halls

(ii) All the time with friends

(b) Have you got a friend(s)?_______________________________________________

(i) Which language do you use with your friend?______________________________

-When Playing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cards</th>
<th>Tennis</th>
<th>Soccer</th>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>Rugby</th>
<th>Cricket</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Who is your super speaker of your source language?___________________________

6.1 How often do you meet him or her?

-Everyday

-Twice a week

-Once a week

-Once a fortnight

6.2 What makes you like him or her?___________________________________________
7. Is there any newspaper in your source language?

7.1 How often do you read it?

- Everyday
- Twice a week
- Once a week
- Once a fortnight

7.2 What is your favorite article in that newspaper?