

## The Interpretation of “*Botlokotsebe*” V/S “*Bosenyi*”

Pule Alexis Phindane

*Language and Social Sciences Education, Faculty of Humanities,  
Central University of Technology, Free State Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa  
E-mail: pphindane@cut.ac.za*

**KEYWORDS** Terminology. Language Practitioner. Standardization. Criminal Activities

**ABSTRACT** The present paper is based on the findings from a study conducted to examine the interchangeable use of the concepts ‘*botlokotsebe*’ (mischief) and ‘*bosenyi*’ (crime) as an English equivalent term ‘crime’. This study is thus a survey in which questionnaires were used to collect data from 165 (of which 15 are experts in the language practice) Sesotho speakers. The respondents were intentionally selected from language users in Motheo and Thabo Mofutsanyana districts in South Africa. Documents from different domains (where these terms are appearing) were also analysed to assess the everyday use and usage of these terms in distinct contexts. The results show that ‘*botlokotsebe*’ cannot denote criminal activity but ‘*bosenyi*’ is the relevant equivalent term to describe any crime. The implications of these findings are discussed. The study also provides an insight as to how Sesotho language users should be careful and cautious in implementing certain terms without following relevant sources. It also proposed that ‘*bosenyi*’ be regarded as superordinate term referring to criminal activities.

### INTRODUCTION

It is perceived that Sesotho translators and interpreters are amongst of those language practitioners who find it hard to pursue their career under severe conditions of not having sufficient or standardized corpus to use (that is not enough Sesotho dictionaries, term lists or glossaries at their disposal). In most cases, every Sesotho speaker can translate or interpret even without formal training. This is often noticed at churches and social gatherings. Miller et al. (2014) emphasized the importance of the use of a standardised tool in measuring the language development in a given society. However, it is not startling to find that language practitioners (whether literate or not) compose their own translation corpus or diction because they do not have reliable documented sources. The results will be translations with multiple meaning (that is, ambiguous). This view is observed by Bishop (2014), Drame (2014), Hazbavi (2012, 2014) and Phindane (2014) when they agree that an increase in polysemy in terminology would lead to a creation of communication barriers. It is against this background that this study attempt to discuss the interpretation of the pairs ‘*bosenyi/sesinyi*’ and ‘*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*’. Most of language practitioners/users are in favour of the term ‘*botlokotsebe*’ when referring to crime. In real contexts criminal offences differ. Criminal activities associated with children in Sesotho are referred to as ‘*botlokotsebe*’

(which has a connotation of idiomatic expression ‘*ho hloka tsebe*’ (not listening or naughty). Serious offences like rape, murder or armed robbery are best described as ‘*bosenyi*’ (destruction). *Bosenyi* can be used as superordinate term classifying hyponyms like ‘*botlokotsebe*’ (mischief), ‘*polao*’ (murder), ‘*boshodu*’ (theft), ‘*seba*’ (frivolousness) etc.

Even though there is no written evidence as to where the term ‘*botlokotsebe*’ has been harvested from (that is where it is originated); there are so many written texts (both officially and unofficial) and visual recorded materials that can bear as an evidence that the term ‘*botlokotsebe*’ is frequently used by the Sesotho speakers and in some cases it has been officially documented as such. The following documents serve as reliable sources in terms of frequent use of the term ‘*botlokotsebe*’: *Free State Provincial Gazette* (2005); *Batho pele/People First document* (2009); *Dumela Free State University Newsletter* (2006); *Setatemente sa Naha sa Leano la Kharikhulamo* (2005); *Setatemente sa Kharikhulamo ya naha Dikereiting tsa R - 12* (2011); *Debates of the Legislature of the Free State Province (Hansard)* (1997); *Sesotho Online* (2011); *Free State Provincial Government internet* (2014); *SABC: Lesedi FM* (Current affairs programmes and other daily programmes), etc. These are some of the sources where you would find frequent use of the term ‘*botlokotsebe*’ as an equivalent to English term ‘information’.

The question is whether the above mentioned sources and those that never been identified, conduct a research as to whether this term '*botlokotsebe*' met the standards of the previously developed terms. Was there any formal sitting to discuss the appropriate use of the term '*botlokotsebe*' when referring to the criminal offences? Was there any raised concern regarding the frequent use of the term '*botlokotsebe*'? This study would not be able to answer some of these questions; but it intent to show that '*bosenyi*' is a superordinate appropriate equivalent term for 'crime'.

### **Botlokotsebe V/S Bosenyi**

#### ***Botlokotsebe/Setlokotsebe***

This is the most notorious used pair of Sesotho terms in relation to the criminal activities. The term '*botlokotsebe*' is associated with the idiomatic expressions like '*ho thibana ditsebe*', '*ho hloka tsebe*' (not listening/ naughty/ mischievous). It is often manipulated in becoming an equivalent of 'crime' and also 'mischief'. Paroz (1988: 353-354) refers to '*botlokotsebe*' as 'audacity', 'impertinence', 'disobedience'. Olivier (2009: 1010 – 1011) relate to this as 'mischief', 'impertinence'. Pitso (1997: 80) extends the former definition by saying '*botlokotsebe*' is '*bohla-kanahloana*' (mischief), '*bohlanya*' (madness), '*bohloane*' (lunatic), '*botoutu*' (mischief), '*ho thibana ditsebe*' (naughty). Chitjha (2006: 60) refers to '*botlokotsebe*' as 'delinquency' 'crime' and 'vandalism'. Apart from Chitjha (2006), these are not the only documents that say that '*botlokotsebe*' is related to non-criminal offences.

The South African Policy Service department of police (2004), in promoting the children's rights, makes use of the term '*botlokotsebe*' throughout the document. Thapelo Selepe (2008) in his study guide for SSOL, which professes: "From Oral to written literature" uses the concept '*botlokotsebe*' when referring 'criminal activities. The National Gazette of 2009, No. 32033 Vol.525 "*Yuniti e potlakelang le ho lwantshana le Dinyewe tsa Botlokotsebe* (PCLU) professes about the fight on crime courts. Again here the concept '*botlokotsebe*' is used extensively to mean 'crime'.

The proceedings of the National Council of Provinces (2010); use '*botlokotsebe*' and '*bosenyi*' interchangeably to denote 'crime', for

example...."*hore ba kgone ho tla thusa ho lwantshana le botlokotsebe*' .... *Bo amanang le ho ajwa ha mehlodi... twantshong ya bosenyi*. (...so that they can be able to assist in fighting on crime that is related to distributing fight against crime). The two concepts (*botlokotsebe* and *bosenyi*) are used in this extract to mean one and the same thing, crime. The Centre for Applied Legal Studies (CALs) in its summary of criminal law appendix: '*Botlokotsebe ba Motabo*' (sex crime) used the concept '*botlokotsebe*' throughout the document when referring to crime.

The debates on child protection (working together to protect our children) from National Council of Provinces (documented under Hansard) in 2011, used the concept '*botlokotsebe*' when referring to criminal activities. The *Sesotho* third paper for Grade 11 of 2012, from question 1.3 in the essay type question: '*Botlokotsebe bo jele setsi Afrika Borwa*'; translated as 'crime is escalating in South Africa'.

#### ***Bosenyi/Sesenyi***

It is interesting to note that both these concepts are pure Sesotho terms. According to Paroz (1988: 456), *Bosenyi* (crime/destruction) is a deverbative noun derived from the verbal stem '*senya*' (to spoil; to destroy; to damage; to waste etc.) It has been classified under class 14 of the abstract noun denoting the status of destruction. Pitso (1997: 74) refers to '*bosenyi*' as '*ho senya; tshenyo*' (to destroy and destruction). This edition is supported by Setswana Terminology and Orthography No. 4 (1998). This version does not differ with Peroz's (1988).

This verbal stem '*senya*' can also have derived nouns from class 1, of people (that is *mosenyi* (destroyer); class 7, of experts (that is, *sese-nyi* (destroyer/criminal); and class 9, of objects/ results/things and or action and processes (that is *tshenyo* (waste or results of destruction) (Phindane 2011: 294 - 295). The class 7 noun, '*sese-nyi*' is supported by Olivier (2009) in his Online Sesotho –English dictionary. He does not commit himself by relating to '*bosenyi*' but he made it clear that by '*sese-nyi*' he is referring to a 'criminal'. Pitso (1997: 254) refers to '*sese-nyi*' as: "*mohlola-a-li-etsa; raehlotse; ramelato; senere...*" which summed as 'a cunning criminal'.

It is from this point that the concept '*bose-nyi*' (destruction) is going to be scrutinized against its present usage from different sourc-

es. In the 2009 ‘*Batho Pele*’ document named “*Tseba ditokelo tsa hao tsa ditshebeletso le boikarabelo* (People first: Know your service and responsibility rights); ‘*bosenyi*’ is used as referring to ‘crime’. Here is example: ...*ha ho etswa bosenyi kgahlanong le rona, re ba mahlatsipa a bosenyi...* (If crime is done against us, we become victims of crime...) (2009: 8).

In the document; ‘*Toka ka ho nka boikarabelo*’ (Justice by taking responsibility) (2011), it was found out that the same concept ‘*bosenyi*’ is used to denote ‘crime’. “*sehlopha sa thibelo ya bosenyi le polokeho se nkile tshebediso ya Toka ka ho nka boikarabelo bakeng sa mabaka a mmalwa...*” (2011: 5). A team of crime and safety have taken justice usage by taking responsibility for few reasons...’ Pages 6 and 7 of the same document highlight crime as ‘*bosenyi*’: ‘*Lehlatsipa le mosenyi ba ba le seabo tshebet-song /mananeong .... A bonamodi ba mahlatsipa le Basenyi..*’ (The criminal and the victim have participation from the system/programmes... of criminals and victims interventions) (2011: 6-7).

The document of *Bili ya Makgotla a Dinyewe A Setso* (2011 Bill of Traditional courts) refers to ‘*bosenyi*’ as ‘crime’. Then the 2005 Department of Arts and Culture document; Multilingual Terminology for Information Communication Technology refers to ‘*tlolo ya molao ka inthanete*’ as ‘*bosenyi*’ *ka inthanete* denoting ‘Cyber crime’.

The 2011 Department of Independent Police Investigation Directorate document also refers to ‘*bosenyi*’ as crime. A 2013 document: ‘*Ditsamaiso tsa Seboka sa Kopanelo*’ refers to ‘*bosenyi*’ as crime. The 2008 document on ‘Terms of references: Presidential pardon refers to crime as ‘*bosenyi*’. This concept ‘*bosenyi*’ (crime) works alternatively with ‘*sesenyi*’ (criminal).

The concept ‘*bosenyi/sesenyi*’ is also captured in the translated version of *Sesotho Bible*. The earliest people to record and preserve indigenous *Sesotho* were the missionaries. Most of the *Sesotho* terminology and history of Basotho were recorded by them. The biblical *Sesotho* version (*Testamente e ntjha* 2011 version) was therefore perceived to be reliable in terms of outsourcing terminology. In this case, when looking at the gospels (that is Mark, Matthews and Luke) in narrating the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, different names are provided in relation to the two criminals that were sharing agony with Jesus on that day.

In the gospel of Luke, it is clearly narrated that “One of the criminals hanging there hurled

insults at him...” (*Se seng sa disenyi tse thakgisitsweng se ne se mo soma le sona...*) (Luke 23: 39). This translates to the fact that a criminal was regarded as ‘*sesenyi*’. On the other hand Mark relates this almost the same as Luke: “*Hammoho le yena ba thakgisa le disenyi tse pedi, se seng ka letsohong le letona, se seng ka ho le letshehadi*” (They also crucified two bandits with Jesus, one on his right and the other on his left) (Mark 15: 27).

When coming to Matthews, nothing different can be said apart from pinpointing what others have said: ‘*Jwale, ba thakgisa le yena disenyi tse pedi, se seng ka letsohong le letona, se seng ka ho le letshehadi*’ (“Then they crucified two bandits with Jesus, one on his right and the other on his left...”) (Matthews 27: 38).

### Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate the proper /suitable Sesotho equivalent of the English concept ‘crime’. It is often noticed that for a very serious offence committed, people will always refer to this as ‘*botlokotsebe*’ which to an indigenous Mosotho is regarded as a mere mischief (that is rape, murder, armed robbery and malicious damage of goods or property). The counterpart concept ‘*bosenyi*’ is often regarded as a general concept that included ‘*botlokotsebe*’ in it or it may, at some point be used synonymously or interchangeably depending on the suitable context of the writer.

### Research Objectives

- The study intended to:
- ♦ Find out whether language users are able to distinguish between the appropriate use of pairs ‘*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*’ and ‘*bosenyi/sesenyi*’ in a matching the English equivalent ‘crime’
  - ♦ Identify the suitable pairs to use in describing criminal activities

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Design

The study uses quantitative approach in which questionnaires were used to collect data. The documentary method was also implemented. The questionnaire was structured in such a

way that comprehensible questions were formulated by the researcher. Ten sentences were provided where pairs of terms '*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*' and '*sesenyi/bozenyi*' were provided to fill in the missing word exercise. The last part of the questionnaire consisted of an open ended question as to how the respondent feels about the everyday use of these terms; whether they have been used correctly or incorrectly.

According to Bailey (1994: 13), the use of documentary method refers to the analysis of documents that contain information about the phenomenon we wish to study. While on the other hand, Payne and Payne (2004: 36) describe the documentary method as the techniques used to categorise, investigate, interpret and identify the limitations of physical sources, most commonly written documents whether in the private or public domain.

In terms of documentary method, articles, books, textbooks, Hansard records, government and educational documents were scrutinised. Texts and documents that discussed about these concepts '*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*' and '*bozenyi/sesenyi*' were observed. The old Sesotho Bible version was also evidenced as an early source of translation by missionaries in their first interaction with Basotho people.

### Population and Sampling

The population in terms of this study was made up of 15 purposely selected Sesotho language practitioners (that is, one lexicographer; one translator/interpreter; two learning facilitators; two Grade 12 educators, three lecturers from Qwaqwa, Welkom and Bloemfontein from the two universities in Free State; two writers from *Mokgahla thesele* and *Moabasesotho* associations; one provincial PANSALB representative and three SABC Sesotho presenters) and 204 Sesotho students from Welkom, Bloemfontein and Qwaqwa campuses.

### Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher collected data using questionnaires and analyzed different documents. The said data was organized, checked for accuracy. Categorized and then analyzed in accordance with the research aim. Over 204 questionnaires were distributed in two universities (that

is, University of Free State and Central University of Technology, Free State) in the department of African Languages and Language and Social Sciences education department respectively. These questionnaires were only distributed to the third year level students. Only 150 (74%) questionnaires returned completed and answered. Fifteen language practitioners identified were given questionnaires personally by the researcher. Fortunately, they were all returned answered and completed (100%).

All in all 165 (81%) questionnaires reached the researcher and were prepared for analysis. These questionnaires were classified according to the ten answered sentences and the last part of open ended question which required own opinion of the everyday use of these concepts.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In his study on school and terminology as the means of preserving language diversity, Pysztay (2014) observed how language as the tool of education can be able to save the language. On the other hand, Bishop (2014) claims how unstandardized terminology can disadvantage the research studies. This follows her study on ten questions about terminology for children with unexplained language problems. The above mentioned scholars believe that standardized terminology is very important in giving the development of the language a clear direction. Table 1 reflects the overall responses on the everyday use of '*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*' and '*bozenyi/sesenyi*' pairs. Out of 165 received questionnaires; 128 (63%) responses shows that the everyday use of '*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*' pairs is used inappropriately; meaning where we see these pair, it should be replaced with '*bozenyi/sesenyi*' instead. '*Bozenyi/sesenyi*' pair is appropriate and suitable in that context. 55 (27%) responses revealed that 'there is no difference between the two pairs' (that is, '*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*' and '*bozenyi/sesenyi*'). They still convey the same message, that is, they can be used interchangeably. The most striking point was when 20 (10%) responses revealed that the pair '*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*' are the relevant concepts to be associated with criminal activities. The last 2 (0%) responses were partially completed; as some of the questions were not answered.

Some answers from the open ended question also show that respondents were confused and not yet sure which concepts to use. The researcher had mixed feelings regarding the outcomes. Here are some of the responses:

“..*botlokotsebe le setlokotsebe di sebediswa haholo leha boholo ba rona ba a sebedisang mareo ana re sa tsebe tlhaloso tsa ona ...hona ho baka pherekano e feteletseng ha re se re utlwa le diradiong hammoho le dikoranta di a sebedisa jwalo..*” (...‘*botlokotsebe*’ and ‘*setlokotsebe*’ are used extensively, even though, most of us used them without knowledge of their explanations... this makes a great frustration when we also hear them used like that in radios and newspapers...’).

This response make a reference of being able to use a term that has never been investigated and standardized to be used publicly (that is, informal terms). According to Hazbavi (2014: 1053), terminology standardisation supports language planning efforts and facilitates the implementation of new terminology. There is also a claim that even our media also use these terms without being sourced for the original and background. This is one of the major problems observed that many unstandardized terms are frequently used without any formal meeting to accept and approve them. Drame (2014) in her observation say that in order to avoid that negative impacts, attempts should be made on standardisation of terminology ‘as a choice among competing terms on the basis of economic, reasons, precision and appropriateness (2014: 45). The fact that they are being used without drawing a distinction with explanations; also open our eyes that term lists and dictionaries are needed and should be updated from time to time. This response thus justifies the fact that some of Sesotho terms are not standardized.

“*Ho bolela ka ‘botlokotsebe’ o buwa ka ho thibana ditsebe e seng ho ba mmolai. Ho ba mmolai o sesenyi se lokelwang ho tloswa setjhabeng...*” (Saying about ‘*botlokotsebe*’ you are talking about to be naughty and mischievous and not a murderer. To be a murderer you are a criminal (destroyer) that should be removed from society...).

Another point of view is reflected from this response. The term ‘*botlokotsebe*’ is equated to mischief and being naughty. It shows the consciousness of a person that his/her actions do not intent serious harm or offence. This percep-

tion also brought into picture that those who referred to as ‘*ditlokotsebe*’ cannot be referred to as murderers or killers. The emphasis again here is the term ‘*sesenyi*’. And for that matter this ‘*sesenyi*’ should not be kept in our society. This indicates that the one who destroys cannot be associated or matched with the mischief or naughty one. ‘*Setlokotsebe*’ is bound to change (because of his/her mischievous activities) and ‘*sesenyi*’ is not trustworthy hence should be cleared from the community. This interpretation is shared by 128 responses from the ten asked questions stipulated in the questionnaire.

“*Ho ya ka nna, setlokotsebe se teng ho sesenyi seno...kapa sesenyi se teng setlokotse-beng seno*” (According to me, ‘*setlokotsebe*’ is within that ‘*sesenyi*’ or ‘*sesenyi*’ is present in that ‘*setlokotsebe*’). This response only deduce that there is no difference between the everyday use of these terms. It says that we can always replace and alternate them, that is, ‘*setlokotsebe*’ and ‘*sesenyi*’. This might create a problem when a seven year old child shows an act of mischief or naughtiness. Are we supposed to equate her/him to an adult who kill and destroy people’s property? According to this response there is no level or degree to the type of an offence. Again here, the response like this shows that people are using these terms without complete knowledge of their origin and background. This response also highlights the sense of ‘*bozenyi*’ being the superordinate term.

“*Setlokotsebe re ka se shapa sa tlohela bosawana le boswaswi; empa ha e le sesenyi sona se lokelwa ke tjhankana kapa lona lefu*” (‘*Setlokotsebe*’ can be disciplined and forget about mischief and jokes; but ‘*sesenyi*’ should be jailed or executed).

In the response there is a degree of comparison. ‘*Setlokotsebe*’ is associated with petty offences whereby the offender can be rehabilitated by certain forms of discipline; that is, frivolousness of a person or being nonsensical. In addition, ‘*botlokotsebe*’ is associated with behaving in a silly way instead of being serious. The issue of comical activities denotes the non-seriousness of the offence when coming to ‘*botlokotsebe*’. This assertion is supported by the 20 (10%) responses from the collected data as reflected in Table 1.

An adult may commit an act of ‘*botlokotsebe*’ and regret without causing any harm. But when coming to ‘*sesenyi*’, the response is quite

**Table 1: Responses on the everyday use of ‘*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*’ and ‘*bosenyi/sesenyi*’**

	<i>Botlokotsebe</i> <i>Setlokotsebe</i>	<i>Bosenyi/</i> <i>Sesenyi</i>	<i>Interchangeably use</i> <i>(Both Botlokotsebe/ Setlokotsebe and Bosenyi/Sesenyi</i>	<i>No. com- pleted</i>	<i>Total</i>
Responses	20 (10%)	128 (63%)	55 (27%)	2(0%)	205 (100%)

adamant that ‘*sesenyi*’ should be jailed. The mentioning of prison also implies the seriousness of the offence. That is to say, a seven years old boy cannot be put into jail but can be given few lashes to remind him of the correct way of living. There is also a mentioning of death or execution, if someone is found to be involved in ‘*bosenyi*’. The implication here is that ‘*sesenyi*’ and ‘*bosenyi*’ are involving serious criminal activities. This response cast no doubt that ‘*bosenyi*’ and ‘*sesenyi*’ refer to crime/criminal activities.

“*Setlokotsebe ke sesenyi se a senya; leha eba se sa senye hampe kapa ka tlolo ya molao e seng boima haholo; e ntse e le sesenyi; kahoo di a tshwana dintho tsena.*” (*Setlokotsebe* is a ‘*sesenyi*’; even though does not destroy badly or with breaking the law not that much; is still a ‘*sesenyi*’. Hence these things are the same).

This response also cast an element of similarities between these sets of terms. In fact, one can even go to such an extent of replacing and alternating each other. But if one goes deeper in analyzing the comparison between ‘*botlokotsebe*’, ‘*bosenyi*’, ‘*setlokotsebe*’ and ‘*sesenyi*’, they are absolutely different and cannot reveal the same meaning. The degree of the offence in both cases is not the same. This can be illustrated by citing an example of someone who wished to save his money on regular bases. At some point he decided to change his mind and use it without really apparent reason. This is not an offence but it is silliness or nonsense when someone revokes or changes his positive opinion without valid reason. From this example, there is a serious concern that this person should start investing for future. On the other hand, there is no crime or offence committed. We would then refer to this person as ‘*setlokotsebe*’; but if he was using someone’s money which was supposed to be invested, then this would be referred to as ‘*bosenyi*’.

These are some of the responses from the open ended question. The overall results shows

that even though there is a sense of uncertainty as to what differences might be; most responses feels that ‘*bosenyi/sesenyi*’ set is associated with criminal activities while ‘*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*’ goes hand in hand with mischievous activities.

Since *Sesotho* is one of the Sotho languages, the study recommends that in developing a terminology other Sotho (Northern Sotho and *Setswana*) languages should be consulted as they share same grammatical structures. *Setswana* and *Sesotho sa Leboa (Sepedi)* uses ‘*bosenyi*’ when referring to criminal activities. Documents like ‘*Tshata ya tirelo ya Batswasetlhabelo Ba bosenyi mo Aforika Borwa; Taelo ya IPID; Molao wa Dibetsa tse kotsi* etc., from *Setswana* and *Sepedi* proved this version.. The treatment of *Setswana*, *Sesotho* and Northern Sotho came as early as the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This came as no surprise as some of the European linguists could not establish a difference between these languages. According to Nfila (2002: 16), from as early as the 1928, there was a proposal to develop a “common orthography for the three Bantu languages namely *Setswana*, *Sesotho* and *Sepedi*”. These three languages differ in various phonetic details, grammar and vocabulary. The differences between the three languages are not that much. In short both *Setswana* and *Sepedi* refer to ‘crime’ as ‘*bosenyi*’.

The study reminded us about the concept of standardization. Most of *Sesotho* harvested terms are not standardized. Webb and Kembo (2000) agreed that the standardization is the “process by which an authoritative language body ...prescribes how a language should be pronounced, how its words should be spelt, which words should be accepted in formal situations and what the appropriate grammatical constructions of the language are” (2000: 18). From this observation, it does say something to *Sesotho* speakers that some of these terms are only used without their origin being verified or checked.

Standardization of terms is an issue in Sesotho. According to Phindane (2014: 358), most of Sesotho terms are documented without being first standardized. Our media is very quick in adopting terminology without verifying it. This in turn creates a problem as school learners thought everything that they read and heard from media is standard.

### CONCLUSION

To conclude this discussion, it is observed that the pairs ‘*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*’ and ‘*bosenyi/sesenyi*’ cannot be interchangeably used as an equivalent of the English term ‘crime/criminal’. By the document and data collected from the language practitioners, it was discovered that ‘*sesenyi/bosenyi*’ can be used as an equivalent of the English term ‘criminal/crime’. But when coming to ‘*botlokotsebe/setlokotsebe*’, it can be deduced that they are related to petty issues associated with mischief, impish or being naughty of a person. The overall data analyzed from this study compels one to have another view in the use of these pairs of concepts.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The disagreement and uncertainty from the results and discussion of this study leave so many questions unanswered. Hence this study will recommend further study on issues of standardisation.

Another problem that is often encountered by Sesotho language users is the lack of documented corpus. Few Sesotho dictionaries and term lists lack certain terminology that is current. It is important to encourage corpus documentation (that is, term lists and developed terminology).

Language bodies and committees are formed with the hope of enlightening the community and language users’ about the new developments and discoveries in Sesotho language. In fact, language research and studies are conducted to match Sesotho with other languages standard but these language committees meet after a long time. This view stands to encourage community engagement by the language bodies. At some point during terminology development, one or two members of these committees will be sent to represent them; only to find that the feedback needed to be disseminated in these

committees is not given or recorded in the archives of those committees.

The present study also encourages a revision of Sesotho language corpus from time to time. New developments require that old strategies and methods of dealing with language should be benchmarked frequently. Actually, language is a dynamic mode of communication. By revising terminology frequently will enhance writing new textbooks with recent information. In turn, this will also encourage writing and publishing discrepancies that are found in an unstandardised terminology.

### REFERENCES

- Appropriation Bill (Policy Debate) 2010. *Proceedings of the National Council of Provinces*. Wednesday, 26 May 2010. Cape Town.
- Bailey K 1994. *Methods of Social Research*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. New York: The Press.
- Batho Pele/People first (Tseba Ditokelo tsa hao tsa ditshebeletso le boikarabelo)* 2009. Pretoria: Department of Public Service and Administration.
- Bishop D 2014. Ten questions about terminology for children with unexplained language problems. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorder*, 49(4): 381-415.
- Botlokotsebe ba motabo* 2007. *Kgutsufatso ya Sehlo-mathiso sa molao wa Botlokotsebe*. Number 32 of 2007. Pretoria: Centre for Applied Legal Studies..
- Chitja M 2010. *Patlamantsoe ya Sesotho ya Machaba* (Sesotho International Dictionary). Alberton, South Africa: Nalane.
- Drame A 2014. *Terminology Standardization at Service of Diversity*. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- Free State Provincial Gazette 2005. From <[http://www.fs.gov.za/Information/Documents/ProventialActs/2005/Act\\_4\\_2005.Pdf](http://www.fs.gov.za/Information/Documents/ProventialActs/2005/Act_4_2005.Pdf), Bloemfontein> (Retrieved on 17 April 2014).
- Free State Provincial Government Internet 2014. *Botlokotsebe Bo jele setsi*. From <<http://www.fs.gov.za/department/SAC/Library/department/languagecontent.htm>> (Retrieved on 21 April 2014).
- Hazbavi A 2014. Investigating Iran’s success in standardization of terminologies of computer and information technology. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 11(8): 1053-1058.
- Hansard 2011. *Debates on Child Protection: Working Together to Protect Our Children. Proceedings of National Council of Provinces (NCOP)*. Cape Town. 429 Take, 27 October 2011.
- Maemo a Fasefase a Ditirelo tša Batšwasehlabele Ba bosenye: Sepedi* 2008. Pretoria: Department of Justice and Constitutional Development.
- Miller E, Webster V, Knight J, Comino E 2014. The use of a standardized language assessment tool to measure the language development of urban aboriginal pre-schoolers. *International Journal of Speech Language Pathology*, 16(2): 109-120.
- Molao wa dibetsa tše Kotsi* 2013. Pretoria: South Africa Police Services.

- Multilingual Terminology for Information Communication Technology* 2005. Johannesburg: Department of Arts and Culture.
- Olivier J 2011. Sesotho Online. From <<http://www.Sesotho.org>>
- Paroz R 1988. *Southern Sotho – English Dictionary*. Morija: Morija Sesutho Depot.
- Payne G, Payne J 2004. *Key Concepts in Social Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Phindane P 2011. *Lexical Semantics and Deverbal Nominalisations in Sesotho: Analysis of Deverbal Nominal in Sesotho*. Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH and Co.KG.
- Phindane P 2014. The interpretation of Tlhahisoleseding v/s Tlhahisolesedi. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(2): 357-368.
- Pitso T 1997. *Khetsi ea Sesotho: Pokello ea Mantsoe a Lumellanang le a Hananang 'Moho le Maele le Mabitso a Batho*. Cape Town: CTP Printers.
- Presidential Pardon 2008. *Terms of Reference – Sesotho*. Pretoria: Department of Justice and Constitutional Development.
- Pusztay J 2014. Schools and terminology as the means of preserving language diversity. *Linguistica Uralica*, 2(13): 131-137.
- Setamente sa Kharikhulamo ya naha Dikereiting tsa R – 12 2011. Lefapha la Thuto/* Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Selepe T 2008. *Sesotho sa Perspectives: From Oral to Written Literature. Study Guide for SSOL 222 VSC*. North West University, Potchefstroom: The Platinum Press.
- Sesotho Puo ya Lapeng Grade 11: Pampiri ya 3* 2012. Pretoria: National Senior Certificate. Department of Education.
- Setswana Terminology and Orthography No. 4. Mareo le melawana ya Mopeleto* 1988. Department of Education: Bophuthatswana, Mafikeng.
- Taelo ya IPID* 2011. Pretoria: Department of Independent Police Investigative Directorate.
- Testamente e njha: Sesotho* 2011. The Gideons International Afrika E Borwa. Cape Town.
- Toka ka ho nka Boikarabelo: Mokgwa wa ho lokisa* 2011. Pretoria: Department of Justice and Constitutional Development.
- Tšhata ya Tirelo ya Batswasetlhabelo Ba Bosenyi mo Aforika Borwa: Setswana* 2008. Pretoria: Department of Justice and Constitutional Development.
- Webb V, Kembo-S 2000. *African Voices: An Introduction to the Languages and Linguistics of Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.