THESIS
6
(1998)

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 01712 6636

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

NARRATIVES OF DOMESTIC WORKERS
AND THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN
THEIR EXPERIENCES IN SWAZILAND

presented by

Sarah Mkhonza

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in English

Diane Brauner
Major professor

Date July 22, 1996

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution O-12771

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX
to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
OCT 23 1999		
JUL 06 2000		
SEP 05 2006		

1/98 c:/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.14

NARRATIVES OF DOMESTIC WORKERS AND THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN THEIR EXPERIENCES IN SWAZILAND

BY

SARAH MKHONZA

VOLUME I

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1996

ABSTRACT

NARRATIVES OF DOMESTIC WORKERS AND THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN THEIR EXPERIENCES IN SWAZILAND

By

Sarah Mkhonza

In this study I look at the narratives of domestic workers who live in Swaziland. They recount their experiences at work in colonial and post colonial Swaziland. Their stories bring out a sociohistorical construction of domestic work that is useful in understanding how paid domestic work came to be what it is today. The lives of women give directions for language planning by pointing out how women, who are in the lower class of society, are oppressed.

I interviewed twenty women, ten who were under forty five and ten who were over forty five in 1993. The ten who were over forty five worked in colonial Swaziland and the ten who were under forty five are working in post-colonial Swaziland. I use Labov (1972) and Polanyi (1979) as the main methods of looking at the narrative texts. I also look at discursive acts as outlined in tuse Perinbanayagam (1991). Structures like commands, questions, quotations, and many others are examined for issues of power. Domestic work is the social context that shapes the discourse of the narratives.

The analysis relies on linking grammatical structures that occur in discursive acts in order to bring out issues of power. The breakdown of structures reveals how

language is used by the workers in constructing their own lives. Strategies of discourse construction like marking and voice are examined for issues of power by linking speakers to the social context.

The research findings show that the world of domestic work is a world in which the employer has power. Employers' voices are heard in the narratives marked in their languages. The prevalent structures in their voices are structures that show that they have power over the worker such as imperatives. The domestic workers construct themselves as objects who have to obey their employers. When they construct themselves as subjects, they are subjects in the maintenance of the powers that oppress them. Through narratives they bring out how they were victimized in the different periods that they worked as domestic workers.

In my concluding chapters, I argue for language planning as a way of dealing with the inequalities that exist in Swazi society. I outline areas which could inform language studies about the situation of people in Swaziland.

COPYRIGHT by

SARAH MKHONZA-DUPONT

1996

DEDICATION

This document is dedicated to my grandmother Labhukubhuku, Lomadibhi Mamba, who died when I was six years old. Grandmother, I am grateful for the love and hope you gave me. I think about you always. Your strength of personality, your insight into things is something I will always cherish. Thank you for believing in me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to thank Dr. Diane Brunner, my dissertation chair for helping me with this project. I would also like to thank Dr. David Dwyer, Dr. Kitty Geissler, Dr. Geneva Smitherman, Dr. Ken Harrow and Dr. Nancy Ainsworth-Vaughn for their contribution to my understanding of the world and the role of language as discussed in this study.

I wish to thank my family, my sons Wakhile and Khulani for the sacrifice they have made while I was studying at Michigan State University.

I would also like to thank USAID for funding my research in Swaziland.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES xiii

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION-LIVES AS EXPERIENCES WITH LANGUAGE IN DOMESTIC WORK 1
- LANGUAGE, WORK AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCE 7
- LANGUAGE AND DOMESTIC WORK IN SOUTHERN AFRICA 13
- ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY 19

CHAPTER II
DISCOURSE, POWER AND THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT IN SWAZILAND 20
- THE SWAZI MONARCHY AND THE BOER AND BRITISH CONCESSIONAIRES 22
- CREATION OF THE COLONIAL ORDER 28
- THE MISSIONARIES 30
- COLOREDS 36
- THE AFRICANS 37
- THE REIGN OF KING SOBHUZA II 39
- THE EDUCATION OF AFRICANS DURING THE COLONIAL PERIOD 42
- 45
- SOCIETY IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND 47
- LANGUAGE AND POST-COLONIALISM IN SWAZILAND 52

CHAPTER III
REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ON NARRATIVE AND LANGUAGE 54
- THE INSTITUTION OF DOMESTIC WORK AND ITS SOCIAL TEXTS 58
- NARRATIVES AS SOCIAL TEXTS 59
- LIFE HISTORIES AS SOCIAL TEXTS 62
- LANGUAGE AND THE EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN 77
- LANGUAGE, THE SELF AND INSTRUMENTAL COMPETENCE AT WORK 80

CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD 89
RESEARCH QUESTIONS 89
THE PILOT STUDY 90
REFLECTIONS ON THE INTERVIEWING PROCESS AND DATA GATHERING 93
TRANSCRIPTION 98
..... 98
SUBJECTS OF STUDY 99
DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS 100
BRIEF PORTRAYALS OF WOMEN 103
WOMEN WHO WORKED DURING THE COLONIAL PERIOD 103
..... 103
WOMEN WHO ARE WORKING IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND 105
PROFILES OF WOMEN 107
COLONIAL LIVES 107
LOSIMILO 108
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 108
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 109
LINAH 114
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 114
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 118
MARY 120
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 120
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 126
SENTENI 131
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 131
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 136
LOBUTIMBA 144
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 144
B. LINGUISTIC PROFILE 152
POST COLONIAL LIVES 157
SIBONGILE 157
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 157
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 162
HLUPHEKILE 165
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 165
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 170

CEBILE 173
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 173
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 180

LOZINDABA 182
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 182
B. LINGUISTIC PROFILE 184
SENANILE 185
A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT 185
B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE 186
DATA ANALYSIS 188
THEMES ON COLONIAL SWAZILAND 188
THEMES FROM POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND 189
AN EXEMPLAR 192

CHAPTER V
EXPERIENCES OF GROWING UP IN COLONIAL AND POST COLONIAL SWAZILAND 195
LANGUAGE CHOICE IN DEPICTING EXPERIENCE 196
WOMEN'S STORIES OF EARLY CHILDHOOD 198
THE LAW OF MASTERS AND SERVANTS 199
CHILD LABOR IN BOER FARMS 201
CHILD LABOR ON FARMS OWNED BY THE BRITISH 214
CHILD LABOR ON SWAZI NATION LAND 219
STORIES OF GROWING UP IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND 225
ENACTMENT OF POWER AND CHILDREN'S LIVES 234

CHAPTER VI
NARRATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF ENCOUNTERS AT WORK 239
NAMING AND THE SELF IN DOMESTIC WORK 241
NAMING IN COLONIAL SWAZILAND 242
NAMING IN BOER HOUSEHOLDS 242
NAMING IN BRITISH HOUSEHOLDS 246
NAMING IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND 247
ROLES AND ROUTINES 249
MAKING MEANING OUT OF WORK IN COLONIAL SETTINGS 251
THE CREATION OF ROLES IN BRITISH HOUSEHOLDS 252
THE CREATION OF ROLES IN AFRIKAANER HOUSEHOLDS . 282
ROLES AND ROUTINES IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND ... 289
ROLES IN THE HOUSEHOLDS OF COLOREDS 291

ROLES IN SWAZI HOUSEHOLDS 294
ROLES IN HOUSEHOLDS OF NON-SWAZI SPEAKING AFRICANS 299

CHAPTER VII
LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND DOMESTIC WORK
..... 303
LANGUAGE AT WORK IN AFRIKAANER HOUSEHOLDS 306
SYNTAXES OF THE SELF IN AFRIKAANS 312
LANGUAGE AND WORK ON ENGLISH SPEAKING FARMS ... 321
FANAKALO AS A SOCIAL CODE OF DOMESTIC WORK 328
WORK WITH EMPLOYERS WHO KNEW SISWATI 336
LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN HOUSEHOLDS OF MISSIONARIES 339
LANGUAGE PROBLEMS AT WORK IN POST- COLONIAL SWAZILAND 340
LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN THE HOMES OF WHITES 341
LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN THE HOMES OF THE CHINESE .. 350
LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN NON-SISWATI SPEAKING HOUSEHOLDS 351
SYNTAXES OF THE SELF IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND .. 352
LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN THE HOUSEHOLDS OF SWAZIS .. 354

CHAPTER VIII
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN WOMEN'S NARRATIVES OF DOMESTIC WORK
..... 358
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN AFRIKAANER HOUSEHOLDS ... 360
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN BRITISH HOUSEHOLDS 368
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND .. 375
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN HOUSEHOLDS OF COLOREDS .. 375
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN HOUSEHOLDS OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING AFRICANS 380
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN SWAZI HOUSEHOLDS 384
MASOCHISM AND DOMESTIC WORKERS 391

CHAPTER IX
TRANSFORMING THE SELF IN DOMESTIC WORK 396
THE SEVERING OF THE BODY AND DOMESTIC WORK 405
LEAVING FAMILY IN SEARCH OF ONE'S FREEDOM 408

CHAPTER X
WOMEN AND THEIR RESPONSES TO THE LANGUAGE SITUATION OF SWAZILAND 413
LANGUAGE USE, WOMEN AND SOCIETY 415
LANGUAGE AND WORK 416
LANGUAGE AND THE CHURCH 420
LANGUAGE AND HEALTH 421
LANGUAGE AND GOVERNMENT 423
LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION 424
LANGUAGE AND THE HOME 425
CODE SWITCHING 426
THE ROLE OF FRENCH 428
THE ROLE OF SISWATI 428

CHAPTER XI
CONCLUSION-LANGUAGE AND THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLE IN SWAZILAND 432
DOMESTIC WORK AS A DOMAIN FOR LANGUAGE STUDIES 443
THE RIGHT TO WORK 444
LITERACY AND THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN .. 445
CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AS AN ASPECT OF WOMEN'S RIGHTS . 446
LANGUAGE AND THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL 448

CHAPTER XII
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 452
WOMEN AND THE VIOLENCE OF LITERACY IN SWAZILAND 452
TOWARDS A PROPOSED PLAN FOR SWAZILAND 455
The Legal Domain 456

The Communication Domain 457
The Social Welfare Domain 457
The Education Domain 457
The Commercial Domain 458
The Domain of Science and Technology 459

CHAPTER XIII
AN AFTERWORD: A PERSONAL SOCIAL TEXT 466
A PERSONAL SOCIAL TEXT 467
UNDERSTANDING THE BODY AS A SOCIAL TEXT 470

APPENDIX A
LIFE HISTORIES 475

APPENDIX B
QUESTION PROFILE 476
PART A BIOGRAPHICAL DATA 476
PART B-CONVERSATIONAL INTERVIEW 477

BIBLIOGRAPHY 480

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 2.1: TYPE OF SCHOOL AND AMOUNT SPENT BY THE GOVERNMENT: 1932 46

TABLE 4.1: BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF PARTICIPANTS 102

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION-LIVES AS EXPERIENCES WITH LANGUAGE IN DOMESTIC WORK .

This is a study of narratives of domestic workers who are Swazis and how they express their experiences at work through language. The narratives of domestic workers bring out how they were oppressed during the colonial period when they had to work for white employers, and also how this oppression has been maintained in post-colonial Swaziland. This racial subjugation still continues in today's Swaziland. Women who work as domestic workers are also oppressed because they have to do difficult work in other people's houses. They constantly have to take instructions from an authority who is usually a woman. Another level of subjugation is the traditional system, which dictates that a woman be given a lower status than a man. Through their own stories women tell how all these forces structured their lives from birth through adulthood. The period that the study covers is from 1930 to the present. In these years Swaziland was ruled by two kings. Sobhuza II ruled Swaziland from 1921 until he died in 1982. King Mswati III was crowned King in 1986, and he rules Swaziland to this day.

Swaziland is a small country in Southern Africa that was under British colonial rule from 1904 up to 1968. Like most African countries Swaziland is characterized by a dualism of western and Swazi life that coexist alongside each other. When looking at Swaziland one notices gross inequalities in this dualism. It is a situation in which some people earn starvation wages while others earn high wages (Booth 1983). The existence of these inequalities dates back to the concessions era, where

1983). The existence of these inequalities dates back to the concessions era, where the settlers appropriated two thirds of the land from King Mbandzeni (Matsebula 1972). The rest of the population was left crowded on very little land, while the white settlers had farms on which they started to grow crops like cotton. The Swazis eventually had to abandon their subsistence life and go to work on the farms of the white settlers for meager wages. This way a situation of dependency was created as the poor Swazi became a source of cheap labor. This situation exists today (Booth 1983).

The situation of dependency that was created can be understood by studying the lives of women who experience it on a day to day basis. Swaziland's system of inequality is similar to most African countries in that is has a duality that breaks the society into a traditional and a western one. The majority of the people who are poor live a life of poverty that is mainly traditional. The Swazis who are the elite live a western life. This duality is also maintained through language because the elite, who live a more or less western life have been to school, have better jobs and speak the English language. Life is much easier for them. The Swazis who live a traditional life are poorer and they are employed in low-paying jobs such as domestic work. In order to look at the inequality that exists between the different groups it is necessary to look at the lives of the people who live under these oppressive conditions so that we can understand how they live their lives.

In this study I look at female domestic workers because I feel this can bring out the nature of the oppression of women in Swazi society. Studying their lives at

work is useful in that it enables us to understand how power in society is created. The issues of power are brought out in their telling of their stories as they relate how they go about their duties. Cixous (1976) insists that women should write in order to break out of the mode of being silenced. She says:

> It is by writing, from and toward women, and by taking up the challenge of speech which has been governed by the phallus, that women will confirm women in a place other than that which is reserved in and by the symbolic, that is, in a place other than silence. Women should break out of the snare of silence. They shouldn't be conned into accepting a domain which is the margin or the harem (Cixous 1976 as cited in Marks and de Courtivron 1980 p. 251).

By writing about women's lives one gives a voice to women. In domestic work the issues of gender, race, and class interact so as to make women in Southern Africa the most underpriviledged group mainly because of the way apartheid structured the lives of Blacks. All this inequality is mediated through language.

Most members of the elite employ domestic workers in post-colonial Swaziland. The domestic workers are usually poor women (and men) who are not educated, and who come to the towns looking for employment. In some cases they may even be relatives of the employers. These women are not in a position to negotiate their conditions of employment. Since Swaziland's literacy rate is at about 40%, there are many uneducated people who provide a constant supply of cheap labor that can be employed as domestic workers.

The study traces domestic work from the colonial period to the present. The establishment of domestic work as a source of employment is linked to the colonial period. The colonialists brought with them the class structures of Europe where the

rich upper class had maids who worked for them. The creation of colonialism followed the same pattern. Since colonialism was based on domination and subordination on the basis of race, the relations were those of master and servant. While issues of power in domestic work were dictated by race and class in colonial Swaziland, in post-colonial Swaziland the element of race is no longer an important issue because today's power elite is mostly black.

Swaziland is a patriarchal society in that the man has power over the woman in social settings. Inheritance is also passed on along patrilineal lines and children are given the father's name. The demarcation of roles is very rigid. From the time a girl is born, it is known that her duties center around the home. She is taught the duties of fetching water and firewood as she grows up. After marriage, the woman plays the role of home-maker, looking after children, helping with ploughing and weeding the fields and harvesting. It is only old women who enjoy the respect of the community because they are revered for their wisdom. The women in the study expressed their experiences in a male dominated world in ways which reveal how they were dominated by men in their social relations. Thandi had this to say:

> That is when I found a man who said he will make me a wife. I go and the man says he will make me a wife. I have another child and the other one is with my mother. I get another boy. I cook. I work for nothing. There is nothing I am getting. The person no paying 'emalobolo' (bride price). The person no marrying me. I had to go and work.

Thandi's extract shows how women resorted to work after realizing that there was no hope in marriage. Their experiences at work were no different because these women had to go into gender-specific work; the work of domestic work where they

cook, clean the house and look after children. The position of women in Swaziland's society has been challenged by the changes that have taken place. Colonialism, which brought with it industrialization and urbanization has influenced the roles of men and women tremendously. More women go to work outside the home. The alienation of land during the concession's period and the imposition of taxes were among the first things that forced adults to move to towns or even to South Africa to look for jobs. Furthermore, subsistence agriculture as practiced by the Swazis did not produce enough food to meet the subsistence needs of the family. These changes required that women also join men in looking for jobs. Today urban migration in search of jobs has become the norm. The women are drawn into working on plantations where cotton, sugar cane, pineapples and the like are grown. Domestic work is just another alternative.

Education made a difference when women were drawn into wage employment. Those who were educated got jobs as teachers, nurses and clerks. Even though these became 'women's jobs,' the women who went into such jobs earned much higher salaries than domestic workers. The women with no education could only gain jobs weeding fields in the plantations or working as domestic workers. Women's work has not changed in the post independence era because governments have not drawn development plans that clearly outline and seek to enhance the role of women. This has been due to lack of information on the role of women in development and improper analyses that do not clearly outline what the role of women in African societies is. This results in women struggling single handedly as they raise their

children in societies that leave women's work to welfare organizations. This is why policy planners should focus on the work women do.

Domestic work in Southern Africa is gender specific. While men work in people's homes, they work in the garden most of the time. They do not constantly take orders from the master on a day to day basis like the women who work inside the house. The women are the ones who constantly have to deal with the employer's demands. Doing the work of maintaining cleanliness in other people's houses requires constant contact and constant interaction as one tries to work out what is required to be done (Olsen, 1987).

The situation of women in Swaziland can be understood by looking at the situation of women in Southern Africa as a whole. The institution of apartheid in Southern Africa and its links with colonization of the African states surrounding South Africa affected the lives of women in the region as a whole. Cock (1986), in her study of domestic workers in South Africa, points out that while all women are oppressed, black women are the most oppressed. She points out that patriarchy, class and racism converge, making the situation of black women worse than that of any other group. It is important that the voices of the oppressed be heard if society aims at doing away with oppression. It is by investigating the experiences of people who are oppressed that we can understand the way language, race, class and gender are synergistic systems of domination and oppression. The people who have lived under the conditions are the ones who can tell us how it is to be oppressed. It is

through knowing how those who live oppressed lives understand their lives that we can know what oppression is about.

LANGUAGE, WORK AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

The situation that the domestic workers find themselves in puts them in the position of the oppressed because of the inequalities that exist in Swazi society. The women expressed the prevalence of violence at the hands of their employers. Both physical and social violence were mentioned by women who work in post colonial Swaziland while those who worked in the colonial period only cited social violence. Social violence is different from physical violence which means hitting someone. Social violence includes different forms of abuse that result from discrimination (Stuckey, 1990). In order to deal with social violence, society has to know exactly how it is constituted. Stuckey makes a difference between physical violence like beating someone and social violence. She says social violence is:

> a covert form which is perhaps most devastating of all for those subject to it. It is the passive violence of the refusal to recognize overt or real violence. It may be expressed in deeds; or in positions, stances, attitudes, rules, codes, manners, inertia, cynicism, scientific objectivity, coyness, humor; in refusal, disavowal, negation, or disconfirmation - but also and especially at all levels, in words (Stuckey, 1991, p.63).

Since social violence is sometmes effected through language, it is by looking at the lives of the domestic workers that we can be able to understand how this is done. Coates argues that language is a means by which people place themselves in social space (Coates, 1986). Coates' use of space refers to space as a cultural construction. What she says can be interpreted to mean that people create

themselves in interactions as they go about doing their everyday duties. The situations that people find themselves in can be studied in order to bring out how the relations of power are created by looking at how people in a social situation interact. Issues of language and everyday life are important in that language reveals the dimensions of power at play as people construct themselves in relation to others. The interactions of the worker and the employer are done through utterances which are always directed at the worker, who has to follow the instructions as told. This is the everyday order in domestic work. Acceptance of the job is acceptance of a role that is below that of the employer. Looking at the interactions of workers and their employers helps us understand how power is maintained in the way they use language. Domestic workers who worked in the colonial period show how the employers told them how things are done in their households. The employee had to do things as said by the employer. A woman I call Lobutimba had this to say about how she learned to do things at work.

> She taught me how to make a fire in the stove. It was a ...We used a wood and coal stove. She taught me how to cook rice. When I cook meat I should do this. Day by day I learned.

In this excerpt the employer was the one who stated how things should be done. The worker did not know what a stove was or how to make a fire in it. Knowledge became power in that the worker could then perform the duties as told.

Berger and Luckman (1966) argue that language is power and discuss how the relationship of language and power shapes one's social construction of reality. They

postulate that language is an important function in people's lives. It perpetuates the interpretations of life that are maintained by society to the detriment of the powerless. This has a bearing on how human beings see their experience of the world.

> The common language available to me for the objectifications of my experiences is grounded in everyday life and keeps pointing back to it even as I employ it to interpret experiences in finite provinces of meaning. Typically, therefore, I 'distort' the reality of the latter as soon as I begin to use the common language in interpreting them, that is I 'translate' the non-everyday experiences back into paramount reality of everyday life (Berger and Luckmann 1966 p. 115).

What Berger and Luckman say is important in that people interpret their lives through their lived experiences. Domestic workers are always being ordered about in their work places. The construction of their lives as workers who have to serve others is a result of a socially constructed world that they have to accept. It is a world which causes one to accept an oppressive role on a day to day basis. This role created in the colonial period had its own language in which Blacks were looked on as inferior. Workers internalize the tradition of this period even in present-day Swaziland and recreate themselves as people who are to serve others instead of thinking of themselves as people who can express themselves at work. The messages that are constantly called out such as 'Geer my dy dang' (Bring me the thing), are internalized and people become 'other-directed' as they go live their daily lives. In this study I plan to look at the lives of women at work and examine their life histories for evidence of lives lived in oppression as shown in their recreation of their experiences.

It is by looking at the lives of people within a social situation that the relations of power can be understood. Language is a means by which social relations are maintained (Tollefson, 1991). It is the main means by which interactions take place. The social discourse is important since it tells us how society through ideology has constituted how individuals should behave in different social contexts.

Studying people's lives at work and how language impacts them enables us to understand the issues of power as dictated by work situations. Fasold (1984) points out that there are domains of language use that reveal how people are affected by language. He points out that work is one of these. He says people's struggles with language, in places like schools, courts, banks etc. can best help us understand how language is a factor in people's lives that is used in the maintenance of power. Fairclough (1989) looks at power and how it is maintained through language. He argues that language is used in dominating people because ideologies that make people accept definitions of society are created through language. This creates 'orders of discourse' that infiltrate the consciousness of people and recreate the social relations of power that those who dominate others want in place. The creation and maintenance of the slave-master relationship that colonialists created in paid domestic work is maintained linguistically in many ways. In order to understand it is necessary to describe it and break it down using analyses like the critical language study that Fairclough advocates. In this study of the domestic workers' lives I will take some texts from their life histories and show how they are evidence of language and power

that is created through social practices which embody the relations of power in the society.

> 'Do this and this. Go and work. Go and clean the stove. Go and work in the room. You have not done well here.' You are with the 'mesisi'. The man is gone. There is no rest. She touches the surface. 'You have not cleaned this here.' She says, 'here it is dirty.'

This passage from the woman's life shows how she was constantly ordered around by another woman. The talk is one sided. The commands come one after the other. The constant criticism of everything is revealed in the way the speaker talks about the situation. The woman who had the power to go through the house checking what had been done was the employer. In telling it like it was the domestic worker would point at the surrounding in a way that showed that she had brought the experience to the present. The tense used also showed how much of a presence the employer was in the worker's life when it came to showing what had not been done well.

This created dialogue, taken from the life of a woman I call Mary allows us to see the ordering of life in domestic work. The fact that her employer was white brings out how domestic workers had to put up with the racism, being workers in a household of people who did not look like themselves. Women tell how discrimination was created through the creation of difference through naming, objects, spaces and the like. By looking at the narratives of workers we get a sense of how the whole structuring of domestic work came to be what it is.

Post-colonial narratives also show the carry over of the discourse of the colonial period by an elite that has maintained the colonial tradition of having

servants and treating them in the way the colonial masters treated them. The way domination is created differs because it is maintained through class. This is because most of the employers are black.

> I thought everything was different. They told me that I had to change because I was from the country...She said this place is not like home. I have to change and do things the way they are done in the city.

In this segment Cebile expressed one of the ways that difference is created by today's Swazis when they deal with their employees. Difference is created by making them feel small because they are from the rural areas. In colonial Swaziland, Africans stayed in the country. The towns were for white people. If Africans were employed by the colonial government, they lived in small match-box houses in the locations. This created a situation where the Swazi elite started to see themselves as better because they lived in town in the houses that had been occupied by the colonialists. This excerpt shows how the employer feels better than the worker who has come into the city. It also brings out the fact that Swazi life has its disparities. A person has to learn many things about maintaining a house in the city because in the country the stick and mud huts are not as demanding when it comes to cleaning and daily maintenance. This difference makes the employees feel that they are in a strange world. The difference also brings out the inequalities in class because it is only the elite who can afford to live the way Cebile's employers lived. Such people demand that workers learn to work as the colonialists made them work so they can maintain their life style. The prevalence of rural-urban migration keeps the employers with a steady supply of workers.

Seidler (1994) argues that self realization is best articulated at work and expresses that work does not have to be oppressive. He argues that people in post colonial situations have to look closely at the legacies of colonialism and bring out how they are oppressive to people in order to help them gain self respect. In this study, the lives of workers are used to tell how they came to understand their different situations as shown in their retelling of them.

LANGUAGE AND DOMESTIC WORK IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Most studies on domestic work have concentrated on South Africa because of the way the ideology of apartheid relegates Blacks to a life of servitude in that country. Interactions between employee and employer reflect the power dimensions that prevail in the social context. The power that the employer has is always recreated in the relationship with the worker on a day to day basis.

Among writers who have looked at domestic work in Southern Africa are Hansen (1989), Cock (1986) and Bozzoli (1991). Hansen (1989) looks at domestic workers in post colonial Zambia and gives us a broader perspective of the domestic worker-master relationship that goes beyond the issues of race and gender. She looks at the subject from the time when colonialists first arrived to the present, which provides an invaluable sociohistorical background to the problem. This study shows that domestic work was not always the work of women. Men were the main target group for the travelling settler because of the nomadic nature of the explorer's life. Malawian men who belonged to groups like the Bemba were considered the best

domestic workers. The advent of mining resulted in most men going to work in the mines. This left domestic work to women (Hansen, 1989).

In looking at all the studies and how they portray the social side of domestic work, one realizes that the question of language was very important even in these earlier relationships. Hansen says that early settlers preferred domestic workers who had been to mission schools because they knew English.

> Because travellers rarely spoke any local languages, some found it useful to employ mission boys who had learned some English (Hansen, 1989 p. 38).

In Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, Hansen points out that a hybrid language was used to communicate with domestic workers. She calls the language 'Kitchen Kaffir' and says it was first used in South Africa. Today this language is called Fanakalo, a pidgin-creole language that uses the syntax of Zulu and borrows 70% of Zulu vocabulary and the rest from the other languages spoken in South Africa. While this 'Kitchen Kaffir' was used, the power to communicate rested with the master since the servants could not initiate conversation with their masters through it. In this study on Swaziland, workers reported using Fanakalo. In the colonial period, they used it in the homes of the settlers. One woman who worked in colonial Swaziland also reported using Fanakalo when working for a Chinese family. Even though 'Kitchen Kaffir' was useful in communicating with the employers, the power of the employer gave him/her the prerogative to use it first when speaking to the servant. Servants could not just address an employer in this language. They only spoke when they were spoken to. The right to talk at work was

also the employer's. When on duty servants were not supposed to talk unless they were spoken to. Hansen says:

> Communication around domestic work was itself a hierarchical situation, especially in households where 'Kitchen Kaffir' was the main communicative mode. This hybrid language, which had arisen through contact between whites and blacks in South Africa, was used to some extent in Northern Rhodesia, especially by settlers who came up from the south, but it never developed into a lingua franca. Consisting mainly of commands and expressions, 'Kitchen Kaffir' provided a language of subordination (Hansen, 1989, p. 67.)

Many servants are said to have learned English in colonial Africa because they wanted to communicate with their masters. The servants made a lot of mistakes that are recorded by many scholars (Hansen, 1989, Davies (1904). Hansen 1989 says:

> Servants who did not master English well were likely to be caught in all kinds of problems:mixing wrong ingredients into recipes, not doing what they were told to do or doing it very differently.

The obligations of the job dictated that the servants perform well in their job. Failing to do the work could not be excused because one did not understand the language.

Bozzoli (1991) writes about the women of Phokeng and shows that the women who were aspiring to go and work in the cities such as Johannesburg made sure that they learned English from the African American missionaries' school because they would need to speak English and understand the madams they worked for instead of going to the German missionaries who taught Tswana. Naomi Setshedi points out that they needed to know English so that they could be understood by their employers in the city.

> The Bafokeng tribe argued that they wanted to know English so that they would be able to communicate with their white employers. They used to have a very big problem of language with their employer. One

> white employer once said to the servant, 'Make me a cup of tea please.' The servant could not understand what the woman was trying to tell her and she said 'what is she talking about, she says please, please, I don't know what that means.' The poor employer had to show her cups and a kettle, it was then that the servant could understand what she was trying to say. Now they wanted to know English so that they would have no problem with their employers (Bozzoli 1991, p.69).

The narratives on the experiences of domestic workers with language are interlinked in that most of the women entered the sphere of work ignorant of the language of the employer, especially in colonial times. The problems that women faced also arose from the fact that the environment was not only challenging linguistically, but also culturally because the African women, growing up under African traditions, had only been educated along traditional expectations. The uprooting of women from their homesteads into the places of work challenged the belief that the women's place is in the home because they had to travel and take up jobs away from the home, often in the urban areas. It is by looking at some traditional expectations that we can understand how the transition from one's homestead to the place of work takes place in the Southern African context.

The discussion of language and domestic work from a historical perspective shows how communication in domestic work is done through the language of the employer. In Swaziland this was a problem that workers had to deal with, especially in the colonial period because almost all the employers spoke languages that the employees did not understand. In post colonial Swaziland, the situation is different. In order to understand the problems of language and people's experience in Swaziland, it is necessary to look at language planning from a historical perspective.

On gaining independence in 1968, the ruling party, the Imbokodvo party, did not put into place a language planning policy that would embark on status and corpus planning in order to change from having English as the language of power to siSwati. The Imbokodvo policy statement just states that 'siSwati and English will be the official languages of Swaziland' (Dlamini, 1972). Since no measures have been taken to effect policy change, people remain frustrated in the lower strata of life because they do not understand all that is said in work and other situations.

Improvement in the situation that exists between those who know English and those who do not know it can be brought about through a language policy that creates a situation in which everybody participates equally. Democratic language policies that affect the majority of people can only be initiated by a focus on issues that bring people's problems with language to the forefront. Corson (1990) provides a list of characteristics of an ideal language situation. He says:

1. All participants must receive equal distribution of opportunities to select and use speech acts;
2. All participants must have an equal chance to initiate and maintain discourse;
3. All participants must have an equal chance to advance their points of view and question ideas, to give reasons for or against claims made in language.

Since power is about having an equal voice, speaking in the language of the majority would create better power sharing among Swazis. The fact that the Swazi elite has maintained work such as domestic work results in inequalities that are observable. A class structure is maintained in many ways. People who work in

domestic work are paid low wages. They work hard for long hours under difficult conditions. They are at the mercy of the employer. One woman pointed out how her employers wanted her to work throughout the week. By looking at the interactions between groups, one can start to understand some fundamental issues about power and its maintenance in Swaziland. Looking at interactions at work in a bilingual situation can also reveal how deprivation of education results in people who are not able to articulate themselves and end up in jobs that are oppressive.

In this chapter I have argued that the lives of domestic workers show that they were oppressed during the colonial period when they worked under Boer and British employers and they are still oppressed in post-colonial Swaziland when they work for the elite. They are also oppressed under the patriarchal system because Swazi law and custom constructs women as inferior to men. By looking at how women construct their experiences we get to see how this oppression is maintained in society. The next chapter gives a detailed analysis of the socio-political context in colonial Swaziland and post-colonial Swaziland.

It is necessary to define some of the terms that are used in this study. Space is used to mean both physical and metaphorical space. Physical space can refer to the household, the kitchen and even the country of Swaziland itself. Metaphorical space means cultural, linguistic and sociopolitical space as used by Brown and Gooze (1995). Identity means people's sense of the self as socially constructed within the social settting. Domestic is used to refer to the home instead of work that is situated outside the home in places such as offices. The word Boer and Afrikaaner are used

interchangably to mean a South African of Dutch origin. Afrikaans is the language that these people use. Ideology means the creation of ideas in people's minds using language (Fairclough, 1989).

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This section is on how the study is organized. The second chapter looks at the socio-political situation in Swaziland. The third chapter presents the literature review. The fourth chapter is on the research method. The fifth chapter is on the stories of growing up in colonial and post colonial Swaziland. The sixth chapter is on narratives and encounters at work. The workers tell about naming and getting to know the self as a worker through the role one learned at work. The seventh chapter is on language use in domestic work. The eighth chapter is on narrative and conflict resolution at work. The ninth chapter is on the transformation of women from being objects to being subjects. The tenth chapter is on the responses of women to the language situation of Swaziland. The eleventh chapter presents the conclusion and the meaning of language rights to the individual. The twelfth chapter is on implications for further research. The last chapter is an afterword which is a personal reflection on writing about women's lives at work.

CHAPTER II
DISCOURSE, POWER AND THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT IN SWAZILAND

The discourse of the domestic workers can best be understood when placed within its socio-political context. The discourse of domestic workers, when linked to the organization of Swazi society as it evolved in the colonial structuring, brings out clearly the people's understanding of their lives. The historical context is important if one is to understand how the domestic workers fared in the discourse and ordering of society that colonialism created in Swaziland. Lincoln (1989) argues that discourse is used to give authority in imperial situations. He points out that it is discourse of 'all forms - not only verbal, but also the symbolic discourses, of spectacle, gesture, costume, edifice, icon, musical performance, and the like' which are used to give power to a dominant group (Lincoln, 1989, p 4.). This is because these all bring out the discourse of the imperial power. In this chapter I will briefly look at the creation of the colonial discourse by discussing the interactions of the settlers with the Swazi monarchy in order for us to understand how the structured ordering of society that came with colonialism filtered down to the ordinary people. I will do this by discussing the concessions because they were the main reason for a creation of a discourse and power that resulted in 'competing' discourses, the imposition of colonialism, its educational system and language, in Swaziland. I will also look at the role of the monarchy in the concessions issue and the lives of the ordinary Swazi people.

Lincoln (1989) argues that power that legitimizes a certain group of people has an effect on all members of a society. Most of the women in this study were born after the colonial order had been established. Their reflections help us understand how interactions were between ordinary Swazis and the settlers. Some of them confirm that fear was the order of the day in their lives when they worked for the Boers.

The colonization of Swaziland by the British brought about the imposition of English into the country. English became the language of the courts, schools, banks and in many spheres of life. SiSwati, the language of the people of Swaziland, remained the language of the home. This created a dualism in that the Swazi people and their culture became dominated by British culture. Ngugi (1986) argues that colonialists wanted to control people and their wealth through language. He says:

> The real aim of colonialism was the control of people's wealth: what they produced, how they produced it, and how it was distributed; to control in other words, the entire realm of language and real life (Ngugi 1986, p. 16).

He sees language and control as the destruction of the people's text in areas of religion, culture, history geography and in the whole sphere of life of the people. To Ngugi, language encompases language as speech, as written signs and also language as seen in the relations of people. In this study we will look at language as Ngugi looks at it. The way people speak at the level of code and also in their relations. This means that such constructions as racism will be looked at in the way people related to each other within the context of domestic work.

In the case of Swaziland the major way in which language and power affected people was through the concessions. The people lost their land because they could no longer understand the discourse of their own country. When they took their children to schools, the children learned a foreign language. Since they could get jobs in the colonial government, this ended up being acceptable. Lincoln (1989) brings out clearly how the discourse of the colonialists became imposed on the discourse of the Swazis. He argues that there was a conflicting discourse especially in the way royalty was named. His argument brings out how the people of Swaziland were denied their right to protest. He says the disarming of all the Swazis in 1910 was a way of taking the power to protest from them. In this event, all Swazis who had guns had to submit them to the colonial office. This was Swaziland's 'pacification of the natives.'

THE SWAZI MONARCHY AND THE BOER AND BRITISH CONCESSIONAIRES

Essentially, Swazi traditional society was organized on feudal lines. The king held the land in trust for the nation and people got land because they showed allegiance to the king. Even today, it is still organized on these lines.

The granting of concessions is traced to King Mswati II in the eighteenth century when he allowed a few Boer farmers to come into Swaziland and graze their sheep. These farmers would come in from the Transvaal and bring in herds of sheep which would graze in Swaziland throughout the winter and then go back to the Transvaal in the summer. The period from 1880 to 1889 marked a surge in the

requests for concessions when gold was discovered in Swaziland. This was during the reign of King Mbadzeni. White people flocked to Swaziland, thinking that the discovery of gold would match that of the Gold Reef in Johannesburg (Matsebula, 1972). The concessions were for mining and all other types of industries that the white people could think of. This led to conflicts between the Boers and the British because the British were sometimes given mining rights on the land that the Boers had asked to graze their sheep on.

While the Swazis gave out land thinking they were creating relations with the white people, the domineering attitude of the whites started to be a problem when they ill treated the people. When Mbandzeni died in 1889, two thirds of Swazi Nation Land had been taken as concessions by whites.

An extract from a typical concession can help us look at the discourse of the colonial document so as to analyze its contents, relations and subjects. This extract is from the concession that Mbandzeni granted to Ryland in 1886. It reads:

Ryland (Swazi) Gold Mining Company, Limited

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

> The following copy of a concession, the property of the above Company, granted by the King of Swaziland on the 20th October 1886, is published for general information.
>
> Concession
>
> Grant made by me, Umbandine, son of Umswazie, King and Paramount Chief of the Swazie Nation, in conjunction and with due approval and consent of my Councillors in Council assembled to Robert Felix Ryland, Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society, known as Usikota, for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators or assigns. I, Umbandine, do certify that on this twenty fifth day (25) day of

October, one thousand eight hundred and eighty six 1886, in the presence of my Councillors and the subscribed witnesses, that I do hereby grant to Robert Felix Ryland, his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, full sole permission to explore, prospect, dig, or mine for minerals and precious stones, and to extract the same for his own use and benefit; also with right of erecting suitable machinery and appurtenances thereto, for such purpose, and the introduction of white labor on payment of ten shillings (10*s)* per annum, and the right to dismiss, discharge one or all of the employed and introduce others in their stead.

The tract of land which I, Umbandine, and Councillors do grant to the said Robert Felix Ryland, his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, is situate, to wit:-

From the junction of the great Usutu River and the Ukompies River to the Transvaal boundary, that is to say, all the land situate between the great Usutu River, the Ukompies River, and the Transvaal boundary, at a rental of fifty pounds (50*l*) sterling per annum, the first payment received by me this day. And it is further understood that on the discovery of payable alluvial gold or reef an additional sum of three thousand pounds (3,000*l*) shall be paid, as also rent of three hundred pounds (300*l*) per annum.

It is also understood that like sums be paid on the discovery of each succeeding reef that be discovered on the above described tract of country, preference always being given to the said Robert Felix Ryland, himself, heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns for fifty years.

It is also agreed to by me that the said Robert Felix Ryland shall have the sole and undisturbed right to cut timber for whatever purpose he may require from time to time; and also grant him full rights to cut watercourses and erect machinery, make roads, erect a store or stores, graze cattle and cultivate land or lands; but not in any way to interfere with cultivated gardens, kraals, or huts, the property of my subjects, without their full consent and permission. In making this grant I, Umbandine, do not alienate from my kingdom this or any part of it, but reserve intact the sovereignty of my dominion. The said Robert Felix Ryland, his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, shall not take any claim contrary or injurious to my right as sovereign of the country, but are to make any claim contrary or injurious to my right as sovereign of the country, but are to recognize my right authority as King, and to apply to me for such protection as he or she may require: and I engage to grant such protection as shall enable them to enjoy all lawful and proper use of the privileges granted to him by me. It is understood that this agreement is in ratification of one made by me on the twenty-second (22) November, eighteen hundred and eighty-four. I, Umbandine, regard this as binding on me and my successors

In witness thereof:

I, Umbandine, King and Paramount Chief of Swaziland, with the advice and consent of my Councillors in Council assembled, have hereunto affixed our marks in the presence of the witnesses whose names are attached to this document after the said document had been fully and properly interpreted to me and my said Councilors assembled as aforesaid. In the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six (1886) at this head kraal M'bepeleni.

At the end of the text of the agreement, those present when the concession was agreed upon appended their signatures. They were:

		his			his
(Signed)	UMBANDINE	X	Signed	ZANDHLANA	X
		mark.			mark.
		his			his
	TIKUBA	X		GWABABA	X
		mark.			mark.
		his			his
	UMBOZANA	X		MGIBEKI	X
		mark.			mark.
					his
Witnesses.				FOLOGWIZI	X
ANDREW SILILO					mark.
CHAS B. ACTON.					
G.S. TOWSONl					

(Parliamentary Papers of Swaziland, 1897).

The concessionaires introduced a new discourse on the land. They had their own ways of looking at things. The concession itself is a document that reveals a lot about the social context and its discourse. The discourse shows that it was the British

who wrote the document. This document brings out the social relations of power in Swaziland at this time very clearly. Mbandzeni is referred to as Paramount Chief, which was a title the British gave him. Instead of calling king, they argued that there could be no kings in the colonies. The Swazis were the only ones who regarded Mbanzeni as king. To use both King and Paramount Chief is to say 'King of the Swazis and Paramount Chief to the British.'

The name of Robert Felix Ryland also comes out with its Swazi counterpart 'Usikota (which means the wild unploughed land). While the British had their own names, the Swazis gave them names that had a meaning. Robert Felix Ryland is repeated several times in the concession, circumscribing him and his associates and attaching him to the social space demarcated by mentioning the rivers for all future prospects that the land might have.

A concession gave power to the white person, in this case Robert Felix Ryland, to mine, bring laborers, bring machinery, and relate to his employees in the manner he wanted to for the meagre sum of ten shillings a year. The clause on his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns gave him power to bring in other people if he did not want to be there himself. This established the absentee landlord system that Swaziland has had to deal with where land is owned by people who live in other countries.

From the signatures at the bottom of the concession, it becomes clear that the Swazis did not know how to write. They were there to append their 'marks,' which meant an X in the place of a signature. The misspelling of King Mbandzeni's name,

Sandlana Zwane's name and even Ryland's Swazi name USikota shows that it was not Swazis who wrote this document because the names are not correctly spelt. They are spelt according to the white people's distortion of the name.

This document gave the concessionnaire land which belonged to the nation without the consent of the people who occupied the land. While it is obvious that the Swazi King and his Councilors did not write the concessions, their role in the land issue remains very clear. They gave away the land of the people to the whites and agreed to enter into an agreement that adversely affected the Swazi people. The people found themselves living on land that was owned by the colonialists.

Lincoln (1989) points out that the unequal relations that were played out in the creation of these relationships might not have been clear to the Swazis when they were making crosses on the documents. These unequal relationships became clear when the Swazis tried to evoke some of the concessions in court. The courts favored the whites because such disputes could only be settled in the courts of white people.

The concessions were a new type of land tenure system in that people who understood the ownership and value of land along western traditions requested land from Swazi kings who thought that they were signing for land that was being granted in the Swazi way where people just settle without permanently owning the land. The need for having white people and their allegiance to the king was also thought of favorably because many neighboring Nguni states had lost land because they had attempted to fight the whites. By the late nineteeth century the Zulus had lost their power because the whites had established themselves in Natal and in the Transvaal.

The Swazis had already heard of this and were looking for entering into friendly interaction with the whites.

The antagonism between the Boers and the British as they fought for land led to the Swazis requesting Sir Theophilus Shepstone to come and be the king's mouth - piece among the white people. This led to the formation of the European Advisory Council, the body that formed the basis of the colonial structure in Swaziland. Boers and British continued to fight over control of Swaziland with the Boers increasing pressure because they wanted a passage to the sea. This led to the Swazis seeking British protection through deputations which were sent to England. In 1904, a dual suzerainty over Swaziland was granted through a convention that allowed the Boers and the British to administer Swaziland together. This is how the laws of the Transvaal, among them the Masters and Servants Ordinance, became part and parcel of Swazi Colonial Law throughout the Colonial period.

CREATION OF THE COLONIAL ORDER

The establishment of British rule in Swaziland happened under the jostling for power between the British and the Boers that took place under the Swaziland Convention of 1894. The Boers who had an ulterior motive, used the incident of the killing of Mbhabha (a Swazi leader who was killed by Mbadzeni) an excuse for invasion. This led to Swazis struggling for protection allying more with British protection in order to avoid Boer entry into Swaziland. The establishment of British protection over Swaziland resulted in a weakened monarchy. The king of Swaziland

became Paramount Chief under the Resident Commissioner. According to Lincoln (1989) all this took place during King Sobhuza II's youth (1899-1921). In this period, the Swazis were disarmed and taxes were imposed. He says:

> During the period of Sobhuza's minority (December 1899-December 1921), the power of the colonial administration increased dramatically, all firearms in the hands of Swazi were confiscated, the collection of taxes was expanded and regularized, the legality of crassly exploitative concessions (often granted under false pretenses) was ratified, and the land question was 'settled' by a ruling that assigned a full two thirds of Swaziland to white interests (Lincoln, 1989, p, 63).

Sobhuza came into a power structure in which the power of the monarchy was under that of the Resident Commissioner, a British official, who presided over the affairs of the nation and maintained order according to British understanding of politics. The European Advisory Council which had been formed to look at the issue of the concessions became the base of the colonial adminisration. Under British rule Swaziland became divided along racial lines. The legal system, educational system, government and many other spheres were divided. Most jobs in the colonial government were done by white people from the Transvaal or Britain. The Swaziland that Sobhuza II became king of when he was crowned in 1921 was one that was under colonial rule.

One of the ways that the settlers came into contact with the ordinary people in Swaziland was through domestic work. The coming of the colonial period created a need for money. The way whites and Blacks related to each other is brought out by Hilda Kuper. She says:

> The only other avenue of local employment is domestic service, which in 1938 absorbed 500 Swazi probably half of whom were women.

> Wages range from 10s. to 70s. per month, most domestics earning under 30s. per month, quarters and food being invariably provided. Domestic servants are in very close contact with the personal life of Europeans, and probably in no other occupation does the character of the employer so greatly influence the reaction of the workers. Some Europeans 'cannot keep a servant'; others are more fortunate - or - considerate - and have employed the same domestics for many years, permitting them periodically to go home to their kinsmen (Kuper, 1947, p. 14).

Kuper brings out how the culture of servitude came to be established. Whites hired the Swazis to work for them in their homes. This established the slave master culture that Swazis experienced in the homes of the Boers and the British. The Law of Masters and Servants was used to cement the relations of master and servants.

THE MISSIONARIES

The missionaries were a much smaller group of white people who did not get directly involved in Swazi politics. They were more interested in establishing schools and spreading the gospel. The establishment of the school in Mahamba in 1872 by the Methodist Church marked the introduction of education of Africans to Swaziland. Later, many denominations came in and established their schools. When Swaziland came out of the colonial period, there were Anglicans, Catholics, Evangelicals, Lutherans, Methodists and many others. Missionaries did not form a class of their own. They were a part of the white community that has to be looked at separately because their mission was somewhat different from that of the colonialists. While the others had concessions, the missionaries did not have. While the settlers were

looking for permanent settlement, most missionaries were sent out by religious groups to establish religious settlements and go back to their countries. This, however, does not mean that they could not settle in Swaziland if they requested permission from the king. The missionaries are also important because the settlements they created had a tremendous impact on people's lives. Mary tells how the missionaries came to their community to proselytize.

> The Catholics came riding on horses, male ones. They brought us avocado pears. We did not know them. There were none in this area. They would pray for us, going from homestead to homestead. The Catholics would be riding a horse. This one was riding a horse. Who was this white man? I forget, my child. It is old age! He would carry these avocado pears and say. 'Do you know this?' He would find us at home. We would eat and it would not taste nice, yet now we like the avocado pears so much. He would then preach to us, which is why I sent my daughter to school at the Catholic school. I then baptized her. My children were baptized at the Catholic church, Nkhosi. The man would say we should be believers, believe in Jesus. Then we would go to church. We went, taking the children. They would say if a child is born after ten days you should bring that child to the church for baptism. We would then walk, when we enter the door we would dip our hand in water and say,'Our father who is in heaven. Your name must be holy.'You have your hands like this all the time, and you bend your back. You do not close your eyes. Even when you pray you open your eyes. You touch here, starting with the head, and then where do you go? They say, 'mother of God.' You touch your chest. 'Holy Mary, mother of God.' Then it is the forehead. You touch the shoulders, to this one and this shoulder. You go to your chest and bring your hands together and say 'Amen.' They say it means to pray, Nkhosi. The Catholics say so.

In this text we see how the missionaries brought their own discourse of worship to the people of Swaziland who had no idea what Christianity was about. The introduction of the colonial order, religion and education to a people who were not literate resulted in the acceptance of the way of thinking of the colonialists. The

missionaries became agents of a western way of looking at the world. The way Mary tells the story brings out what a spectacle the white man who came on a horse was to young Swazi girls. She even noticed that the horses were male. The power of image as shown in the white man, the male horse, and what the message they were delivering was, polarizes the Christian and the non - Christian in that she gives us a full picture of the missionaries and says nothing about herself or her beliefs. This telling of the story portrays the scenario of a young Swazi girl fascinated by the presence of the missionaries and their message which had come to challenge the social values of the society and reduce them to a lower status.

Drawing from a historical event, Mary shows how the act of proselytizing was achieved through attracting children with small gifts by a people who symbolized the new order in society. The introduction of avocado pears to the lives of people who lived on Swazi Nation land was done as missionaries moved from place to place preaching to the people. Mary lived at the chief's homestead because her father was the brother of the chief. Her story shows how the missionaries interacted with the traditional Swazis on Swazi Nation Land.

Swazis believe in one God, Mkhulumncanti. This is a god who is unseen, just as God is in Christianity. While Christians believe in saints, Swazis believe in the ancestors, the people who died. They believe that these people intercede on their behalf to Mkhulumncanti. They do not pray to the ancestors in church, but elders will speak to the ancestors in times of good and bad. They slaughter beasts in honor of the ancestors. This is the religious text that Mary had when she encountered the

missionaries. The learning of a new religious text was a superimposition of a text upon text.

The learning of the religious text, both the symbolism of the dipping of hands in water and saying the words, '*Holy Mary, Mother of God,*' as one touches different parts of the body, bending one's back with one's eyes open, shows how a new discourse of looking at the individual and his/her spirituality were brought into the discourse of Swazis. This religious ritual and how it is performed was knowledge that the people had to learn with its inflexibility. The sequencing of the procedures had to be done right. This was a way of showing allegiance to a God that the people did not know existed. The girl-like fascination with this ritual came out in the way Mary kept trying to get right the sequence by constantly asking me how it is done as if I knew. The 'knowers' of the ritual had taught them what it was. She says, 'they say it is to pray. The Catholics say so,' meaning the procedures of making the sign of the cross and saying parts of the Catholic text. In this text we see how the woman got involved with the church and then sent her daughter to the Catholic boarding school.

The polarization of traditions that went on in Swaziland is clearly shown in this text. Westernization, religion and education came to be one thing and the traditions of the Swazis another. How education and religion came to be established as the main insignias of 'the civilized' also came out clearly in Mary's life in that she pointed out how her Catholic school educated daughter has a job and earns much more money than she does. She sent her daughter to the boarding school. The mission station, with a boarding school on its ground, became the main center for the

transmission of western culture. Children of Swazis learned western ways of living from everyday things such as food, respect, dress and etiquette. The main objective of preaching the gospel superseded everything.

Lindiwe, a woman who worked for the missionaries, told how they took her into domestic work after Standard IV (Grade 6) after attending night school in her home where only boys were sent to school. Lindiwe says:

> My home is at Ngudzeni. I am from Ngudzeni. I grew up looking after cattle. My parents just thought a girl cannot do well in school. They would send the boys. I looked after cattle and went to night school. I would go to school at night and look after cattle during the day. After some time I went to school during the day. I left school after Std IV and a white person from the mission took me and said I should work for her....She liked my ability to work hard. I worked fast. I worked on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. Wednesdays I did not work. I would sleep and she would bring me tea She would knock on the door and say I must not do anything. I must rest. Thursday, I would go to work. There were people who washed clothes. We would just iron. After two years I became pregnant and went home. Those who had made me pregnant did not look after the baby. I raised the child because my father bought me cattle with my money. Those days a cow was one pound ten shillings.

Lindiwe was the only woman who worked for a missionary in this study. Her life history brings out what working for the missionaries was like. It also brings out the practice of discrimination by parents in regards to whom they would send to school, sending boys but not girls. It touches on the issues of child support and the lives of women and their babies.

Lindiwe uses language which shows how she was objectified. She uses the passive and says 'she was taken' by the missionary. The construction of 'being taken' by white people in the study is a theme that links women with the master-slave

relationship of the colonial period in that the white person became the agent and did the action of taking. In this case the woman was telling what seemed to be a favourable breakthrough in her troubled life. The discrimination she had suffered at the hands of her parents is what made her see going into domestic work at the home of the missionary in a favorable manner. She had stopped going to school. Going into the household of the missionary would also mean breaking away from looking after cattle. She tells her story and brings out a different way of relating from that of other white people because she had a day off. She says in her time - table of duties she had a day - off when she was given tea in bed by the missionary. This was different treatment from what women who worked for the Boers and the British reported.

The relationship that Lindiwe tells about in her experience with the missionaries shows how they were viewed differently by the Swazis. While the missionaries were white, they were not seen in the same way as the colonial settlers who were the Boers and the British. Most of the land they settled on had not been taken by force from the people. They negotiated with the kings and chiefs because they had brought education, a needed resource in Swaziland. The dream of King Somhlolo, a king who ruled before Mswati the second, gave Swazis a text on which to lean in their attitude towards the white people. In his dream, he is said to have stated that the people with the hair like the tail of a horse would come with two things, a button and a book. He is said to have warned the nation not to take the

button, but to take the book. This created a favorable atmosphere for missionaries in all their encounters with the people.

Even though the missionaries did not employ a lot of women, they are an important category of white people in the transformation of the Swazi traditional text in women's lives and the imposition of the colonial order in that they brought western ideas that required people to accept in their consciousness the existence of a world order that was controlled by a God who looked like the people who were instituting the colonial order. The contribution of missionaries in the area of education and medicine is visible everywhere in Swaziland.

COLOREDS

Coloreds were another social stratum that is worth mentioning. Most of the Coloreds were the result of intermarriage between the Africans and the whites. The colonial government structured society along the racial lines established in the Transvaal, where Coloreds were given a higher status than Africans. The Coloreds, who were usually referred to as Eurafricans had their own schools.

There are no women who worked for Coloreds in the colonial period in this study. The mention of Coloreds by Mary is only in reference to the children of the farmer who left with her to go to South Africa. She tells how she was the one who informed the farmer's children about the death of the farmer. Her story brings out how the Colored stratum came into existence. She points out that the farmer she worked for had two families. He had children with a Colored woman before he

married his white wife. His white family was a second one. The telling of the story of these two families shows how the Coloreds became alienated from their parents and ended up struggling with weak claims on both the African side and the European side. This conflict of interests that arise out of interracial births continues to this day.

THE AFRICANS

The African population was stratified. There were the affluent Africans who could afford maids and the ordinary people who were employed as maids. The workers also worked for African employers in the sixties. In both cases, the people mentioned were South African teachers who came to teach at a high school in Swaziland. Swazis who were rich enough to employ workers were not many at this time. Losimilo and Tryphina worked for these Africans from South Africa. It is at one of these households that Tryphina learned how to sew. Losimilo said she worked for African teachers who worked at a school near her home. Among these were South Africans who came to Swaziland because of the shortage of teachers and also because they could not teach under the Bantu Education System of South Africa, which dictated syllabi that were controlled by the state.

The political situation and its discourse created a situation where the people found themselves having to deal with the colonial order and its racism on the one hand and the monarchy on the other. Most of the encounters with white people took place when Swazis went into wage employment. The creation of the colonial state and the imposition of taxes resulted in people having to go to work. The most

obvious places where they could get jobs were the farms, the towns, missions, and other places where there were white people. Going into employed labor meant a different thing for men and women. Boserup argues that women went into wage employment and occupied the lower stratas of jobs such as domestic work and weeding while men went into avenues such as tractor driving. In this study, apart from domestic work, the most available form of work for women was picking cotton on white people's farms.

In Southern Africa mining created a job sector that women could not go into. The men who could not get jobs in Swaziland would go to the mines in South Africa. Recruiting offices were built all over Swaziland and most countries in the region. The relationship between labor migration and the breakdown of the Southern African family has been discussed by many scholars. In this study, Nokuthula was raised by her grandparents because her parents were in Johannesburg. In her case it is not clear whether her father was a miner. Her mother also lived with her father in Johannesburg. She states clearly that her mother would have child after child and send them to her grandmother after a few years. She tells how she grew up and left school because she was pregnant after accepting favors from a boy in exchange for sex because the boy gave a little bit of money. She says:

> I grew up at my mother's home. Our grandmother brought us up....Myfather used to work in Johannesburg. My mother also lived in Johannesburg. She would come back once a year. She was just living there and having children. When one is older, she would leave the child with mygrandmother.... We were not eager to go to school because we were poor. We did not go far because we did not have a lot of things. They would beat us because we did not have school fees. We did not listen. I had a baby. After having a baby, I had to see what I could do.

Nokuthula used 'we', to bring out how all of them were brought up by their grandmother. The role of grandparents in the lives of the women brings out clearly how they became the sole support of children whose parents were working in different places. Nokuthula tells how her grandmother struggled with them. She told how she would sometimes take her own clothes and make clothes for them.

The poverty that came out of not having someone to look after their school needs comes out clearly in this text. The teachers, who are also indicated as 'they' would beat them for school fees. By pointing this out she makes clear how their suffering resulted in physical abuse at school from teachers who wanted them to pay school fees. Her part in the problem gets summarized as 'we did not listen.' This expression has a meaning behind it. It is her way of telling how she became pregnant and eventually had a baby and had to go into domestic work. In her story, she did not talk about the men in her life. She talked a lot about her children and grandchildren.

The stories of women who lived on Swazi Nation land show how they were born into a society that was patriarchal in that some of them could not go to school just because the parents did not value the education of girls. In some cases the girls did not have proper parenting because of the disruption of the society that came with labor migration.

THE REIGN OF KING SOBHUZA II

In order to understand the relationships of these groups to the monarchy, we need to look closely at the life of Sobhuza II and how he led his people out of colonialism. Sobhuza II grew to be a strong ruler in spite of the problems he

inherited from his successors. His grandmother, the Queen Regent Labotsibeni, who took over after the death of Bhunu in 1899 and served till Sobhuza was crowned in 1921, worked hard to create a Swaziland that put emphasis on education and creation of funds for the Swazi people. The main project that Labotsibeni started was that of sending miners to South Africa and having them contribute some of their money to the Swazi Nation Fund. It is money from this fund that she used to send Sobhuza II and other princes to the school the London Missionary Society had established in Lovedale in South Africa. Equipped with an education, Sobhuza II fared better under colonialism than his forefathers had done. He sent deputations to England to question the British on different issues, some of which were led by himself.

Sobhuza II got the support of the people, not just because of his own personal charisma, but also because the system of British indirect rule supported ruling people through their own political structures. The land issue became a bone of contention throughout his reign. In his time Swazis managed to buy back some of the land. He continued projects that the Queen Regent Labotsibeni started such as building schools for the Swazis and the buying back of land. Sobhuza relied on his own personal rule when he ruled Swaziland. Jackson calls it personal rule. He says:

> Personal rule is a system of relations linking rulers not with the 'public' or even with the ruled (at least not directly), but with patrons, associates, clients, supporters, and rivals, who constitute the 'system.' If personal rulers are restrained, it is by the limits of their personal authority and power and by the authority and power of patrons, associates, clients, supporters and - of course - rivals. The system is structured, so as to speak, not by institutions, but by the politicians themselves (Jackson and Rosberg, 1982 .19)

Sobhuza II became a legend to the people. His successes were exaggerated in different ways. His dealings with the colonialists were never really clear to the people of Swaziland, especially women. Women in the study revealed very little understanding of politics. The extract from Mary's life reveals how people understood issues such as the WWII and the land issue.

> There was a difference after the king came back with the land. They used to say the king has gone to get the land back, the land of Swaziland. He has gone with the soldiers. We were still young. We were scared thinking we would die. They would say the king has gone to the war. That is why, as you see, now we have this independence. It is here in Swaziland, my child. There are our people in jobs in Swaziland. The king is back. He has come back with his land. Instead of my ten shillings, there was a salary increase.

Mary thought the king was all - powerful. She said he 'came back with the land' meaning the coming of independence. She talks about the Second World War in a way that shows that she did not know what was going on because she was young. Even now, in her old age she does not know. Her life is typical of most uneducated women in Swaziland. They do not understand politics. Their everyday discourse does not involve analyzing political events. They do not know how 'the land was taken.' They just know that the king brought it back. They associate independence with a rise in salaries because they do not link their salaries to inflation as shown in Mary's last sentence. How the woman portrays King Sobhuza II as all powerful reveals how people created a legend out of him. Sobhuza led Swaziland out of colonialism and became a constitutional monarch, leading the Imbokodvo party because it supported the monarchy. Jackson and Rosberg say that this period lasted a short time. The constitution was repealed in 1973 because members of the

opposition had gained three seats. After the repeal of the constitution, Sobhuza adapted the traditional tinkhundla system where people sit under a tree and discuss political issues and made it the only avenue towards voicing ideas in parliament (Jackson and Rosberg, 1982). He banned all political parties and appropriated the power to choose some members of the cabinet himself.

THE EDUCATION OF AFRICANS DURING THE COLONIAL PERIOD

An understanding of educational policy in Africa in the colonial period is useful in that it provides a basis for understanding how the women's lives with language came to be shaped the way they were. Since Swaziland was administered by the British the policies that were created for Blacks in South Africa affected the Blacks in Swaziland. It should be noted that British policy was more or less similar throughout Africa.

In order to understand the education of women in Swaziland, it is important to place Swaziland's education within the whole of colonial education in Southern Africa from its inception. This is because the policies that were drawn by the British when the first school for Africans was built in the Cape in 1896 have been maintained with little adaptation up to this day. The reason for this has been the lack of critical analysis among African scholars and policy makers, a problem which characterizes every sphere of life in Swaziland.

Education came to Swaziland through the missionaries who started by writing languages of Africans while in South Africa. Their projects included the writing of

Xhosa, Ndebele, and Tswana. The missionaries wrote the languages with the help of African informants and printed the first books and proceeded to teach the people the message of salvation which was their main mission. This period goes back to the year 1819 when the London Missionary Society and the French Huguenots arrived in Southern Africa. This was before the colonies were officially established, a period before the main conflicts between the Dutch and the British became so heated that wars were fought. The establishment of the Cape as a British colony forced the Dutch to move to the interior where more colonies were established. It was in this colonial era that the issue of the education of Africans was taken over by government. This education policy came into effect in the late 20th century. The discovery of gold and diamonds resulted in a South Africa where there would be a viable economy that would need labor, so the question of how the state would organize its labor and structure relations of production that would enable industrialization had a lot to do with the question of the education of Africans. According to Loram (1917) Africans had to be taught the 'dignity of labor.' He says:

> As regards education for the Native, the only education he needs is to be taught to work. The dignity of labor is the lesson he needs to learn, by the way, which the white man cannot or will not do himself. Native schools are a mistake, but, if they must be established let them teach nothing but the three R's. As regards industrial education ....the native must not learn to do more than the heavier manual work. Nothing more could bring him into unfair competition with the white man. (Loram, 1917, p. 19)

Loram points out that the ideas about education for Africans were what brought missionaries and the government into conflict. The missionaries were fighting for educating the Africans so that they could read the word of God, while the

government was totally against education because it was thought that it was useless to educate the 'native.' It is the words of Sir Langham Dale's special report that Loram uses to put forward what came to be among the first policies that resemble apartheid when the government had finally resolved that the education of the Black South African could be undertaken. His report also emphasized segregation of the races.

> The only way to enable the groups (i.e. Europeans and Natives) to do their parts respectively in the social world is to provide instruction adapted to the needs of each: for the Native races ordinary school instruction and training in the workshop and in domestic industries. You may thus send forth into the labor market from year to year a fair supply of ordinary artisans and domestic servants, while the mass of the Colored races must fulfil the humbler tasks of agricultural laborers and shepherds; and climatic considerations point to the necessity of securing colored labor for outdoor occupations under semi-tropical sun. (cited in Loram, 1917. p. 51.)

The education of whites was meant to be different. They were educated to be masters of the Africans. Loram cites that Sir Langham Dale's Report:

> If the European race is to hold its supremacy, the school instruction of its children must not only be the best and most advanced, but it must be followed by a systematic training of the young colonists in directive intelligence to be brought to bear on all the industrial arts. As the future employers of labor, they need themselves to have practical experience in the productive interests as well as in the mechanical arts which if supplemented by a good commercial education will enable them to take their places as superintendents, foremen, and ultimately masters in trade, agriculture, manufactures and the constructive branches of the arts. The majority of the natives may be at the best qualified to do the rough work of artisans; but even this work must be under the direction of the guiding eye and hand of the skilled European, and it is the paramount duty to see that the colonist is well fitted for the exercise of this directive intelligence as the stranger who comes hither with the cultivation and energy and developed in the populous beehives of European industry. (cited in Loram 1917, p. 45)

It is obvious that the separation of the education of the whites and the Africans was meant to facilitate the creation of disparities that would result in the socio-economic differences that we find today.

THE EDUCATION OF AFRICANS IN SWAZILAND

The result of the implementation of the policies outlined above resulted in Africans getting very little money for education from the government. Very few schools that offered higher education were built. Lovedale, a school built by the London Missionary Society stands out among these. Since most Africans from neighboring countries went to this school, the education that the South Africans had designed for Africans became the standard for colonies that were established later.

In Swaziland, missionaries were very active in education. The first school was established by the Methodist Church at Mahamba. Later, the Queen Mother Labotsibeni organized the Swazi regiments to go and work in South Africa and established the Swazi National Fund which was used to subsidize the education of Swazis. Racism was an important feature of education in the colonial period. There were European schools, Colored schools for children of mixed blood and the so called Native schools for Africans. The Report on the Financial and Economic Situation on Swaziland shows that there was a disparity in the amount of money spent on education. While whites were fewer, more money was spent on their education. Table one shows the disparities in education in Swaziland in 1932.

TABLE2.1: TYPE OF SCHOOL AND AMOUNT SPENT BY THE GOVERNMENT: 1932

Type of Schools	Attendance (Number of Pupils)	Amount Spent (Pounds Sterling)
European Schools	507	6,441
Coloured Schools	55	700
Aided Native schools	2,970	2,500

Source: Report on the Financial Economic Situation in Swaziland: 1932. p.62

Of the 2,970 pupils in 'native' schools 1,100 were boys and 1,870 were girls. The amount of money spent on Africans was subsidized by 1,000 pounds which came from the Swazi National Fund. As we can see from this table, more government revenue was spent on the education of the children of white settlers than was spent on the children of Africans. The government spent on average 13 pounds per child on European and Colored schools. On the other hand, it spent only 84 cents per African child, which is about 15 times less than the expenditure on the 'superior' groups. It is obvious that the quality of education was also different. The report points out clearly that among whites there was a Compulsory Education Proclamation which did not apply to the Africans and Coloreds. The white students later went to the Transvaal for secondary education, where education was free.

Holleman (1962) shows that although there were many women who were enrolled in school in Swaziland throughout the colonial period, the bulk of them ended up becoming domestic workers because they did not go far with their education. Many men also ended up in domestic work even though the variety of occupations that they could go into was much larger as compared to options for

women. It is important to link the experiences of African women with language, literacy and work in that the deprivation of education shaped how their lives would turn out. The low literacy rate among Africans resulted in a large group of people who provided a cheap labor supply that was always available for domestic work.

How people such as domestic workers, were able to cope with language can be understood in relation to the way schooling influenced their experiences with language at work. The few years they spent in school were not enough for them to acquire good language skills. The ordinary people like domestic workers got closer to the colonial settlers when they went looking for jobs. Lobutimba says they would go to the surburbs of the white people and say, 'I want job' and they would say, 'what do you want?' She says she would reply and say the same thing. They would correct her and tell her to say she wants a job correctly. The study of domestic workers in colonial Swaziland brings out how the Swazis became servants during the colonial period and how they came into contact with the colonial masters and had to learn the language of the kitchens. It gives us a chance to look at language during the period and how it was used in the social construction of people in the social spaces they occupied.

SOCIETY IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

As mentioned earlier, Swaziland came out of colonialism under the leadership of Sobhuza II. He reigned until 1982. He was succeeded by Prince Makhosetive, who became King Mswat III. Young Makhosetive went to school in England and

became king in April 1986 at the age of nineteen. He is still king today. The problems of ruling the country in a situation that does not allow opposition are ones that will remain challenges for him unless he finds a solution. Swaziland remains the only country that has not instituted democracy in Southern Africa. The recent strikes are attempts by people to show that they want to have a voice in government. King Mswati III has always insisted on the Tinkhundla system that his father left.

The workers who are in domestic work in post-colonial Swaziland face a different situation from that of workers who were domestic workers in the colonial period. They work for a diversified group of employers which includes Coloreds, Chinese and an African elite which is largely made up of the up and coming Swazi elite and Africans from other countries. Domestic work, having come out of the colonial era, still reflects the slave master relationship of the time it came out of. It is a job in which relationships are clearly defined by the employer, who has control over the worker's understanding of the role that he/she has to play.

The white people who are employers of domestic workers in post-colonial Swaziland are people who come to work in companies and institutions like banks. They are often recruited by the companies they work for. They are well known as 'expatriates,' a word that means people who have left their own countries and bring skills that the locals do not have. Balibar and Wallerstein (1992) argue that racism in Africa can be understood by looking at relations between Africans and this group of white people. They say displacement can be understood when we look at how

Africans are constructed as objects in their interactions with these whites who become the subjects (p. 204). They say:

> Almost everywhere there is a group of whites holding high status and filling technical positions. Their prestige rank has scarcely changed since colonial rule. The local high rank of whites reflects the position of these countries in the world-economic-system where they are 'proletarian' nations, suffering the effects of unequal change (p. 197).

The language that the workers use in the homes of white people is English. Since the Boers left at the end of the colonial period their language was only used up to the end of that period. In this study, Hluphekile, Khabonina and Sibongile said they worked for white people. Most of these employers come and go. They do not settle in Swaziland. They are usually on short contracts which last for less than five years.

Another group that the domestic workers mentioned is that of Africans who cannot speak siSwati. The need for educated personnel resulted in the recruitment of personnel from all over Africa. Africans from the rest of Africa come to work in companies, teach in schools, work at the universities and many other spheres that need manpower. These are the people that domestic workers like Senanile worked for. She said that she worked for a Nigerian family. Others include Ugandans, Kenyans, Tanzanians and many other people. These people do not speak siSwati. English is the language that domestic workers use when they speak to them.

The post colonial period in Swaziland is a period of the rise of the Swazi elite. This is a group of people who lived lives as their colonial masters did. Having servants is a practice that has lived on since the days of slavery. This group of people

does not question the moral values that are attached to having a servant. Women who are working in post colonial Swaziland complained about how they were discriminated against because they are from the countryside and did not know life in the city.

Another group of employers the women mentioned is the Colored population. The separation of Coloreds from the Swazi-speaking employers is necessary. Colonialism created a stratum called Colored for the offspring of African and European intermarriages. Initially, they were called EuroAfricans. It is much later that they came to be known as Coloreds. Coloreds were treated differently from Africans in the colonial period. That is why some of them still see themselves as different up to this day. The workers also saw them as different. Sibongile, Thandi and Fikile reported that they worked for Coloreds.

Women in the study also mentioned working for the Chinese. Hluphekile worked for Chinese employers at the Agricultural Project. It is possible that these could be people from Taiwan. To Swazi women, someone from Taiwan and someone from mainland China is the same. Even the employers who employed Sibongile, though called Chinese, could have been from Taiwan. Swaziland has had a relationship with Taiwan for a long time. Chinese in this study could mean Taiwanese.

The last category of people is that of the ordinary Swazi people. These are the Swazi people who do not have a high education. Some of them are illiterate. If they have any education, it is just a few years of schooling. This category of people is no

different from the one referred to in colonial Swaziland. The older domestic workers who are forty five are still there. People who are well off in today's Swaziland are the Swazis who are educated. They can afford whatever they want while the ordinary people are still poor. The poor people from the rural areas flock to the towns in search of jobs. They get employed in such work as domestic work. Life on Swazi Nation Land still follows the Swazi way. There are still medicine men and people still observe the dances and celebrations of the Swazis. They still pay allegiance to the chiefs and the king as it has always been. The disparity of the gap between the ordinary people and the elite is very wide. The elite speaks English while the rest of the people speak siSwati. To create a history together these gaps would have to be closed. The knowledge of women of history can be brought out in Lobutimba's understanding of how the white people left Swaziland.

> When independence came we heard that the white people are leaving Swaziland. We did not know how many were leaving, or even where they were going. We did not know the years when they flocked to Swaziland or why they came or what was happening. I do not even remember how they left. I do not remember how they just disappeared because I do not remember a day when someone said they are going by bus. We just saw the white people gone. Nothing. They had gone. We knew the ones in the suburbs because I stayed in town. You could count the ones who remained. Africans started to come in.

Lobutimba is talking about a period in history. She reflects how she does not know what happened. People like her will never know their own ability to talk about life factually as long as they live in a world that is divided the way Swaziland is. The homes of the domestic workers who are working in post-colonial Swaziland are in places like KaLanga in Siteki, Mbekelweni, Madvubeni and many other rural areas

of Swaziland. Education in post colonial Swaziland is still like it was in the colonial period. People still have to pay to send their children to school. The medium of instruction is still English. The schools of the colonialists' children became English medium schools, which means they use English as the medium of instruction. Most of the elite send their children to these schools.

LANGUAGE AND POST-COLONIALISM IN SWAZILAND

The use of language that was created by the colonialists still prevails in Swaziland. English is still the language of power. The attitude of the educated Swazis towards English is one of idolizing the language. The British accent is considered the epitome of success. In circles of the educated, life is reduced to the linguistic.

English also creates disparities in the society in that those who know it are the ones who get the best jobs. They work as lawyers, nurses, teachers and the like. The ordinary people who do not know English end up in low income jobs like domestic work. The lives of these people have to be looked at closely so that we can see how they use language in their everyday lives. In this study we will look at people who work in domestic work and hear how they are treated and also how language is used in the job they do in people's houses.

Ngugi points out that the use of language that has been transmitted through history creates a double identity for Africans. It maintains the alienation of the self that was created during colonialism because people still have to use one language at

work and come home and use another. He argues for a shifting of the center from an western oriented life to a life that is centered in an African identity (Ngugi, 1993).

Like educated Africans in many African countries that were colonized by the British, the educated Swazis are caught up in a double bind. They have to use the language of the people who once colonized them in the courts, schools, business, and the like. They have to live with the fact that this is not their mother tongue. Social development means development in one's language. The educated Swazis do not have that opportunity.

In this chapter we have looked at the arrival of the colonialists and also looked at the role of the monarchy and how the land was given to the Boer and British farmers. By looking at the colonial period we have seen how the Swazi text was displaced by the colonial text. We have also looked at the different groups of people that make up Swazi society. The next chapter is on the literature review.

CHAPTER III
REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ON NARRATIVE AND LANGUAGE

This chapter discusses ways of looking at language and how narratives are useful in bringing out people's experiences in a socio-political situation. Many writers have pointed out the importance of narratives in studies about policy. Among these are Brown (1987), Fairclough (1989) and Olrik, (1992). Brown points out that it is important to examine linguistic capabilities of people in a sociopolitical context, especially low income groups because they do not make their own choices in the languages that they speak. Such examination will allow us to see how members of these groups go about being creators of the self in their own socio-political context. He points out that sociolinguistic studies have the obligation to do this. He says:

> By investigating the linguistic capacities of persons, sociolinguistics presumes their agency as creators of language and culture. Analyses of language may illuminate this question especially if we relate them to broader social structural political issues. In this ...wediscuss theories that apply the methods of linguistics to microsociological studies of speech behavior. Our task is to relate this work to the rich ethnographic literature on culture of low-income groups, and then place this amalgam in a larger political-economic context- a moral and political commitment (Brown, 1989 p.10)

He goes on to point out that Labov did similar work and the conclusions he made illuminate some of the problems that people in low-income groups have with language. Labov observed that 'The main speech problem for low-income people is not that they cannot express themselves effectively, but that others too often control the situation in which they are expected to speak' (Labov, 1972 p.19). What Labov says is true of domestic work, especially in the colonial period. Workers could not

just speak to their employers. They were afraid that they would be fired. This meant that they would go on living under unpleasant situations and not talk about them. A woman who worked for eighteen years in domestic work said:

> A long time ago even if you had a problem, you could not call a white person and talk to him. If you called a white person, they would show you the way home and tell you to leave....There was nothing you could say because if you say anything you would be sacked....It was the law. Whites were above blacks.

In colonial Swaziland, race was the main reason why the employers had power. The Boers practiced apartheid, a system which bestows power on the basis of the color of the skin. The British system of colonial rule was also based on discrimination. The Black workers were silenced when they interacted with their employers. The silencing of workers throughout colonialism became a feature that marks domestic work in that even in post-colonial Swaziland, workers feel disempowered. They are violated by employers who even use physical violence on them.

The silencing of domestic workers also resulted from not knowing the language of the employers. In the colonial period, the languages of the Boer and British employers were a barrier to communication. The employees would even rely on the children of their employers in order to understand what was said. A look at the experiences of domestic workers reveals the many ways they used in order to understand and be understood in a social situation in which they were disempowered. Another writer who discusses the use of narrative in explaining issues of policy is Olrik. He makes two important observations.

> The primary task of oral narrative research is to understand the narrative as part of human intellectual life. The secondary task of oral narrative research is to use the narrative as evidence of external conditions such as social structure, working and political events (Olrik 1992 p. 1).

From these discussions it becomes clear that the experience of social groups can be studied through narratives which can be used to project policy issues that affect the individuals in their political situation. The narratives of domestic workers show how they are a product of a sociopolitical situation that did not favor the women because they were Africans and also because they were women. The low allocation of funds for the education of Africans resulted in very low numbers of enrollment. Women also did not go to school because their parents did not value the education of girls. Misfortunes such as sickness and early pregnancy were also a problem. Nokuthula blamed her inability to continue in school on poverty.

> I grew up at my maternal grandmother's home. Our grandmother brought us up... My father used to work in Johannesburg. My mother also stayed in Johannesburg. She would come back once a year. We were poor. We were not that eager to go to school because we were poor. We did not go far because we did not have a lot of things.

This woman's narrative brings out the problem of the poor family structure that is caused by the migrant labor system in Southern Africa. Children are left with old people who struggle, trying to do the work of parents. These children are deprived of the love and guidance of parents and end up having problems. Nokuthula said that she ended up getting pregnant and had to leave school. The narratives of women revealed struggles under social conditions that are difficult. Looking at these reveal different types of living conditions that shape the narrative

of the person. An analysis of the narratives brings out a clearer understanding of how women fared under different socio-political conditions.

Tollefson (1991) also points out the need for studies in language policy which take from the real experiences of people. He says that the language of social science research 'dehumanizes' people in that they are referred to with research terminology which reports on 'subjects', 'populations' as if the people were not human beings who can express themselves. This argument points out the need for narrative research that will show that language situations of people can be told through their own experiences.

In this study I look at a group of low income women who live within a socio-political context in which the social relations that were established during the colonial period are maintained to the present day. The social stratification that was created during colonialism is referred to as dualism in a manner which does not bring out the inequalities that exist in society. It usually describes the fact that Swazi society is divided into two distinct ways of life; a traditional and a western way of life. Most studies do not show how these two ways of life interact in a way that recreates dependency of one on the other. It is through critical studies that look at social situations that we can see how people relate to each other. This study of domestic work was done to bring out how people's texts are socially constructed through unequal relations of power that reflect issues of race, class, and gender. I chose the institution of domestic work because it gives one a chance to see how power is constructed through language in this institution which is largely a woman's world.

Cock (1976) points out that what is unique about domestic work is that it is the domination of women by women based on race and class. I interviewed women who worked during the colonial period in order to arrive at a sociohistorical construction of domestic work and language. I also interviewed women who are now working as domestic workers in post colonial Swaziland in order to link social constructions of language and work over a period of time in today's Swaziland which has the Africans as members of the elite.

THE INSTITUTION OF DOMESTIC WORK AND ITS SOCIAL TEXTS

Brown argues that institutions are normal forms of social conduct. He says that institutions have languages and codes of their own. They have scriptural texts and behavioral texts. They have verbal codes which are transpersonal and historical. He says:

> Institutions are not things, nor are they merely ways of doing things, they are also grammars that account for these ways of acting.... To institutionalize a behavior means not only to regularize its performance but also to provide models, normative justifications and sanctions. In this sense social institutions, like paradigms in science, are expressive vehicles for exemplary definitions of normalcy and deviance, recipes of duties and obligations and syntaxes of self or of signs whose values are interdependent or diacritical (Brown, 1989 p.122).

Brown (1987) states that an institution has its own 'overdetermined' text which is filled with ways of speaking that are maintained with rigidity. He says an institution is a 'narrow constricted world in which characters are uniform because they can articulate themselves only through rigid rules and 'reified symbols'. He says that life is regulated by the 'reigning grammar' (p. 122). What Brown says about an

institution applies to domestic work in Southern Africa. It is a life that is lived in the same building, under the same authority, using a grammar of the self that has its own grammar. The way the Masters and Servants Law was used created a legacy of an institution that is controlled by the employer even though when the law was instituted it was supposed to help in mediation between masters and their slaves because of the conflicts that took place after the emancipation of slaves in the mid-nineteenth century (Bundy, 1979). It is by studying lives that we can get to understand the institution of domestic work and how its rigidity affects people's lives.

NARRATIVES AS SOCIAL TEXTS

Brown (1987) argues that a narrative reflects larger social text. He says by studying the social narrative we can reveal how 'historical forms of consciousness' come to be forms of oppression that people deal with on a day to day basis (p.122). This is because narratives are ways of shaping one's destiny. As people talk they represent themselves and their lived experience. They portray themselves as they struggle under the orders of their employers at work. Narratives of women about domestic work provide information on how the women confronted the choices inherent in their actual historical possibilities as they tried to control their destiny. They are a 'telling of the self', representing their experiences as 'the real world' (p. 122). Brown sees the exercise of deconstructing people's lives as a moral obligation.

> The intelligibility of our moral and political life depends on the restoration of narrative discourse. This is because the sense and meaning of individual acts are construed through attributions of motive and intentions that depend on temporal contexts and roles and identity

> and on the larger moral traditions of which these contexts are a part. Though they might be cast in terms of psychological science, attributions of motive presuppose a narrative logic that gives moral meaning to particular acts and unity and continuity to particular lives. Narrative thereby links personal conduct with the possible impersonal good of the community by showing that past actions are causes of the present and that the future is a potential extension of present conduct.

What Brown says is somewhat similar to Fairclough's theory of understanding the text. Fairclough (1989) thinks that a text can be understood through a method of discourse analysis he calls critical language study (CLS). He argues that the text can best be understood when we look at the social conditions that involve two things: social conditions of production and social conditions of interpretation.

> In seeing language as discourse and as social practice, one is committing oneself not just to analyzing texts, nor just to analyzing processes of production and interpretation, but to analyzing the relationship between texts, processes, and their social conditions and linking them to the immediate conditions of the situational context and the more remote conditions of institutional and social structures (Fairclough, 1989 p. 26).

Although Fairclough does not dwell on narrative, his method of discourse analysis is useful in understanding the narrative as a text that reflects what is happening in the society (Fairclough, 1989 p 26). Losimilo had this to say:

> I was born in 1930. When I was born the school in my area had just started. I went to school for a short time. I started when I was twelve years old. After I passed Standard III because our home was built on a Boer's farm we had to go and work for the 'plaas' for six months and we would come back after six months. So this Boer took me.

This woman's narrative shows how she had to leave school and go and work on the farms of the Boer who owned the land on which their homestead was built. The requirement of the Law of Masters and Servants was that children of the land-

tenants should go and work and not be paid. If they did not want to go, the family would have to move away from the land. The power of the Boers over the workers was upheld by colonialism, which was a system of oppression that was founded on racial discrimination. Analyzing the text and placing it in the social situation by looking at the laws that guided relationships between the families of land-tenants and those of the white settlers brings out clearly how the narrative is a product of a social situation and also how it reflects the discourse of the social situation. The language of the workers shows that they had accepted the conditions under which they were taken. Being children they were in a very difficult situation. Getting into such oppressive situations at such an early age might have led to the docile acceptance of oppression by the Boers.

Looking at the text for issues of power and domination is useful because it ties in narratives with the bigger picture of things. The narrative is seen as a reflection of the society because it reflects its ideology. If we look at narratives this way we can understand institutions and how they reflect the whole society better. What Fairclough (1989)says outlines a process for studying texts. He says they can be understood through description, interpretation and explanation. By analyzing texts following Brown and Fairclough's theory oppressive situations can be revealed for what they are through narrative in that narratives depict the discourse of the situation. The speaking persons are the ones whose word attests to the vagaries of living under the situation. Advocating for change is made with word of testimony that bears witness to the lives of the oppressed.

LIFE HISTORIES AS SOCIAL TEXTS

In this study the life histories of women were looked at as narratives of experience that could give women a voice. This was done so that the women can validate their experiences by 'telling it like it is.' They got a chance to recreate interactions between them and their employers which made them producers of the discourse about a work area in which there are a lot of silences (Olsen, 1987).

Watson and Watson Franke (1985) point out the importance of looking at life histories and how they 'show the individual as a component of a larger system of structural relationships whose ongoing functioning and patterned meanings maintain society in a state of internal equilibrium as well as adaptation to its external environment' (p.1). What they say is useful in linking the narrative and the life history in that the narratives of the domestic workers will be drawn from life histories of the women, which shows that the narrative and the life history are not mutually exclusive. This means that the policy planner would want to use the life history as an illustration of how the individual 'occupies successively and simultaneously a series of defined roles for which he or she is socialized and whose proper realization has functionally adaptive consequence (Watson and Watson-Franke, 1985).' The social texts allow us to look at how social control is successful in producing people who can maintain a system the way it has been designed in their social functioning (Denzin 1989).

Life histories are useful because they give individuals a chance to express their experience. In this study the women got a chance to tell stories about domestic work

and talk about language and their experiences with it at work and in the larger society. Their narratives showed how the narrative is determined by the social text and how it represents it. They showed how one woman's experience of domestic work is similar yet different from another in many ways. In this study life histories are used to bring out information on domestic work and what women who went into it experienced. The excerpts from their corpus are analyzed for ways in which power is maintained. Strategies for creating difference such as naming, lexical choices, codes, are examined. The women's lives reveal how language is a part of a person's life as women tell how they experience language and discriminations in hospitals, churches and the like.

The women's stories will be analyzed for their discourse. Narrative has a structure that shows the intentions of the teller. Labov (1972) outlines ways of looking at narratives that are applicable in many situations. He divides the narrative into parts such as the abstract, the coda, the orientation and the evaluation (Labov, 1972). In this study Labov's method of looking at narrative will be used in order to look at the way women tell their narratives.

Scholars who have studied interactions of people have a lot to contribute to a study of women at work. The language of the life history lends itself to different types of analyses that bring out how power is constructed at work. Women tell of their interactions with their employers in ways that bring out clearly the struggles involved. Goodwin (1990) studied the interactions of young girls and came out with different ways that the girls structure their talk. This study is very useful when one

wants to look at how people construct themselves in a social situation because it spells out the structures that are used. She identified different types of activities such as *directives, argument, instigating and stories (p 9).*

What makes this study important is that it clearly articulates the strategies that are used in a way that helps one understand the construction of social talk and also evaluate it for talk that is powerful or powerless. Domestic workers recreated typical interactions between the worker and the employer in a way that shows that the latter used directives when speaking to the maid. Mary Gama said:

> 'Do this and this. Go and work. Go and clean the stove. Go and work in the room. You have not done well here.' You are with the 'mesisi'. The man is gone. There is no rest. She touches the surface. 'You have not cleaned this here'. She says, 'here it is dirty'. She touches here. 'You were not doing anything'. She is speaking Zulu. I do not know English.

Mary Gama used directives in the way they were used by her employer. In this excerpt the presence of the employer is felt as she uses the present tense, telling the worker what to do as they check things in order to see if they have been done according to the requirements that the employer had stipulated. The analysis that Goodwin (1990) does is useful in that typical structures can be analyzed in order to show who has power in the social situation that is reconstructed in the narrative. In the study of life and domestic work it is important to look at the lives of the women and point out how they construct themselves at work by looking at the situation, the language, and experience as they are constructed by people placing themselves in social space through their interactions.

West and Zimmermann (1983) also studied language and power and pointed out that the structures such as questions, topic changes, and turn taking reveal who has power in social talk. The breakdown of conversation into structures that are observable enables one to think about language and social interaction and issues of power in a much more objective way. In this study, since the construction of the social situation is done by the workers, one has to rely on them and their construction of a situation and interpret it from what they say. West and Zimmermann identified questions as structures that are powerful. In the data from workers the situation gave power to the employer. The kind of questions that the employers asked could not be asked by workers. In her syntax of the self Losimilo brought out the following questions:

Waar kom jy?
(Where do you come from?)
Waar was jy gistermidag?
(Where were you yesterday.)

These questions are in Afrikaans, which shows how the workers would mark speakers in their discourse and bring out the ethnic background of the speakers in their dialogue. Brown (1987) argues that in an institution, the worker's time belongs to the employer. The workers had to be answerable for time and how it was used. They could not ask the employers the same questions. What West and Zimmermann say about questions is useful because it enables us to examine data that are presented by the workers by looking at the structures that were used and to link these with the meaning that is being created in the situation the worker is describing. The issues

of language and domination come out clearly in the replays of typical conversations between the worker and the employer as retold from the perspective of the women.

Perinbanayagam (1991) argues that conversations between people bring out how people relate to each other in that each person constructs his/her world as they interact. He says this self construction brings out social issues because people bring out their conflicts. He sees the self as 'an assemblage of signs, a more or less coherent text that a mind claims as its own and identifies as a presence in the world of others (p. 12).' He argues that everyday conversations mirror the social relationships that the people are in when they enter into conversation. He says:

> ...conversations constitute procedures by which selves are given shape and substance. Conversations lead to the emergence of selves, and selves in turn create conversations. In and through reciprocal conversation, two selves reveal what each wants to be taken as: together they not only find each other, but themselves as well (p, xi).

What Perinbanayagam says is true of domestic workers and their employers. As they enter into conversation the self as constructed in the social situation has a role that clearly dictates how one is to relate to the other. The day a worker arrives, she is told what to do. From that first day, the duties as outlined are to be carried out as the employer says. The everyday conversations mirror the social setting. It recreates how the domestic worker and the employer view each other. By studying their conversations we can see how the worker reveals herself to the employer and vice versa. According to Perinbanayagam (1991) it is by looking at the stories and sentences that people choose to talk about in a situation that we can learn what it is that creates 'presence, interactional resonance and engagement.' Perinbanayagam

(1991) thinks that it is through discourse that we can understand how people relate to each other because they encounter each other through it. He says people's discourse becomes personalized in their use of language. Through language they express themselves in discourse styles that bring out their individual creativity. Perinbanayagam calls the discourse that a person uses to carry out his/her intentions a discursive act. He says that a discursive act is a combination of the linguistic, literary and vocal structures that a person selects when interacting with the other. He says:

> In so far as discourses are capable of producing richer and more complex differentiations and similarities than visual signs, they become powerful methods of constituting and sustaining the maxisign that is the self. These discourses are artfully assembled as acts composed for the responsive attention of others. The self, in fact, is constituted in a signifying discursive medium, a discursive culture in which every word and sentence, every tonation and intonation, pause and emphasis, metaphor and metonymy, syntax and symbolism, defines it and qualifies it in small or not so small ways....The self, in fact hears and sees around it other selves that produce signs in and through discourse, every one of which is redolent with meaning for the conceptualization and estimation of the speaking and the listening self. In and through such discursive acts, the ontological representation of complex ideas is achieved by equally complex representational processes (p.15).

The discourse that is produced by domestic workers and their employers can be understood when we look at it as discursive acts. As workers relate to their employers they use syntactic devices, literary devices and many other ways of signifying that bring out the self in relation to the other at work. Discursive acts are made up of 'forms of discourses p. 113).' According to Perinbanayagam these include orders, commands, assertions, instructions, requests, accounts, jokes, teasings, scoldings, complaints, and many others. This breakdown of discourse acts is useful

in that it gives one a way of dealing with the forms of discourse that workers and their employers use in relation to each other.

In the life histories of workers, one sees a lot of discourse forms. When employers require a worker to do something, they do so through commands. Imperatives are used by workers when they tell how they were called. Tryphina, one of the domestic workers I interviewed said the employer would say, 'Annie, *Kom!* (Come! in Afrikaans). She said on hearing this command, the worker had to run. In this study, I will use Perinbanayagam's break-down of discursive acts in showing how workers constructed themselves in their relations with their employers. A command such as 'Annie, *Kom!*' reveals the way the Boer employers related to the domestic workers. The command is not a neutral structure in conversation. It gives power to the person who utters it. The recipient had to do as the person who commands wishes. Not to do so is an offence that can lead to expulsion. In this social situation, the Boers had power over the workers because the Boers were white. White people had power in colonial Swaziland. This command brings out the relations of power as constructed in the social setting. The domestic worker represents the Black people. She had no choice, because when you have no power you have no choice. You do as you are told.

The verb is in Afrikaans because at that time there were Afrikaaners in Swaziland. The Boer employers used Afrikaans. The Black people had to understand what was said. Structures such as imperatives that are in Afrikaans were used by different women to bring out what life was like in colonial Swaziland. This

expression links the narrative with the sociohistorical situation that it represents. As the domestic worker and the employer interact in the life histories of women, one gets a chance to see the person who was on the receiving end of all instruction tell what it was like. She gets a chance to shift positions and weave the story in and out of the two personas that she tells about.

Chafe (1980) looks at the linguistic presentation of discourse about a narrative and brings out how different structures are used in talking about the pear stories. In that study one learns how different people tell the pear stories differently, bringing out their cultural background in attention to detail. I am more interested in the discussions of the different structures used in the discussion of the stories. Strodt-Lopez used discursive acts such as the narrative to analyze lectures. Her study shows that it is possible to be eclectic and use many methods in the analysis of discourse and bring out how the discourse recreates the social situation. Her study used Labov's narrative successfully. I intend to use Labov' method of narrative analysis in the manner she used it. I will also concentrate on Labov's evaluative devices and show how the workers bring out the most important points in their narratives.

Perinbanayagam (1991) also sees the narrative as a discursive act. In this study narratives as discursive acts will be looked at using Labov's analysis (1972). Some of the analysis will also take Polanyi's approach (1979). Labov says a story has an abstract, which provides a summary, an orientation, which identifies place and time, persons and situations. The evaluation indicates the point of interest of the narrative. A narrative also has a complicating action, which explains the problem faced by the

people. The result gives the outcome of the narrative and the coda signals the end of the story. Labov's analysis looks at narratives as texts. The parts of the narrative tend to have corresponding grammatical structures that people use in narrating. I will table the parts and the corresponding structures as they are discussed by Strodt-Lopez (1993).

Strodt-Lopez's Analysis of Narrative Structure

Strodt-Lopez's Narrative Structure	Identifiable Syntactic Structures
The Abstract What in a nutshell is this story about?	familiar evaluative adjective, adverb, noun that repeats the maxim
Orientation who, what, when, where?	adverbials, statives, progressives, perfective who, verbs, evaluative adjectives, adverbs and nouns
Complicating action Then what happened?	conjunctions, subjects, complements, locative adverbs, temporal adverbials, quasimodals like start, begin, keep, used to, want.
Evaluation How is this interesting?	nouns adjectives expressing emotion such as good, bad, happy.
Result What finally happened?	nouns, pronouns
Coda That's it; Let's come back to us now.	(intensifies, adjectives, nouns, adverbs) all repeat what the result says

Strodt-Lopez articulates each of the parts that were first identified by Labov through a short question and then links each part to some structures that can be used to identify the part in a story. This outline should not be taken to correspond to Labov's analysis or even Strodt-Lopez's closely. I have elaborated on it in order to

make it even simpler and more accessible to use. The narrative that is called The Story of the Lost Ring, which was told by Siphiwe is an example. The discussion will look at how the narrative reflects the social setting as stated in Brown (1987).

The Story of the Lost Ring

Abstract:	The ring got lost. Even then the baby, their only baby because they had just had a baby. They used to leave the baby to play. And this baby was very young.
Orientation:	This baby played with the ring when she was up in the bedroom of their mother. I don't know but it fell down because I found it one day. I was cleaning a trench. There was a trench outside. It fell out. The woman thought the ring was in the bedroom because the baby was playing in the bedroom. It got lost for three weeks. The woman said 'sisi,'look for my ring until you find it or else.' She would not say or else what. I did not care because I did not know where it was. I did not look for it. It got lost for three weeks. Even this woman, I think it came to her that I had taken the ring because I saw the way she was difficult to me. I am, I am, I saw it in the trench. There is sand in the trench. There is grass. It is another thing.
Complicating Action:	The following day I gave it to her. She said, 'where does my ring come from, 'sisi?' It is like this.' I said it was in the trench. She said, 'that can never happen. In that trench? What put it there because the baby was playing with it in the house?'
Evaluation:	Oh, it was bad.
Coda:	It was bad about the ring.
Result:	She called her husband and said, 'my ring is here. It comes back looking bad.' I don't know what she meant. The man called me because he was nice. He said, 'sisi' where did you find the ring? I told him that I found it in the trench.

According to Labov, this story was told to show how things became bad because of the ring which got lost. The evaluation shows why the woman told the story. When this woman told me this story I had asked her if there was any thing she remembered that happened at this household because she had just told me that these employers were the kindest that she had ever worked for. Even though I had initiated her telling, her story brings out the relations of power in the household. She brings out how she was brought into the story as a person who should find the ring yet she was not there when it got lost.

The domestic worker constructs the story of the ring in a way which tells about the participants, their rights and how they were violated. This brings out the social organization in the home. The grammatical constructions she uses are important because they bring out clearly how language is used to create a social setting and its participants. She uses syntactic structures and links them with the participants in ways which tell how the story illustrates conflict resolution in this speech community.

The abstract has the noun 'baby' repeated several times which shows clearly that the baby was the main cause of the ring's disappearance. The ring and the baby occur in this part of the narrative because they are important in the telling. The verb 'lost' is linked to its object 'ring' in the abstract. These are important in understanding how the story starts. The baby and its parents, who are important participants, are stated in the abstract in a way which links them to each other in 'the baby' and 'they'. The relationships in the story are also brought out. The baby is linked to the parents through a possessive 'their' and a quantitative adjective 'only.'

This brings out the nuances about the baby and why they 'leave the baby to play.' Linking two verbs 'play' and 'lost' leads to the action that is the most important in the story; the disappearance of the ring. These verbs have a cause and effect relation between them. The baby played and the ring was lost.

She sets the scene of the actions of playing by telling about the 'bedroom.' The way she links the possessive to the parents brings out the cultural nuance that in siSwati, even though the mother is the mother of one baby, she is seen as a mother to many. She says the baby was up in the bedroom of 'their mother.' Swazi culture constructs people as related to others. Plural definitions such as this one are not necessarily seen as ungrammatical in cases like this. The verbs used show the worker doing her duty, cleaning the trench. She provides a lot of information about the setting to bring out how the woman was mistaken and thought the ring was in the house. The nouns trench and bedroom and how they relate to each other are necessary in explaining how the setting was also a problem in that the ring fell into the trench.

She uses time, 'three weeks,' to show how long the ring was in the trench. This is important for the reaction of the woman to the tarnished ring. It is important also for explaining the change of attitude and daily reaction of the woman. The woman used to threaten her in that time with 'or else.' 'Or else' is a threat that creates options for the one threatened. The way she constructs how she saw the ring by repeating 'I am,' expresses the hesitancy and brings the act of seeing and the

person seeing into the listener's focus. Her use of the present tense in reconstructing 'I am' recreates the experience and brings it to the present period.

In the end she brings out how her right was violated. She was not believed when she had a right to be believed because she was telling the truth. She was also falsely accused by the woman's question when she calls her husband and says, 'my ring is here. It comes back looking bad.' Her criticism of the ring reflected on the person who had found it. It was tantamount to an accusation. It created a contradiction in that the same person who said her ring should be looked for ended up casting her doubts on the person who found the ring. The personalities of the people come out very clearly in the telling. All the questions are asked by the woman. She is the one who is creating the confrontation through questioning and not believing answers she is told. The domestic worker brought out how being a maid is about being asked questions one cannot even answer. The right to ask is appropriated by the employer. Even when the maid has questions as revealed in 'I don't know what she meant,' she did not ask. Her social position places her in the role of the silenced person. The hierarchical structure between the man and his wife is brought out in that the woman interacts with the baby and the maid more. They are the symbols of work in the household. The maid is the one who runs the home and does duties and the baby is the one who is cared for. The man finally judges the situation. His judgement is linked to his personality. This story sets out the relations of power in the home and in the society itself. This narrative brings out the social

situation. It dramatizes the relations of power in domestic work in a way that shows how the employer has power.

Polanyi (1979) looks at narrative differently. She emphasizes that a story is a story because it tells the listener the point the story-teller wants to emphasize. The story-teller is negotiating his/her point by pointing out that his/her story is worth telling. He breaks down the story into a proposal for meaning, introduction, and support from the text and evaluative devices.

If this story is analyzed according to Polanyi's method, the propositional meaning would be how the ring brought about problems in a peaceful situation. The introduction would be the beginning, where she tells how the baby lost the ring. The rest of the text provides support as the teller creates the situation for the reader. In this study a narrative will be looked at according to these methods and then evaluated for how it reflects the social players and the social situation. I will concentrate on evaluative measures, the abstract and the complicating action and use Polanyi's proposition of meaning in most of my arguments.

Another way of looking at how people talk about social settings will be looking at subjects in the stories. In this research I will investigate relationships between workers and the other people they interact with. I will use the theory of 'intersubjectivity.' It looks at the 'ongoing intrinsic inner awareness and responsiveness to the continuous existence of the other or others and the expectation of mutuality (Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver and Surrey, 1991, p. 61).' People create each other as subjects and objects. When people create others as objects, they see

them as 'separate from the self' (p. 140). They are not seen as 'a subject with his or her own comprehensive personal construction of continuous reality.' When they are created as subjects, they are seen as people who have their own 'frame of reference.' When people who see each other as subjects and objects interact, they create 'mutual intersubjectivity,' a situation where 'one is both affecting the other and being affected by the other. One extends oneself to the other and one is receptive to the impact of the other.' Interactions in which there is mutual intersubjectivity are those where there is 'responding to and affecting the other's state, receptivity and active initiative toward the other.' This shows a balance of power between interactants. In this study women's stories will be examined to see who the subjects are and who the objects are. In the following example Cebile says:

> I thought everything was different,...the way whites do things. They told me that I had to change because I was from the country. She said this place is not like home. I have to change and do things the way they are done in the city.

If Cebile's discourse is analyzed for subjects the sentences will be written one after the other to bring out the subjects at the beginning:

Cebile: I thought everything was different,...the way whites do things.
They told me that I had to change because I was from the country.
She said this place is not like home.
I have to change and do things the way they are done in the city.

The subjects are 'I' and the other interactant is created as 'they' or 'she.' Cebile was talking about how she was treated differently when she was working for a woman who had employed her. In the first sentence she is reflecting on her

thoughts in this situation. She then tells in indirect speech using laminator verbs 'told' and 'said' what the woman said to her (Goodwin, 1990, p. 90). The woman told her to change and also that this was not a place like home. The last sentence also continues to tell what else the woman said she should do. She constructs herself as the subject in the last sentence in a way which brings out that a subject can be one that is constructed by another in situations where there is mutual subjectivity. Such subjectivity does not create people as responsible subjects who are engaged in changing their lives.

LANGUAGE AND THE EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN

The studies of language and gender have focussed on how women and men use language differently. In her study on language and gender, Lakoff argues that male and female language is different. She looked at how the English language is used by women and how it portrays women. Her conclusion is that it is the way women are taught to use language that puts them at a disadvantage (Lakoff, 1976). Much of the criticism of Lakoff's study is based on the fact that she argues on the basis of difference, an argument which weakened her stance on this very serious issue. The issues of race, class and gender combine synergistically in the creation of oppression in the lives of Swazi women who are domestic workers. For someone studying issues of language and work in Africa, the fact that scholars like Lakoff leave out the issues of race and class make it difficult to use their theory of language and gender in a way that can make the issues of language and work in domestic work

clear. This study is a useful study in that it brings out the importance of language and gender in social situations by looking at language at the level of discourse. Kramarae (1981) contends that it is very important to present the argument of male and female language within a language and power framework that reflects the struggles of domination and subordination that exist in the real world. She points out that the dominant group creates a view of the world that favors it.

> Over the years a dominant group may generate a communication system that supports its conception of the world and then call it the language of the society, while at the same time subjecting others to experiences that do not reflect their interests (p.3).

Her analysis is based on 'muted group theory'. She says that what Shirley Ardener and Edwin Ardener (1975) point out is true of social situations. 'Muted group' theory advances that talk is hierarchical and male dominated. Kramarae says women - including other members of society who are dominated - exist as a muted group because the social norms of talk are not set by them.

> The language of a particular culture does not serve all its speakers equally, for not all speakers contribute in an equal fashion to its formulation. Women (and members of other subordinate groups) are not as free or as able as men are to say what they wish, when and where they wish, because the words and the norms for their use have been formulated by the dominant group, men. So women cannot as easily or as directly articulate their experiences as men can (p. 1).

In her study Kramarae takes ideas from a number of fields including religion, psychology and anthropology. Picking up the argument, Coates (1986) points out that language is used by men and women to show power struggles. In her study she looks at the difference in male-female language and points out that these differences are also reflected in conversation. She says:

> Language is one of the means by which individuals locate themselves in social space. Speech is an act of identity: when we speak, one of the things we do is identify ourselves as male or female (p. 41)

It is such theories of language and power that have strengthened arguments on male-female language. This is because they show that social talk is a power struggle. While studies of language and gender have focussed on language and gender as constructed by western scholars, they are helpful in understanding issues of language and power in non-western situations in that one pays close attention to how social talk is constructed in a social setting along gender lines. Domestic work is work that is female-dominated. The workers interact with their employers who are women. It is interesting to look at how women construct themselves as 'master' when they interact with their servants. While they may not use the same words in this 'master-servant' relationship, the power issues end up constructed in the master-slave traditional way. Oppression is oppression whether it is practiced by men or women. The theory of language and power is useful in analyzing women's stories in that it brings out how they are gendered in the social creation of their roles. They tell of lives lived in social situations as people who are treated as less valuable than men.

Domestic workers are a 'muted group' not because of their sex only. Issues of class, race and sex interact in making them a 'muted group.' This concept of 'muted groups' bring in the issue of voices. The ability to express oneself through the voice is a right that needs to be exercised. People who are silenced are deprived of the power to express themselves. By looking at voice in the narratives we can understand who has the right to say what and how. Bakhtin (1981) says:

> My voice gives the illusion of unity to what I say; I am, in face, constantly expressing a plenitude of meanings, some intended, others of which I am unaware (p 88).

This means that a person's speech is made up of many voices that bring out the people who have interacted with him/her. In this study the domestic workers will be viewed the way Horton (1994) looks at character. They will be looked at as people who are speaking persons creating a discourse that has multiple voices that came out of the culture of domestic work (p. 29). The voices of speakers will be examined to bring out which group is silenced and which group speaks and also what it is that it says. Thinking of women as a silenced group enables one to look at social silences critically and give women a chance to create themselves through their narratives.

LANGUAGE, THE SELF AND INSTRUMENTAL COMPETENCE AT WORK

In this study work is used as a domain that uses language. The concept of language domains helps us understand how narrative can be studied in specified social contexts. It brings down the arguments on language to the level of social institutions. Fasold (1984) sees domains as 'constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants.' These domains are found within the social institutions people live in. It is these social institutions human beings have created that should be the main focus of language studies. This study focuses on work as a domain in which language and power are socially constructed in a way that affects workers. This study looks at micro issues by focussing on the situations the workers raise about how they are affected by language at work, and then looks at how the workers are affected by

language in the society by looking at their experiences in church, hospitals and the like.

It is by looking at social situations that the issues of power can be understood as they are constituted linguistically in people's everyday lives. Since language is the principal means by which interactions take place, the social discourse is important because it tells us how society, through ideology, has shaped the way individuals should behave in different social contexts.

In this study of domestic workers I look at domestic work as a socially constructed work area. Looking at language and work is important in that it enables us to place people within a linguistic setting of what Roberts, Davies and Jupp (1992) call a 'strategic research site,' which is terminology they borrow from Gumperz (1982). Language and domestic work provides a setting which enables one to study issues of power and language within a language domain in which the individual's position is already compromised by the fact that she is a worker. The issues of work and how it exerts power on human beings has been looked at by Martin-Baro. He points out that work applies pressures on personal experience that need to be looked at closely so that the individual can be able to understand him/herself on a day to day basis.

> To work is not only to apply a series of thoughts and abilities so as to satisfy one's own need; to work is first and foremost to make oneself through the act of transforming reality. In the web of interpersonal intergroupal relations that work introduces, one encounters oneself or becomes alienated from oneself. In either instance, the formal meaning of the activity is pierced by a sense that is not decipherable from the measurable surface - yet absent a comprehension of this intangible

> substance, little or nothing can be understood about human existence (p. 39).

Everyday discourse is important in that it can link language and work in a way that can help people understand the issues of power at work and bring about changes in their lives. This means that through studies of language and the self at work, we can contribute to a body of knowledge that seeks to liberate the self as a person goes about in interactions with other people (Martin-Baro, 1994). What Martin-Baro says is useful because it illuminates how work affects the individual at the level of the self.

In order to understand how language relates to the self and work, it is useful to look at the self as divided into Spindler and Spindler's definition of the self. Spindler and Spindler (1994) break the self into the enduring self, the situated self and the endangered self. They define the enduring self and say:

> The enduring self is that sense of continuity one has with one's past - a personal continuity in experience, meaning, and social identity. It provides the ego-syntonic functions of the self - and functions as an integrating principle of the personality phenotype....The situated self may be thought of as encompassing those aspects of the person as he or she copes with the everyday exigencies of life. This self is situated and contextualized. The self is linked to the attainment of ends defined within the framework of a lifeway or social context. If this sense of self (the enduring self) is violated too often and too strongly by the requirements of the situated self that is constructed as and as an adaptive response to situational contexts, the enduring self will be damaged or even endangered (Spindler and Spindler, 1994, p. 14,15).

These divisions of the self are useful because they help us understand that people go into a situation with constructions of who they are. When they are in the situation they construct themselves as who they are in that situation. The lives of

domestic workers reveal a pattern of selves that can be looked at as Spindler and Spindler look at the self. They bring their own meaning to the situation and then construct it according to the given meaning. Constant violations result in uncertainties that threatened how they perform.

Spindler and Spindler argue that people who are in a work situation should feel that they can do the job. They should have instrumental competence, a concept they refer to as self-efficacy. Their definition of self-efficacy brings out what instrumental competence is. They say:

> We define self-efficacy as a prediction that one will be able to meet the demands of the situation effectively....It is constructed of self-determined perceptions and predictions of behavior that interact with those of others in situations....Instrumental competence requires that one understands what activities are linked to what goals and how to perform the activities. Self efficacy is expectation that one can exhibit instrumental competence in the appropriate context (Spindler and Spindler, 1994, p 24).

In this study of domestic workers, the self will be looked at from these different levels. The workers are seen as people who bring in a past perspective of themselves and then adapt to the demands of the situation. They adapt to the situation according to their ability to bring out the expectations of employers. The role of language in this is that it is a means by which people relate. When they talk about their experiences they bring out a self-perspective that is linked to how well they performed at work. The ability to do one's job well depends on one's understanding of one's situations. The domain of work provides a setting where selves adapt themselves as they reveal how the task is performed. Doing everything

well produces a self-image that is positive and not doing it well produces a self-image that is negative.

Schiffrin (1987) looks at language and argues that it is power in that it can be used to dictate actions. This means that within a socially constructed situation we can understand the interactants by looking at how they use language. Schiffrin puts forward a way of looking at language that makes it easy to see how a situation can be studied in context in order to show how it is linked to the actions of human beings.

1. Language is potentially sensitive to all of the social contexts in which is occurs, and even more strongly, language reflects those contexts because it helps to constitute them (p. 5).
2. Language is always communicative....because it is directed to a recipient (immediate or eventual), because it is intended to be so directed or because it is attended by a recipient (p. 6).
3. Discourse is a linguistic structure which can be studied with methods that linguists have devised. Discourse has meaning, which is arrived at when one looks at 'both the propositional meanings displayed by cohesive ties and the inferences and understandings derived through application of contextual and pragmatic principles' (p. 6).
4. Language is a vehicle through which a range of different functions can be realized - functions which differ markedly from the referential function (the transmittal of information about the world to one who does not share that information) and also the fact that functions of language influence its structure (p. 10).

What Schiffrin says about language reflects how people can use language to direct the actions of others. The power of language derives from the structures that exist in institutions. Schiffrin discusses different structures that people use in discourse such as 'you know,' 'but', 'because,' and many others and shows how they are used in creating meaning between speakers. Language is power in that it reflects the hierarchical structuring of social situations. In situations where there are class differences, language reflects the class differences because the powerless become the

ones who experience language as a force that is used to give directions. The interactions of workers also reveal power that is constructed along racial lines. Thandi outlined the instructions that she was given when she went to work for a Boer.

> There is no food. You cook your own porridge. I will give you brown sugar. The fruits that are outside are not to be eaten. If you see any eggs in the yard, you take them and bring them in....Youdo not touch our food. The bread we eat you do not touch. You do not eat out of our dishes.

The language that was addressed to the worker in this excerpt shows how the employer exercised power over the worker. She used it to create a hierarchical structure that created difference. The worker is referred to as 'you' throughout the excerpt. She created difference through the type of food that the worker would eat. She stated clearly what she could and could not do. The racism expressed in this excerpt reveals the attitude of the Boer employer towards the Black domestic worker. Blacks could not eat out of the dishes of their employers. In this case the worker said she had to wipe food off a plate and eat from the sink. Difference was created through delineations of 'our and yours.' When Schiffrin says that language is directed at recipients, it comes out clearly in an extract such as this one that people relate to each other through language. They recreate themselves as subjects. The interactions of domestic workers and their employers show what Schifrin points out in that they are seen in interactions which give power to the employer. They dictate what is supposed to be done through different ways of instituting power in the social situation. All talk is directed at a recipient, a worker who has to know what action

to take when they hear the instruction. The hierarchy is created through the class structure that exists in the social setting.

In this study language means parole. Ferdinand deSaussure, a Swiss linguist separated language into langue and parole. Ferdinand deSaussure regarded langue as a system or code as different from actual language use. It is the same for all members of a language community. It is also the social side of language as opposed to parole, which is specific to a particular individual (Littlejohn, 1989). In this study English and siSwati are codes which can be regarded as langue, meaning that they are nationally chosen languages that are spoken in political entities that are designated. Language also refers to speech. Speech is used to accomplish purposes. Speech is practical language. It is conversation or discourse. By discourse we mean a unit larger than a sentence (Pope 1995). Sociolinguists have looked at language and how it is linked to culture. In looking at the narratives of women domestic workers, I am looking at language as discourse of the self and how it is articulated and also how these articulations can help us view the cultural context the speaker is talking about. I am also looking at the social development of the individual and the transformation of the self with the aim of arriving at the possibility for social transformation of lives that can be arrived at through language policy. This will be accomplished by looking at their texts and discussing what they reveal about the self.

This study touches on issues of work and class. Class is used in the way that Karl Marx expressed it. According to Marx, social class is based on the positions that people hold in relation to the means of production. They are either owners of the

means of production or workers who sell their labor (Dye, 1983). In Swaziland, among the Swazis themselves there are no big industries to enable one to argue strictly along Karl Marx's lines. However the Black bourgeoisie that occupies better positions because of its education is seen differently from the ordinary worker that sells his/her labor in jobs such as domestic work, weeding in the plantations and the like. When we talk of class differences, we are creating difference on the bases of social indicators such as income and a higher standard of living. Language is linked to class because the power that people have enable them to employ servants. Bakhtin (1981) points out that every speaking person represents a language and its class. In order to see people and their language the issues of class make it easy to look at relationships at work.

In most places, English is the language of work in Swaziland. It is the language used for commerce, education, technology and parliament. The people who do not speak English are at a disadvantage because of this. This affects mainly those who did not have a chance to go to school. Swaziland has an illiteracy rate of around 40%. Most people who occupy low income jobs are virtually uneducated.

In this chapter I have discussed ideas regarding narrative, language, work and stated how they will be used to study the discourse of domestic workers in Swaziland. Through the use of ideas on subjectivity and objectivity, language theory, theories of voices, discursive acts and many others, I try to analyze the language of domestic workers and discuss how they are constructed in ways which bring out power between employer and employee. In this study domestic work is seen as a social institution

which is also constructed linguistically. By studying the narratives of women we can understand how people's lives at work are constructed through language. Chapter IV deals with the methodology.

CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

In looking at social contexts it is important to bring the people who interact into focus by studying closely what happens in their lives. Qualitative studies give us an opportunity to examine people's experiences closely and draw conclusions that are illuminating for policy studies. This chapter discusses how life histories were recorded and analyzed for evidence of experiences at work and the role of language in the lives of domestic workers in Swaziland.

In this study I focused on domestic workers and how language affects their daily lives at work. The life histories of the women were recorded in siSwati and analyzed at the level of narrative in order to get specific information on how language affects women at work. The narrative analysis followed the method stated by Roe (1986). The life history of the worker is used as the main source of information, from which a thematic analysis of issues is made. These issues were analyzed in the narratives and show how the situation of language in Swaziland affects the women in their everyday lives.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

There are seven major questions which this research seeks to address. They are questions which center on trying to understand the social construction of domestic work as understood by the workers involved in it. These questions are:

1) What are the relations of power in domestic work?

2) How are the relations of power maintained in domestic work?

3) How does language reflect these relations of power?

4) How do domestic workers view the world of domestic work?

5) How did the situation of domestic workers come to be the way it is?

6) What do the narratives of workers tell us about domestic work and the social situation in Swaziland?

7. What do the narratives reveal about the language situation in Swaziland and emergent policy-making?

I decided to use interviews so that I would be able to interact with people in Swaziland and get authentic data for the study. The interactions with the workers were an opportunity to create knowledge that gives a voice to people.

These research questions were answered by looking at the lives of the women for evidence of the relations of power and how these came into existence. The consciousness of the women and how they view domestic work relies on how they tell of their experiences. The language used by the worker is studied for evidence of words that show how they interpret their experience.

THE PILOT STUDY

I did a pilot study to see how the research method would work. In my pilot study I interviewed three South African women living in East Lansing whose ages were between 25 and 45. They were interviewed for their experiences with language in South Africa. From these interviews I learned a lot that I applied in the present

study. I learned that the life history of each woman is different. Even though the ideology of apartheid had affected each woman's life, the experiences were as different as the personal ideologies of the women.

The women's aspirations for their children were an area that I found brought out a lot about a woman's ideas on language and how it is linked to people's experience. It gave me an insight into how women interpret language and society in a futuristic sense. Nowhere were women's ideas as explicit about language as a personal policy that they shape as when they were talking about language and their children. They made practical choices that they felt would empower their children in their cultural settings when they were older. I discovered that language choices are constantly being made in the home. Women participate actively in shaping language use in this domain. One woman who decided that she would teach her children Shangaan argued that she did not want them to lose their roots:

> Shangaan is their future because they have to have roots these kids. If I teach them English only, you will find they don't belong anywhere. They will not fit in with whites and when they are among the Shangaans they will also not fit in with them. Shangaan is their roots.

In this example the woman refers to Shangaan, the language of the Tsonga people which is now commonly known as Tsonga. I realized that women make choices about language where their children are concerned because they see themselves as people who can make decisions on behalf of their children. These decisions give one a lot of insight into how women look at the country and trends with language. They also reflect the socio-economic issues that link lives with language in a practical sense.

I observed that I had to opt for a conversational interview in soliciting answers because asking questions in an interrogative manner would not work. It was culturally impossible because it has an intimidating effect. The interaction with Senteni shows how the interviews went.

S: Please tell me about your life, your home and where it was.
A: My life, we were born to real Swazis. I was born to Swazis at a place called Mkhitsini. We lived because we had cattle, goats and we also had fields. We ate home food, real Swazi food, not going to school. We had a chance to learn a little bit, enough just to learn *a, e, i, o, u* only because the land we live in belonged to Boers. We were taken when we were young and went to stay with the Boers. There is nothing we did. We did not get a chance to go to school. I can say we only went as far as first year.
S: Were you picking up what you learned?
A: There was a church that we used to pray in. Those who were older than us used to help us so that we can read the bible.
S: What church was it? What denomination?
A: It was the Congregation church.
S: It was the Congregation.
A: That is the one we were learning at.
S: You were learning, but where were you when you had classes.
A: We had classes in the church building. We would start at nine, and then come out. We would learn a little bit and then go and sleep.
S: Did you have books?
A: There were these spelling books, the red ones. We used to write in slates.
S: Where did you get these spelling books?
A: They were bought in town.
S: Each person has his/her own?
A: Yes, each person has his/her own.
S: What language did you learn.
A: Is it not Zulu? We learnt Zulu.
S: Who was teaching you?
A: The person was a preacher.
S: It is a man.
A: Yes it was a man.
S: How old were you at that time?

A: I don't know how old I was because it means I cannot know how old I was because we were people who did not count years. The slightest idea I have about that time is what the Boer knew. He said in 1931 I was fourteen, in that year.
S: How old do you think you were when you were in school?
A: It means we were very young because our busts did not develop as fast. I had not 'broken' in '31.

In this data Senteni (A) is creating responses in question and answer interactions that lead to a fuller picture. I realized the need to give a speaker time in turn-taking so that she could shape responses herself because in the pilot study I constantly had to hold back from filling in words for someone. This was a skill I had to train myself in. Listening became an area I had to work on because I am generally quick to rescue someone and shape the text together with them.

REFLECTIONS ON THE INTERVIEWING PROCESS AND DATA GATHERING

Using interviewing as a means of collecting data meant engaging in a process which is a shared activity; a process which results in two people relating to each other in talk. Tannen (1992) points out that the interviewer 'participates in sensemaking' which is what I did when the domestic worker tells me her life history. Tannen says that there is 'mutual sense making, a response to image and the power of images to communicate meaning and emotions as residing in the power of the teller to evoke scenes' (p. 329). She postulates that there are three levels of self-involvement; that of the speaker as she tries to remind herself; interpersonal involvement which is between speaker and hearer and involvement of the speaker in what is talked about. This is involvement with the events as they happened. I experienced a fourth level

of involvement as a listener in some situations that were talked about where a woman would make me feel removed from her in what I call involvement with the listener as the 'other'. Tannen says:

> It is the creation of shared meaning that unites the individuals socially, in a community and personally, in relationships. Conversely, it is through the creation of a shared world of images that individual meaning is created (1992, p. 32)

In the construction of the narratives I was an active participant and I asked questions. I shaped the interviews in that I asked the women to tell me their life histories from a spatio-temporal perspective (telling me where they lived and what they did at the time). I found this information useful when asking questions about language because it gave me an outline of the places where the person had lived so that I could ask questions about language at that place. It turned out that language was used differently in different places depending on the language that the people spoke and the linguistic competence of the worker.

I also participated as listener. Women would interact with me personally, especially those I knew prior to doing the study. There would be times when they would interact with me as a fellow Black person, especially on issues of racism. They would create themselves as 'you' in a way that brought me into the context. I would become 'you' as different from them when they bring out issues of class. Lobutimba said:

> A white person will understand you and answer you. You educated people are silly, let me say that. You think your education did not come from us, your parents. You just became educated. You are like this because of your mother. She was doing this so that you cannot be like her.

The way she uses you in the first sentence brings out the 'you' that is 'me' as a Black person. It is a 'you' that is inclusive of both of us. The 'you' in the second sentence is not inclusive. She becomes different when I am seen as a member of a class of educated people. Listening to these differences in the construction of our selves made me realize that our worlds were different, even though similar in some respects. It made clear the question of having to investigate language and the centering of identities for people within the same polity.

Interviewing the women led me into the homes of Swazis that I did not usually mix with. Being a member of the Swazi elite, I tended to mix with the educated Swazis who speak English as I do. I identified women for the study by asking questions in the locality. I would tell people what I was doing and ask them if they knew women who worked as domestic workers during the colonial period. Those who knew such people would talk to the people and find out if they had worked in Swaziland.

In interviewing some of the women, I was exposed to information that I did not know existed. The situation that Cebile, the daughter of a medicine man, grew up in was strange to me. The vocabulary she used, even though it was in my language was very difficult for me because it is jargon that only medicine men/women speak. It was a chance for me to get an education in an area that I might have never come across if I had not done the research.

I would also go out to talk with people in other settings, especially in crowded places where women work like the market. I once went to the market in Mahlanya

to buy fruit and started talking to one woman. I could tell from the way she talked that she was a good story teller. I was buying pineapples from her. Some were fifty cents and others were a rand. She agreed to sell all of them for fifty cents. Her reason was 'because the children of the widow must eat. I saw the soldier go down six foot deep. What can I do? Stand here for the whole day?' I decided to ask her questions about domestic work. She laughed her lungs out and told me the story of Gladys. Gladys was a co-worker where she once worked for a white woman. The white woman had a tough time giving her instructions. They would bake cakes which they would have to throw away because Gladys had not followed the instructions. This woman worked for the white woman and watched Gladys make many mistakes over a long period. However, when I tried to make an appointment with her, she refused. I went to her homestead three times trying to get an appointment, and she still refused. The last time I went, she told me that she did not want to have her voice talking in a tape recorder after she had died. She was scared of the tape recorder. I started to be sensitive towards women's reactions to the tape recorders I was using. I would observe their reaction and then put the tape recorder where it would not disturb them, rather than risk them being frightened throughout the interview. This tended to calm those who were scared.

Another problem came with the recording of time. The women did not keep diaries. I had to use major events such as WW II, the birth of their children and the like in trying to establish dates. This made estimating time very difficult. There were times when I needed to be more focused in terms of time in order to understand

what the women were talking about, especially when I was linking their stories to the Law of Masters and Servants.

The fact that the interviews were done during elections made some of the older women afraid to participate. They would relax when I told them that the study did not have anything to do with the elections. I told them that I wanted to know about language and how it was used when they were at work.

The use of the tape recorder presented its own limitations. Since I was an active participant, a lot of gesticulation and eye contact was lost. Some of this data is valuable because it gives specific answers. I asked Mary how many months she worked in domestic work and she said, 'they were these,' showing me on her hand the number and using an expression that is familiar to me because we speak the same language. Since I was looking at her at the time, I knew how many years it was, but when I transcribed the data I could no longer figure out what she had said because the number was never mentioned. When a tape recorder is used, a lot of the gestures and body language are lost because it is a medium of recording that relies on voice. I learned from this that interacting with someone in a conversational interview is a physical activity. Reconstructing data through the transcript leaves out a lot of relevant data.

Interviewing is involvement that the interviewer has to go into with an open mind. There are a lot of issues that need to be taken into consideration in the engagement of selves as interviewer and interviewee. The text that results is an interactive linguistic text. As an interactive text, it is a product of persons in

interaction with other people. I wondered how the women viewed me as I reflected on the addresses they used such as 'sisi' (sister), 'Nkhosi' (king), 'my child,' or even 'child of my child'. While all these are forms of direct address that are always used in the society. I wondered if they were still the same when we both navigated the terrain of the woman's story.

TRANSCRIPTION

The data were transcribed verbatim. Three dots in a line meant that the writer left out some information that was thought of as redundant or irrelevant within a sentence. At the beginning of sentences four dots were used. Bozzoli (1991) uses a similar method of transcription. This method was useful because I was not taking a structural approach to the narratives where I would have had to count turns and the like. I was more interested in the life as a social text of linguistic experience. This enabled me to single out the socio-political issues. This does not mean that I do not value other methods of transcription. It was a question of what was useful for this study. I did not count pauses or time them. I concentrated on turn-taking. I was mostly interested in the content.

There are limitations in translating from one language to the other. In this study I tried to translate as closely as possible, trying to bring out the nuances of siSwati into the English language. I would solicit opinions from other Swazis with problematic words. One of the major problems is translating text from a language that does not have male-female pronouns. I had to constantly refer to the previous

information to know if it is a man or a woman in cases where I had not asked the person. Another example that kept coming up is 'umlumbi.' There is no equivalent in English for this word that is one word in siSwati. I decided to use 'white person' where they have used this word. Ideophones were also a problem. The word 'bhaca!' is the sound of a letter being put on the counter. It carries a lot of cultural meaning that I cannot interpret in words. There is no equivalent for it in English. The fact that language is culture became very clear in such cases.

I have translated most of the siSwati speech into English. However where women would speak and then switch to another language I had to use italics. I felt that there would be no difference between my translation and the woman's speech if I did not indicate these words differently.

SUBJECTS OF STUDY

A total of twenty domestic workers were interviewed. Ten were above the age of 45 and 10 were below. The selection of women was based on purposeful sampling. I used pseudonyms for the names of women in order to create anonymity. I have used typical names that are used in Swaziland in naming them.

Each woman was interviewed, and her life history with language at the work place was recorded in siSwati and later transcribed and translated into English. Each interview was structured into sections which established a) biographical data and a focussed life history; b) experiences at work and specific questions on experiences with language at work and c) perceptions of experiences at work and the role of

language and how it is used in Swaziland. After the interview, I gave each woman a token amount of E10.00 for showing appreciation for the time they had taken for taking part in the study. I decided on this after doing about five interviews and realizing how much of their time I took, and also after realizing that it was the time they could have used to go and do some work. For example, Linah used to sell some frozen ice during the day. However, since I was coming to interview her, she had to stay at home and wait for me.

DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The table below summarizes the biographical data of the participants. The employers are coded as follows: Missionaries 0, Boers 1, British 2, Africans in the colonial period 3, Whites in post colonial Swaziland 4, Chinese 5, non siSwati speaking African 6, Colored 7, Swazi 8, and Swazi Royalty 9. The marital status is coded as married (M) and single as (S).

The highest level of education of the women who worked during the colonial period is standard 8 and the highest level of education for the women who work in post-colonial Swaziland is Form 3. The standards start after two years of schooling. This means a person does Grade 1 and Grade 2 and then they proceed to the standards. In the colonial period they did standards all the way. In post colonial Swaziland, after the two grades, they do standards up to standard 5 and then start the forms. If we take Thandi as an example of colonial schooling, she completed Grade 1 and 2 and then did 8 years of schooling. In order to finish, she had to do two more

years. If we use Sibongile as an example of post-colonial Swaziland, she did Grade 1 and Grade 2 and then did Standard 1 up to 5 and then did forms 1 up to 3. All together she did ten years of schooling. In order to finish High School she would have had to do two more years.

The women were all mothers. The average number of children in the colonial period is 4. The numbers range from 1 to 8. In post colonial Swaziland, the average is 2.5. The range is from nil to 7. Seven of the women were married and the rest were single. Most of the ages are estimates because the women did not keep diaries. In Swazi culture, people do not record age as it is done in western society.

The number of years women who worked in the colonial period served ranges from 5 to 20. The range for women who are still working in domestic work in post colonial Swaziland is 5 to 12. The languages that their employers spoke is indicated by the column that lists the employers.

TABLE 4.1 BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF PARTICIPANTS

Pseudonym	Place of Birth	Marital Status	Age	Last Class Attended	No. of Children	Employers	Years
Losimilo	Kalamgabhi	M	62	Std4	8	1,2,3	20
Tryphina	Sigombeni	M	70	Std2	5	1,3,	13
Linah	Phonjwane	M	46	Std4	4	2	18
Lobutimba	Vusweni	S	57	Std1	2	9,9,2	16
Mary	Enyakeni	M	65	Std1	2	1,2	5
Senteni	Emkhitsini	M	76	Gr.1	7	1	30
Lindiwe	Luqolweni	S	50	Std4	7	0,1	6
Thandi	Mvundlelwa	S	51	Std8	3	1,2	8
Nokuthula	Mbekelweni	S	50	Std6	2	1,2,3	6
Fanisile	Nkiliji	M	47	Std3	5	3,7,6	6
Cebile	Kalanga	S	25	Std4	2	8,8,8	5
Hluphekile	Mbananan	S	29	Gr.2	1	8,4,4	8
Lozindaba	Nsingizini	S	44	nil	7	8,8,8,6	7
Senanile	Luhlangotsini	S	19	Std4	nil	6,	5
Sibongile	Hlathikhulu	S	36	Form3	4	4,7,8,	7
Thoko	Mankayiyane	S	37	Std5	2	8,4,4	12
Khabonina	Sicelwini	S	31	Form3	3	4,4,4	7
Siphiwe	Mbikwakhe	S	28	Form3	1	6,7,6,	7
Zanele	Sitobela	S	22	Std3	1	8,8,8	5
Fikile	Nhlangao	M	40	Std4	4	8,8,8	5

BRIEF PORTRAYALS OF WOMEN

In this section I will provide a short description of each woman that is a short summary of what she said about herself. I use the descriptions that stuck in my memory about what each woman said, where they were when I was interviewing them and how they behaved.

WOMEN WHO WORKED DURING THE COLONIAL PERIOD

1. Losimilo was taken into domestic work when young under the Law of Masters and Servants. She had to forego schooling in order to do this. She worked for a Boer family, a British family, the owner of Dup's Bazaar, and some teachers. She now makes her living as a farmer.

2. Tryphina worked for a Boer called Mahlakaniphane. When she left the Boer's place she went to work for her uncle as a domestic worker. This is where she learned how to sew. She bought herself a sewing machine and decided to leave domestic work and earn her living as a seamstress.

3. Linah Maseko is a woman who entered domestic work as a young girl. She did not earn money because she was to play with the white man's children in exchange for a bag of maize that would be sent to her parents once in a while. She was bitten by a snake and her leg was amputated when she was approximately 15 years old. She worked in Swaziland and eventually went to South Africa with her employers. She is now married and stays in a suburban house with her husband and children.

4. Lobutimba started off as a young domestic working for the royal family in Swaziland. When she entered domestic work, she was employed by the British and now works for a government institution.

5. Mary Gama worked for Mhhwabadla a Boer driver, a white woman and a Scottish man. She sent her two children to the Catholic school and now works at a doctor's surgery cleaning floors.

6. Senteni married into a family that lived on a Boer's farm in Southern Swaziland. She decided to leave her husband and his other wife when the Boers wanted to take her child out of school so that he could work for them. She went and settled on Swazi Nation Land.

7. Lindiwe worked for missionaries and later worked for the Boers. She stopped working when she got pregnant and stayed home to look after her children. She bought cattle while she was working and lived by selling them. She used the money to send her children to school. She now works for a government institution as a cleaner.

8. Thandi worked for the Boer who was well known to domestic workers for being cruel. She moved to work for a British family and later settled down to look after her children. When the children were grown up, she went to work for a government institution.

9. Nokuthula grew up in a poor Swazi family. She left school because she became pregnant. She had to go into domestic work in order to raise her child. She educated her children. They speak good English because she spoke English with

them when they were young. She complained that her grandchildren do not know some of the most simple everyday siSwati words like 'kubondza' (to stir food with a wooden spoon).

10. Fanisile was born in South Africa, grew up in the locations (residences for Blacks in South Africa), and moved to Swaziland when her parents moved to Swaziland. She could not continue her education because there was no money and she ended up working as a domestic worker. She could speak Afrikaans, Southern Sotho English and Zulu. She worked for Coloreds, Swazis, African Americans and whites.

WOMEN WHO ARE WORKING IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

11. Cebile is the daughter of a 'sangoma' (medicine man). She left school because her father would not pay school fees. She went into domestic work and worked for cruel employers who constantly made her feel inferior because she was from the rural areas. At the time of the interview she was happy with her employers because she felt they treated her well.

12. Hluphekile left school because she had an eye problem. She went to work in the plantations weeding and watering sugar cane. She ended up in domestic work where she worked for the Chinese, a Swiss man, an African and a Dutch family.

13. Lozindaba was the only woman who had never been to school. Her parents died when she was young and she had to stay with her brother. She found electrical gadgets very intimidating and later decided to go to Sebenta, the adult literacy program.

14. Senanile was a young domestic worker, under twenty years of age who had worked on farms picking cotton. She eventually got into domestic work. She left school because her father was an alcoholic. He refused to pay fees.

15. Sibongile left school because she got pregnant and went into factory work. Her 'fly by night employers' left her jobless. She went into domestic work and suffered physical violence at the hands of two of her employers.

16. Thoko was a woman who started working as a domestic worker for her cousin. When her cousin left for South Africa she went to work in the plantations and later went into domestic work. She found the size of the house of her employers big and difficult to clean.

17. Khabonina was employed as a cleaner. She left school because of pregnancy. She had taken courses in sewing and planned to open a hair salon as soon as she could.

18. Siphiwe was a clever young woman who could cook different types of African cuisine. She felt that her employers did not care about her performance at work because they never complained about anything. Before she joined domestic work she had worked in a store.

19. Zanele was a very clever woman who worked as a domestic after selling vegetables for many years. She felt that her job as a vegetable vendor was better because she controlled her time herself. She had left it because she found walking from place to place a problem. She was employed in two households and took turns working for two days in one place and the other two in the other household.

20. Fikile worked for her relatives and also in the plantations. She ended up working in the kitchens. She worked for a white employer who always gave her eggs to take home to her children.

PROFILES OF WOMEN

COLONIAL LIVES

I have decided to present profiles of five women who worked during the colonial period and five profiles of women who are working in post-colonial Swaziland so that the reader can understand the interviewing process and also get a holistic picture of the women's lives and the place where the interviews were done. Cleary, (1991) used profiles in her study of students and their views on writing in a way that I found useful for this study.

The interviews were structured so that the woman would tell about her life, and after she had finished I would ask specific questions on language and how it was used at the different places she had mentioned. This allowed me to check information and also to hear a different perspective of the work situation, one which brings out the interactions and the opinion of the domestic worker on the language situation of Swaziland. I could have merged these two sections and created one profile as Cleary does, but I felt that they should be separated so that the reader can have a clearer picture of the manner in which the interviews were structured. The first section of the profile is presented as A (THE SOCIAL CONTEXT) and the second as B (THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE) .

LOSIMILO

[Recorded in a hut at her home, at Mbekelweni on August 30, 1993.]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

I was born at LaMgabhi, the place we now call Etiyeni there at Mdzimba. I'm sure that I was born in 1930. The school in my area had just started. There was no school in our area for a long time. When the school started, I went there when I was a little girl of about twelve. I went to school for a few years. When I was beginning my fifteenth year, after Standard III, the Boer took me. When you were with the Boers you served for six months on their farm and spend the next six months at home. I worked in the kitchen, washing and cooking and cleaning the house and looking after their child. He would take us and we would go and work in Breyten. He had land that side of the border and this side.

In April the sheep would come and graze on this side. They would be here April, May, June, July, August, September and in October they would go to the other side. April was called Mabasa. The sheep would come down. The whole winter they would be here. The Boers would also come here. They would come to see if the sheep were well looked after. I came back in my twentieth year.

After I finished my six months this Boer did not allow me to come home. When I wanted to come home, he would refuse. I would ask why I was not allowed to go home. I came back in the forties. A white person does not see when you do get angry and shout. He/she makes a fool of you. You also don't know how to answer back. You keep saying you want to go home. He/she says stay, stay. He

would ask why I wanted to go home because we were just from there. He was also a friend of my father. When they are used to you, and you treat them nicely they do not want you to leave. That is why I spent such a long time. I raised three of their children. I was nineteen when I came back home.

When I came back, I got a job in Mbabane. I used to wash clothes and clean the house with another woman. I worked there until I was 27. I went home to get married. After I got married, I went to work for teachers in Matsapa. I worked for an African teacher who had just arrived and another white man. They are both late. They died in a car accident. I later went to work for another African teacher. I worked there from 1959 to 1960. I stopped when I got pregnant. When my child was big, I went to work in Manzini for a white man they called Ngini because he had a limp. I used to wash clothes there. I washed clothes and cooked for them. I did not go there everyday. I worked there for two years. I then worked for people who would ask me to help them on a temporary basis. I then came home to work on the farm. I work for myself.

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

We used to speak siSwati with our parents at home and then when we went to the homes of the white people we would speak their language. We are all Swazis in our community. The British were far. We spoke Afrikaans because we learned it when we worked for the Boers. When you are working for the Boers or the British, you would learn what they say when they say this and what they say when

they say that. You would learn and know that this means that and this means that. You end up knowing things.

At work you would find other girls who already know Afrikaans, when the white person speaks, they tell you what it means. You also have to like to know what it means. When you are young things are easy. I was also very young and my head was still clear. I liked to learn things. English and Afrikaans are more or less the same. Even if you do not understand very well, if you went to school, you understand some things. Like saying 'mummy,' that is almost the same as siSwati. A lot of things were the same. Like saying '*Goeir more*' (good morning). You then learn. There was a time I went to Pretoria with the white people. We spent one week. There were Ndebeles, and I almost learned their language. If I had stayed a few months, I would have learned their language. When you are young you learn things quickly. You say to yourself, 'because I am staying with this person, I have to know this language.'

In our school we learned English and Zulu in schools. This was in the thirties and forties. I knew that there was siSwati because my father wrote siSwati. It is now that I can tell because I see the children's books. He did not write as we wrote. He did not write Zulu. The Boers were not there. We learned Afrikaans because the Boers would come for us and take us to their farms in Breyten. They did not stay this side for long. They just had farms here in Swaziland. They did not even stay on their farms. My father knew Afrikaans. My mother did not know it because she never worked for the Boers. They would just take girls and boys. The old people would just go there and weed if they had planted crops. They would go and weed

and go and harvest. They would go and weed in December. This Boer would also grow crops. They would also go and do the shearing of the sheep. My father learned Afrikaans. He was the friend of this white man. The white man that my father was working for was a child of the white man that my father learned Afrikaans from. It is their father who taught my father Afrikaans. These Boers also spoke siSwati.

There were no jobs in our time. It is now that there are jobs. Even with farming, it is now that you can grow crops and make good money. A job like domestic work was the job. You would think that this is the job that I can do to make money. I liked to work. I would knit jerseys and people would buy.

When white people spoke to us, they spoke Zulu. They would say, 'wenza kanjan so,' (how are you doing, so). They could not speak siSwati. What they spoke was close to Zulu or else they spoke Afrikaans. It is easy to learn a language when you stay with the people. You hear what they have said and then ask when they have gone and say, 'so and so said, what does this mean?' Someone will tell you and say, 'when he/she says this, she means this.' Afrikaans was easier to learn when you look after children. As I told you, I looked after children. I would ask them because they spoke both Zulu and Afrikaans, especially the older ones because they knew Zulu. Even the Boers they spoke like the people.

We would hear them say, 'Waar gaan jy heen? Waar kom jy? Waar was jy? Waar was jy gister midag?' He/she means where were you? On Sondag we gaan wuenge daarso by die pieknik. He/she means on Sunday we will go for a picnic.

When you go for a picnic you take meat and then make a fire and cook a 'braai' (barbecue). We understood because even where we worked, there would be three of us girls. When we arrived there we would find others who already know Afrikaans because some girls were from the Boer's country.

The girls who had just arrived would have problems. They would call those of us who understand and ask us to interpret for them. We would tell them what the 'mesisi,' is saying. There was a time when we went to visit another white family. We went with the children that I was looking after. When we came back, this woman says, 'I said to this one she must wash my clothes. How did she wash them?' She had just dipped them. I said you must 'purra' them, rinse them. The girl just covered them. The girl thought she meant she should soak them. She said 'haai', no, I said she must wash my clothes. How did she wash them....I said you must 'purra them,' meaning she must rinse them. The girl took them. She thought she meant she must soak them. she took them and covered them, yet the madam had said she should rinse them thoroughly. When she came back she said:

Madam: Haai man! Kyk heir so.

(Hey man, look here so)

Wat hierdie meid gemaak hierso?

(What this maid did here).

Wat, wat ek het jou gese?

(What did I tell you?)

Se vir haar sy moet was hom en spoel hom.

(Tell her she must wash him and rinse him).

Losimilo: Ek het hom gese.

(I told him).

Madam: En nou?

(And now?)

Losimilo: Ek weet nie.

(I don't know).

Sy het nie mooi geweet nie.

(She did not understand well).

At X's they spoke English and even siSwati. They were British. They had also been here for a long time. When they were alone they spoke English. They would speak siSwati and say, 'so and so, do like this, so and so, do like this.' If they do not speak English, they would speak siSwati, especially if they think you cannot understand English. She will say in siSwati, 'wena hamba lapha kamelweni, wena thatha lo. Vula wardrobini, wena thatha lorok kamina (You go there and open there in the bedroom. You take this. Open the wardrobe and take my dress).' They would speak this Fanakalo so that we can understand each other. This was not a language, it was used by someone who wanted to speak with you because you do not understand English. The person does not know siSwati very well and I do not know English very well. If you make an example for a person who does not understand English, you do not use the proper language because the person does not understand and you also don't understand siSwati. That is why the speech is confused. Like me,

I learned a little bit of English, I then learned a little bit of Afrikaans. It happens like that when you are speaking in languages which are not yours. Each person tries to hear what the other is saying.

I worked for Africans who spoke siSwati. The woman was a Colored. They knew siSwati. There was no problem with understanding each other. I also worked for other Africans who spoke their language. They spoke and I would understand. I got to understand them. I have forgotten what they said. They used to try and speak English. I could not understand their language. Their children learned the language quickly and started to tell me things.

LINAH

[Linah Maseko recorded on September 2, 1993 at her home, in her suburban house in Manzini]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

I was born at Phonjwane. Ours was a very poor home. Even in school some of us would go and others would remain for the whole day and go the following day. Then there was a white man who asked for me from my mother because my father was already dead. 'Can I take one of your children?' My mother said I should go because I was more clever than the others. I went and stayed with his children. They had a farm near Sipofaneni, down in the lowveld on the way to Big-Bend. It was in the fifties.

A long time ago teachers were not strict about registration. We would go one day and not the next. It was not like now when you are required to go everyday. I would go and look after cattle one day, and my brother would go to school. The following day, my brother would go and look after cattle and I would go to school. Even when I was at the white people's farm that is what I was doing. I would miss one day of school and work at the farm and then go to school the following day. On that day I would wake up in the morning and go to school. I went to school at Phonjwane.

We were suffering because we were not talking. A long time ago you could not talk to a white person. They would chase you away. There was nothing you could talk to a white person about. You would be expelled. If something is difficult for you, you would go and look for a job somewhere else. I am still afraid of white people. Even though I have lived with a white person for twenty years I am still afraid. I still remember what happened to us a long time ago.

We would wake up and clean the dining room of the white people and the kitchen. When they wake up around four, they would find that everything has been set, even the tables. After that I would prepare the water for the children. We used to make fire in a 'bore hole' a small thing that you did so that the water can become hot. When the children woke up I then washed both of them. When we had finished with the children we would go with the children, to the fields and pick cotton. I would pick cotton and look after the children who are playing. I was supposed to pick and watch them at the same time. At eleven we would go home to the white

man's place so that the children can get food around one. It was quite a distance, but they used to carry us in a tractor. We would be happy because we were riding in something like a car. A long time ago a tractor was a car to us. It is because we were children that we liked to be in the tractor. When we came back we would find the woman, your mother, having cooked food. She had cooked for the white people. They would arrive and we would dish for them. When I finished eating the children would go to bed. I would then go and feed the chickens in the chicken house. When I finish feeding them, I would come back and also help your mother with the ironing. I would iron the clothes of the children. I had to help your mother because she would finish eating and wash the dishes and iron. I did not get any pay at all. They just gave me food and sent my mother mealie-meal. The others were paid. Your mother was getting one pound and five shillings at that time.

I left Phonjwane, because I was bitten by the snake and had to go to the hospital. The snake bit me. We were going to the chicken house because I had forgotten the container that we dished the dogs in. We went there when it was dark. The others accompanied me. They walked ahead of me and I followed. It just hooked onto me, this cobra. I think it was angered by the others. I stayed for two years in the hospital. They had to leave just after I came back from the hospital.

They left me with another white man here. I stayed there. I would wake up in the morning and clean. After I finish I then go to school. They used to call the white man Magezimpi. I went to Little Flower Primary school. Today it is called St. Theresa's. I continued to stay at the white man's place. I think I stayed one year

and then I had to go to hospital. I went back to the hospital and they had to amputate my leg because there was no rest. A lot of pus would keep coming out. That was in 1959. You were already born then. I don't know very well because the snake bit me around fifty six - fifty seven. You were born...it is as if it was after it had bitten me. I think it was in 1958. I only went as far as Standard III and then my leg had to be amputated.

When I left the hospital, I went out to my mother's. She had moved to Ntabamhloshana because my younger father had 'ngena' her (married her after her husband had died). I stayed with my mother for four months and the white people came. They found that I was no longer going to school. Then they took me again. They went with me to Natal. That is around 1961-62. I stayed there and when the man from Swaziland we had gone there with left, I asked them why they would not let me leave....Iremained because I could not pay back their money for the artificial leg. It was painful to me, but I could not pay it. I had to stay because they bought me an artificial leg. I thought that they bought me the leg because I was their child. I had grown up under them. But they were oppressing me because they were not giving me even a five pence so that I could give my mother yet they had said they would buy her mealie-meal because I work for them. When we were there they were not giving my mother anything yet my mother was having problems. I was like someone who works for the 'plaas.' I said who will support my mother because I am not in school. Even the others are in school, I should be supporting my mother and be able to give her a little bit of money so that she can help the other children who

are younger than I am. They said it would be better if I can pay back their money. I can be free to go and see what I can do. I wrote to my uncle and he said, 'why were you quiet about this, people of my clan.' My uncle then sent the money. He sent them 45 pounds. That is how I became free and came back to Swaziland. They gave back 10 pounds. I came back home in 1968.

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

At my home, we spoke siSwati. I started school when I was at home. We learned English and siSwati. I started school when I was four years old. My father died that year. There was a teacher who thought I was clever and then she said to my father, 'my, brother, send this person to school, she is clever.' When the white people took me, I could understand how to say 'sawubona,' (siSwati greeting which is equivalent to hello).' I could understand, 'morning and hallo,' so when the white woman wanted to say something difficult, she would call her husband because her husband could speak siSwati just like me. He would explain.

I continued to learn when I was at the farm. When the children were in school, the wife of the Boer would teach me. She would teach me English. She would write for me and then tell me to write and then say what the words mean. She taught me how to call out the words. The children went to school in Manzini. I picked up my English a little bit. I could help others when she spoke to them when her husband was not present. I would tell them in situations like when she wanted

them to milk the cows and also where they should take the cattle. She did not take me further because ....I think I was disturbed by getting hurt.

The woman spoke English at her home, even though she was a Boer. They did not speak Afrikaans except when the parents of the wife came to visit. The husband did not understand Afrikaans. When he saw that they were speaking Afrikaans, he would leave them alone. He would take the car and drive to Manzini.

When we were with their children we spoke siSwati. They knew siSwati very well. I also found them speaking siSwati. They knew siSwati, English and Afrikaans. They spoke the languages of their parents when they were with them.

Even when we went to Natal, they spoke English. There was no problem there because the woman who used to cook was educated. She could cook looking at a book. We could not read a book and cook. I knew how to bake very well, but I could not read from a book. I would remember everything without reading a book. There was an Indian girl who spoke English. I would hear her speak Fanakalo when she is outside with the boys. I could not speak Fanakalo. The boys could not understand English. The Indian girl was a cleaner like us. When we were still cleaning, she would go and count the eggs. Maybe they respected her because she was better. They thought she was better. Elizabeth's father was paid and they got a chicken and eggs. The Black people did not get eggs. They just got milk. On Saturday the Indians got a chicken. These Indians did not even get paid when they were working for the employers who used to own the farm. They were working for the plaas. This white man paid them.

In Natal most of the white people had small houses for their workers. I used to sleep in the kitchen. I ate their food. They gave me their food, but I did not eat with them. They would dish me and I would sit on the floor, not on a chair. I would sit a distance from them. It was a law. You had to respect the white person. Even with dishes, they did not want you to eat in their dishes. There were dishes for you as an African. Even when you washed the dishes, you would start with the dishes of the white people and end with yours, the Black person. You knew your dishes, they were not the same. We used to eat in the enamel dishes, you know them, these which are green and blue. They are the ones which do not break.

If I had my way, my children would learn English, French and siSwati. I like the French because they will go to other countries and it might happen that there are people who speak French. If they went to the land of the British, they would be able to speak the language. This gives them enthusiasm. Siswati is also good because people who are in other countries would ask you to teach them siSwati if they know that you know it.

MARY

[Recorded on September 15, 1993 in a doctor's surgery in Manzini]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

I was born at Mkhulamini. I grew up at the chief's homestead. My father is the brother of the chief. We were many in our family because it was at the chief's homestead. We did not go to school because we were sent there. We used to run

away. We used to carry milk to the dairy. We would take our cans to the dairy and then run away and go to learn at Nyakeni. They used to call the place Enyakeni. We used to wear our skirts and leave the milk and run away. Our parents did not send us. They just knew that we had taken the milk to the dairy.

Our parents did not want us to go and learn. They wanted us to carry the milk. We had a lot of cattle in our family. They would say 'take the milk to the dairy.' They did not want us to learn because we are female. They said we females will not go to school. They believed that a female person cannot go to school because she will get married. We would carry the milk and get to the dairy when some of our friends are in school. After taking the milk there and they process it, we would put away the gallons and run to school.

We would get there and the teacher would register us. We would learn. We did not pay those days. They would teach you how to write your name. It was not like today when there are universities and all these things. We would get there and learn 'As' and 'Ms' and 'Bs' and then we would go and take the milk and run home. We hid our skins on the way when it was raining and wear them on the way home. They would ask us. Every day you come back with the milk spoilt why is that? The cream was already in the gallons.

There were no cars. We only knew Mshibo's car. There used to be Mshibo this side. When his car came you would hear it from afar and we would look at it and say. 'There is Mshibo's car. There is Luzaluzile Mshibo's car!' We say 'Luzaluzile, Mshibo's car!' It is because it comes slowly, now that there are so many

cars I am surprised! We used to look after cattle. They would beat us for going to school and we would run away and hide in my grandmother's hut. We could not go to school in our schools because schools were civilized places. I had a slate. My mother bought me a slate. I also found a broken piece on the ground.

We grew up and became big girls and had lovers. I could write when I started work. I could write my boyfriend a letter and I could read his. My boyfriend was in the rural areas, Nkhosi. He did not come because we came here to work. Even when we just came to weed here at Helemisi. I also went to Mankanka. He was also a white man. He used to make bricks. He had a donkey. I don't know where he used to put it. It would turn and turn from early in the morning mixing the mud. He would also be grinding maize near the Umzimnene river here in Bremersdorp. We would wait to grind and then watch this donkey as it mixes the mud. It would not get food, Nkhosi, this donkey. It will grind and things get cooked in Mankanka's pot, then they bake the bricks with his workers. They make these small bricks, you see them? And then we watched him and we said, but this child of a white man he is also very poor, my God! What can he hire us to do because here is a donkey which is a pitiful sight. It does not eat in the morning. It is spanned and works until five. I wonder when he fed it,...inthe evening?

After that we came to Manzini. It was not Manzini, Nkhosi. It was Bremersdorp. We came to look for jobs when hunger was a problem in the homesteads. The Boers did not want to hire us. Another white man hired one of us. I don't remember his name. We came and stole the other girl. Because she was

hired. We wanted him to hire all of us. We decided to go and get jobs somewhere else. We arrived and started looking for jobs. We looked and I was hired at Mhhwabadla's home. He was a bus driver here. You call it OK now. He had a bus. The baases (bosses in Afrikaans) go and drive the buses that go to Jozi, Johannesburg! I remain with Nkosazana and Nkosana. I did not know how to work in a white person's house.

I slept in the kitchen, at the Boer' house. Early when it is still dark, I wake up, there I take my blankets and go and put them in the garage, where he kept his car and his dogs. You wake up and go and make a fire on the stove and get very black on what you are wearing. This is because the stove needs to be emptied, washed and have everything removed. You would become black all over, even around the eyes. You wore your apron, there was no uniform. I would come back and take the pots, the black ones that are smeared with this thing. They have three legs. They cut off the legs. I go and cook thin porridge and put it on the table. The Nkosazana worked at the post office. At eleven we take tea to them. It would be all white trays there in Bremersdorp. We are carrying and taking it to them. They will drink, and then we come back with the trays. They will come back at one. They are coming to eat at home.

We cooked like mealie-rice, 'putu'. The Boers like 'putu.' In the morning they wake up and make coffee, black coffee, very black. They drink it and then you pour it into the bottle of the umnumzane (man or the house in Zulu). You wake up

early and he will fold it and take it to the buses. We did not say 'madam' we used to say 'Mesisi!' She would say, 'Mary!'

'Mesisi!'

'Mary! Mary!'

'Mesisi!' if the baas calls me, 'Baas!.'

I also wash, I wash the overalls of the baas that he uses for driving the buses. There are no taxis, as it is now, Nkhosi. At eleven o'clock, I would take tea there. The post office was there at the corner of the bus station. We would meet with my sisters who were hired in the other homes.

After that I clean the house inside in rooms, their bedrooms. There was not much civilization at that time. The work was difficult. The woman used to say 'Do this thing,' and you would be frightened because the person is white. I get scared because this is not a person, this is a white person. When she is talking there is some fear. It is as if I should run away and go home. You could not get used to these people.

But food! We ate meat. I became this fat! They were generous! They used to give you and they would cook. We wash the dishes. They give us the pots that they had used. There were no refrigerators, my child. After they had cooked, because the Boers cook. We would take the pots with the boy and go and eat what is left, even what is left at the table is eaten.

The only thing is that they were very mean these people. They used to shout. Their shouting! Especially when there is something you have done, say maybe you

broke a cup or a glass broke. They would shout and there would be no, 'sorry, no sorry.' What can you say because you came to them and said you wanted a job, my child. There is nothing you can say, Nkhosi.

They had children! The children would treat us badly! They would insult us, they would say you Kaffir! What are you doing with my dog, you Kaffir. That is what I remember. You would say the dog must move, especially when it enters with mud on its feet when you are polishing the floor with the red polish. The child then insults you. You would clean the stove with coal. At the end of the month you get ten shillings and fifty cents. We ate at the Boers' places! The only thing is that the Boer used to say you should not get pregnant. Once you get pregnant you would go home. That is when there was the story that the girls who work in the kitchens give birth to babies and throw them away.

I went home and got pregnant, gave birth and then I had another child. After I had given birth and the children were big and following each other in the yard, then I went to look for a job. I got a job in Mbabane. I have forgotten the white man. My god! The wife had two children. She was a Boer. There were no British then. We have never worked for the British. We worked for the Boers. This woman used to make me work hard. There was a lot of work. 'Eyi!' there was a lot of work. I used to wake up and make fire on the stove and then cook. I would cook breakfast- thin porridge. Then she would dish and put it there on the table. They would eat with the children and then go. They would go to school, carrying their

backpacks on their backs. I would remain and clean the whole house, dust it, and do all that.

She would speak Zulu. She would say, 'you did not work very well. Look, even the stove, you did not wipe it. You did not do anything in the bedrooms.' All the bedrooms even the children's bedrooms. She liked to be mean. She comes back and pays me ten shillings and fifty cents! There was no money, my child. In a way this money went according to the times because there was bread for a tickey. Things were not expensive like now when it is so expensive, my child. You would be surprised and not know what you would say about this. I thought of running away from her and going to work for another Boer.

I left her place and went to work for the Boer. Life was much better, but I was from very difficult situations. I would not care if he shouts at me. What was important was that I was eating, and getting my money so that I can go back to my children.

The father of my children died. He died a long time ago. That is why I am working, because these children don't give us the money. The child gets paid and buys her own things. If she gives you E20.00 one day, you say thank you.

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

A long time ago the white people wrote letters. They wrote letters so that we can take them to their meat at the butchery, my child. You would keep running with this thing and give the owners of the shop. You will just see them giving you one by

one. You don't know what the white man had written. When you go to the butcheries you take what he has written. You just come back with the things. With milk, there was a white man who used to bring it in the morning. You will look for the meat that they have written. You just put the letter 'bhaca'. The white man reads it and takes out what is required by your employer. He reads again and takes out ha! A long time ago the whites used to send you and say, 'go and shop, here is a letter. The one at the butchery would read. You were not given money. I think they used to pay at the end of the month, Nkhosi, the Boers.

We used to speak Zulu at the home of the Boer I first worked for. The wife was a Zulu, she spoke Zulu. She was an Afrikaaner. Mhhwabadla did not speak siSwati. They were from Zululand and spoke Zulu. She would say, do this and this Ntombazan! Go and work here, Ntombazan. Go and clean the stove. Go and work in the room. Here you have not done well. You are with the Mesisi now. The man is gone to work, Nkhosi. 'Hey, do this. Work fast.' The Mesisi would say. There was no rest. You would not sit down because the Boers do not want you to sit down like I am sitting now. They wanted to know where you are going, who is calling you. This is a place of work not just sitting.

We worked hard. You would not rest because even in the evening you work until you go to bed. You finish the dishes that were used, and then clean. The water for their bath you have to warm it with a what-you-call a container. They go and wash one at a time and then you have to warm the water again and go and pour water for another one. After that it is the children. There were four children, six

with the wife and the husband. When you go and sleep you are very tired. They will tell you to go and get your blanket in the garage and sleep in the kitchen and lock the door and make sure the dogs are inside. Some of the dogs were small, you sleep with them in the kitchen. They sleep on the sofas so that they can be warm like in winter. You watch them because you are 'Kaffir,'You are a Kaffirtjie. I don't know what this means. They say you are a fool? It is just that you work for them.

I was hired by a Scottish man. The wife was very cruel. At the white woman's place, I worked for nine months. She was cruel that woman, and yet she used to leave me alone. The children went to school. She would also go to work. Her husband had died in the war where they were fighting. She just found herself without a husband.

With these foreigners, they say 'here, it's dirty ' and they touch here and there. 'You were not doing anything here at home. English, I don't know it at all. She would speak in Zulu. All these whites I worked for they hated us, my child.

The wife was a Boer, and the man was what they call a Scottish. He was not a Boer this man. What did he speak then? He spoke, and I did not understand, Nkhosi, this language of his. They spoke English with the wife. I would not even pay attention a long time ago. I don't know what was happening. Now is the time when we are becoming clever.

They knew what I speak. Not that they did not speak siSwati like the wife of this one who did not know. All the children could speak Zulu. They would speak until you understand. They would say in English 'take this one, take this one,' when

they want you to give them something. 'Take this one, give me what' and then I know that it means I must take something and give it to them. 'I want water.' I would know that the child wants water and I would take it and give him. You give him and he says thank you.

The children went to St. Marks in Mbabane. They would go to a school for whites. When we are at home we would see them. They are carrying suitcases and back packs. The Black people went to school at the Roman Catholic School, near the river, Mbabane. They went to school there. There were other schools which I do remember seeing when going to work. I stayed at Msunduza.

The language of this country should be siSwati. It is because we were born speaking siSwati, child of my child. I would not understand these white people a long time ago. I still do not understand them today.

There was a difference after the king came back with the land. They used to say the king has gone to get the land back, the land of Swaziland. He has gone with the soldiers. We were still young. We were scared thinking we would die. They would say the king has gone to the war. That is why, as you see, now we have this independence. It is here in Swaziland, my chid. There are our people in jobs in Swaziland. The king is back. He has come back with his land. Instead of my ten shillings, there was a salary increase.

My children speak the language they learn in school. I'm saying this because I see children writing in the what-you- call...in the offices. Even the jobs, they now get them through writing my child. I sent them to school. I sent them to school for

English. My girl went to Mzimpofu. When I was working she was in boarding school. My girl has been to boarding school right now. The boy went to the Catholic school. He went when the Catholics were here.

The Catholics came riding on horses, male ones. They brought us avocado pears. We did not know them. There were none in this area. They would pray for us, going from homestead to homestead. The Catholics would be riding a horse. This one was riding a horse. Who was this? I forget my child. It is old age! He would carry these avocado pears and say. 'Do you know this?' He would find us at home. We would eat and it would not taste nice, yet now we like the avocado so much. He would then preach to us, which is why I sent my daughter to school at the Catholic school. I then baptized her. My children were baptized at the Catholic church, Nkhosi. The man would say we should be believers, believe in Jesus. Then we would go to church. We went, taking the children. They would say if a child is born after ten days you should bring that child to the church for baptism. We would then walk, when we enter the door we would dip our hand in water and say,'Our father who is in heaven. Your name must be holy.' You have your hands like this all the time and you bend your back. You do not close your eyes. Even when you pray you open your eyes. You touch here, starting with the head, and then where do you go? They say, 'mother of God.' You touch your chest. 'Holy Mary, mother of God.' Then it is the forehead. You touch the shoulders, to this one and this shoulder. You go to your chest and bring your hands together and say 'Amen.' They say it means to pray, Nkhosi. The Catholics say so.

SENTENI

[Recorded at her son's house in Courts Valley on November 4, 1993]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

We were born by real Swazis. I was born by Swazis at a place called Mkhitsini. We lived well because we had cattle, goats and we also had fields. We ate home food, real Swazi food, and did not go to school. My father had four wives. There were four homesteads. Another one was here, another one there. All of them were on the farm of the white man people used to call Mdabula. Even now the place is called at Mdabula's. They called him by this name because he used to beat people. People often told stories about him. They used to say he beats people up. There is a Mkhatjwa man I know that he once beat up. He called him and made him lie on the ground and 'killed' him. He 'killed' him and 'killed' him. Whatever he did, they exaggerate.

We had a chance to learn a little bit, enough just to learn -a, e, i, o, u. only because the land we lived on belonged to Boers. We were taken when we were young and went to stay with the Boers. We did not get the chance to go to school. I can say we only went as far as the first year of school.

There was a church that we used to pray in. It was called the Congregational Church. We had our classes in the church building. The schools were on Swazi Nation Land. They were far from us. The nearest school was at Dwaleni and another one was at Mahamba. If you woke up early in the morning, you would get

to Dwaleni when the sun is up here. If I walked there, I could get there in the evening.

We would start at nine and then come out. We would learn a little bit and then go and sleep. Those who were older than us used to help us so that we can read the bible. We had spelling books, the red ones. They bought them in town. Each person had her own. We learned Zulu. Even the man who used to preach. He taught us. We used to write in slates.

I don't know how old I was at this time. It means I cannot know how old I was because we were people who did not count years. The slightest idea I have about that time is what the Boer knew. He said in 1931 I was fourteen. When I went to school I was very young. My bust had not developed. I had not started to menstruate in thirty one. I had already started working at the white man's place? I started very young. I used to look after the baby because they said so. The white man said so. He spoke to my parents and told them that he wanted me. That is why I went to work. The baby was too heavy for me to pick up when I started. I could have been around ten or twelve.

He spoke to my parents and told them that he wanted me, I had to go and work. He knew all of us by name. He would visit us at home. I remember when I still feared him. I would cry. He would pick me up and I would cry.

When I was looking after the child, I would take the napkins to the Mgwenya river and wash them. When I come back, I would wash the baby and give him food and hand him to the mother so that she can feed him. After that I had to put him

to sleep by patting his back and then go and work in the kitchen. She would look at the napkins and if they are not clean she would say I must go back to the river, until I became clever and started to see. She sent me back to the river four times.

It was better to look after the baby because you got time to sit down when it was playing. What was painful was when the person who looks after the baby is not there because you had to take over and look after the baby and work in the house. They just gave me the baby and said, 'here is the baby, go and play with him.' I took the baby and went with him, he was crying because he was not used to me. I played with him and played with him until he got used to me. I started to learn how to talk to him. The one that was born when I was there I started to look after him when he was an infant. I brought him up until he could see in the eyes and he liked me because he knew I was the one who stayed with him. I was told when to feed him.

I did not work for long because I left the Boer. I worked for some years even though I don't remember how many they were. I started when I was young. I started menstruating when I was working there. After some time I left and fell in love and quickly got married.

I went and worked for another white man because the man I married lived on a farm. We worked on that farm. It is at Mkhitsini, near Mageli, the chief. Our homestead is here at Mageli, it is just because their farms were big. He would be here and his farm would reach as far as Matsapa. Here he is in another chief's area. Matsapa would be another chiefs's area, but it would still be part of the Boer's farm. I worked for a Boer called Mabhahane, then Makhomba.

That one chased us away. He says, 'Move away from this farm.' He says we must move away from his farm. He did not want there should be nobody working for him. They always wanted to have a boy and a girl working for them. The boy would work in the fields and the girl would work in the kitchen. The girl who was working for them ran away. She came home and said she did not want to work. When your child ran away, they chased you away. We went to Swazi Nation Land. It was clear that there was little food. We went back to the farm. Ha! We went back to the farm, the one which belonged to Mabhahane.

At that time you found that we were given specified tasks. There were two of us women. When my husband's other wife was doing the washing, I would clean the house. This I did on Fridays and Saturdays. I would wash clothes for three months. We went on like that until they left. They sold the farm and another man bought it. He was from the Highveld. We stayed with him ploughing. He said we would work for him for three days and work for ourselves for three days. The men worked for six months. After six months they would rest and not go and work on the farm. Those were the summer months. When it is time for ploughing at the white man's farm until harvest time. From December they would stay at the white man's farm until the months are finished. When the sixth month was over they would leave. We did not leave, we worked even in winter. We worked there for a long time because three of my children were born there.

I left because I could not take it any more because my child, the one who was at home, I sent him to school in Hlatsi. It became clear that white man wanted him

to come and work for him, yet their children went to school. They used to have a school for their children there. I could not allow them to take my son out of school. The Boer had already taken my eldest son out of school. There was a small school at Mkhitsini that they went to and the white man took him out. I was hurt by that. I said, 'this thing of living on the farm is difficult for me.' That is when I started to get away from the 'plaas'. I left and went and looked for land on Swazi nation land. I left with my children. My husband and the other wife remained. He did not want me to leave, but after I talked to him there was nothing he could do. I told him that I no longer want to be enslaved by the Boers because there is nothing they can do for me. They would chase us away for the slightest mistake, and yet I will have taken my children out of school because of him. He failed to argue further. I went and built a home near my people on Swazi Nation Land. My people were at Mahlalini. I sent my children to school. I struggled with them. This one was successful.

When we were working on the farm, we did not get paid. I used to get money from our produce. We used to get a little bit, especially with cotton. We used to plough for the Boer and pick cotton, apart from working in the house. When we lived on Swazi Nation Land, we did not have much land. I would also take temporary jobs with the white people who are in the lowveld because of the children I was sending to school. I would go and do what they call 'kushaya inkosolo (weeding the fields temporarily). I mean to work for a few weeks.

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

At home we spoke siSWati. We were Swazis. In school we learned Zulu. When we read a book, we would read in Zulu, because the words that were written were in Zulu. We also learned to write Zulu. I worked for Mdabula, did he speak siSwati? He did, but he did not speak it well. They spoke their language. I learned their language on my own. Sometimes they say bring something, then you learn. In other cases they will also ask you something because you pick up the language little by little when they speak to each other. They used to tell you in their language what it means. You would see when they say give them water, they would say it in your language. Eventually you would learn. Like a small baby, it does not understand the language, but because you keep saying the same things, he ends up understanding. When you say 'so and so, take this,' he hears that he must be given something. Eventually when the time comes he talks. Even with us it was like that. When you got to understand their language they would be happy. When you speak to them they would start to send you in their language. They would be happy when they see that you can understand.

I could not speak to the child I started raising first, I could not speak to that child. I used to speak to him in siSwati because the one I spoke to in their language was the one who was born when I was already there. There is one that I could speak to.

I used to look after that child when he was an infant and then he picked up and started to walk. You learn the way you speak to any child because even in

siSwati you say 'tsatsa (take),' 'tsatsa (take),' and he eventually knows and says 'tsatsa,' 'tsatsa,' and then he speaks siSwati. Even with this one, I say I could speak to him in their language because I could understand it then I used to try everything on him. He eventually got to understand what I was saying. He also learned from his parents when they spoke and he would speak with me and we would end up understanding each other very well.

They would keep saying 'bring this, bring this'. They say:

Geer me dy dang

(Give me this thing)

Gee vir my die kombers

(Get for me the firewood)

Gan haal die hout

(Go get me the wood)

Bring my die water

(Give me the water)

Kom ons eet

(Come and we eat)

Bring die kos

(Bring the food)

Ons gaan ploeg

(We are going to plan)

skepsel (derogatory word for person which means thing)

meidtjie (derogatory word for a maid which means small maid)

vrou (woman)

ouma (old woman)

ou nooi (young woman)

baas (boss)

You get to know these things. You would also ask the children. When you say 'what is this?' to the older children they tell you. It is like when you start to learn in first year because even there you get there unable to say anything and learn 'a' and 'e' and then continue. When you worked in the kitchen you got to hear them often, but when you worked in the field you did not. At Mabhahane's farm, I knew their language, but I did not answer them in it often. I knew how to answer in their language and they spoke to me in it. When he says I must take something I would take it. Even when they sent me somewhere when I got to the other white man I would speak in their language and say 'so and so says.' In some cases he would talk things I cannot say in my language. If I use his language I learn that this is what it means.

I would interpret for them when they were talking to other Swazis. One time they wanted to buy a pig from my husband's wife. My husband's other wife did not understand their language at all. They were asking how much the pig is. They tried to talk to them and they did not understand. They were saying it is four pounds in siSwati and the white man thought that it was too expensive. I told them what he was saying and they brought it down to three pounds ten.

When they are talking about boys they say 'Kaffirs' or 'Kaffirtjie' or meidtjie. It does not mean that they were insulting them. Sometimes they would say it to their children. They would say 'nona' and 'nonatjie to the old women and the young women.'

We learned how to cook food at work. We learned how to cook things like meat, porridge, rice and cabbage. The other things we learned because we saw them bake scones, but even then they did not teach us. We would look when they mix flour and then look how they do it. Most things they did like baking biscuits we did not learn we looked at it from afar. They did not do that everyday. The biscuits, no, we did not learn that. We looked at it from afar. They did not teach us in the manner of saying, 'you see, this is how you do this. You should cook like this.' We used to look at them when they cook and they would say cook and you would cook. Even when they say cook meat you just wash it as they wash it. You tried not to make mistakes because they will scold you if you make a mistake. They showed you when they were angry.

I don't know what language we should speak because we did not go to school. We only know siSwati. There is nothing else we know. I say it is good that even if people are educated they should speak siSwati when they speak and speak English when they have to. It should not be as if they do not know siSwati. They speak English too much. In churches there are some where they speak English yet the white people are no longer there. Even the songs that are sung, many of them are in English. You do not understand. Those of us who do not understand we just open

our eyes wide in dismay. We do not understand. In the church problems are there there is a point where it makes me lazy because people make as if we all know English.

Ha! Even in the hospitals. Isn't it in the hospitals you find that the doctor is Black, but he speaks English and has an interpreter. You speak to the person and he speaks to him. You do not understand if he understands what you are telling him, you don't know. That is one thing that is a problem.

You find that even on the radio they speak the news and you find that most of the news is spoken in English. There is news you do not understand if you do not know English, except in cases where there is an interpreter because there are interpreters. With most people they just talk and that is it. I feel bad when I do not understand. If I do not understand it is not good because I do not understand what you are saying. If I could understand, I would be happy.

When I was older, I remember that I did not want to be enslaved by a white person. I did not like it. I felt bad deep down because even if there was a small thing that I had to talk to them about I would look at the white person in the eyes. Even when they sent me heavy loads. If I felt that load was too heavy for me, I would come back and talk and tell them that I do not want this thing.

I could see that they are just people like me, they are nothing. It just came into my mind that they are just people. I did not have to lay myself down in front of them until I die just lying there. I remember that at Mabhahane's farm they sent me to go and carry two big containers of paraffin. I mean the big ones that are used

for carrying the food for school children. I do not know what they are called or how many liters they take. They were full of paraffin those big containers and they were two. I had to carry them for a long distance, a distance from here in Manzini to the Usutu river in Matsapa. I went there and it was very painful to get there. I had to leave one of them there and return with one of them. I left it at another white man's farm. At Makhomba's farm they said I should leave it there. When I left I did not know that I was going to carry such a heavy load. I came back and delivered that load. And then one day they sent me two containers of sugar. I shouted at them that day.

I said 'you see, I do not want to be given such a heavy load again.' I spoke to the woman. She kept quiet and said nothing. I left the load there and went home. You see at Mdabula's we were children. Even if they talked to us, they could say anything. They used to say a lot of things. One day some girls cut some material. I remember that day because I was standing on the table painting the houses of the white people. That day I was painting. It was still early in the morning. This white woman came in and she says, 'Ya! I caught you today.' I jumped down from the table and I say to myself I wonder what we have been caught doing. She says, 'you cut my material and go and cut them at Lohhawuza's place.' I said, 'no, I do not know what you are talking about.' The others also denied, because they knew how to deny, but since this woman already knew me because I worked along in the house, she could tell I was telling the truth. I am telling you about the day the woman once talked to us. Most of it does not mean anything because I was still young.

At X's farm I remember that people did not want to talk to the white man. They would complain about the hunger and say, 'this white man is killing us.' I said, 'I am not scared of him. I can talk to him. The only thing I see is that it does not help because it would be good if I tell him that and you support me and say you also suffer because of hunger. You will say you are surprised by me. You don't know what is wrong with me. You will no longer say that is true, master, we starve. That is why I don't understand what you are talking about right now. That was the last day they complained because I know people. They could not speak to a white man. That was the last day they said they starve. I did not talk on their behalf because I did not like to speak to the white man only to find that when he asks the people, they deny that they have a problem. They were shy because they are scared of the white man. I did not fear him. When I was older, I did not fear a white person. I just realized that a white person is a person like me. It does not help to crawl before him when he does something I don't like. He had this strong feelings against our children going to school. He wanted the children to line up in front of him. That is when I left because I was angry and said, 'ha, this white man is making us slaves.'

I also remember that the first time I stood up face to face with a white person was to talk about that heavy load, I mean to speak strongly. I also remember another incident. There a time when the cattle got into my mealie field. I spoke to them again. I faced them and said, 'Hey, I don't like this thing, I mean this thing of the cattle getting into my field.' The boys who looked after cattle let them go into my field during the day. I found that they had grazed on everything. My mealie plants

had been eaten. I decided to speak to the white man's son. I said, 'the cattle are spoiling my crop over there.' His son was running the farm. I was telling them so that they can pick up their socks. When you talk to a white person, even when you are saying something good you must not look down. He wants you to look at him in his eyes. Even when you are angry you have to look at him in the eyes. This you learn when you have become clever. Before you become clever, you do not do it. You look at him when you are saying something good, but when he scolds you, you look down.

We black people do not want to be looked at in the eyes. We want a child to look down when you talk to him. I do not want him to look at me in the eyes. It is white people's ways that say they should be looked at in the eyes. We Africans, no. They have to be polite and look down. They can sort of look, but not to pierce you with their eyes.

I am surprised when some children look at old people in their eyes. Some do not do that. Sometimes I think it is because of what they learn in school. They learn to look at old people in the eyes because the teachers are also like white people. They do what white people do.

LOBUTIMBA

[Recorded on August 6, 1993 in a house, at her home at Mbhuleni]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

I was born at Vusweni which is in Hhohho, but I grew up at the Royal Residence in Lobamba. I was born in 1936. I went to Lobamba because my maternal grandmother had to come and close the door for the king. In siSwati, to close the door for the king means someone that the king can send, someone who sleeps near the door. The female king needs someone who is a nonentity to sleep near the door so that if something comes in through the door, it can start with that person. They needed an old person from this country to stay in the palace so that the king can send her. I mean the female queen. That is how I ended up staying with my grandmother. I did not stay with my mother. My mother remained where I was born.

I stayed with my grandmother until it was time to go to school. There was a school in Lobamba. I attended that school until there were problems with the children of the big people. I had to leave school and go and look after their children. I left after a few years because we were eager to go and work for our king in the homes of our kings. I was in school for three years and then in 1941, when my mind was just opening and I was starting to count things, they built the Prince's home across, on the Mdzimba mountains. I went there and looked after the children of the prince's wives, looking after the child of one woman and then going to another one of his wives and looking after her child.

After that I went to Mangwaneni to look after the children of the princes who lived there. I stayed there until I had my first child. I don't even know how old I was at that time. We did not care about counting years. It was not in our world to know how old a person is. Even the children we looked after, we did not know how old they were. I see one of them, she even has her own children. I carried her on my back.

After some time I came to Manzini and got a job in the kitchens. I was old then. I was thinking about the pleasures of the world. I worked in the kitchens of the British and the Boers. I earned three pounds ten. I worked for that white person for a long time, nine years in all. He ended up paying me five pounds ten. I said,'all this money, and it is mine!' Things were cheap those days, my child. You could buy material for my skirt for two shillings. When I arrived the 'mesisi' said, '*OK Lobutimba, I like you.* I will teach how to work. You see, '*I am going to teach you. Do you know cooking?*

I say, '*No, Nkosikazi, just little bit.*' She says, '*OK I will teach you.*' Well, she teaches me.'

'*You see,* when you cook, *you do like this, and like this.*'

Your mind then gets to understand because it is picking up. You want to learn this job. You get to understand. When you arrive, she teaches you for a few days, say three or four days. When I got to understand, I said, '*OK Nkosikazi,* take this newspaper and sit in the sitting room and read. Tell me what we are going to cook and I will cook it and see if I will not cook it nicely.'

The work of the kitchen is a lot, my child. Even the wall you clean it, the windows, you wipe them, the silver, you do it. The silver has its things. The Nkosikazi bought them. This Brasso (a brand name of a product for polishing brass), the polish. I used it to shine it, and then dip it in water again, so that it can look nice. She would buy the things and then say, 'this you will use like this.'

I used to clean the house, a house with three bedrooms, one dining room, one sitting room and one bathroom, a pantry and a veranda. I would clean and cook and wash clothes and do all the work that is done in the house. It was all supposed to be done by me. I would be a 'look-after-girl-tonight'. Even when they come back the following day they would pay me twenty five cents for being a 'stay-in-a night.' You would be a 'stay-in-a-night' and earn your twenty five cents and then wake up and work. We thought twenty five cents was a lot of money because we could buy a shoulder cloth with it.

Six o'clock, I knock in the kitchen. The 'mnumzane' opens. I put water on the stove in a kettle. I have already washed my face and my hands outside. I had to wash my hands because I was going to touch food. I use an electric kettle. I have switched on the electric lights in the kitchen. I make the coffee for the 'mesisi.' I go to the bedroom with a tray. I knock, 'misisi, misisi, good morning, coffee time,' The man would open the door for me and I would put the tray and I go away. He would then go back and sleep.

I would then go and start polishing the floor. I would start with the sitting room. I would polish the floor in the sitting room, dining room and put things in

order, dust it and then go to the kitchen. When they wake up they find that the food is ready, the sitting room is clean. I have prepared their breakfast. When they have breakfast, I will have made them some more coffee, and then fry eggs and bacon, and cut bread and margarine and then take a net and cover the food and continue with my work. They will come and eat and then say, 'OK Lobutimba, we are going.' They would leave me with their baby, a baby that is just starting to walk. This baby would cry and do everything. I would have to stop working and look after the baby because it was crying. I would wonder how I would work with this crying baby. I thought the white people would chase me away. After some time I decided to phone, when I knew how to use the phone. I would tell them that the baby is crying. He would say, look here Lobutimba, if I can go to your grandmother, she would tell me that you used to cry. You must stop working and look after the baby. I would then stop working and look after the baby. At first, it was difficult because I still had to clean the house. There was nobody who would clean it except me.

The work never got finished. I would then wash the clothes, both the clothes of the children and the parents. Everyday, I had to wash clothes and iron them and then prepare lunch for them. They had told me that they do not eat a full meal at lunch time. They eat it in the evening. Food like meat and vegetables was eaten in the evenings. In the mornings they ate food like bacon, eggs and coffee and also drank milk. In the afternoon at three you had to make fire in the coal stove because we were saving the electricity. At four o'clock the meat is on the stove. You cook the meat nicely and make a 'post roast.' It must not burn. When you cook it you do

not leave the kitchen. These days when people cook for us they just leave the kitchen and the food burns. We used to cook beef steak, 'post roast,' T-bone steak and frying steak. Before the 'mesisi' leaves at one o'clock, you ask, 'what is for supper tonight?' She will tell you and take out the things and put them outside.

The white woman would show me. The steak, the big chunk of meat, the white woman would say, '*you know what*? Today we are going to have this,' talking to her husband. I would then pick it up. She would say, '*what about a T-bone steak, today.*' I would then see the meat as it is taken out, and I say '*Wo (Oh in siSwati)* T-bone steak is this one. I would note a thing when they say it when they are by themselves because they would tell me. They could not interpret for me. I did not know their language.

At times, there was a boy, their boy Ronnie. They would say, '*Ronnie, please go to the bathroom. Go and fetch a soap in the bathroom. 'Wo,'* I say to myself, the bathroom is where people wash themselves. I start to get the story, I take notice of which room is which. The child would bring the thing. I could not, they knew that I am from the royal family.

At this time, I could understand a little bit of English. Even in siSwati you say, 'sizodlani ntambama nkosikazi? (What will we eat in the evening, nkosikazi). You could even ask in English, 'what will we eat tonight Nkosikazi?' A white persons understands. A white person does not say you are breaking English just like you educated people. They know what a person is trying to say. They are happy to understand what you are saying. They listen to understand what you are trying to say.

You people, you think you are educated. It is as if your education did not come from us, your parents. You just became educated. We are the ones who gave you bread, because you are like this because of your mother. Your mother who brewed beer and taught you school was trying to open your eyes so that you are not like her. Now that your eyes are opened you look down upon her. You cartoon us and say,'look at this woman. Listen to what she was saying. She was saying 'broad' instead of bread.' You see, you cartoon her instead of explaining and saying, 'don't say that, you should say this.' There are many times when people say such things to me. I used to get angry until I grew up in my spirit, as the Christians say, and got to understand that when a white person says 'what do you want,' they mean 'ufunani? (What do you want in siSwati.)' I would say, 'ngifuna (I want in siSwati) job,' and hear the white person say 'what do you want?' I got to know that I am supposed to say '*I want a job*,' and yet you educated person will come and laugh at me. You do not explain to me.

In the evening when they arrive they would smell the food when they come in. The Nkosikazi when she arrives, she would smell the food and say, '*Hm*! *It's nice, it's nice Lobutimba.*' Their pots look nice. She opens them and she is happy. They go and read the paper. When the time for them to eat comes, she fixes it up and then dishes it in the pyrex dishes. She dishes it in the dish which has a lid because they will dish out of that. You go and put some plates and spoons and they dish for themselves, even when somebody wants some more. You ate your food in your own room, after you finish everything. When they eat you have to be there. As they eat

you wash the pots. When the phone rings you answer it. It is around seven o'clock at this time.

You ate out of the pot. Your meat was called 'dog's meat.' They bought it especially for you. It was hard. You cooked it on another stove because there were'nt any stoves in the kitchen. Your food was not cooked like theirs. Yours was 'plain food.' You cooked it yourself. You did not have any margarine. You did not eat white sugar. You ate brown sugar. I am surprised today when we all eat brown sugar. You got a ration. After sometime, when you see that when you take out the meat, you do not have any meat in the deep freezer, you tell them.

There were no problems in this job because I used to have a day off on Saturdays at two o'clock. I would leave after washing the dishes and making sure that the kitchen is clean. Sometimes when you are ready to leave, they would ask you to stay and say,'no,you know what Lobutimba. This afternoon, I suppose to go to Casino.' You could not go even when you had told your lover that you knock off at two o'clock and he is there waiting for you. You could not even cry. This is your own time. You do not say anything because you are begging them for a job. These days when people complain at work I even join them and complain because I see others doing it. Even though I am not educated and I have no certificate, I join and yet I do think that I am spoiling my chances at my job.

We did not get angry even though we were laughed at. When I grew up, we did not get angry. This thing of getting angry is old age. Even when you talk and you are really making me angry, I would go into hiding, go into the toilet and cry

there, wipe my tears, pour some water on my face and come back to the person singing because I do not want to show my anger. You are not supposed to show your anger. That is disobedience even in siSwati. SiSwati says you are disobedient, you do not want to be chastised, because at times a person may be advising me. Even this siSwati is not practiced well these days. You no longer say things correctly. You no longer say you repeat a speech and examine it, *'yibukisise'* You say I repeat it *'yibukete* (repeat it).' We do not say that in siSwati. SiSwati does not say 'buketa' (repeat). It says 'bukisisa (look at it carefully).'

After that there was this tax where they said we must pay R18.00 a year. The white man came home and said, in the language that we spoke because I was not clever to speak their language myself. We spoke Fanakalo. He says,'wena yazi manje, sikhatsi yena fika lomuntu, lobuya lapha Swazini, lobuya lapha KaSobhuza. Khuluma kawena mangakhi mali lonika kawena, wena khuluma mina lonika R25.00 ngoba uma ungakhulumi lokho hhayi khona lunga, azikho lungile kimi. Bazangicosha lopha kaNgwane.' (You know what? When the person from Swaziland, from Sobhuza comes and asks you how much money I pay you. Tell him I pay you R25.00 because if you do not say that nothing will work out for me. They will chase me away from Swaziland). I agreed to say that. Fortunately, nobody came to ask me that question. I was getting R11.00 and I was not aware this white man was cheating me. He did not pay me as much as I was supposed to be paid. I see where I work that they give us more money. Even when people complain that the money is not enough, I am surprised because I say, 'how can I complain when I get so much money when

I have no education? These people of God just give me the money'. I used to work for R11.00 and I did not complain. I just tell them that I am old my child, I was cheated a long time ago. Now I am going back home. I am old.

Then there was this period of not being settled. They were saying other people must return to their countries. It was a way of ruling the land. That is the time the white people left and went to their countries. Those who remained are those who asked to settle here. My employers like us, so they stayed. I do not know what those years were. We just saw that white people were leaving.

B. LINGUISTIC PROFILE

At home we spoke siSwati. I spoke real siSwati because I grew up kaBayethe (the Queen mother's place) at Lobamba. My mother and father are Swazis. They are not educated. I learned the languages that were taught in school like Zulu and English a little bit. We learned Zulu and English in school, but I left early. I left in the second year of school. I did not need anything as such when I went into domestic work because even the child I gave birth to died. I just wanted money.

When I got into domestic work, the white people would speak English when they are with me. Sometimes they would say, '*do you understand?*' I would then say, '*yes madam*, I do understand.' I would listen. They tend to say things many times. I would then know that, this is a bottle. This is a bottle. This is a bottle,' when they are many. I would then 'catch.' It means it was a thing I would have learned if I had gone to school. I used to remember things. I did not forget things.

The white people did not care if I heard or did not hear something. What was important was that I do something well. That made them happy. They would say, 'listen here, listen here.' This listen here, I learned when they talked to their child. They would say, 'Angela, do not do this, do not do this,' then I learned that it means you should not do that. That helped me. Where I work now there are Nigerians. They do not know siSwati. They know English. I do not know English very well, but I try.

We did not write a long time ago. We learned everything in our head. Everything had to be in your head. This is what killed us. If it was now, we would know how to write. There would be schools for those who did not go to school. we would learn something. Even today, when I go to the shops. If I go to O.K. I just stand and keep quiet. I mean now (O.K. is a big supermarket). I get there and stand and say, my child I get tired of taking stock of everything. Show me where OMO is (OMO is the brand name of a detergent). They then tell me. It just got into my head. I did not grow up reading for myself. They would also speak and say, 'wena yazi, today, wena yazi pheka lo oxtail (you know today, you know today. Cook this oxtail in Fanakalo). They meant the meat that comes from the tail. *'Oxtail is a very hard meat, suppose to cook slowly and slowly and slow. Wena yiva* (Do you hear in Fanakalo?). *Anser me*. ('Yes mnumzane, yes Mesisi.' Then I would cook the tail. It would burn if it burns. They would find me crying if it burns. I would cry because I have made a mistake. I think they will chase me away. Sometimes I would put the heat very high, very high! There was no reason why it would burn if the heat was not

high. They would say they will not do anything. Even the plates, the ones which break, if they broke, they would find me in tears. I say, oh my god! I have wasted this. This white man will not pay me or maybe even expel me. They come and say in their language, 'OK mama. OK mama, stop crying mama. OK Baas is going to buy another one. Baas is going to find another one. They did not say they would deduct money. I would get my pay. I thought it would be better if they deduct money than for them to expel me. I was in that state of mind.

When I was with the children I could speak English a little bit better. The children found me able to speak. I had started to say, 'No, Angela, stop it! I had started to try. The children would also say, 'you are naughty Lobutimba. You are naughty. I would learn that they say I am mean. I learned a lot from the children. I learned to talk from them. They would say, *'I am go to tell Daddy, my Daddy is going to smack you.'* I would then learn that they say their father will beat me. Sometimes the children would be naughty. The parents say when they are naughty, I should smack them so that they can stop. I would then smack them. I would not beat them hard. I would do it just to scare them. The child would cry out loud and think the father would defend him/her. The father would say, 'OK Lobutimba, smack more.' The children would cry, my child.

I remember that they would say, *'Let us go to town, we must take a money when we go to town, go to buy some sweets for you.'* When we get to town and I have no money to buy sweets, they would say, '*you are naughty Lobutimba. You got no money. You poor. You naughty.* Something like that. I would tell their parents and

they would laugh and say, 'don't call her, its a poor.' I could hear the children, but I could not understand what they mean.

When independence came we heard that the white people are leaving Swaziland. We did not know how many were leaving, or even where they were going. We did not know the years when they flocked to Swaziland or why they came or what was happening. I do not even remember how they left. I do not remember how they just disappeared because I do not remember a day when someone said they are going by bus. We just saw the white people gone. Nothing. They had gone. We knew the ones in the suburbs because I stayed in town. You could count the ones who remained. Africans started to come in. My employers stayed because they knew the life of Boers. The man, unfortunately, was married to a Boer from Tzaneen. The man did not like Boers. He would say, 'the Boers, Lobutimba, the Boers is no good.' The wife was a Boer. She was mean. She refused with the money. She is the one who wanted me to earn R11.00 for all those years. When Boers see you at their door they just tell you to go away. They say, what do you want *Kaffir, wat sy jy so Kaffir.'* I would ask my 'mesisi' what it means to say '*wat so.'* She would say it means, what do you want.

The Boers did not like to speak to Africans in English, if you lost your job and they hire you. Some people would lose their jobs, and if they were hired and they spoke English, they would lose the job. They would not last even one month. The Boers would say you are making yourself a white person. You speak English. Are you a white person? You would rather speak Fanakalo. Why don't you know the

Afrikaans which they speak? Boers are jealous. They look down upon people. You do not hear the word which says Kaffir. It means you are a Black person. Those Black people from that side speak Afrikaans. If you speak English they expel you and say, 'I got to give you sack,' I cannot afford to speak English with you. When other Boers come they will find me speaking English with you!

I did not see any difference after the white people left. The white people had homes in town and Swazis had theirs in the country. We did not have the mind of white people. Even when we saw the horse galloping, we would be happy and say, the white man comes. We knew horses because we saw them at the show. They would come from the land of the Portuguese. We also saw cattle, not this milling around which happens today.

Here in Swaziland, we should speak siSwati. It must be spoken well. I can go back to the word *'kubuketa'* (to repeat). It should be *kubukisisa* (to look at it carefully). English is OK. We earn our living through it. If I know it, a Zambian can hire me and I can wash clothes and earn R90.00. If I did not know how to speak to the Zambian, he would not know how to say, *this cup is dirty*. I need money for my children to eat. I hear even the announcers on the radio also speak bad siSwati. They teach our children bad siSwati. If I could talk to the announcers on the radio, I would ask them where they got such a word. Little children should also learn English and siSwati.

When we grew up we did not look at old people in the eyes when talking to an old person. That was a practice. Look down, look down. When I look down I am

showing respect. Even in the shops, we would look down. We were afraid to go there. We would send others. We would look down even when speaking to the person who owns the shop. We respect him. These days I am not afraid. No matter what. Even when I go to O.K. (a supermarket chain in Swaziland) I stand and wait and keep quiet. I stand and say, ' my child, I get tired of taking stock of all the things in the store. Show me where OMO (a brand of washing powder) is. The person will tell me. I cannot read for myself. I have to be told where something is. I am not afraid to ask. If there is a problem, I just leave things at the till when I am tired of shouting and walk out. I don't care. I am no longer shy. I don't care. The shyness is gone.

If I could be young again, I would go to school. I would be a good girl. I would not have a boyfriend. I would not do this because I know that sin starts with having a boyfriend. You stop respecting your parents, or even anybody. You do not even see the sun even though it can burn you. You do not see even trenches because you walk and look up and think you know everything.

POST COLONIAL LIVES
SIBONGILE

[Recorded in the house of her employer at Matsapa, on December 7 1993]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

My home is in Hlatsi. I was born in 1957 to very poor parents. My father moved to settle here in Embikwakhe in 1959. He arrived here and they gave him a place and he stayed. In 1960 our home burnt down. The Red Cross helped us. My

mother was not working. My father was working, but he was a polygamist, and he did not look after my mother. The Red Cross helped us by giving us clothes. Apart from giving us clothes they gave us food. Then my father came to our home to fight with my mother about going to The Red Cross to get help because when the home burnt down she had gone to another homestead where they had asked her to do washing. My father took all the clothes the Red Cross had given us and burnt them.

We were very poor people. There were fifteen of us children. Seven of them died. When we grew up we ate the remains of beer and then my mother got a job, working at Zitheni for another man who was a D. O. (District Officer). She worked there and got money to send us to school. We had a difficult time even though my father was there. I went as far as Form III and then I became pregnant. I had to leave school. That was in January, 1974. I gave birth to the baby. After I gave birth to the baby, when it was three days old, my mother died. I suffered a lot. My uncle took us to my mother's eldest sister' place in Hlatsi. When we got there they treated us badly. The three of us ran away. It was a boy, a girl and myself. We left my mother's eldest sister's place at night and ran away. We got a lift and came back to Manzini. We went to live at my sister's inlaws. Even now we still stay with her inlaws. My sister was married to a prince. He also died.

I got my first job in 1977. I worked at the Joy Knitting Center. I learned how to link pieces of knitted material and got very good at doing this job. In 1978, the Chinese man asked me to ask my parents to allow me to go with him to the Transkei. We got to the Transkei and taught the Xhosas how to knit, but they got jealous and

started threatening us with 'impundulu' (a type of witchcraft used in the Transkei). They looked down upon us Swazis. One man explained that they meant that one of us could get killed at work. In 1981, we decided to come home. I went back to the Knitting Centre. In 1989 the Chinese left overnight without paying us a penny. I got a job at another white man's house. At this place I cleaned and looked after the baby. I ironed and washed dishes and knocked off in the evening. At this place they did not speak siSwati, they spoke English, but we could understand each other. I can speak simple English. I went and worked for a Colored woman at Magevini. I looked after a child this big and took her to the creche.

I worked there for three years then we quarrelled. She came back from work drunk and then she said I must spend the night and I said, 'I told you auntie that you must tell me the day before if you want me to spend the night because I also have children. She then took a tomato and hit me with it and I took a wooden spoon and hit her with it. She then went to the police and filed a case against me. They kept me there and said I should pay R50.00 fine. I hit her with the wooden spoon and she went to the police station and when she got there I had left her place.

I ran away and went home and she followed me. She found me at home and when she got out of the car, she said 'here she is.' When I explained to them she was quick to argue with me because she is a Colored. They said we should go and talk at the police station. I put my baby on my back and went to the police station with them. My brother in law followed me. The police talked to him and said I would sleep in jail because they would discuss our case the following day. My brother in law

asked them not to make me sleep there because he would bring me back in the morning. They agreed. She left. She insulted me at the police station. She said,'you poes' (poes is the Afrikaans equivalent of pussy in English). They said leave this thing alone because it has two brains.

We went back on Tuesday and they said I was wrong because I had hit back. They said I should have come to tell them with the dirty overall. I could not just stand there. I wanted to hit back. After that they said five months in prison or R50.00. My brother in law paid the money. The woman was there when they passed the judgement. She was just uttering insults. She is a two-brained creature. I mean she is a Colored and she doesn't want to be told. She wants to have the last word. She is 'ngqondombili.' This means she speaks English and siSwati. The color is not the same. She is a Colored, the type that knows siSwati and English. She eats our food. It used to eat 'umbhidvo, ligusha and inkaka (types of greens eaten by Swazis). You see, but the skin is white. The hair reaches the shoulders.

I then left that woman because another woman asked me to go and take her place where she was working for another man. I worked there and worked there and then the man and his wife quarrelled. When they quarrelled the wife took pepper and poured it into his eyes. After she poured the chili powder on him it did not get into his eyes. The woman said I must boil water. I plugged in the kettle. When I plug the kettle the water boils. She says I must pour it in a jug. I pour it in the jug in the veranda. The husband was in front of the car. I gave her the water and the man said where is the water going. The wife said 'Foetsek' to the man. He was a

very humble man. She poured the water on him and he got burned in front, from the stomach down. He went to the police station. They came back and found that the woman had run away. Auntie said that I should tell the police that she is not around. She had not run away. She had locked herself in the bedroom. Auntie was hiding in the bedroom. To these women we say auntie. They also say auntie to you.

The police came with the man in bandages. They asked where the woman is and I said I don't know. The man said he will beat me because I am the one who brought the water. The police asked me, 'You brought water, where did you get this water?' I said 'Auntie said I should plug the electric kettle and pour water into the jug which is outside.' The man had left the jug there and not picked it up. He left it there. The police found it there where the water had spilled. The woman said I should take the water and give him and he said, 'what is the water for?' She insulted him, yet she had started with the pepper. The police said, 'where is the chili powder?' and I went to get it. They asked the man if he used chili powder and he said he did because he used to drink. The other policeman said,'you girl we have to go and lock you up. If we don't lock you up we should beat you up until you tell us where this woman is.' I told them where she was.

The man went in because in his car keys, there were keys for the bedrooms. He went and opened the door. When he opened he found her under the bed. The police went with her to Malkerns and the man payed a fine for her after they talked out their family matters, you see. They talked and he came back and dropped her at home. When he had dropped her she took a shoe and beat me because she said

I am the one who told the police where she was. That is how I left. She said she had told me that when the police arrive, I should say she is not around. I was in the kitchen mixing the children's sour milk and then she came in. I collected my things and went back home. My money was brought by the man. He came to home to pay me.

After that I went to work for a woman who had young children, nieces of one woman who works there. They were from Johannesburg. It was during the war. Their mother used to come after six months to check her children. I worked there for two years and fell sick and had a lump. The woman took me to the Nazarene and they cleaned me. It came back again and she took me to Mbabane Clinic. It came back again and she took me to Compton's. At Compton's they took me to the theater and operated on me. She then said I should go home because you cannot stand because of the operation. When it has healed you will come back. My place was taken by a woman from my home area who has many children. Her husband does not work. I put her in my place and did not go back. I stayed at home for a year and six months. I then came to work here.

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

Where I first worked they spoke English. When I arrived because I arrived on Monday, they showed me where they keep scrubbing cloths and polish and brooms. They also showed me where the dirty clothes are kept, the child's clothes and also where they wash the clothes. This is because the house was a double.

There was a downstairs and an upstairs. They showed me the things for cleaning. You did not use soap or polish, the dry one. You used self-shine because the house had tiles. They showed me how ironing is done. She asked me how we wash nappies and I told her that we start by removing stools and then wash them with clean water and rinse them and then put them in soapy water and soak them. After soaking them we add Sta-Soft and wring them and hang them outside to dry. She said that she also knows that. The washing was done differently. You did not stretch the clothes, but held them in both hands in soapy water and washed them like that. They did not stretch them. I did not cook. I would be lying. They used to cook. Everyday I arrived at seven o'clock and soaked the washing. I took the carpet cleaner and cleaned the carpet. I did not sweep the floor with a broom. I used the mop and rubbed the floor. This place had a tree that hung ove the house. Once a snake went into the house, so the windows were never opened. He used to say that if you sweep there will be dust and the baby will sneeze.

I used to understand them. Sometimes the man was fast and I missed some things then he would explain what he means. Like when they send me. Some things I would not understand. I would not understand what they were sending me, but most of the time I understood. One day, when he left to go to work, he said I should wash the baby so that when he comes back at lunch time we can take her to the hospital at the Mbabane Clinic. I thought that he had said I should wash the car. I washed the car. When he came back he found that I had not done anything to the baby. He asked why I had not washed the baby? I said he did not tell me. He said

he told me. I said it means that I made a mistake. I heard as if you were saying I must wash the car because when you come back we are going to the Mbabane Clinic.

The Colored woman spoke English and siSwati. She did not show me much because I arrived at her place very late. She used to work in Mbabane. She would hitch-hike because she did not have a car. She said I should take the baby to Magevini. On the road near the Robertson's there is a bus stop on your way to SUT. I would drop the child there so that she can get on the Malkerns Valley bus. When I arrived she said 'auntie, you are old. You will see what you will do.' The house had three rooms, a kitchen, sitting room and a bathroom. I found a small enclosure that has a door. I opened that and found all the cleaning things, mops, brooms and scrubbing cloths and yellow dusters. There were shelves in this room. I took those things and started working. When she came back she said her house is airy and asked who showed me what to do. I told her that I found everything myself. She said, 'auntie, you are very clever. We will stay together and be happy. My only problem is that I drink. I also have a 'kobho' (temper). I have no husband. The man I am with left me and went to Cape Town.' She told me that he would come and he did come in November. She spoke siSwati. Her child did not speak siSwati. She spoke English. In all the other homes that I worked in they spoke siSwati. Everywhere I worked they spoke siSwati and I have no problem, except at the white man's home.

HLUPHEKILE

[Recorded at a hut that she was renting in Matsapha on December 10, 1993]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

I was born in Nokwane in the year 1964, June 25, which means, I was born at my mother's home so I grew up there at my mother's home. This means they were not rich, they were not poor, they were in the middle. At school I went there across at Bethany, for two years. It means I developed an eye problem, which is a sickness that I grew up with. There were problems, my mother's children were dying, so I had to stay at my grandparents' home. This means she went there when she was already pregnant because she stays in the Transvaal. At first she stayed in Carolina. She was working in the kitchens, and my father worked for another company at a place called Sabie. They treated me very well. It was because of my eyes that I never went to school. When I looked at a paper I would see the same thing. The word would become dark, or I would see the paper only. I went to doctors and my grandparents would buy me medicines for my eyes. When I grew up I started to think that I could work. I tried to look for a job, even though it was difficult. I got sick again in 1976. I was sick all over my body. My stomach was painful, my head and all over even my bones ached. It took a long time, and my parents took me everywhere. There came a time when I got better. In 1979, I went to look for a job in Simunye. I got to Simunye and they hired me to work in the cane fields, weeding sugar cane. I worked at Ngomane. I worked for three months.

We used to stay in hostels, the ones called 'emagigigi'. We stayed there and got our food from the kitchen. They used to prepare food for us. They gave us porridge 'mahewu' (a drink made out of fermented mealie-meal). Sometimes they gave us meat.

We would wake up at four and then go and wash. After that we would go and stand where we wait for the tractors which take us to the fields. Sometimes the places were near, so we walked. There was a man, 'indvuna,' (leader) who would show us the lines to work on and also where you would stop. When you had finished you would leave. We had numbers which were given to us when we registered. Each person had a number, my number was 7439. This number is your employment number. They give it to you when they hire you. They register you by number and name, even when you get paid they use the number. You have to know it because say you are sick, they have to know, that this person whose number is this is sick and then go and give it to the clerks.

I worked at Simunye, at the main cane fields, but after some time, I had a problem there because the sun was too hot. I cannot work when it is very hot. They gave me the watering job because it is done at night. I worked at night. We started at nine and knocked off at six in the morning. We were changing the sprays that water the cane, all over the sugar plantation. There was a tractor, in the evening, that would take us to the different places. What helped us a lot was that we used to wear hats that have a torch on them so that we could see where we are going.

There were a lot of pigs there, we had to be careful. I started to have a problem again. I would faint, because I felt weak all the time.

I left Simunye in '84 after the heavy rains, those rains which caused a lot of damage. I came back home and went to work at the Chinese project at the Usushwana River. We would plant rice, spinach, maize, sweet-potatoes watermelons and also water the crops. The Chinese man said I should stop working in the fields and go and work in the house. That is when I became a domestic worker.

At first I used to stay at home, but after some time we found some wood with another girl and made ourselves a two-roomed shelter. They gave us roofing material. We lived there and cooked our own food there. The Chinese paid us very little. They paid us R60.00. I worked at the Project Manager's house, helping his wife with cooking, cleaning and washing clothes. There was no washing machine. I would iron clothes, scrub and also help them when there were parties. I left the Chinese project because there was very little money and when I worked in the kitchen, there was no day off. There was no time to rest.

I did not get a job when I left the home of the Chinese Project Manager. A Swazi woman asked me to just help her by looking after children when she is at work. She did not have much money. She gave me R50.00. I worked there for two months and another friend of mine told me that there was a white man who was looking for someone to work for him. I had a problem because I did not know how to speak English. I did not know what to do. She said she will talk to him on my behalf and explain that I cannot speak English. She said that if she tells him, he will hire me.

I then told the woman whose children I was looking after that I was going to leave. That is when I came to work for the white man. It was very difficult because I did not know English. I worked here, washing, cleaning and ironing. I worked for six times a month and he paid me R30.00 and then he asked his friend to hire me. I worked both at his place and at his friend's place. His friend gave me R60.00. I worked at his place three times a week. The white man got married and had a child and I had to help them because the child was very young. I looked after the child and he gave me more money. He gave me R100.00. His friend also left and went somewhere, I don't know where. The mother of the baby also had to go and work so I had to start very early at seven. They gave me R50.00 more.

Another man also asked me to help him. He was very good, but his problem was with paying me. He could never pay me on time, such that in the end I had to tell my employers that he had not paid me for two months. In eighty nine they left. They gave me references for the work I had done as a domestic worker. After a month I got a job. Another friend of mine told me that there were some white people who wanted to employ me and also that they wanted reference letters. I did not know what a reference is even though I had them. When she explained I knew that it was the letter that my previous employers had written on my behalf. She said when your employers left they gave you papers. Take these papers to these people. When I got to the job they asked me for those letters and I gave them. They did not give me a problem because they read them and they could see that I had worked, because the letters were saying I had worked, and also that my problem was in

talking. I did not understand English. I could not even read the papers that my employers had given me. I showed them to my friend and she said they are very good and she said I must go with one of them because there were two of them. The woman employed me and told me that she works at a nursery school. I had to work in the house until she came back and knock off at four. She gave me more money than the R150.00. I got R180.00. While I was working there they asked me if I like to sew. I said I like it. And she said what if I can go and learn how? I said I like it but I do not have the money. She gave me a letter and gave me some money, a cheque and said I should go to Three Sisters. I will find a woman and give her the cheque. This woman was expecting me because they had already spoken about me. When I went to the sewing classes there was no one to look after the children, so they employed another woman to work on those days. That is why there are two of us working here.

Then they asked me if I have a house at home and I told them that I don't have. Then they said I should get a small place, they will help me with the house. I tried to get a place and got it and they gave me the money and I went and built the house. They built me a brick house. I bought the first bricks and then later I asked some boys to make them. It is expensive to buy the bricks. They built me the house for ten thousand rand. They deduct R50.00 from my salary. I do not know if I will ever pay back all this money. These days there is another boy who stays in this house

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

At Simunye I did not have problems because we worked in the fields. We spoke siSwati, but the Mozambicans we worked with had a problem. They were forced to speak. When I worked for the Chinese I had a problem because I did not know English. But it was not a language they spoke often. They usually spoke what is called Fanakalo. That is almost easy to understand. Maybe when she is sending you, she would say 'Skhathi mine tjelile wena thatha lo bekile lapha' (When I told you to take this and put it here in Fanakalo). She used to use it. This does not mean that they spoke to all the people in Fanakalo. Those who understood English spoke it. There were those of us who had a problem. We spoke Fanakalo. It was not my first time to hear Fanakalo. When I visited my mother in Carolina, I would hear it. They used to speak it, especially the Indians in Carolina. Indians generally use Fanakalo. That is where I heard that this language is Fanakalo.

When I was working for the white man I used to have serious problems because there always had to be someone to tell me what was being said by him. I would ask another girl to interpret for me when there was something he wanted to say. He would also ask her to tell me what he was saying. For example when he was sending me to the shop, he had to write down what he wanted. Then he would take the paper to another neighbor and then that person would explain to me that he is saying I must go to the shop. Then I would go to the shop with the paper and give him the things. After sometime, I came across Sebenta classes at Khoza. I started to learn English. Luckily, his sister also came to visit and I also gave her

problems. She is a person who likes to talk. She bought me books, the books that have one word, she gave me an exercise book and a pencil and rubber. I would often go to X after lunch and I would pass at her place and she would show me what 'this' means, and 'come' what it means. She would explain many words and even at Sebenta I was also learning English. It really became better.

After this there was a difference because my employer could send me and I could hear what he was saying even though it was difficult to answer, it was easy for me to understand what he was saying. If I wanted to ask a question I would have problems. For example, one day, he told me that I had to fix the house nicely because a girlfriend of his was going to visit. This was before he got married. I heard what he was saying and I did not know how to ask a question because I wanted to ask when, and I chose to keep quiet.

When I worked for his friend, I did not have a problem because he spoke Zulu. He only spoke English with his friends. I did not feel good when they were all speaking English. I felt bad because I could see people talking and not hear what they were saying. I had serious problems. So that when they were talking among themselves I used to leave them alone and not sit with them. When I had finished working I would ask for permission to go or if there was still something to do I would go and do it.

I got this new job when I had improved. I can now understand a little. I am much better. When the woman called me I could answer. If she says I must do something I would understand. I just could not answer, if it was difficult. Even now

when it is difficult I fail to understand. For example there are times when I have to explain to them my problems and I find that there are still some words I do not know. Right now my things got burnt at Khoza, I tried to explain to her and told her that my things were burnt and then we went to see. And even now my things got stolen. You find that there are other words I do not know. I cannot explain very well what I mean. I could not explain to her how the fire started. I was not there when it started, but they told me how it had happened and I failed to explain to her what they had told me. When I was talking about my stolen things it was better. I could tell them that all my things had been stolen.

When I am with the children, we speak English. We are able to chat, and they ask me to read stories and I take the ones that I can read. Even then when there are words I cannot understand the kids tell me how to pronounce it. The children help me learn English, especially the younger ones. They like to have me read to them and then when there is a difficult word they tell me what it says. At times it is necessary for me to stay with them and when they go to bed I take a book and go and read to them before they sleep. Sometimes the parents go away for a whole week and I stay with them.

I think that even if English is spoken, we must not lose our language. We must not lose it because it is our national language. It means if we can stop speaking it there can be no Swazis. Even my children, I would teach them both languages, especially the siSwati. My employer tried some time ago to push me to learn to count, and then my eyes started to give me a problem. She was helping me to learn

to count because I do not know how. They helped me even though my eyes started to give me problems. Now I can count. She taught me sums like one plus one. I can now count, add and subtract and multiply. I can divide as well. My employer helped me after washing the dishes, we would sit down and learn. Even with writing, she was helping me. It is just that my eyes started to be a problem because when they start I cannot look at any paper, no matter what book it is. Even the bible, for that matter, I cannot read it.

A white person is better to work for. I say this purposely because when you have serious problems he/she can help you out. Sometimes you are sick, like I was sick for two months but I did not lose my job. Someone who worked for a person from Ghana and her child was sick. She lost her job.

CEBILE

[Recorded at her employer's house in Matsapa on November 15, 1993]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

My home is in Siteki, KaLanga. We used to wake up in the morning. My father was a 'sangoma' (medicine man), so we woke up and did his work and then cleaned the house. After that we would wake up and wash and then go to school. When we came back from school we would go and look after the goats, when we were still looking after goats or we would come back and drive the goats into the kraal and continue with my father's work, playing the drums for the sangomas. Then

we would sleep and wake up in the morning around four o'clock and go and play the drums again. Sometimes we had to help him with the medicines by grinding. There would always be around ten sangomas at our place. We would help my father when he was teaching them. He was 'gobela' (a sangoma trainer). The sangomas would spend two years under his tutelage. When the sangomas have trained, they would bring a cow to my father.

To train a sangoma, a goat is needed. When the sangoma arrives he is covered in the 'indvumba' (the hut of the sangoma) with the covering used by the sangomas. The drums are played for the sangomas, when he/she first arrive at the home. The drums are played until the 'lidloti' (the spirit) rises and comes out, and then says who it is and where it comes from. 'Libaso' (some smelling potion that gives strengh), is added and the drums are played. If the 'lidloti' does not come up, we stop for a few days and then play the drums again. We sing and the 'lidloti' wakes up and says who it is and also its surname. When it comes up you see the person shaking and then you hear him shouting. He talks and then shouts and then my father talks to him. He is spoken to and the 'mahiya' (cloth) that he bought are used to cover him and his hair is twisted.

The following morning, he is twisted and ocre is smeared into the hair. The drums are played until the 'lidloti' matures. This means it is ready to eat intfwaso.' This means to eat goat blood. Drums are played and you drink the blood of a goat. After drinking it you vomit it in a river where there is running water. The drums are still playing. After that they come back and dance and then the skin of the goat and

the bones are hidden. These are the bones of the goat that the owner is going to make 'tinhlola' (the sangoma's bones which tell the mystery). This is done to find out if he can 'phengula' and find something on his own. This means the 'lidloti' looks for them not him. This is when it has awakened. It looks for the things and tells him where they are. He then goes and finds them. When the sangoma has finished the process, his people are called and they are told the day when he will be brought home. They have to prepare and brew beer. When the day comes he is taken home. Drums are played and then the people are spoken to and they give my father the cow.

Apart from helping my father we would also clean my father's hut and also my mother's. After that we would go to school. The school was close to our home. It was across the road. My father did not want to send us to school. He said he did not have money for us girls. I had to leave school. I felt bad because we tried to ask my mother, but she said she cannot afford. She does not have money. My mother tried, but it was difficult. She thought that people will see that she is very poor and decided that only the boy should go to school. She was saying that because our father was no longer sending us to school, yet he had money. He used to say he doesn't want his money to be used on girls. He said he doesn't want to spend his money on a girl's education. He started saying this when we were around standard IV. Before this, he used to pay, even though there were times when he would not. He would pay when he wanted to. He used to pay when he wanted to. Sometimes

he wouldn't pay and we would not go to school. We would stay at home until he paid for us.

We stayed at home one day. When he asked us why we were not going to school. We told him that we did not have any money. We were only able to pay when they had chased us away. This is when I was in Standard III. That is how I eventually left school. I stayed home from eighty two to eighty seven when I had the baby. In eighty eight when I had the baby, I was still staying at home.

When I stopped breast-feeding the baby, I went to look for a job. I went to Manzini in Zakhele. I got it through another man. I had to look after a baby. I worked at another woman's home. I used to wash the baby's clothes, wash the baby himself and cook his food. She was staying with her stepfather, a white man. I lived with them in the same house. There was a difference in the way they prepared food for the baby. I had to learn how to prepare food differently. She would say I must fry bread, prepare carrots, add potatoes and margarine and minced meat. I would also prepare him an egg. I did not know how to prepare the minced meat and potatoes for the baby. I did not know how to fry the bread for it. She would say I should beat eggs into a cup, add aromat (a type of seasoning) and dip the bread in them and fry it in a pan.

I got there and stayed one day and she taught me the following day. She took one day. She taught me how to cook the potatoes and carrots for the baby. I was cooking the carrots by cutting them, making them into slices yet she wanted me to grate them. She realized I did not know how to cook the food of the baby because

when she came back, she found that the baby had not eaten the food. She said I have to peel the carrot and grate it first and then boil the potato. I then remove the water and add margarine.

When I came to work for these people, I thought everything was different, the way whites do things. They told me that I had to change because I was from the country. She said this place is not like home. I have to change and do things the way they are done in the city.

Another thing which did not make me happy was that she would give me my money after a long time. She would promise to pay me on the thirtieth and I would get paid on the fifteenth of the following month. She would also demand that I sleep in her bedroom and yet her boyfriend would come and visit. She said she was afraid that I would run away. Her friends would visit her and she would make fun of me. She would call me a fool in front of the people. She would say this is a person from the country. She comes from the rural areas. When they had parties, because her father was white, she would say 'this one will not eat meat because she is from the countryside. A servant eats fish. I would feel very bad and keep working for them because I came to work for money. I ended up leaving because I did not like the situation.

After that I got a job at Zakhele. Even there I was just cleaning. There were no children. I used to wash and cook for them. They treated me well, until I left. They used to show me how to clean, because where I was working I was not cleaning. They told me that I had to clean the rooms and how to clean them; go to the kitchen

and the sitting room. In the bedrooms I had to change the sheets. They used to make the beds and I would just change the sheets and clean the floor and dust. In the other rooms I had to clean as I did in the main bedroom.

The woman taught me how to clean the carpet tiles. She said you pour water into a bucket and pour in a solution for cleaning it. I have forgotten what it is called. You then add it and kneel and take the foam on a brush and use it to clean. I continue cleaning with the foam. There is a solution you use. I have forgotten what it is called. If the stains are stubborn I use Handy Andy. I could also use steel wool, if there was something that would not come off. I would then apply polish, Step One if there was any or just plain Cobra. I did not cook for them. I cooked only if the woman was late from work. Their food was similar to food I used to cook at home. It was different because you added different things. I had to know what to add to the different kinds of food. The only thing she taught me that I was not used to cooking was tinned fish. She said you cut a carrot into small pieces and then cut green pepper and onions. When it is ready you add tomatoes. When you finished you do the fish. You take it out of the can and remove what is inside it and then pour it. You cook potatoes separately and then add them. Afterwards you can add soup. But she had taught me not to add soup. Even minced meat. She would cook potatoes first and then add onions and pour it in and cook it. She would then add the potatoes and close. If it is not thick, she would add powdered soup.

I also learned how to bake. She would bake biscuits. She would mix margarine and sugar. She would then break an egg into a cup and add it. After that

she would add flour and add milk and grate an orange and add the peel. She would put the flour on the table and use a glass to cut out rings and then take pans, grease them and then put the mixture on them, and put in the oven. After watching her bake, I could bake under supervision.

I went home because when I went there I was pregnant. I went home and stayed there until I got a job at another man's place. He was raising chickens. I used to fetch water from a tap far away. I would feed the chickens and sell them when they are ready for sale. They taught me that it is important to clean the chicken house, take out the saw dust, scrub and spread new saw dust on the floor so that the chickens should not feel cold. When there are chickens, I would gather firewood and pour water and food in the containers. I would close the door and the windows. I would feed them and make a fire for about three weeks. When they have feathers, I would stop making the fire and continue with water. I had to separate them and stop them from clumping together, so that they don't kill each other. I would leave at five and someone else looked after them at night. After three weeks we took them out of the house where we used to make the fire and took them to another chicken house which is where they grow up until they are ready to be sold. Even there, I washed the containers, especially the ones they drink in and then add food and water. I would wake up and watch the chickens all day long. The woman was lazy to look after them. I left because the man could not pay me. I left and stayed at home. I looked for a job at the industrial sites and failed and went back home.

I was still at home when someone told me that my employers need a person to work for them.

When I arrived here, they asked me if I had worked anywhere and I told them where I had worked. They told me that they had also employed me to look after the baby. The woman said she needs someone to look after the baby because she goes to school. She said I should clean her house as if it was mine. The treatment here is different from the other places where I had worked. They showed me that there are good people who think for another person, that when someone is working for you, you have to treat the person nicely. I mean the way they talk to me. They talk to me nicely. They do not shout at me and gossip about me. Where I used to work with the chickens, I would hear people saying, 'we hear that you give people chickens on credit and then don't pay,' if there were people who did not pay. I heard these things from people who had nothing to do with the work. He did not tell me that.

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

At home we spoke siSwati only. At Zakhele, the white man spoke siSwati. When there were other white people, he spoke English. With us he spoke siSwati, so we did not have problems. Even when he spoke with his friends, I could understand some things. Even though I could understand some things, I could not explain what was said. One time I heard him talking to his friends saying we cleaners, me and the woman who cleaned, had to look for other jobs because he could not pay us. We kept quiet because the other woman could also understand. We realized that he did

not want us to work for him. We felt bad. We would have liked him to tell us openly to go and look for other jobs because we were working for him and yet he did not want us there. I told the woman who was the cleaner that at the end of the month I would not come back. This man was saying that because he thought we could not understand. When we arrived, they asked us if we know English. I told them that I do understand some things, even though I cannot answer.

Where I worked in the chicken house, they spoke siSwati. The only thing I did not like was that the man had said I would eat there during the day. When the woman cooked meat, she would say she has forgotten me. When she had cooked green stuff like 'ligusha' (a type of okra leaf eaten by Swazis). She would not forget to dish me. I would go and ask for my food and she would say, 'I forgot you,' when she had cooked meat. If it was green stuff she would call me and give me the food. I ended up telling the man that I will eat at home and have them give me more money. He refused to do that. I told him that his wife has a problem of forgetting me when she has cooked meat. Even when I asked her kids to go and get me my food, she would tell them to come and tell me that she forgot me. They would also insist that I collect outstanding monies from people and not pay me if there was money that had not been paid. That is how I left. When I left, they had not paid me. I kept going back until they paid me.

I think the language of Swaziland should be siSwati. I have problems when I find educated people speaking English when they know that you are not educated and they carry on speaking English. You don't understand even when they gossip

about you. Near my home, there are educated people who do that. When they are together they speak English, even when you are there. One time some girls I know were talking. They thought I don't understand. They said, 'this one does not go to school. She stays at home.'

I would like my children to learn English if they go to school. People in the community should speak siSwati because this is a country for Swazis. I first learned English in school. When I went to school, we greeted teachers in English. Even when asking for permission to go to the toilet, you had to ask in English. When you start school they tell you how to say it. I could only ask in siSwati when I was young and then they told me to say 'please teacher may I go out.'

One time, I went and came back and the teacher saw that I had gone out. She called me and asked me where I had gone. I said I had gone to the toilet. She said 'who did you ask permission to go to the toilet from?' I said I did not know what to say. She beat me and said I should ask. She said I cannot say it is difficult to say 'please teacher may I go out.' I said I could not because I was not used to speaking English.

LOZINDABA

[Recorded at her Employer's house at Matsapa on October 11, 1993]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

I am not sure what year I was born. Maybe it was in 1949. I was not brought up by my parents. They died when I was very young. I was brought up by my

brother. I never went to school. I used to look after cattle and from there I did this thing of marrying yourself to someone. I stayed there and failed because of the treatment. This man could not look after my children. I was later taken by my sister. At my sisters I stayed there and would get piecemeal jobs in the fields. The work I did was weeding. When I left I came here. Life is very difficult. If it were not for my employer who is helping me, I do not know what I would do.

When I started working, the only thing which gave me a problem was the telephone, when a person is speaking English. Even when someone comes and asks for my employer, I cannot answer because I don't know how. I do not know English. They often come here, especially the foreigners. I just tell them that I cannot speak English. I tell them in siSwati.

When I started my problem was electricity, when ironing or cooking. I worked where I looked after the baby. When I had to cook food for the baby, my brain would think that if I touch this, then something happens. This used to give me a problem. I would think that if I touch something there would be a problem. It used to give me problems. They did not show me how to iron at first. This woman must have thought I would know because I am old. A shirt got burned and a night dresses. I reported and then she showed me what you do and where you set the temperature when you do not want it to get very hot. Even now I don't do anything when they have not shown me, because I don't know.

I had to learn many other things. These solutions they use for cleaning, I did not know them. If you have not explained to me in siSwati, I cannot take them and

use them because I do not know how they are used. Sometimes I have a problems with medicines. If you have not told me how to give it to the child, it gives me problems. What I do is count the numbers and then fail to determine if is three or if I should give the baby the medicine three times a day. It is also difficult to determine if it is a teaspoon or a spoon.

I can now see the figures. The reason why I can recognize them is that the woman I work for allowed me to go to Sebenta (the adult literacy program). I would often go to Sebenta. There was another woman who used to teach us out there across the river. She was from Sebenta. She stopped teaching. That is why I no longer go. My brain is going down again, yet it was better. If I found another school I would go again. I am looking for a school.

In this job kneeling on the floor is a problem. It is a problem. They do not give us clothes. My few clothes get old and I fail to go and purchase something at the shop from the little money I earn.

B. LINGUISTIC PROFILE

I think siSwati should be spoken in this country because it is our language. I want my children to know siSwati and English. This is a time when there is education. I want them to learn the language of white people. They should not be like me because now it is English that is spoken. Even jobs, you no longer get them if you don't know English.

If I could be young again, I would go to school so that I can get a job so that I can support myself and my children. Look at these children, they speak English. They speak to me in siSwati because they know I do not know English. I ask them to teach me, but children are afraid as if to teach an old person is a shame.

SENANILE

[Recorded at her employer's place at Matsapa on December, 19, 1993]

A. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

I was born at Luhlangotsini near Pigg's Peak. It is just before you get to Pigg's Peak when you are from Mbabane. We used to stay with my grandmother. My mother left when we were young. We don't know her very well. We started to know her when we were grown up. We moved to Madvubeni in 1985. We used to pray with my grandmother. My father drank beer.

We would wake up in the morning and work in my father's garden, water and sell the crops. I went as far as Standard 1V and then my grandmother said she could not send me to school anymore because she had no money. My father did not give us money for school fees. He used to buy beer with his money. I stayed at home and then went to a nearby farm to pick cotton. There was a white man who owned a farm near our home. When we got to the farm they would give us plastic bags which we would tie on our backs and then pick it and throw it in the bags. We would later go to the scale and they would check how much the cotton weighs. A kilo was six cents. I learned to bend and pick cotton with both hands and ended up making

twice as much as I was earning. When I started, I would get R15.00 per week. I would give my money to my grandmother so that she can buy food. After that I went to stay with my mother at Madlangempisi. I was not working at this time. I then got this job.

When I arrived here, I knew how to do most things. They had to show me how to use the things which are run on electricity. They showed me things like switching on the lights and switching them off. They do not show me difficult things like switching off the fridge. They do that for themselves. I just clean their fridge at the bottom, not the top part.

B. THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE

At home we speak siSwati. I can say I started speaking English at Sitfobelweni, because they did not want us to speak siSwati. They would write our names and beat us if we forgot to speak English. I remember how I forgot how to speak English to another friend of mine. I was borrowing a pen. I did not see the one who writes us down. She wrote me down and the following day the teacher call us and beat us.

When I worked at the cotton farms, we spoke siSwati. It is at this job that they speak English. I have problems here. I understand some things and not others. They usually see when I don't understand and show me. I remember when I started, the woman said I must take out the tomatoes from the fridge. I did not understand

and the woman went away. I did not take them out. I heard that she was talking about tomatoes. I took some out and left others, yet she meant all of them.

I also had problems with the children, I did not understand when they say, 'I want a bath'. I did not know what the children meant. The woman knows that I do not understand English and she tells me by showing me with her hands. She says, 'I mean like this.' I can also remember the time she said I must take out the sponge. I don't know the word she used. Sometimes it is because you do not know the words. Like candles. I wanted a candle for making polish and she did not know what I was saying. I said 'candle'. Another thing which makes me not to understand is that they say something and I cannot hear. But now it is better because I am getting used to them. When I first came I did not understand.

I find the children easier to understand than the parents. It is because they do not say difficult things. They also repeat the same things like when they want to eat, or drink or go to the toilet. They say,'I want to wee wee. I want to poo poo,' when they want to go to the toilet. When they want food they say, 'I want rice.' I learn most things from the woman, and also from another girl. I ask this girl how to say things and she tells me. I asked her how to say, 'I have forgotten,' and she taught me. There were things they would ask me to do only to find that I have forgotten to do them. I did not know how to tell them that. Sometimes there are things that they asked me to do and I forgot. I find it much better to explain when I forget things.

I think siSwati should be spoken here in Swaziland because this is Swaziland. I would also teach my children siSwati unless they go to school. This is because English is something you learn so that it can help you when you go to other countries. If I had a chance, I would go to school.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data from the life histories was analyzed for content features that addressed the issues of social structuring in the study. The life histories were examined at the level of content, for existential themes on spatio-temporality (lived space and lived time), relationality (lived relationship with others) and corporeality (lived body), by looking at the discourse and analyzing it by linking the experience with the social context. This analysis is a simplified versions of the analysis discussed by Van Manen (1990, p.172) and Kegan and Tippins (1991).

The existential themes are related to the interview questions which looked at the stories of growing up, schooling, work and experiences with language in all these places. A breakdown of these is as follows:

THEMES ON COLONIAL SWAZILAND

I: Stories on Childhood

Spatio-Temporal, relationality, and corporeality themes

a) on Boer Farms

b) on British Farms

b) on Swazi Nation Land

II: Stories of Schooling

a) on Boer Farms

b) on British Farms

c) on Swazi Nation Land

III: Stories at Work

Spatio-temporal, relationality, and corporeality themes

a) on Boer Farms

b) on British Farms

c) working for the royal Family

d) working for missionaries

e) in the homes of Africans

IV: Language and Experiences at work

a) on Boer Farms

b) on British Farms

c) in the homes of missionaries

c) in the homes of Africans

THEMES FROM POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

I. Stories on Childhood in rural Swaziland

Spatio-temporal, relationality and corporeality themes

a) Growing up with family:

b) Growing up with grand parents:

c) Growing up with relatives:

II. Stories of schooling in rural areas

III. Work Experiences

Spatio-temporal, relationality and corporeality themes

a) Working for white employers

b) Working for Chinese employers,

c) Working for Colored employers

e) Working for African employers (Swazi and non-Swazi)

IV: Experiences with Language

a) with white employers

b) with Chinese employers

c) with Colored employers

d) with African employers (Swazi and non-Swazi)

In writing out the life histories I followed Roe's method of looking at the narrative. Roe (1982) points out how the narratives that are collected should be treated if one wants to link them to the social setting. While Roe looks at narrative analysis as a tool for pointing out discrepancies in what politicians say, her method is useful for the policy analyst who wants to show how people are affected by policy. Roe outlines four steps. I have adapted Roe's steps to suit the purpose of explaining issues of social construction in the way that I found useful for my study. I found the first step Roe points out useful, and since the last three did not particularly serve my

purpose, I changed them so as to make meaning of my study by adding two steps of my own. This means I ended up with three steps instead of Roe's four. The steps are as follows:

1. Basic definitions of stories and identification of narratives:

She says in this step the policy analyst looks for narratives that are useful in illustrating the point one wants to make. She says if they are narratives they should have beginning, middle and ending.

2. Link narratives with the social situation that they illustrate.

In this case the narrative is explained as an illustration of the institution of domestic work and its language and power dimensions. This shows how the social situation contextualizes language.

3. Recast the problem in a way that conforms with the social situation and show how the narrative explains the linguistic situation in terms of the interactions of individuals and the larger social context. I looked at social policy in order to show how the players are constructed in the narrative and how this reflects the sociolinguistic situation and power dimensions within the polity. The major goal of the narrative analysis was to show the sociolinguistic situation that is illustrated in the narrative and the implications for language planning within the polity.

AN EXEMPLAR

The data in this abstract is taken from the life of Thandi, who is describing her childhood:

> My mother gave birth to me when she was a girl. I grew up at my mother's maternal home. My father denied me. He said I was too light-skinned. He said I was a white person.

In this text Thandi is talking about her birth. Talking about her birth gives her a chance to make herself the subject. She begins all her sentences with 'I' and tells how she grew up by bringing in all the significant people in her life. From the nouns, we can tell the relationship between her and her father. We can also tell the place where she grew up from her use of the adverb 'at my mother's maternal home.' She brings in ownership by using the possessive 'my.' The way she views her birth reflects the interpretation of the birth of a child that is socially created. In order to understand the text, it is necessary to understand the social construction of a person's birth in Swaziland. She says her mother gave birth to her when she was a girl. That sentence creates a background that lays ground for an understanding of how Swazi culture views the birth of a child to a young woman.

The birth of a Swazi baby has to happen between married adults, under traditional Swazi custom. If the baby is born at home, to an unmarried girl, the mother of the girl has to inform the people who are responsible for the pregnancy before the baby is born. She goes with her daughter to the parents of the alleged father to 'report a pregnancy.' If the boy who is responsible for the pregnancy knows that he is the one who has done it and accepts his responsibility, he informs his

mother about 'the people who will come' and tells her that he knows them. If for any reason, he is not happy with the situation, he keeps quiet and the woman and the pregnant daughter go through the ordeal of the pregnancy being rejected.

In the case of this woman, it is obvious that the pregnancy was rejected. She tells about the showing of the baby to the boy's parents and says her father did not want her because she was *light-skinned*. It is very common for men to deny babies that they think do not look like them. In this case the father thought that she was *light-skinned*. The creation of discrimination based on skin color by whites resulted in a reverse type of discrimination that was practiced by Blacks among their own people. This may be linked to the prevalence of whites and Africans having children of mixed blood. Swazi men will deny babies on the basis of pigmentation and overlook the fact that there may be a carry over of genes in the genes of that particular baby. Different clans claim different types of ways of identifying their own children. Old women are supposed to be the repositories of ways of identifying babies by looking at bodily features like fingers and many other ways which are sometimes very vague. These forms of identification are unreliable and often result in babies that grow up without the proper parents.

Grandmothers do a lot of looking after babies because the mothers of young girls are often at work. There are cases where a woman will look after her grandchildren and then raise great grandchildren. In this study, this woman was raised by her grandmother. While she says she had a good upbringing, she was not able to go on in school because she had a heart disease that hindered her from chances of

going into a teacher-training college. Hearing her say her father did not want her because she was light-skinned makes one wonder about the troubles that women have to go through because the man's word is final in the identification of a baby. The woman was as Black as anybody.

The interpretation of her birth showed how the contradictions that came with the dichotomies of Black and white affect women in a Southern Africa where Black people come in all shades of colors. This narrative helps us understand how women were born under circumstances that made it impossible for them to continue with their schooling because of poor parenting and then ended up going into domestic work. It also helps us link the life of the woman, the domestic worker, and marriage when she goes out to have children with a man she thought would marry her but ended up leaving her after giving birth to two children, she had to go into domestic work for the rest of her life. Since this woman was born in a patriarchal society and had no parents, she went to work at a young age under the most cruel circumstances of racial discrimination, where she ate only porridge and brown sugar. With nowhere to go, with nobody, the circumstances of work had to be tolerated. In my analysis, I have drawn from information about the social context that situates the narrative of the domestic worker in the Swazi social context. I have brought in a 'cultural interpretation' of the narrative and brought out how the worker situates herself through the sentences she utters as a young baby born in Swaziland to an unmarried young woman (Sarbin, 1986).

CHAPTER V
EXPERIENCES OF GROWING UP IN COLONIAL AND POST COLONIAL SWAZILAND

This chapter presents the stories of women by looking at their encounters with employers. The stories of women of growing up are interpreted through their telling. They create stories about themselves as they know their lived experience. The position of women as creators of their own experience gives them power to construct the 'I' instead of being people in interpersonal roles where they are referred to through the interpersonal pronoun 'you' as they are constructed in their roles as domestic workers. The discursive acts they used in their telling are looked at in order to bring out how they interpret their experiences. In this study, language is seen as a means by which women express their consciousness of happenings as they bring back memories and focus on events that happened to them. White (1992) says in order to understand a social discourse we have to look at the experiences of people by examining how they are expressed through language because language and how it is used reflects how people see the experience.

> Perceptions and experiences influence the nature and use of language, and the nature and use of language influence what we perceive and how we experience it (White p.30).

Since working under colonialism meant working under white people, the women's are told in ways which bring out the racially constructed configurations of people that was adhered to. Studying the lives of workers in this way helps us focus on the *person*, the *information* and their *consciousness* as they tell them (Chafe, 1980

p. 11). It helps us link the person with the socio-cultural discourse as it is enacted in the telling. Domestic work is a context worth looking at because it brought the domestic workers and their employers in close contact in a work relationship that gave them a chance to take positions according to the social construction of society. Through the telling of stories these social players come alive as they make deliberate decisions in everyday matters as they did a long time ago. Through the stories, the social and the historical become a linguistic text that brings out the social ordering of society.

LANGUAGE CHOICE IN DEPICTING EXPERIENCE

The telling of their stories gave the women a chance to construct their experiences through their own language. They created experiences in ways that showed how they themselves viewed what happened. The choices they made in what words and intonation to use, were their own creation of the experience that was based on a reconstruction of the colonial. There were observable patterns they used when talking about themselves and when talking about people they see as different from them that are worth mentioning. They used pronouns, repetition and many other structures to create different effects.

Rothstein (1991) argues that the linguistic structures chosen by people are a personal choice that arises out of 'linguistic and cultural determinism as well as irrational and impulsive features of human personality.' This means that people construct themselves and their context through conscious choices of linguistic forms

that express the social context. The way in which the linguistic forms chosen are laid out in the story reveal a conscious effort to tell about events the way the domestic worker experienced them. This is done the way a person feels they best represent what she wants to say. According to Rothstein while the telling may seem to be an act that one can manipulate as one feels, language presents some limitations in that it confines what one can say. He says:

> The structures of grammar and syntax do form parameters that limit the ways individuals can describe and understand their universe....But they are also influenced by the personal ongoing histories, by the socioeconomic hierarchy, and by the unconscious, impulsive features of human personality (Rothstein, 1991, p.75).

These limitations that language creates are linked to the social situation that the people live in. The linguistic construction of the self created by the women reflected issues of personality that were shaped by many social issues such as, race, class and gender. This is because it is through language that people learn who they are.

The lives of people are social constructions that are determined by the social order. In the colonial period race was a major issue. The domestic workers found themselves working for whites because they were the ones who made up the upper class in Swaziland. The ideology of apartheid, as practiced in South Africa, affected people in Swaziland because most of the whites who settled in Swaziland were either from South Africa or England. Their attitudes towards racism were the same. The creation of separate educational systems and the institution of laws that regulated domestic work were among the major causes of inequality.

Even in the study of post colonial interactions we are able to see a legacy of colonialism carried out by the members of the Swazi elite, both Black and white and the categories that come out of workers' stories and their interactions such as the non-siSwati speaking Africans, Coloreds, and the Chinese. A look at encounters in childhood that happened when children encountered the Boer masters gives an insight into what it was like to be drawn into domestic work for those women who served under the Law of Masters and Servants. They give child-like encounters using a discourse that depicts a period of the cruelty of alienating children from their parents and introducing them to slavery through force.

WOMEN'S STORIES OF EARLY CHILDHOOD

The limited choices that domestic workers had in their lives have shaped how their lives as 'lived experiences' are told. They tell of lives of forced labor that were shaped in childhood and of growing up having accepted domestic work as a part of their lives that had to be. They tell of a linguistic construction of experiences that lacked individual identity when they were growing up and working for the Boers. This creation of lives, while limiting to them was much more open on the master's side. Encounters involved creating identities with race attached to most things that separated what was for workers and what was for the master. Accepting one's definition meant knowing oneself in terms of specified spaces.

The encounters of workers and their employers took place when the worker went to the employer's place. It was an encounter through which the workers

learned the job in terms of their roles. Learning one's role involved listening carefully to instruction and being a participative learner. The worker had to show her understanding by carrying out the instructions given. It was a time for learning new vocabularies, new names and everything that was defined as working in the kitchen in western terms. Coming from the Swazi way of life, most women did not know how the white people live. The way women tell their lives reveals how they interpret their lives through their knowledge of the experiences. It shows what White (1992) calls a self-system. White (1992) says people organize their knowledge of experience through a way of interpreting themselves and their world.

> Our self-systems are largely derived from three historical sources: our social experiences; our intrinsic method of perceiving and symbolizing what is perceived; and our formal language usage (White p. 27).

How women organized their experiences on Boer farms, British farms and the other places where they worked, showed how their lives are determined by the social order that they reflect.

THE LAW OF MASTERS AND SERVANTS

The Law of Masters and Servants, which was instituted after the abolition of the Slave Trade, resulted in a law that the Boers in South Africa maintained when they moved to the interior. Those who moved to Swaziland practiced the law to the detriment of the Blacks who lived in Swaziland. This law dates back to 1841 (Bundy, 1974; Hansen, 1989 and Keegan 1986). Bundy points out that this was a law which affected farmers and the people who lived on their land. It was a law which was

instituted in order to make the relationships between masters and slaves more tolerable. However, over the years it changed to reflect the desires of the employer. The Masters and Servants Ordinance as applied in Swaziland came about when the laws of the Transvaal became Swazi laws through the short lived period of Boer suzerainty that sought to establish dual rule of Swaziland by the Boers and the British through the Swaziland Commission of 1890. The Masters and Servants Ordinance was effected through the Swaziland Convention of 1892 (Bischoff, 1990). Kuper (1947) argues that the Masters and Servants Ordinance was instituted to ensure that whites were able to get cheap labor. She says the Masters and Servants Law was specifically designed to subserve the labor demands of Europeans. The laws of the Union of South Africa became the laws of Swaziland by virtue of Proclamation 3 of 1904. Kuper also points out that the relationship between the Swazis and colonialists was racially defined. The Africans were looked down upon. She cites figures of people who were tried in Swaziland under this law.

The law regulated how the farmers, who were almost always white and the employees, who were mostly Blacks could relate to each other when they lived on the same farm. The application of the Masters and Servants Law varied from place to place. In the Boer Republics, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, it became a labor tenant law that required people who live on the farmer's land to agree that their children and sometimes the wives would work for the farmer for a fixed period. In the case of Swaziland, the women I interviewed said that they were required to work for six months each year. This law was abolished in 1974 in the Republic of

South Africa. In Swaziland it ceased to be law when the country became independent in 1968.

CHILD LABOR IN BOER FARMS

The white farmer always knew the children of the land-tenants because he had to know when to call on them for service. He created a relationship in which the father of the children was bound to him in order to maintain such a system. The women repeatedly told how the Boer was a 'friend' of their father. Service in Boer farms was something that the women who worked in Boer farms could not avoid because the 'akord' was entered into by the farm owner and the man of the homestead if he had built it on the farm of a Boer (Keegan, 1986). It required that all the children of the Swazis work on the farm. Boys looked after stock and the girls worked in the farmhouse doing domestic work. The lives of the women were shaped by the Law of Masters and Servants, a law which varied from farm to farm according to the agreement the farmer entered into with the father.

Forced labor has been a feature of the apartheid system that has deprived Blacks of the right to education, resulting in a large population that can only occupy such jobs as domestic work. Farm dwellers lived for handouts from the farmer such as soap, matches and maize while providing necessary labor to run a whole farm. All the Boer had to know were the names of children of the Black person and the order of their births so that they could take turns in taking up employment in the house. Keegan (1986) points out that the contract was a verbal agreement that the farmer

made with the male household member, binding all his children to provide labor on the farm (p.131). This is why Losimilo Nhleko and her sisters and brothers had to take turns working 'for the plaas' so that the family could live on the farm. When the children of farm dwellers grew up they had to forego their chances of getting an education and go to work on the farm. They tell of lives that were lived away from their parents. These are lives lived in servitude.

Losimilo was taken when she was young to go and work in the kitchen as a domestic worker. The Boers Losimilo worked for raised sheep and used Swaziland as a place for grazing them. Their migration patterns followed the Swaziland winter season. They would return to the Highveld of South Africa in the summer months. Losimilo told how some of the time was spent in Swaziland and some of it in South Africa. An analysis by subjects will bring out how young Losimilo grew up. Her telling brings out the most important people in her life.

> This Boer would take us to go and work in Breyten. He used to have land both in Swaziland and South Africa. In April the sheep would come down to Swaziland to graze on the farm. They would be here grazing in May, June, July, August, September and then in October they would leave and others would have to drive the sheep back to Breyten. We girls used to work for them when they came in April. April was called 'Mabasa' (April in siSwati). In April everybody knew that the sheep were coming down. They would give birth and then the Boers would come down and stay for the whole winter so that they could see if their sheep were well looked after. They would come down with us from Breyten and when they go up they would go up with you so that you can go and work that side. I used to work in the kitchen, doing the washing, and looking after children.

The most frequently mentioned person in this passage is the Boer. He is mentioned alone and also in plural 'they' to show that they were many. This might

mean his family or other Boers who were grazers. The use of 'take us' objectifies the children and shows how the Boers did not give them any choice. The objectification of Blacks in a racist society is looked at by Anzaldua. She says that the oppressed people are dehumanized in the minds of their oppressors:

> Through objectification - the process by which people are dehumanized, made ghostlike, given the status of Other - an image created by the oppressor replaces the actual being. The actual being is then denied speech; denied self-definition, self realization; and overarching all this, denied selfhood - which is after all the point of objectificaion (Anzaldua 1990 p.272)

The children of the Swazis were taken by the white people and as a result they could not have a life of their own. They went into Boer kitchens to work for the white people. They could not go to school or live self determined lives in anyway.

In this passage the months are mentioned in order to show the seasonal pattern of the migratory cycle of the Boers and how it was linked to the lives of the women. While Losimilo mentioned all the months in English, when it came to April she mentioned it in siSwati to show how important this month was to the people. It was the month of the arrival of the Boers. They did not 'call' 'Mabasa' April because at that time months were known in the language of Swaziland, siSwati. Today people do not know the twelve months of the year in siSwati. I do not know them because I did not learn them in school. Even if I could recite them for an exam, since the months of the year are always written in English in most texts I read, I quickly forget them. The way she says April was Mabasa shows how the English text has replaced the siSwati text in Swazi society. People no longer know their language. This is what Anzaldua says happens to people who are objectified. She says they are 'denied their

language (p. 272).' The biological cycle of the sheep is mentioned to bring out why the Boers wanted to graze their sheep in Swaziland. The Boers were just concerned about their sheep. She tells her duties by listing them. Losimilo used the word 'inkwenteleka' in her telling and said this is what they called going to work for the Boers. The word is a siSwati borrowing from the English word 'contract.'

People's lives had to also follow migratory patterns of the Boers. When she says 'we girls used to work for them when they came in April,' she spells out the division of labor of the land-tenant system. The boys, who were the ones who looked after the sheep, would have to follow the sheep in and out of Swaziland, according to the seasons. The Boer and his family would live in Swaziland until the new ewes were born and then return to South Africa in October. The Boers that Losimilo worked for were the Boers who had land in Swaziland as a result of the concessions that were signed by Mbandzeni. Most of the concessions that the Boers requested from Mbandzeni were for grazing land while the British asked for mining concessions.

The concessionaires arrived in Swaziland during the time of King Mswati II in the eighteenth century. However, it was in the time of Mbandzeni in 1899 that most of the land was signed off to the Boers. Swazis ended up living on one third of the land, and the concessionaires and the British Crown owned two thirds. When Losimilo grew up, her family lived on the farmer's property as tenants which meant that they had to provide cheap labor.

Losimilo Nhleko tells of her school life and brings out the sadness of having to be a domestic worker instead of getting an education. She says:

> I left school because we lived on a farm. I was still attending school when one man came and said the white man had sent them to come and fetch me so that I can go and work on the farm. I cried tears. That is when I left school and went to work on the farm. With us girls, we used to take one whole year working in the kitchen. If you looked after them well they would not allow you to go home. I worked for four years and nobody from my family came to take over for me!

Losimilo's first sentence tells that she left school because of living on the farm. Her use of the gerund phrase 'I was still attending' shows how her life was interrupted by having to go and work for the white people. She goes into the past tense to express the consequences of having to go and work. The proposal of meaning for this story is the clause that begins with 'that.' It is constructed in a way which tells why this story was told (Polanyi, 1979). The sadness with which Losimilo told how she felt when she had to leave school depicts the experiences of women in helpless situations. She compared her life to that of her brother who could afford to attend school to bring out the contrast in their lives and how they turned out.

> There is one of my brothers who was able to attend school. When he came back with the sheep in April he would attend school. When he went up with the sheep he would take his books with him and read them when looking after the sheep. When the sheep came back he would pass on to the next grade. I could not do that because I started working on my fifteenth year and spend the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth year. All these years! How could I go to school with my chest fully developed?.

The construction of her brother as subject in how she says 'he came back' 'he would take' shows how his brother 'was able' to bring about change in his life and create a self that is self-determined even though he was also enslaved. The propositional meaning of this story comes at the end. She says, ' I could not do that

because I started working on my fifteenth year.' This story links with her life story because she wanted to create contrast between the two lives.

Losimilo's use of 'there is one' shows how this brother of hers was an exception to the rule. This young man linked his schooling to the seasonal pattern of the sheep. She uses 'up' to show direction, which is a Swazi was of indicating the Highveld of South Africa. She lists the years she spent at the farmers place. This listing convinces the listener that she knows what she is saying (Strodt-Lopez 1993). She indicates her age by saying her 'chest was fully developed.' That is why she could not go to school anymore. This shows how as a teenager she was self conscious of her body. Her experience is contrasted with the experience of the young man. The number of years he served is not mentioned.

The movement from the home to the farm marked the beginning of encounters with the masters which meant encounters with different languages. The situations that the women found themselves in were controlled by the farmers. Even if the women wanted to be in school, there was no way they could be because they were bound by the Law of Masters and Servants.

Women who lived on Boer farms got to know the Boers when they came to their homes to visit when they were still young. The Boers made it a point that they visited the homes of the Africans who lived on their farms so that they would know their children.. The women told of encounters with the Boers and how much they feared them even before they even had to go and work at their farms. These early encounters took place when the Boer visited the homestead of the African who lived

on the land. This helped them keep a register in their heads for which children to call on when it was their turn to serve in their houses. In the following excerpt Senteni tells how the Boer would come to her home and pick her up. She tells how she cried whenever he picked her up.

> We were on his farm, he knew all of us. Even when he came to visit, her would also visit us at home. I remember when I still feared him. I would cry. He would pick me up and I would cry. I would cry.

When we look at this excerpt we see that Senteni refers to the farmer as *'he'*, *'his farm.'* At this time the Boers had become owners of the farm that Senteni's family lived on. As a young girl, she was not used to the farmer because the Africans lived on the farms in their own stick-and-mud houses. They did not come in contact with white people at this age. It was the older girls who were over ten. Most of the women in the study estimated that they went into the homes of the Boers when they were around twelve years old.

In this excerpt Senteni tells about how she felt about the Boers prior to going to work for them. She mentions how she cried. Her language reveals how she constructs the self through the emotional. Denzin (1985) argues that emotions are a way of expressing the self. They are 'self-situated feelings,' in that they are a way the body expresses how it feels to the other. While picking up a child may be an act of love, a child picked up by a complete stranger cries to express the unfamiliarity that she is in contact with. Perinbanayagam (1991) argues that emotions do not have to be verbalized for them to be interpreted because their meaning comes out through gestures. The farmer in this excerpt could have felt that the young Senteni did not

want to be picked up by someone who was a stranger and left her alone. The Boer decided to disregard her crying and imposed himself on her. Disregarding the emotions of people who are looked down upon socially is discussed by Morays (1994). She points out that people in higher positions do not respond to the emotional frustration of people whom they consider inferior.

In the texts of the girls who worked for the Boers, crying was often mentioned as they expressed the helplessness with which they became a part of the Boer's household. This interaction was ignored by the Boers because their intent was not in creating a happy environment for the servants.

Another woman who told of her first encounters with the Boers before going to work was Tryphina. Her excerpt reveals how the Boers were like strangers on the land. Since she lived in the north of Swaziland, she rarely saw the Boers because they did not settle on the farms permanently. They would come in and graze the sheep seasonally. This way, they only spent some of their time on the farms in Swaziland. The children of the tenant-dwellers did not often see them. Tryphina says:

> Ha! Had we seen the white man before? When we were young we did not know white people.... When his horse appeared over there...we would hide. He will not see where we went. He would shout and no one would answer. We had closed every little hole. We would run away from the white man. We grew up eventually and then we got used to them. When we were clever we did not fear the white man anymore.

Tryphina used an exclamation to show their surprise at seeing white people. Tryphina dwelt on the unfamiliarity of the white man, as some strange person they

had never seen before. She creates a popular image of the white settler in her text; that of a man on a horse. This was a time when there were not many cars in Swaziland. She shows how they would hide and not respond to the Boer as he shouted. The act of running away becomes the final response they would make to get away from the unfamiliar.

The way she asked the question, 'Had we seen the white man before?' brings out in an inversion, her recreation of cause and effect. She uses the past perfect tense in an inversion that is her own idiosyncratic way of expressing what had never happened. An assertion could not have done what this inverted question does. It engages the listener in a way that makes him/her wait for the answer, not in terms of the question itself because it is a question and an answer in and of itself. The listener opens up to whatever the teller wants to say after that.

Tryphina talks about the man on the horse and how he appeared 'over there.' When she was talking she pointed in the direction of the farm where the landscape rises so that a person coming from the other side has his figure stand out when they were on the expanse of land that leads to her home. She says they would hide from the Boers. She says they were afraid because they were not clever when they feared the Boers. The interpretation of women of the things they knew and their lack of knowledge of western life is often referred to as 'cleverness.' They do not see lack of exposure in neutral terms. This social construction of 'cleverness' needs to be examined because people who know western things may not be necessarily more clever than those who do not. This interpretation distorts the way people should feel

about themselves. 'Clever,' is too strong a word to describe lack of knowledge that is a result of not being exposed to something. Further investigation of what Tryphina meant by 'being clever,' could have further illuminated her interpretation.

The Boers who settled in the south of Swaziland grew crops and settled on farms. They also practiced the land-tenant system. Senteni worked in the south of Swaziland. She joined domestic work when she was still a child. She says:

> We were taken when we were young and went to stay with the Boers. There is nothing we did. We did not go to school. I can say we only went as far as first year.

The language that Senteni used also expressed the objectification of being 'taken.' It is the language of the powerless children of land-tenants who agreed to have their children work on the farms in exchange for living on the Boer's farm. The expression 'there is nothing we did' brings out how she views her knowledge of schooling. Since she did not spend any year in school, she is likening her school attendance to the first year of school when she says, 'I can say we only went as far as the first year.' 'I can say,' shows that she is not sure.

The compulsion under which the children worked on Boer farms after they had been 'taken' is expressed by Tryphina. Her excerpt shows how children understood the servitude that they were in. The demands of the job were ones they could not question. They learned to be silent as young women in slavery. It reveals the ease with which children became victims of the system because they could neither refuse nor question why there were at the farm.

> You had to do what you were told. There was no way you could not. What place was this? You did not see mother and father. How could you not do as you were told? Where were you?

The repetition of the pronoun you brings out emphasis and shows a patten of linking ideas by sentence through the subject. She pointed out that one had to do what one was told using the interpersonal pronoun 'you,'throughout her speech. Her use of 'you' engages the listener directly in the conversation. She uses the questions, 'what place was this?' and 'where were you?' to bring out how unfamiliar the Boer's farm house was to the child. Her use of the past tense and the inversion in the second question bring out a personal style, what Perinbanayagam calls a 'self style,' that is used by people when they create their discourse acts. These questions are questions which do not need answers. While they are questions they link up as answers to bring out the fact that you knew what to do just because you knew the place where you were. As much as these questions are about the self and space and obligation, they bring out how one understood force as opposed to knowledge of the self and space that comes naturally. One was forced to do what one was told because of the place where one was.

Tryphina says 'you did not see mother and father,' in order to bring out how parents are the figures of the home and what is familiar. They are figures that help one relate in society because of their acceptance of the child. They create a positive atmosphere in which a child's life develops. The alienation from mother and father that took place when the children went to the Boer farms resulted from not having the people that give a child a sense of acceptance and freedom of being. Working

for the Boers was working in another world. Tryphina's style of asking questions and answering them shows how one interacted in Boer farms. There was no one you could ask anything about you as a 'self' and your being where you were. You had to accept that you are where you are and do as you are told. The home and parents are two essentials that help in the development of a situated-self for a child. Working in Boer households took away both of these.

Children who refused to go and work in the farms created problems for their families because the whole family would be expelled from the farm. Senteni told of a girl who refused to go and work for the Boers. As a result, the whole family ended up expelled from the farm.

> He chased us away. He says, 'Move away from this farm.' He says we must move away from his farm. We left and went to Swazi Nation Land....He did not want that there should be nobody working for him. When there was nobody to work, they chased you away....Itis because the girl that was working for them ran away. ...She ran away from the white man's place and came home. She said she doesn't want to work.

Senteni used the subject 'he' to indicate the farmer and 'we' for them and 'she' for the girl. The use of 'he' and 'she' brings out how the white man and the girl are subjects in their lives and how 'we' and 'us' were objects that were disempowered and chased away. The girl blends into the we with the consequences of being part of the family. On her own she could stand up and say 'no' to the Law of Masters and Servants. She carries the image of the Black woman of whom Anzaldua (1990) says:

> She was forbidden education. She was considered a beast of burden. She was subject to the white man's power and the white woman's powerlessness masking as whim. Her womb was a commodity of the slavemaster and her childlessness, a liabiity of he slavemaster. She was

> not expected to love-but she did. She was not expected to run away-but she did (p. 278).

The result of the girl's refusal to work put the whole family at risk. Senteni uses a command in direct speech to recreate what the farmer said when he chased them away from the farm. He said, 'Move away from this farm.' She also reiterates it as a reported statement in a way that echoes in the ears of the listener. 'He says we must move away from his farm.' The repetition of the same statement gives the listener a chance to hear the drama of telling and how it brings out the different voices involved. She uses 'his farm' in the statement in which she repeats the word of the farmer in a way that attaches the imperative 'move' to the farm. Goodwin (1990) says imperatives, when attached to possessives bring out the power in the interactions of speakers in that when linked to spaces they play out the relations of ownership between people.

The hierarchical order in relation to the farm is brought out in the response of Senteni's family. One listens as the worker changes voices from the role of one person to the role of the other. Direct speech brings immediacy to the telling in that it brings the situation to the present. While the domestic worker may not recreate the whole incident, her telling brings out the main message of the incident of being asked to move. After all the years of work, just because one child would not work, a whole family had to move. Senteni was a married woman at this time. She was married to a man whose family lived on the farm. There are about three generations of people that one is certain of in this movement. It is the father of Senteni's husband's generation, Senteni's and her husband's generation and the generation of

the girl that would not work. This shows how people clustered on the Boer farms in generations. It also brings out how the Swazi extended family is and also how it became bound to the Boers through the law of Masters and Servants.

This incident shows the stranglehold that the Boer farmer had on the land-tenants. The way the land-tenant system was structured created a dependency on the farmer that would make the parents of the children make sure they abided by the law. This ensured that the farmers had a constant supply of cheap labor. The response of the family to the command to 'move away' shows the helplessness of people who lived on the land of the Boers. They just had to obey. The power of a command from a person who is in power is that the person who is a subservient does not usually give a response. They take instruction. The verb carries all the power because it reflects attitude, emotion, and force that is enough to bring out the required response in the other. In this case it moved generations of people to Swazi Nation land.

CHILD LABOR ON FARMS OWNED BY THE BRITISH

The British did not have a child labor system per se. They drew their employees on Swazi Nation Land, sometimes by making arrangements with the Swazi parents. This was not a form of forced labor like the Boers practiced because the Swazi parents could have refused if they did not want their children to go and work for white people. The life of Linah shows how negotiations for workers were done between the British and the Swazi families. She told how a British farmer

approached her father and asked for her to go and work on his farm. Her case is unusual in that most of the workers who worked for the British went into domestic work when they were much older. The arrangement they made was that the farmer would send Linah to school and also give her family a bag of maize. Linah said:

> He asked if he could take one of us children. My mother agreed and I went and stayed with the children of the white man....We used to wake up in the morning and clean the dining room of the white people and the kitchen....After that I would make fire in a little stove which made the water warm. When the children wake up, I would wash both of them. We would then leave with the children and go to the fields where I would pick cotton. I would pick the cotton and watch the children when they are playing.

Linah constructs subjects to show how the white man interacted with her mother first. The first sentences bring out the first people to make decisions about her life. She uses 'we' for herself and the other domestic worker. The children are mentioned once as 'the children of the white man.' After that they become 'the children. In this excerpt she mentions routines. These routines show us what the responsibilities of a child laborer were. She links her duties with adverbs of time. These are structures like, 'after that, 'when the children wake up,' then'. All these bring out a chronological sequence in the construction of duties of the child who went into domestic work. She uses a joining word 'and' to show how picking cotton and playing were done at the same time.

Even though Linah worked on British farms, her language resembles that of the women who worked on Boer farms. In this case a request was made. The use of the verb 'take' in this case is different in that the woman made an agreement with the farmer. She said that they should educate her child and also give her a bag of

mealiemeal. While this agreement may seem to be different from that of the Boer farms, there is a lot that is similar. Even today, the Boers give out rations to people who are on their land. This is the case in South Africa. They may also build a small farm school that the workers attend. The woman seemed to think about the future of her daughter in making an agreement with the farmer. Whether this agreement was enforceable cannot be determined. Linah's life history answers such questions better.

Linah's account also shows that the British farmer came in to save a situation of a woman who had been widowed when she had many children. Since the father had died, the mother might have welcomed the help the white people gave her because it was relieving her of one of her children.

Linah's role was that of nanny. What she did most of the time was to look after the children. While she did pitch in when the other woman worked in the house, she was solely responsible for looking after the children. Working on the farms was work which was regulated even when one went in at such an age. The child laborers were not paid money as was reflected in Linah's life. It is interesting that the arrangement made in Linah's case is similar to that made in the Boer farms.

The procedure about the education of Blacks on British farms seems to have been different from that of Boer farms. Linah might not be a typical example because her parents had negotiated that she be sent to school by her employers. She tells how she ended up being taught by the wife of her employer when their children had gone to school.

> When the children were at school I would be taught by the Nkosikazi from 10 to 11. She taught me English.She would write all the things and then I would also write them. She also taught me how to pronounce the words. I then picked up and my English improved.

In this passage Linah shows how her lessons were regulated by the clock and also how she only had one hour to learn English from the white woman. The mention of 'the children' contrasts with her. Since she was also a child this shows how she was not considered a child like the children of the farmer who were white. While the children of the white people were at school, she was taught by the wife of the farmer for one hour. Her time was allocated by the employer. The disparities in time reflect the differential treatment on the farm. She tells how the woman would write and how she would also write. This shows how her learning was imitative. This is how her English improved. She tells how she was interrupted by the injury in her work.

Linah's Story

Abstract:	The woman did not take me far with my lessons. I think I was disturbed by getting hurt.
Orientation:	The snake bit me. We were going to the chicken house at dusk. I had forgotten the dish for the dogs. The others accompanied me. They were walking in front of me and I was following them.
Complicating Action:	Then the cobra hooked me. I think it was infuriated by the others. I then went to hospital. I stayed there for two years.
Evaluation:	Then the farmer had to leave. They left me with another white man. I stayed with this white man I think for two years then I had to go back to hospital.

Result: I went back and they had to remove my leg because the pus kept coming out.

Linah tells the story of the snake in the past tense because it happened a long time ago. She tells of persons in a way that shows that she was not alone when the incident happened. She uses 'I' and 'the others' to show different subjects. The 'farmer' 'the white man' is another participant. She establishes the story by telling why the snake bit her. Her orientation brings out how she was bitten by the cobra when she went to the chicken house (Labov, 1972). The complicating action is, 'then the cobra hooked on me.' Linah told this narrative so that she can explain why she did not continue with her education. Palus says an experience is something that stays in a person's consciousness. He says:

> An experience is ..defined as one or more closely related life events and their outcomes, as subjectively interpreted and remembered: Experience is not what happens to you, its what you do with what happens to you (Palus 1993 p. 40).'

This incident did not just end in Linah not continuing with her classes. It brought about a lot of problems. Linah had to go to the hospital. When Linah was in hospital, she had a chance to stay with another white family in Bremersdorp, the closest town and got a chance to attend school at Little Flower, a Catholic school. She went home to Phonjwane after her leg was amputated. When she went home the farmer had moved to South Africa.

The farmer who was her employer came back for her and took her to South Africa. When they were in South Africa they bought her an artificial leg. She worked for the artificial leg and never got paid for all the years she spent on the

farm. Since the farmer had left Swaziland, he was no longer giving her mother mealiemeal, which was one of the conditions her parents laid down when they allowed her to go and work for the farmer. When Linah inquired about going home, they told her that she could not leave unless the rest of the money that had been used to buy the artificial leg was paid up. Linah's life history had many turning points in that even though she also expressed fear of whites she eventually married a white man.

The lives of the workers show that they did not spend many years in school. They had to leave and go and work for different reasons. Living in a country where education for Blacks was at a low level, they ended up getting very little if any at all. They grew up alienated from their parents and lived with fear in the houses of the Boers.

CHILD LABOR ON SWAZI NATION LAND

Child labor did not take place on white farms only. It was also practiced by Swazi royalty. While race was a determinant of difference, the difference in classes among the Swazis were shown in the divisions between royalty and the commoners. Swazis who lived on Swazi Nation Land had to show allegiance to the chiefs and the royal family. Lobutimba Xaba tells how she grew up looking after children at the royal kraal:

> I was born in Hhohho, at Vusweni....I grew up at the royal kraal in Lobamba.... My grandmother went to Lobamba. My grandmother had to go and work for the king. In siSwati, the king needs someone to sleep near the door; the female king. She had to sleep near the door.

> A long time ago whatever came in through the door had to start with the commoner. That is why they needed someone, an elderly person to come and stay at the royal kraal, so that the queen mother can send her. That is why I ended up staying with my grandmother there....I stayed with my grandmother until it was time to go to school. I went to school and then there was a problem with the children of the big people and then we had to leave school and go and look after the children.... We were eager to go and work for our king, so we left school.

The use of subjects in this excerpt shows how Lobutimba's life was linked to her grandmother. The subjects 'my grandmother,' 'she,' and I interact in a pattern which showed how they moved from Vusweni to the royal kraal together. The language Lobutimba uses shows the division between the classes in Swazi society. There is a clear division in terms of class between royalty and the commoners when they are at functions dancing together. It is created mainly through space and dress. It is very obvious in public functions such as the Reed Dance and other ceremonies. Members of the royal family occupy different spaces. They dance in the front line. They also wear feathers of birds that the commoners cannot wear.

Lobutimba links her life to that of her grandmother, the commoner. She says her grandmother 'had to go and work,' which brings out how once she had been chosen to be the one to stay with the Queen Mother, there was no way she could refuse. She left her parents at Vusweni and followed her grandmother to the royal residence. The question of choice in Lobutimba's life gets hidden in her telling of her grandmother's obligations. As a Swazi child, once she had been chosen to go and be where her grandmother was, she followed. While this may not seem to be a 'taking' of the child, it is if we define 'taking' as the separation of a child from its parents,

which is a meaning it sometimes carries in Swazi culture. We cannot say the child chose to follow. She was told to go with her.

The class-based division between the 'big people' and the commoners is reflected in the way the people slept in the Queen Mother's house. The commoner slept near the door. The logic of having a commoner sleep near the door shows how the commoners were thought of as people of less worth. It did not matter much if they were hurt in the event of an accident. To ask a commoner to leave the security of her home and bring her to a political situation in which the 'big people' do not even care what happens is not a fair practice. It reveals the unfairness with which people who lived on Swazi Nation Land were treated by the royal family.

As a result of being a commoner, Lobutimba did not go to school. She had to go and serve and look after the children of 'big people' even when it meant losing opportunities for schooling. Lobutimba worked for the royal family until she reached puberty. She moved from one royal household to another after she left school. As a commoner who had accepted her situation, she reports with pride the service she offered to the royal family. She was not paid, but lived with the members of the royal family as a child of the family, raising child after child. Later in her life she went into domestic work because the royal households could no longer make use of her because she had come to appreciate 'the pleasures of the world'. This is how she refers to how she grew up and had a boyfriend and got pregnant.

Women who lived on Swazi Nation Land were not forced to work on the farm. For them it was issues of class and gender that determined whether they would get

an education or not. Since inheritance is done along patrilineal lines in Swaziland, girls are seen as people who will go and enrich the families of other people. A long time ago the education of girls was not valued. Mary Gama tells how the forces of patriarchy were against their going to school. She recalls how she and her sisters had to run to school when they had taken milk to the dairy because their parents did not want girls to go to school. She says the older people expected girls to grow up and get married.

> We did not go to school because we were sent there, we had to steal ourselves to go there....We used to take milk to the dairy. After we dropped the milk at the dairy, we would run away to go and learn at Nyakeni wearing our string skirts (luvadla). Our parents thought that we had taken milk to the dairy. They did not want us to go to school because we were female....When we got there the teacher would teach us how to write. He would just teach you how to write your name. It was not like today when there are universities and all these things. We would learn [a] and [ma] and [ba] and then we would go to the dairy and take the milk and run home. We would hide our skins on the way when it is raining because we were going to school. They said schools are civilized places.

Mary's telling begins with a statement that uses the negative adverb 'not' in order to create focus on the fact that this was *not* going to school that is normal. When people go to school they are usually sent there by their parents. They had 'to steal ourselves.' The way she uses the reflexive is very unusual. It was my first time to hear of such an expression, '*sasiteba*' (we stole ourselves). She also says '*le ekutebeni kwetfu*' (there at our stealing ourselves). This shows how they went to school by themselves, without the consent of their parents. This is a very unique construction in siSwati. She used the phonetic sounds of siSwati to tell that they learned the basics in school. She contrasts that time with the present time when

there are universities to show how different Swaziland was then. 'They' is used differently. The 'they' used first refers to their parents. The second 'they' could refer to school teachers and people in general. Her telling shows how the tasks of the girls were linked to their deprivation of a chance to get an education. The girls decided to go to school without the parents knowing. Her contrast of skin hides and skirts shows how at home they could wear Swazi clothes and wear the skirts in school. This brings out the contrast between the two worlds.

Mary Gama said that their parents ended up discovering that they went to school instead of going to the dairy because they always came back with the milk sour and the parents beat them.

> We would go to school without our parents knowing that we went to school, but they eventually got to know because when we came back the milk was sour. The clerk would take out our containers and put them outside. When we came back we would rush and take our containers and go home at the end of the day. The milk is all whey. Then they would ask us. 'How come you always come back with the milk spoilt'? ....We told them that we go to school and they beat us. And they said why are we going to school because we are going to get married. It is only the males that are sent to school....They would beat us and we would go into our grandmother's hut and hide there.... We stopped going to school.

Mary uses the past tense in the beginning of this excerpt to show that it is in the past. She uses voice to bring out how they were eventually asked about the milk. The subjects in the excerpt are 'we' the 'clerk' and 'they' meaning her parents. She says they would ask why they always came back with the milk spoilt. The difference in power between the children and the adults comes out when she says 'They would beat us.' Mary's excerpt has two important questions, one a direct question and

the other a reported one. The first question was about the milk. They wanted to know why it was always sour when they came back home. The other questions is about school, why were they going to school because they were going to get married. Her telling style links the question about milk and the questions about their lives and where they would end have a focus that shows how the milk linked with their lives in real life as an obstacle that they were able to push aside and become subjects in their lives and go to school. Both these questions are both unanswered, but the consequences of their being asked are known. The girls were beaten and, as usual in Swazi society, they went to hide in their grandmother's place. Grandmothers are seen as a place of refuge in Swazi society. They are liked because they can protect the young. Mary's life resembles that of many Swazi women who lived on Swazi Nation Land. Her story shows that the education of girls was not valued. They would be given tasks to do when the boys are in school. Child labor is one of the most prominent reasons girls did not go to school. Mary said they were paid ten cents for taking the milk to the dairy. This to me is child labor in that they got remuneration from their parents for taking the milk to the dairy. The devaluing of the education of girls keeps recurring in women's life histories.

From the lives of women who worked in domestic work from the time they were young we see how the colonial settlers did not care about the education of Swazis. The women express their experiences in verbal narrations that reveal their personal understanding of their lives. They use discursive acts which are different in expressing how they created meaning in these social situations. The interplay of race

and gender come out as the girls point out duties and responsibilities. They tell how they went to work as domestics, which is mostly women's work.

STORIES OF GROWING UP IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

The lives of women who work in post-colonial Swaziland were not shaped by a law such as the Law of Masters and Servants. The women's lives bring out who the important people in their lives were. They speak of their mothers, grandmothers and fathers and bring out how these people contributed to their lives. Their lives follow a trend that is similar in that there is deprivation, misfortune or some similar reason that derails their lives so that they are not able to get an education and finally end up in domestic work. Through language, they tell of their birth by placing themselves in their text by stating the year and place where they were born. These places place them geographically in the map of Swaziland. The women also create themselves as situated-selves in their homes in a way that is different from women who worked on the farms of white people during the colonial period. Maxine Greene discusses how familiar surroundings create a situated self for a person (1988). All of them were born on Swazi Nation Land, in the rural areas of Swaziland. The telling brings out the directions of migration of work-seeking individuals. Rural-urban migration is a feature of post-colonial Africa that presents most African governments with problems. The unemployment in the urban areas is high.

After women tell of their birth in terms of time and place, they go on to tell of the circumstances of their birth. These tend to provide a setting that leads into

events that made the worker go into domestic work. The pattern of place of birth, time, and circumstances that surround their birth shows how they understood my request for them to tell me about their lives, where they were born and what their home was like. It is a telling that relies on statements of dates and adverbs of place. Significant others in the women's lives are mother, father and grandmother. The adverbials of place situate women and their significant others in terms of place of birth and country. The telling brings out the circumstances of the person's birth. These patterns should be seen as examples of the circumstances that surround the birth of people in their homes on Swazi Nation Land. Lozindaba said:

> The year when I was born... I am not sure if it was in 1949. At home I was not brought up by my parents. They died when I was very young. I was brought up by my brother. I never went to school. I used to look after cattle and from there I did this thing of marrying yourself to someone. I stayed there and failed because of the treatment. The man could not support my children. I was later taken by my sister. At my sisters' I stayed there and would get piecemeal jobs in the fields. The work I did was weeding. When I left I came to work here.

Lozindaba also begins her telling with the year. She shows hesitancy in a way that was not common with most of the post-colonial texts. She was the only woman who had never gone to school. Lozindaba uses statements that bring out a causal relationship between the death of her parents and her not going to school.

She uses an expression that reveals the cultural interpretation of marriage when she says, 'I did this thing of marrying yourself to someone.' Her language shows that she looked down upon her attempt at marriage. The use of 'this thing,' shows how she feels about her marriage as opposed to a real marriage. It brings out how Swazi women feel about marriage. They think it is important to be married to

someone. According to Swazi culture a marriage is negotiated between two families. There is the asking for the girl, an undertaking which is done by the man who is going to marry the woman. This involves going to the girl's home to ask for her hand in marriage. Then there is the payment of 'emalobolo (the bride price). This is followed by a wedding. From her language it is obvious that none of these sequential steps were taken. She just went into a relationship and had children who were not supported and the rest became the story of her life.

It is interesting that Lozindaba says she was brought up by her brother. It is not a common thing for a woman to be brought up by a man in Swaziland. Asking her to explain what she meant by being brought up by a man could have illuminated how her brother understood his role. I did not ask if he had a wife or not. Since she looked after cattle when she grew up, he must have been a well-off man. For him to bring up a child by himself is not very likely. A Swazi man, who has stock has no reason not to have a wife and a family because he can pay emalobolo (the bride price). The division of labor between men and women is very clear. The work of bringing up children is done by women.

The major incident that shaped the life of Lozindaba was the death of her parents. Since she had no education she ended up working as a domestic worker. Her life history resembles that of many women who do not have an education and are tied to low income jobs. I interviewed Lozindaba at the home of her employer. When she says 'here,' she is referring to the house of her employer.

Hluphekile's life history shows that it was her poor eyesight that made her leave school. While her grandparents could have sent her to school, she had to drop out because of her eye problem.

> I was born in Nokwane in the year 1964, June 25, which means I was born at my mother's home... At school, I went there across...there at Bethany for two years. It means I developed an eye problem, which is a sickness I grew up with...I continued like that, going to doctors and my grandparents would buy me medicines for my eyes. When I grew up I started to think that I should work. I tried to look for a job, even though it was difficult. I got sick again in 1976, which means I was sick, all over my body. My stomach hurt, my head and all over, even my bones ached. It took a long time, and my parents took me everywhere. There came a time when I got better. In 1979, I went to look for a job at Simunye. I got to Simunye and they hired me in the cane fields to weed sugar cane.

Hluphekile used the past tense throughout the telling of her life of growing up. When Hluphekile used dates, she was very precise, especially when it came to the years. This was common with the women who work in post-colonial Swaziland. The fact that Hluphekile was raised by her grandparents brings up a very important point in the raising of Swazi children. The work that grandparents do in raising children is a lot. It is not taken seriously in that no research is done on it. The demands of working women result in their children being brought up by mothers and their grandmothers. How this affects children needs to be investigated. In Hluphekile's case, it is obvious that her grandparents took good care of her. They tried all they could to get her help. There is no question that she was in good hands.

Her description of her sickness brings awareness to the body. At first she says it was her eyes that would not let her read. The sickness that attacked her whole body was a second malady. She cites her 'stomach', her 'head' and all over her

'body,' a telling that makes one aware how much interviewing workers is about interviewing bodies. Bodies are a text that needs to be examined because it tells its own story. When the body let her, she went out to look for a job and got one at a sugarcane plantation. The body and how it heals in relation to time is brought out in her saying, 'There came a time when I got better'. This brings out the body as a text that is encoded in history and also a text that encodes history. The person's consciousness of the body and how it encodes is brought out in telling of one's experience (Weiss, 1995). This woman's body controlled what she could do when and how. The bodies of domestic workers tell the history of working in difficult situations. How they get to know experience is told as the body experienced it.

This telling brings out one of the common places where women went to work besides the kitchens of other people. Without an education, one could only get the typical jobs that people with no education do; weeding in the plantations. The routine of those jobs matches that of domestic work in that they are structured and regulated. A woman works under the same authority all the time. Most working class people work in such jobs.

Sibongile's life history revealed interesting factors about life and women in Swaziland's polygamous system. In a polygamous society, the men can marry many wives. While a long time ago men could afford to look after their wives, it is not the same nowadays. In this case Sibongile's father abandoned her mother and did not provide for her children even though he was working.

> My home is in Hlatsi. I was born in 1957. My parents were poor. My father moved to settle here in Embikwakhe in 1959. He arrived here

> and they gave him land and he settled here. In 1960 our home was burnt down. The red Cross helped us. My mother was not working. My father was working, but he was a polygamist, and he did not look after my mother. The Red Cross helped us by giving us clothes. Apart from giving us clothes, they gave us food. Then my father came to our home to fight with my mother about going to the Red Cross....Myfather took all the clothes the Red Cross had given us and burnt them. We were very poor people. When we grew up we ate 'emashica' (what remains when Swazi brew is strained). Then my mother got a job, working at Ezitheni for another man who was the District Officer. She worked there and got money to send us to school. We had a difficult time even though my father was there.

Sibongile also told her life of growing up in terms of place, year and mentioning the parents. Her father is a subject in the first sections. He is portrayed as cruel in terms of the things he did. The verbs that show his cruelty is 'fight' and 'burn. Sibongile brings in the Red Cross to show how the organization tried to intervene in their situation. She tells how her father interfered. This telling brings out the attitudes of men who are polygamists towards their wives. He used his power to take their clothes and burn them.

Her involvement of her father as subject shows how polygamists are generally seen as mean people. The issue that Sibongile's story does not bring out is that a woman obtains land through a man in Swaziland. It is Sibongile's father who got the land on which their home was built. If he did not want them to go to the Red Cross, he could stop them because he felt it lowered him in the eyes of the rest of the community for people to know that his family lived on supplies from the Red Cross. This is my assumption of what was happening in this family.

The way she says 'My father was working, but he was a polygamist' is a use of contrast to show that though he was working he did not support his family.

Sibongile used 'emashica' to show how poor they were. Their poverty brought them down to the level of animals. In Swaziland the remains from brew called 'emashica' are given to dogs and pigs. By saying that they ate such food Sibongile's telling shows how they ate food that even people do not eat. Sibongile used an intensifier to show that they were 'very' poor.

The result of a poor upbringing is what affected Sibongile the most. She became pregnant before she could finish school and ended up in domestic work. The Junior Certificate exam is taken after nine years of schooling. This means that she was left with only two years to finish high school. After she left school Sibongile got a job with a Chinese knitting firm at Joy Knitting Center in Matsapa. She worked there until the Chinese company left overnight to go and start up at another place.

Cebile is the daughter of a medicine man who was possessed by the spirits. Her life as a young girl centered around her father's practice. The duties that they were given at home were attached to their father's profession. She had a lot of social knowledge about Swazi medicine that I did not have. The whole social script of her life is something I had never heard before even though I am from the same country as she is. She not only knew the jargon of medicine men, but also the procedure of training a sangoma. Her life history brings out how the medical text about healing that people who practice Swazi tradition understand differs from the medical text of westerners.

> My home is in Siteki, kaLanga. We used to wake up early in the morning...my father was a sangoma. We woke up and did his work and then cleaned the house. After that we would wake up and wash and then go to school. When we came back from school we would go and

> look after the goats. We...would come back and continue with my father's work, playing the drums for the sangomas.

Cebile's telling of her life at home centers on daily routines. She tells what they did, when and how. They woke up and performed the duties that were stipulated for them and then went to school. Her telling shows how her father was the most important person in their lives as children. He is the only subject apart from 'we.' Cebile uses we in order to show that they were many in her family. There is a sequence that follows a timed pattern in her sentences. Even on coming from school, they would perform duties. Her life shows how the home regulates the lives of children. Children have duties in Swaziland. They wake up in the morning and do the tasks that their parents have stipulated for them. The parent determines what is done when. The time before school and after school is time for the parent and what he/she wants done. Play time is regulated within the limits the parent stipulates. This structures the life of the child.

Sangomas are well paid in Swaziland. They are the ones who have all the medical knowledge of the land. Since her father was even more than just an ordinary sangoma, he got more money. Cebile's father trained sangomas. It is surprising that when his children needed money, he would not spare any. Even though Cebile says they spent most of their time playing drums for her father's trainees, when they needed money for school, he did not want to give it to them. She says:

> I stopped in Standard IV in 1981...We tried to ask my mother, but she said she could not afford. She did not have any money...She tried, but it was difficult. She thought that people will see that she is very poor and decided that only the boy should go to school. She was saying that because our father was no longer willing to pay for us yet he had

> money....He used to say that he doesn't want his money to be used on girls....Heused to pay when he wanted to. Sometimes he wouldn't pay and we would not go to school. We would stay at home until he pays. He said he doesn't want to spend his money on a girl's education.

Cebile also used dates accurately in her story. The way she uses the subject shows how the talk about school started to involve her mother 'she.' Cebile uses reported speech throughout this excerpt. She presents her mother's views and her father's through reported speed using 'she said,' 'she was saying,' 'he used to say that,' and 'he said that,' respectively. Even her mother decided that she should spend money on her son. Cebile story brings out how society sees the education of a girl. She says her mother 'thought that people will see that she is very poor' if her boy also drops out of school. She did not seem to care what people would say if her girls dropped out of school. She decided to spare the money for her son and let the girls drop out. For a woman to value the life of a boy more shows how Cebile's mother also perpetrated discrimination against women. Cebile's life shows that the lives of some of the women are a social text that has a lot to do with their experience of growing up in a country which is patriarchal.

The reasons why the women left school include poverty, pregnancy, sickness and discrimination against women. The lives of domestic workers who work in post colonial Swaziland show how life in Swaziland is for most people who are not part of the elite. Trying to make a living means struggling against many problems from an early age. When the women went into wage employment, they had very few options. Domestic work was one of them.

ENACTMENT OF POWER AND CHILDREN'S LIVES

The way the women cooperated in the oppression of their children needs to be looked at closely. It is not clear whether Linah interpreted the agreement with the Boer according to Swazi culture or the slave culture that existed on the land. What is clear is that the white people seemed to be coming to Linah's mother's rescue because she had a lot of children to bring up and they did not. They were also looked on as rich people because they were white. In Swaziland children are taken by relatives who bring them up on behalf of parents. People often manipulate people by appealing to their anxieties and trick them into accepting agreements because they have power. Linah's mother does not seem to have had much power because she could not renege on this agreement when her daughter was no longer going to school. When one studies the woman's role in the maintenance of her child's enslavement, the issue of meanings as mutually constituted in a social setting comes in. Apter and Garnsey say that:

> Social actions contain reference not only to one's own strain of experience but to that of another and through mutuality give rise to interaction. This notion of actions as embodying reflection and the emphasis on interaction as shaped by shared meanings have implications linking women's outlook to the structural constraints which they encounter (p. 20.).

This means that one has to understand what the mother meant in the interaction described by Linah and how the British farmer understood the interaction. The knowledge that the two shared about children and their upbringing is different. What the farmer was asking the mother to do could not be done to his children. His children went to a school for white people. The understanding that African children

could be requested to work in white people's farms reveals the racist thinking of the day. The Swazi children were seen as servants in the white people's world. Children had no say in whether they wanted to be taken or not. They were never given a chance to express their feelings about being taken. Swazi culture is a culture in which children are seen and not heard.

The concept of 'taking a child' in the Swazi context is one which needs to be investigated because it has serious implications for children. The separation of children from parents with or without permission of the parents happens in different circumstances. It happens when children are taken from mothers by their fathers if they do not want to marry the mother. In Swazi culture a man can 'buy' his child from a woman if he does not want to marry the mother. For a boy, he gives the mother's family a cow. For a girl, he gives them two cows. The separation of a child from a parent that he/she has associated with for some time may traumatize a child. 'Taking' children also happens when the extended family pitches in to help in the upbringing of children. Swazi people need to look critically at whom this social 'taking' of children favors needs to be looked into. I do believe that children's interests have to be taken into consideration when 'taking' is done. To separate children and then treat them inhumanely should not be allowed.

The theory of enactment of power is useful in trying to understand how the parents of the young girls could agree to have their children work on Boer farms and also how women perpetrated discrimination against their own children who are girls in post colonial Swaziland. In colonial Swaziland, I look at the life of Losimilo and

her parents as a main example and in post colonial Swaziland I look at he life of Cebile and her mother who decided to struggle to educate her brother instead of her. Apter and Garnsey (1994) see enactment theory as the mutual acceptance of domination as manifested in the actions of the dominated that support a social structure that is oppressive to them. They say:

> We are aware that we are both active and passive in our lives, that we make choices, but not in contexts of our own choosing. Nor do we expect to control the consequences of actions through our knowledge and intentions. In making choices we draw on the conceptual map we have created for ourselves, based in part on shared assumptions we make as members of a culture with deep-seated conventions....We and others enact our expectations through multiple outcomes of actions based on our perceptions. In these ways interactions are structured and choices preempted by the intended consequences of actions. This set of processes we refer to as 'social enactment.'

Enactment theory looks at how people view social structure and themselves as agents who maintain it and also as people who have a capacity to disrupt it. In this study, the enslavement of the girls was done with the knowledge of their parents. The man of the household agreed to live on the land of the farmer and give over his children to serve the Boers. This means the men accepted this slavery as a way of life. In most of the women's lives their fathers had served the fathers of these Boers. Losimilo said her father 'brought up,' the Boer who took her. She would often refer to the Boer as the 'friend' of her father. Losimilo's father was not aware that he was maintaining a system of slavery by allowing the Boer to 'take' his children. Changing this system would have required a change in Losimilo's father's outlook of the problem. He would have had to resist having his children go into servitude.

If some children could refuse to go and serve as shown by Senteni's story of the girl who refused to work, adults could also refuse. What was interesting in that story is that the family ended up going back to the Boer farms because they said there was 'no food' on Swazi Nation Land. Even when the child had broken the boundaries that oppressed them and given the whole family a chance to be free, they saw the Boer's farm as a last resort.

Cebile's mother's decision to struggle to educate her brother and do nothing for the girl shows how discrimination against women is maintained by women in Swaziland. Women also buy into the myth that the education of a boy is more valuable than the education of a girl. The actions of women show that the way they perceive partriachal behavior is like that of men. They take part in their own oppression by maintaining the status quo. Unless one becomes aware of the disadvantage of maintaining the power of men in a male-dominated society, at the level of everyday practice, things do not change. Sometimes even when women are told about how they participate in their own oppression they will still continue. Understanding of life is linked to language and culture. The everyday constructions of life that surround women send messages that counter the voices of liberation inside them. How people view the structures that bind them has a lot to do with their psychological interpretation of social structures. If people view themselves as underlings of other people, they co-operate in their own oppression. The children suffered because their parents cooperated in the maintenance of domination. They

accepted the domination and control that became a part of the lives of young girls. The result was that the girls ended up in domestic work.

In this chapter we have discussed the lives of women and their encounters with domestic work. We have looked at their perceptions of their lives and how they interpret the events in their growing up experiences that shaped their lives so that they ended up in domestic work. In both the lives of women who worked during the colonial period and those who worked during the post-colonial period, we see major events that disrupted their purposeful lives and forced them into a life of servitude. They create their lives by drawing from personal histories that tell how they encountered domestic work with personalized discursive acts that draw from their social knowledge of their lives. Since the social knowledge is created linguistically, we see how language brings out the social context as encoded in someone's life. The following chapter will discuss encounters with domestic work by looking at women and how they created themselves as meaning-making individuails in their encounters with their employers in the roles they played at work.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293017126636

THESIS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

3 1293 01712 6644

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX
to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
06 21 06 JUL 06 2000		

1/98 c:/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.14

NARRATIVES OF DOMESTIC WORKERS AND THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN THEIR EXPERIENCES IN SWAZILAND

BY

SARAH MKHONZA

VOLUME II

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1996

CHAPTER VI
NARRATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF ENCOUNTERS AT WORK

The encounters of workers and their employers took place when the worker went to the place of employment. It was an encounter through which the worker learned the job in terms of her role. Learning one's role involved listening carefully to instruction and being a participative learner. The worker had to show her understanding by carrying out the instructions as given. It was a time for learning new vocabularies, new names and everything that was defined as working in the kitchen in western terms. Coming from the Swazi way of life, most workers had never lived in houses with cement floors, stoves and the like. Being in the houses of employers was being in a different world, the world of those who could afford a lot of things the ordinary person does not have. This was the feeling during the colonial period and in a lot of ways, it is still the feeling of some workers even today. This chapter looks at how life was socially constructed by looking at the encounters between employers and their employees. It examines the texts produced by women by looking at the discursive acts from the level of the word to the text (a structure that is larger than a sentence) and links these with the social setting and its creation of persons (Pope, 1995). I will focus on naming and roles in the different settings that women worked in.

Said (1978) discusses the linguistic creations of people through colonial discourse. He looks at the oriental culture and how it was created by colonialists in

a way which brings out how language is used in social construction of the other. He says:

> Philosophically, then, the kind of language, thought, and vision that I have been calling orientalism very generally is a form of radical realism; anyone employing orientalism, which is the habit for dealing with questions, objects qualities and regions deemed Oriental, will designate, name, point to, fix, what he is talking or thinking about with a word or phrase, which then is considered either to have acquired, or more simply to be reality....The tense they employ is the timeless eternal; they convey an impression of repetition and strength....For all these functions it is frequently enough to use the simple copula *is* (cited in Bhabha, 1994 p. 71).

What Said says is true of the way colonial discourse dealt with the lives of people in Swaziland. The use of language in the creation of the other was a systematic codification of difference (Said 1993). The role of language in the lives of women when they entered domestic work comes out in their verbalization of their narratives (White, 1992). Language brings out the categories that they use in focussing their world. Their telling brings out how the social system used language in the construction of the social world of work through the racial discourse of the colonial period. When women went to work, they had to accept new 'self-systems' in order to make sense of their world. The definition of a self system that White gives is useful in understanding how a person brings about coherence in a his/her life and the understanding of the world. He says:

> The self system is one's complex of functionally interrelated anchors-or patterns-for perceiving, judging, deciding, remembering , imagining, and otherwise reacting. These functions give continuity and being to an individual. The self-system includes all of the social learning and all the internal factors that influence the psychological functioning of the person at a particular moment. The self-system determines the way we

> view ourselves and our relatedness to others of the present, past and future (White p. 27).

Language plays a role in the creation of the person's world view in that it influences how the person sees him/herself. How the person sees him/herself can be examined by looking at the language used. The narratives of women reveal patterns of seeing the world that were created through the discrimination that existed in the period that the women lived in. The power to create the world rested with the employer.

There is a common theme that transcends both periods about women who belong to the working class in Swaziland. Trying to make a life for oneself means struggling against social forces from an early age. When the women went into wage employment, they had very few options. Domestic work was one of them. Working in domestic work makes the issues of class felt in that the worker is constantly involved with the employer. Both are dependent on the other, constantly interacting in very vulnerable situations that result in daily conflicts (Cock, 1976).

NAMING AND THE SELF IN DOMESTIC WORK

The self is a social construction because it is created within social contexts that reflect the economic and political aspects of the society (Brown, 1987). Domestic workers worked in social situations where power was the prerogative of the employer, and they had to succumb to the identities that they were given because of their position in the social situation. The naming reflected the culture of the social situation they worked in.

Brown states that persons within a socioeconomic situation articulate selves through the language of the social situation. He argues that there are 'grammars of the self' and that these can be understood as emblems of the larger society.

> Selves are articulated through certain grammars and vocabularies that mediate between political economy and personal identity...and these can be understood with reference to the political economy (Brown, 1987, p.55)

There was a difference in the way women were named in colonial Swaziland and post colonial Swaziland. The positioning of people follows the socio-political norms of the period. The naming that was done in the colonial period has changed from blatant racism to euphemisms that the post-colonial Swazis create as they try to make sense of servitude and the present social order.

NAMING IN COLONIAL SWAZILAND

In Swaziland most of the domestic workers who worked during the colonial period worked for employers who did not understand siSwati. These employers had difficulty pronouncing Swazi names, and it became the trend that names would be mispronounced or substituted for names that were not those of the workers.

NAMING IN BOER HOUSEHOLDS

Names were exchanged when the worker first arrived in domestic work. Tryphina said her employers would ask them when they arrived what their names were. She said in Fanakalo the typical question was 'Ngubani logama kawena? (What is your name?)' After the employers were given the name, she said they

would not pronounce it properly. She used the name Lobutimba to give an example of how they mispronounced names. She said they called her 'Buzimba,' leaving out the prefix that is used on girls' names in siSwati. In order to get round the problem of pronouncing the difficult names, the Boers used one name for most African domestic workers. She said the typical name for a domestic worker was Annie. This name was used for every worker.

> The name that a Boer uses for an African is Annie. Once you are a worker your name is Annie. Annie! She would call all of you Annie and when you all looked at her when she called you, the Annie who was looking at her was the one she was calling. She would say 'Annie! Kom! (come). The one she was looking at had to run.

Brown argues that naming is a powerful linguistic device. Appropriating power to name objects is appropriating the right to predicate. He says through naming we can predicate which means giving reality the identity we want it to have. Grouping the names of the domestic workers into one name as it was done by these employers can be seen 'emptying their personal identity (p. 127).' This is because it made the women's identities indiscernible. This is appropriation of the power to give or not to give individuals their personal identity on the part of the employer.

The workers, on the other hand, had a problem pronouncing their masters' names and would end up coming up with Swazi alternatives they made up from characteristics of the employer, e.g. physical features and the like. There were everyday titles that were generally used like'mnumzane' (master), which applies to men. In addition to these, the workers maintained the Swazi tradition of naming employers with names which have a meaning. While they had their own names, the

workers called them by names they coined from their features or manners. There was Mahlakaniphane (Clever one), who owned the farm near Sigombeni where Tryphina worked, and Linah Maseko worked for Ndlumhlophe (White house). On a daily basis the titles for referring to white employers were those that were commonly used. These reflect that the whites were referred to with words used for kings. The title 'Nkosi' (king) was used for addressing men; 'Nkosana' (little king)' was used when addressing the sons of the employer and 'Nkosazana' (female young queen) was used when addressing young women. 'Nkosikazi' (female king) was used to refer to women. 'Nkosazana' was also used for female missionaries by those women who worked as domestic workers in mission stations. This title is still used even today in missionary establishments in Swaziland.

Brown posits that the self is an image that is created through language in everyday events and undertakings. The self is a player in the 'honorable or dishonorable... contingencies' of the situation. What Brown says was reflected in the words that were used to refer to women. The 'grammars of selfhood' reflected that they were referred to with words that reflected the social structure of domestic work (Brown, 1987, p 55). The word 'girl' was used to refer to women. Mary Gama said her employer referred to her as 'Ntombazan' a distortion of the Zulu word for girl. She said it in a way that reflected the situation of being called to do task after task in the way she repeated instructions.

'Ntombazan!'
'Mesisi!'
'Ntombazan'
'Mesis!'

> Whatever she is sending me she would say this
> We would respond and say 'Mesisi' not 'madam'
> This 'madam' is a new thing.

There is a repetitive nature of the calling and responding and taking instructions in Mary's excerpt that depicts the period of colonialism. The domestic worker was always at the beck and call of her employers throughout the entire time she was working there. She pointed out that the word 'mesisi' was used more in addressing employers than 'madam' a word that is common these days. The construction of the worker as 'ntombazan,' as if this is a name, supports the fact that a person did not often hear herself addressed by her personal name in this job. When we name a person by name, we affirm the person's identity. 'Ntombazan' could be used to address anybody. The previous excerpt shows that the domestic workers could have been anybody.

The repertoire of the syntax of the self that the Africans acquired in domestic work was in the control of the employer. The motives behind naming reflected the cultural attitudes of the day. Employers sometimes struggled with the African names of their employees or used names that came to their minds.

Tryphina said that Boers used the name Kaffir to Blacks when they were angry with them. The Africans would be angry when referred to as Kaffirs because they considered this name an insult. However, when Annie was used they were not as offended because the name does not have racist connotations.

Mary said that the children of the employers were rude to them and called them 'Kaffirs', a word that means infidel in its Arabic etymology, and is equivalent

to 'Nigger' in the American context. She said this happened when they were harsh to the dogs.

> These children would treat us badly. They would insult us, 'you Kaffirtjie,' what are you doing to our dog, you Kaffir, you Kaffirtjie. That is what I remember.... Even when you are saying it must move.... You don't want it to come here. It is coming in with mud because we are using this polish. We were using this red one.

The prefix '-tjie- is a diminutive in Afrikaans that can also be used in a derogatory manner when applied to people. The use of words such as Kaffir was common among the Boers. This is a word that means infidel in the Islamic world, but ended up acquiring the meaning of non-white in its adaptation to the South African context. It is a taboo word in Southern Africa.

NAMING IN BRITISH HOUSEHOLDS

The word 'mesisi' which is a Swazi-Zulu borrowing of 'Mrs.' in English was used in the households of Boers and also in the households of the British. In this study, the understanding of English and Boer households is constructed from what the maids understood it to be. The two women, Lobutimba and Linah worked for households where the wives were Afrikaaners and the men were British. The construction of racism in the house could have overlapped because of the family background of these employers. An Afrikaaner woman might practice Afrikaaner behavior in a British house. It will blend in because the British also discriminated. The maids did not say anything about this. They did spell who was who when it came to cruelty and also when they talked about language because the British men did not

speak Afrikaans. The word 'madam' was also used by women who worked in the household of the British. Mary pointed out that this a recent construction of the woman of the house.

The British also seem to have used some constructions that define the duty itself when talking about domestic workers. Lobutimba, who worked for a British employer used names such as a 'stay-in a night,' a 'washing-girl,'to bring out how women who were asked to look after the children overnight and those who did the washing were called. A 'stay-in-a-night' had a price-tag to it. A worker was paid twenty five cents for agreeing to stay overnight. In the morning she would have to resume her daily duties. If there were babies this meant she would be very exhausted when she started work. Another name that was used was that of 'look-after-girl-tonight,' which also referred to the girl who spent the night at the employer's home.

NAMING IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

Working in domestic work makes the issues of direct address felt because the worker is constantly involved with the employer. Both are dependent on the other, constantly interacting in very vulnerable situations that result in daily conflicts. In post colonial Swaziland class is the main difference between employee and employer. Difference is created through very subtle uses of language.

Women would use the word 'auntie' or 'sisi'when talking about how they were addressed in the places where they worked. While the women are servants, there seems to be an acceptable understanding on addressing each other using these

names. This understanding reflects the way people relate to each other in Swazi society. It would be wrong to address any woman who works as just a woman. It would be even worse if she was addressed like that because she is a maid. In Swazi society everybody is seen in relation to somebody else. Once a person is in a household, the way of relating takes on a closer identity to the people in the household than 'maid,' 'servant,' or 'woman.' People who use such constructions know that they are being rude.

Another way of looking at calling domestic workers 'auntie' and 'sisi'might be that of seeing the words as euphemisms for maid and servant. It may be embarrassing on the part of employers who are Black to use such words. This is an area that needs to be investigated.

Even though the women work for different employers in colonial Swaziland, the names used are either their personal names or the ones stated above. There was only one woman who brought out a difference in the naming that takes place between Swazis and Coloreds. When the Colored woman was angry with her, Sibongile reported that she called her 'poes,' which was her way of referring to the private parts of a woman. When Sibongile talked about her employer who was a Colored and how badly she treated her, she used the pronoun 'it'. She defined her as a 'two brained thing' (ngqondombili) a derogatory way of naming Coloreds that Swazis use to speak about people of mixed blood. When asked why her employer was 'two brained,' Sibongile said it was because she ate Swazi greens and spoke siSwati, not realizing how much her description showed how much like her the

Colored woman was. The interview on this excerpt is between the interviewer (S) and the interviewee Sibongile (A). These designations were arbitrarily chosen.

A: She was just uttering insults. She was a 'ngqondombili' (two-brained person)
S: What do you mean when you say she is ngqondombili?
A: She is a Colored and she doesn't want to be told. She wants to have the last word.
S: That means to be 'ngqondombili?'
A: Yes.
S: Explain to me.
A: It means to speak English and siSwati.
S: Here I am, I speak English and siSwati.
A: The color is not the same. She is a Colored, the type that knows siSwati and English. She eats our food. It used to eat 'umbhidvo, ligusha nenkaka' (greens which people in Swaziland eat). You see, but the skin is white.

Her explanation revealed how race is created out of irrational explanations of how different the other is from the one doing the 'othering'. In her words the Colored is someone who does not want to be told. She is someone who wants to have the last word. The Colored woman had beaten her and she had hit back. What she said echoed what Fanisile said about Coloreds being difficult people to work for. This incident should not be used to characterize relationships between Coloreds and their employees because on a day to day basis this is not what usually to happened. It was only in anger that the women used these words towards each other. The everyday direct reference between them was that of 'auntie.'

ROLES AND ROUTINES

Individuals understand the situation the way it is constructed. Since institutions are socially constructed through language understanding the institution

means understanding its language. The entry into domestic work was no different from any other job. Women had to learn what to do and also who is who from the perspective of a maid and her understanding of that role. While the role of maid might be defined generally in the social situation, it was more clearly spelt out by each employer as he/she pointed out the details on how things had to be done in a specific household. Luckman (1975) argues that social roles are constructed linguistically through things like imitation and other nonverbal mediums. This means that there are different ways of telling people who they are and what they are supposed to do. Luckman writes:

> Social reality is not transmitted by language alone. Role playing, observation and 'imitation' of nonverbal models of behavior sanctions and the like, are not linked to language in the same way and with equal cogency in all societies. The particular pattern of these links is related to the general character of the culture and its socio-structural foundation (Luckman,1975, p.31).

The issue of roles differs according to the time that the people worked in domestic work. Race was a major determinant of relationships in colonial Swaziland. The women's understanding of their jobs was linked to the way the white masters defined the role. The women who are working as domestic workers today have to face conditions that are slightly different in that most of the employers are Black. They move from different settings earning a living, learning who they are as they work for the Chinese, Blacks, Coloreds and many other groups. In all these places learning who one is, is also learning one's role as it is defined through spaces, objects and how one interacts with these and the owner of the house. Their stories show how domination is created through language.

As women talked about their roles at work they used intonation, direct speech and many other devices to depict experiences when telling their stories. Their discursive acts brought out ways that can help us understand domestic work. The dialogic nature of the social texts came out when the women changed from the past tense and used direct speech to recreate conversations with their employers. Lobutimba and Losimilo were good at this. Losimilo could speak Afrikaans, thus showing how different the language of her employer was from hers. Some women recreated conversations in Fanakalo, bringing out the social code of domestic work that was used when the worker did not know the language of the employer.

Bakhtin (1981) argues that narratives bring out the picture of the interactants and the language behind them. He says speakers take the discourse of another and incorporate it in their own discourse in a way that reflects the sociopolitical context they live in (Bakhtin, 1981). Women talked about their experiences and brought out how they got to know their job and the employer's place. They used direct speech to bring out the voices of interactants. They told how their experiences have stayed in their minds and are sometimes recreated in their daily situations. Tryphina told me that when she relives the days of slavery under the Boers, she insults her grandchildren in Afrikaans using the word Kaffir.

MAKING MEANING OUT OF WORK IN COLONIAL SETTINGS

The domestic workers had to make meaning about themselves through their work. The roles and routines became a definition of who they were and how they

were to be treated. These were maintained rigidly in all situations. The social roles of the domestic workers were learned when the domestic workers got into domestic work. They were taught how to cook, clean, and look after kids. Most teaching seems to have gone into cooking. The woman of the household did the teaching.

The language that women use when talking about their socialization brings out the hierarchical structure between the participants as they talk to each other about the task. The syntactic structures used include imperatives which are linked to nouns and adverbs that tell how something should be done. Sequencing of structures is also a common feature because tasks were done in chronological order.

THE CREATION OF ROLES IN BRITISH HOUSEHOLDS

Lobutimba tells how the wife of her employer taught her how to cook different kinds of food. Her discourse brings out the power of the white woman because she would ask her questions about her understanding of what she would say. She constantly repeated the woman saying 'Mesisi' with her responses. She changed to English to bring out the different languages. Lobutimba's narrative shows how the woman established a relationship with her when she hired her through an interview which can be broken down into a question and answer pattern that brings out the dialogue clearly.

Nkosikazi: *OK, Lobutimba. I like you. I will teach you how to cook. Do you know cooking?*
Lobutimba: *No, Nkosikazi, just little bit.*
Nkosikazi: *OK, I'll teach you well. When you cook this, you cook it so.*
Lobutimba: *OK, Nkosikazi,* take a newspaper and sit and read and

> just tell me what kind of food we are cooking. I will cook it for you and you will see if it is nice.

Lobutimba used 'marking' when indicating the speeches of her employer and hers. Mitchel-Kernan describes marking as a narrative tactic in which the speaker's words are presented in 'direct quotation, and in words that represent the voice and 'mannerisms of the speakers'. She says:

> Marking is essentially a mode of characterization. The marker attempts to report not only what was said but the way it was said, in order to offer implicit comment on the speaker's background, personality, or intent (1986).

She marked the speech of the employer and started with 'OK' She also marked the words by saying them in English. Her construction of the white woman saying, 'Do you know cooking,' brings out her siSwati translation of cooking, 'kupheka,' into a gerund instead of an infinitive, 'to cook.' This construction is an example of how she translated directly from siSwati into English. Her response 'just little bit,' also shows how learning English in domestic work did not afford her knowledge of grammatical responses. She probably did not know that the correct thing to say is, 'just a little bit.' The most important thing to her was to communicate with the white woman.

Their first interaction was in the form of an interview to established selves at work. The 'Nkosikazi' dominated talk and established a relationship that is 'positive' between them with the statement, 'I like you.' She asked a question to find out her ability to cook at the point of entry in the job. The employee's open admission of ignorance of the job established where the learning should start. Lobutimba's 'No,

Nkosikazi, just little bit' gave them a starting point. In her teaching, the madam started lecturing her on what to do and how to do it. The duration of the learning period is clearly stated by the worker as she does the telling. It was a four-day long period of being lectured. 'When you cook this, you cook it so.' She uses generic 'this' to stand for different items she was taught to cook. The word, 'so' is used to stand for how to do each thing that she was taught. The construction 'so' that is used at the end of a sentential structure is a common construction in Afrikaans. Since Lobutimba's madam was of Afrikaaner decent, she might have used 'so' frequently.

The use of 'OK' signals to the listener that there is something the speaker wants to say. This applies when it is used at the beginning of the sentence as Lobutimba did. She uses 'OK' before her instruction in the same manner that the employer used it. This makes both sentential structures similar in construction.

An analysis of the period of the maid as learner shows that the white woman was the one who controlled talk. The only time the worker spoke was to respond and when she wanted to prove to the white woman that she had learned everything she had taught her. This shows her own personal enthusiasm about her job that was unusual among domestic workers. It shows how she wanted to establish for herself that she had some 'self-efficacy' and have it validated by the 'Nkosikazi.' Her learning of the job meant that the Nkosikazi would finally sit and not do any work. She could even read a newspaper when Lobutimba becomes the agent.

When Lobutimba became the agent, she was an agent in the maintenance of her role. Kester (1995) argues that effective agency is what women have 'been

denied' by history. Since Lobutimba became an agent in the maintenance of inequality, Kester would argue that this is ineffective agency. In this excerpt Lobutimba took over and told the white woman to sit down and read a newspaper and said she will cook and have her taste the food to see if it is nice. The training period came to an end when the maid was ready to take over a role the white woman did not want to do. Agency should strive to change historical constructions of oppression and not maintain them.

The structuring of gender among white people made the white woman to be the one who interviews the maid and shows her what to do. The domestic worker had come to take over her role as cook. The role that white women have played in the oppression of Blacks in domestic work in Southern Africa is discussed by Cock, (1976). Since the maid came to take over the white woman's role, she had to show her what her role was. Cock says discrimination in Southern African ranks white men first, white women second, Black men third and Black women and children last.

The reiterations of, 'Yes, Nkosikazi,' and 'Yes, Mesisi.' show how Black women always acknowledged the position of the white women. This brings out how decorum is used in constructing people's roles (Perinbanayagam, 1991). Perinbanayagam argues that when a person keeps repeating someone's title, they constantly recreate social hierarchies that are maintained through ideology. Pope (1995) argues that these are ways of 'saying' and 'seeing' which are assumed to be natural, neutral, true and factual or asserted as 'proper,' 'respectable,' 'official' etc (p 12). For people who want to bring about equality, they present a problem. He

recommends dropping decorum as a strategy to bring about equality. He says this is risky business if one is expected to use such structures. In this conversation, if Lobutimba just answered 'yes' it takes away the affirmation of the woman as a Nkosikazi, a person who is above her.

The understanding of relationships at work between worker and employee made the negotiation of meaning easy. The worker had to know what she needed to know in order to perform well at work. Four days is not enough to learn everything about cooking. It was probably enough for her to assure herself that she had the 'self-efficacy' to do the job. Spindler and Spindler's use of instrumental competence seems to apply in the issue of roles and routines. The domestic worker wanted to see if she had the ability to do the job. A willingness to learn goes with a positive attitude towards the job. Doing well raises the self-esteem of the worker. Domestic workers constantly repeated that getting a job was difficult. One had to do the best they could to stay in the job.

In the job of domestic worker the task of cooking required the learner to acquire new vocabularies, especially the vocabulary of different types of meat. Swazis do not cook meat in the same manner as whites. The different ways of naming meat and the different methods of cooking it were something the worker had to learn. Lobutimba tells how she learned how to cook oxtail.

> They would also speak and say, *wena yazi, today, wena yazi, pheka lo oxtail* (you know, you know today. Cook this oxtail. They meant the meat that comes from the tail. *'Oxtail is a very hard meat, suppose to cook slowly and slowly and slow. Wena yiva? (you hear?), answer me?.* 'Yes mnumzane, Yes Mesisi.' Then I would cook the tail.

The white woman dominates the talk. The dialogue of this interaction also follows a question and answer pattern that marked the first interaction in learning how to cook. Lobutimba only responds once. This dialogue is also marked. The madam establishes levels of knowledge and then explains. The white woman uses Fanakalo and English when speaking to Lobutimba, she uses English when speaking to her husband. Lobutimba changed languages in order to dramatize the use of language in learning vocabularies. Fanakalo is used in domestic work because it makes communication simple. It attaches the Zulu locative 'lo' to the key word 'oxtail.' She says 'wena yazi' which means 'you know.' Lobutimba listens carefully and then realizes what the woman means. The use of the Zulu word 'pheka' (cook) brings in vocabulary which is familiar because it is the same in Zulu and siSwati. 'Pheka' when attached to the noun with 'oxtail' with lo produces a simple sentential structure that is a command. 'Pheka lo oxtail (Cook lo oxtail). By dropping the word 'ox' from the word 'oxtail' Lobutimba constructs the tail in a way which is familiar to her. Making meaning was looking at an object in a way which is familiar to her. She used inferencing and relied on her own knowledge to work out the meaning of what the employers said. The explanation on how to cook the meat was given so that she can know how it should be cooked.

All the dialogue that is in Fanakalo is structured through questions and imperatives. This is one of the main features of Fanakalo. The power is built into its syntax. It points out objects and asks questions by means of basic joining of syntactic structures. Its surface structure and deep structure are very simply

coordinated. The final question, 'wena yiva? (you understand?' which is in Fanakalo brings out the way Fanakalo uses simple structures like 'wena yazi' (you know?) in order to facilitate understanding. The madam demands an answer with an imperative, 'answer me.' The understanding of the listener is established in the response. Fanakalo relies on elimination of redundancy in Zulu in order to create simpler sentences that can be understood easily by the non Zulu speaker. It eliminates mainly the subject concord. The English that the domestic workers use also relies on elimination of redundancy. The structures which are grammatical, whose absence does not alter the meaning of the instruction like articles are left out. The learner says, 'yes, Mesisi.' The vivid manner in which Lobutimba told of her learning experiences helps us understand how domestic workers came to understand their roles under white people in domestic work. The use of language in learning is very clearly articulated. This narrative shows how cooking is culture bound. Coming to the house of a British settler meant that one had to situate oneself in the context and learn as the job is being done.

Goodwin (1990) argues that one of the ways that participants bring out differences between each other is through their actions. In learning the tasks domestic workers and their employers use the task to differentiate between each other. The worker has her own tasks and the employer has her own. They interact on a day to day basis recreating roles through directives, questions and many other syntactic features. Goodwin says 'task activities' are a major characteristic of groups (Goodwin, 1990, p, 63). She says that they use a lot of imperatives. This study

confirmed these findings. Since Fanakalo is about tasks, it is made up of endless imperatives.

Learning tasks meant that the learner should be participative. Even when she was not the one who is talked to she had to listen. When establishing the menu for the day, the white woman would talk to her husband. The worker had to use context and listen carefully attaching names to objects when she is being taught. Lobutimba said:

> The white woman would show me the steak, the big chunk of meat. The white woman would say, '*you know what*? Today we are going to have this,' talking to her husband. I would then pick it up. She would say, '*what about a T-bone steak, today*.' I would then see the meat as it is taken out, and I say 'Wo' (Oh in siSwati) T-bone steak is this one. I would note a thing when they say it when they are by themselves because they would tell me. They could not interpret for me. I did not know their language.

This excerpt also shows that the white woman dominated talk. It brings out the repetitive nature of instruction. Lobutimba states 'the steak, the big chunk of meat,' and eventually says 'a T-bone steak,' to bring out how seeing, hearing and naming the object and then noting it to herself to record it in her mind attaches the name to the object.

When the white woman says 'we are going to have this,' Lobutimba says she would pick up the meat. The 'we' did not include her because she was not the addressee. There is a simultaneous coordination of speech and action between the employer's speech and the worker's action. She was an implied addressee who picks up the meat in cooperative interaction between husband and wife. The question, 'what about a T-bone steak, today,' shows how the menu was negotiated between

husband and wife. While they could make preferences on what to eat, she could not. Lobutimba was an indirect participant in all this conversation. She would note to herself in siSwati what T-bone is. In this excerpt she depicts how the domestic worker would be in the background listening and noting things as life went on between the white people. She says she had to pay attention because she did not know the language. Things would register in the mind of the worker as she listens to the employers. Her use of the siSwati, 'Wo,' brings out how she would be noting things to herself as they are being said. Knowledge of a social setting means knowing what to do and how to do it. It requires knowing the language for interactions. When she speaks in this excerpt Lobutimba used direct speech to bring immediacy to her telling in a way that brings out the participants clearly. The active role of the wife brings out clearly gender roles in the white family. The man did not have much to do with the preparation of food except to say if he wanted the type of meat the wife chose. How meat is the main part of the meal is shown in the lack of mention of the other food that was cooked.

The workers had to do their repetitive roles which included waking up and fixing breakfast. This meant the acceptance of time constraints as allocated by the employer. Personal time became the time of the employer in domestic work. The maid took over agency and maintained the lives of the people in the home. Lobutimba told how she followed her daily routine after she had learned her duties. By this time she could cook all the food she lists. She starts with coffee in the morning. That had to be taken in and announced. She would then prepare breakfast

of bacon and eggs. Condiments like margarine, are put on the table and a net covers them. the evening meal involved meat like beef steak, T-bone, and pot roast, which Lobutimba consistently called 'post roast.' Her narrative which lays out the day's duties indicates that the day started at six o'clock and ended around seven o'clock. Lobutimba said:

> Six o'clock I knock on the door and 'umnumzane' opens. I put the kettle on the stove. I have already washed my hands because I am going to touch food. I put the kettle on the electric stove. The kettle boils. I make the coffee for the 'Mesisi'.I go to the bedroom with the tray and I knock. 'Mesisi, Mesisi,' I whisper. 'Coffee time,' I say to 'Mesisi.'I put the tray down and the man opens the door. I leave the coffee and I go and start shining the floors. I dust the dining room. When they wake up they will find the place looking nice and the food smelling nice. When the white people are about to eat breakfast, I will make some more coffee, fry eggs and bacon, cut bread and bring margarine and cover up everything with a net. I continue with the work. They will just come and eat. They would leave for work and leave me with the baby. The baby gave me problems. She was crying and I would stop working and also cry and worry about the work because if I do not finish the white man will sack me. I would wash clothes when they had gone. At lunch time they would come back and have coffee and tea and then leave for work. At three o'clock I had to make fire in the coal stove and put the meat for supper on the stove.... The work never got finished. I would then wash the clothes, both the clothes of the children and the parents. Everyday, I had to wash clothes and iron them and then prepare lunch for them. They had told me that they do not eat a full meal at lunch time. They eat it in the evening. Food like meat and vegetables was eaten in the evenings. In the mornings they ate food like bacon, eggs and coffee and also drink milk. In the afternoon at three you had to make fire in the coal stove because we were saving the electricity. At four o'clock the meat is on the stove. You cook the meat nicely and make a 'post roast.' It must not burn. When you cook it you do not leave the kitchen. These days when people cook for us they just leave the kitchen and the food burns. We used to cook beef steak, 'post roast,' T-bone steak and frying steak. Before the 'mesisi' leaves at one o'clock, you ask, 'what is for supper tonight?' She will tell you and take out the things and put them outside....In the evening when they arrive they would smell the food when they come in. The Nkosikazi when she arrives, she would

> smell the food and say, '*Hm*! *It's nice, it's nice Lobutimba.*' Their pots look nice. She opens them and she is happy. They go and read the paper. When the time for them to eat comes, she fixes it up and then dishes it in the pyrex dishes. She dishes it in the dish which has a lid because they will dish out of that. You go and put some plates and spoons and they dish for themselves, even when somebody wants some more. You ate your food in your own room, after you finish everything. When they eat you have to be there. As they eat you wash the pots. When the phone rings you answer it. It is around seven o'clock at this time.

This excerpt brings out the beginning of the day very clearly, using habitual tenses in a way that shows that time for starting work for the maid was very specific, yet time for the day to end so that she can rest was not as regulated. This reveals how the employer controlled time in domestic work. In this excerpt Lobutimba dramatizes the morning experience and the evening experience in detail. Her way of telling the story shows that this was the time when the domestic worker interacted with the family the most. She uses simple sentential structures that attach the idea of routine and role. They bring out 'when,' 'what' 'where' 'how' in a way that brings out sequence of duties as displayed in terms of space and time.

It is a telling of roles that can be tabulated in a way that brings out the worker and employers and shows who did what when. When the worker had learned the routine, it fell into place in a manner that made life easy for the whites. The white people would wake up and find everything ready for them. Everything was done for them by the maid. The man opened the door. In all the roles and routines that the workers outlined, this is the only duty that a man did. He went back to bed after opening the door. A tabulation of subjects brings out how work was structured in

order to create the social order. An analysis of Lobutimba's day in terms of subjects is as follows:

Lobutimba:

Six o'clock, I knock on the door.
Mnumzane opens
I put the kettle on
I make the coffee for 'mesisi'
I go to the bedroom with the tray,
I knock on the door 'mesisi, mesisi,
coffee time.'
The man would open for me
I go and shine the floors
I dust the dining room
When they wake up and..
When the white people are about to eat
breakfast
I will make some more coffee, fry eggs
and bacon, cut bread
and bring margarine and cover and
smelling nice
They just come and eat
I continue with the work
They leave for work
They leave me with the baby
I would wash clothes and iron
They come and have lunch
Three o'clock I would make fire
I would wash clothes
Four o'clock the meat is on the stove
They arrive and find the place is smelling
smelling nice.
The woman says, 'it's nice, Lobutimba.'
She opensthe pots and says,'it'snice.
They go and read the paper
You put some plates and spoons
She dishes
They eat
As they eat you wash the pots and answer the phone.
It is around seven o'clock

When the worker had mastered the routines, she set the tempo of the home. She cooked, cleaned the house, minded the baby and washed clothes. All tasks had a specified time. The tabulation of the roles in Lobutimba's sentences shows how she constructed roles in terms of subjects. She constructed herself as I and you. The white people she constructed as they or 'the man,' 'umnumzane,' and the woman, 'she.' The contrast of pronouns 'I' and 'they' shows how the differences were racially created. In all the work that is done, the man just opens the door each time she announces herself. It is interesting that her whisper was addressed to the 'mesisi' and responded to by the man. The structuring of colonial settler life along specified gender roles is brought out in that the woman interacted with the maid more because she is the one who did the work in the house. In this whole excerpt the man opened the door, and read the newspaper and ate.

In all her actions the maid was maintaining the household. Her agency was directed by the rules of the white people. Perinbanayagam says people's agency should be self directed. He says:

> In so far as the self is a maxisign with powers of its own it is able to exercise these powers and thereby influence other aspects of its activities. That is it becomes an agent in its own right capable of imitating acts and constituting responses. The self as an agent of the signing process implies primarily a capacity to take an initiative in constituting an act (Perinbanayagam, 1991, p. 19).

Since Lobutimba moved into a structured role she cannot be thought of as agent. She did all the work in the place of the white woman. She was transformed by her learning into a role of an 'other-directed self (Brown 1987).'

The tabulation of roles by subject also shows how the maid moved about in the house. There is a spatio-temporal relationship with the house and its rooms and surfaces that developed a pattern of its own. In the morning, she moved from the door, picked up the kettle and then moved to the stove. From the kitchen she went to the bedroom with the coffee. She whispered at the door, 'mesisi, mesisi, coffee time. She put the tray down outside the door and went to clean the floors. She dusted the dining room. When they woke up, she made breakfast. The white people just woke up, ate and left. This analysis shows how the domestic worker did the morning duties that related to housework in the morning. These duties tie one's role to the maintenance of the physical spaces that the people use, such as the kitchen, the dining room, the bedroom and the like. It is a relationship of work and space that is a maintenance of 'their space.'

The role of the domestic worker as nanny was an additional burden as shown in this excerpt. Most colonial settlers also hired an additional person who would look after the baby. In Lobutimba's case she did both duties. This affected her efficiency in doing her work. People were understood through their roles in domestic work. The roles maintained the racial structuring of the time. The domestic worker knew what a domestic worker did 'when and how' after mastering the creation of her role by he madam.

Power was also created through social objects. These were designated along racial lines. Deprivation of certain foods and demarcation of spaces for sleeping and

sitting were also ways of demarcating roles. Most of the use of objects as a social code (meaning-making symbols) was done in relation to food and space.

Lobutimba Xaba explained that she had her own meat and utensils. While she cooked for her employers, she did not eat their food, but had to prepare her own.

> I had my own food and my own pot. My meat was called dogs' meat. It was bought especially for me. I cooked it on another stove. There was a coal stove and an electric stove. Your food is not cooked like that of the white people. Yours is plain food. You would also not eat margarine. You did not eat white sugar you ate brown sugar. I am surprised these days when we all eat brown sugar because it was for black people. You got a ration of food when it was finished. You ate your food after they had finished. You ate it in your house.

She creates expressions that have possessives to denote ownership in an interesting manner. Her linking of 'my own food and my own pot' brings out the objects and how they relate to each other. She had to cook her own food in her own pot. She says the meat 'was bought especially for me.' This shows how her food contrasts with an implied 'their food' and 'their pots' and meat that was 'bought especially for them.' Her saying 'dog's meat' brings out how white people brought Black people down to the level of dogs. Buying meat especially for her, shows how she was singled out. This meat had to be cooked on a separate stove. It was cooked differently. It was 'plain food.' Lobutimba's telling of her food and how it was prepared shows the contrast in the food. When she is learning how to prepare food for white people, she was cooking the more valued cuts of meat such as 'T-Bone,' 'pot roast,' 'oxtail' and when she tells about her meat she uses the generic word 'dog' to denote the naming. The specificity by cut is not there.

She said hers was 'plain food.' The irony of the separate methods of preparation is that the same person who ate 'plain food' prepared the food for white people. This could mean that if she added spices in the food of the employers, she would not add spices in hers.

The deprivation of margarine was one of the ways white people excluded Black people. They would refuse them the right to use certain things. The divisions in sugar surprise Lobutimba because over time it has been established that brown sugar is healthier. During the colonial period white sugar was more valued. The correspondence of the color to people's complexions and the independence of the refining process of sugar shows how creative white people were in bringing the two together to create difference according to race.

Lobutimba uses 'you,''your food,' 'yours' in a way that involves the listener in the narrative. This is a personal discourse style that showed how narrators construct 'narratees' in their discourse (Pope, 1995). She uses 'I' to indicate herself as the speaking subject and uses 'you' which becomes interpersonal 'spoken -to subject' (Pope 1995, p. 198). Since this was her food the listener is drawn into her position. As a Black person, I start to react much more personally to her treatment because the focus shifts to me. This use of you in talking about blatant racism created a solidarity between speaker and listener throughout the narratives.

Lobutimba told about the evening meal and said that she would prepare the food and then hang around in the kitchen to wash the pots. She would answer the

phone while the white people ate. Then she would retire to her room. This shows how even eating time was controlled and allocated according to race.

Linah Maseko pointed out that she had to sit on the floor when she ate. Sitting on a chair was not allowed because the chairs were for white people. She said:

> I used to sleep in the kitchen. I ate their food. They gave me their food, but I did not eat with them. They would dish me and I would sit on the floor, not on a chair. I would sit a distance from them. It was a law. You had to respect the white person. Even with dishes, they did not want you to eat in their dishes. There were dishes for you as a Black person. Even when you washed the dishes, you would start with the dishes of the white people and end with yours, the Black person. You knew your dishes, they were not the same. We used to eat in the enamel dishes, you know them, these which are green and blue. They are the ones which do not break.

Linah also created difference and used the pronouns 'I' and 'they.' When she said she would sit on the floor and sleep in the kitchen she was creating difference through space. She points out that she would sit 'a distance from them.' Proximity was another category which designated spaces that are fixed and apart from each other. She uses 'but' to bring out contrast after stating that she ate their food to bring out that this did not mean she ate with them. She states where she sat and states where she could not sit. The adverb 'not' is used to create difference. Even in washing dishes, the white people's were washed first. Sequencing and ordering of white and Black people's things also created difference. Like Lobutimba, who had her own pots, she pointed out that she had her own dishes. She uses contrast by spelling out the material that was used to create difference. She says hers were enamel. They were ones which do not break. Her telling implies that the white

people's dishes were the ones which break. Her telling brings out how people were socialized into catergories of Black and white by being told what was for them and what was not. In domestic work, life was regimented on the basis of color in almost everything.

Domestic workers and their employers sometimes took their roles outside of he home setting in Thandi's narratives. She told narratives that showed how the domestic worker boosted the social image of her employer in public places. The employer would enter the domestic worker in contests that were announced in colonial circles like the Club and the Show. The capability of the employer at entering the best-dressed maid was recognized. The colonial Club was a place where the whites went for recreation. It was exclusively for them. Taking the roles of domestic worker and employer to public places like the Club allowed the public to see who was who in society for themselves. She said:

The Best-Dressed-Maid Contest

> There was a place called the club...onthe right-hand side when you go to Siteki. There, they would say every madam should come with her girl dressed up in whatever manner. We would dress up well and your white person would dress you up well. We would comb and look nice, and wear our caps. Your madam would feel good, especially if she has invited people to come and eat. She would buy you a very nice uniform and be swanky because of the way you look. It was like that.

Analysis by Subjects

Announcement:	They would say every madam should come with her girl dressed up in whatever manner.

Thandi: We would dress up well and your white person would dress you up well. We would comb and look nice, wear our caps.

Madam: Your madam would feel good, especially if she has invited people to come and eat.
She would buy you a very nice uniform and be swanky because of the way you look.

Thandi: It was like that.

In her telling Thandi establishes the setting of the story by telling about the existence of such a place as if it does not exist anymore. She says, 'there was a place...' She states clearly on which side of the road it is in the town of Manzini and in which direction. This establishment of place is a very common technique in siSwati because people indicate directions mostly though places and objects instead of the cardinal points such like north and south. Thandi states the rules of the contest in an embedded sentence that states who the participants are and what they must do. There is an implied voice that announces the regulations. Since she has said 'there' and 'at the club' any member of the club who is an organizer could be inferred to be announcing. The organizers or club members are understood to be the ones who say, 'every madam should come with her girl dressed up in whatever manner.' Her use of 'every madam' makes it look as if all the madams had to enter their maids who yet since its a contest it is only those who wanted to enter their maids that were referred to. 'Your madam,' is your owner. She became an indirect participant in that she was a winner. She says 'your madam' would buy you a very nice uniform.' This shows the effort the madam put to make sure that 'you' her possession, was a winner. The use of 'your' madam brings out reciprocal ownership in that she is yours and you are

hers. She is 'your' owner. Thandi's narrative showed that she told the narrative to show that the maid was doing everything because of her employer because she does not evaluate how the girls felt.

In this narrative, Thandi shows how the domestic worker became an extension of her madam. By entering the maids in the competition, the madams were able to display how they were 'owners' of maids in their social circles, the way one enters a horse in a race. Maids did not have access to the club unless they were entered by their employers. This further entrenched the relations of power in this situation. When the maid looked nice, this reflected well on the madam. The child-like enthusiasm with which Thandi told this narrative with comes out in her evaluation, 'It was like that'. It shows that she told the narrative in order to illustrate what it was like. The warm feelings about the contest on the part of the madam and the enthusiastic cooperation of the maid bring out that she was very happy with this. She does not talk about the result of these competitions and how she fared. There seems to be deliberate omission of detail that allows one to predict the outcome.

The narratives about the contests that Thandi tells resemble the discursive act Perinbanayagam (1991) calls the proposal. He says:

> These are verbal definitions of contemplated activity that is being arranged for execution or realization, and are discursively offered to social circles and significant others. They define a line of action as well as a goal. Thus they become elements of one's identity and to the extent they are accepted and validated by others, they are signs of the self (Perinbanayagam p. 129).

The structuring of the contest also had an announcement which has a voice that Thandi either reports or tells in direct speech. It has a line of action and its

g

goals. It is the voice of the people who control the action. Everybody entering the contest had to comply with it.

Madams also boasted about the skills of the maids and brought back to the house food that maids could cook well so that they can cook for the white people. This seems to have doubled the work of the maids. Thandi says she was well known for washing dishes. Whenever the white people had a big function at the club, her madam was assured of a person to excel in dishwashing. This shows a cultivation of an attitude through praise in a way that makes the exploitation subtle enough for the maid to think of it positively.

The Skills Contest

> They would announce at the club and say, what is your girl capable of doing. Your madam would say, mine has the capability of cooking chicken, and mine can do whatsoever. I was good at cooking rice. I was also good at washing dishes. When there was a big function at the club from nine to three at the beginning of dawn, I would stand at the sink until sunrise. Even now I like to wash dishes. I tell my children that, 'you are lazy. You are untidy. You cannot wash dishes. Take a wheel barrow and go and get them from the neighbors and I will wash them and take them and put them on the wheel barrow and take them back. My white person like me a lot.

An analysis of the important voices in this narrative is important because it sets out the participants and their goals clearly.

The announcement: What is your girl capable of doing?

Mesisi: Mine has the capability of cooking rice.
Mine has the capability of cooking chicken

Thandi: I was good at cooking rice.
I was also good at washing dishes....
I would stand at the sink till sunrise.

My white person liked me a lot.

Quasi Personal: [You are lazy. You are untidy. You cannot wash dishes. Take a wheel barrow and go and get them from the neighbors and I will wash them and put them on the wheel barrow and take them back].

Thandi asked the question about the capability of the domestic workers and used the word 'girl.' In the first part she talks about doing, and then later changes to the capability of 'likhono' (capability in siSwati). The language Thandi used in telling the narratives about the contests stated the question that established the rules of the competition. The guidelines were based on capability. The white women in Thandi's narrative state what their domestic workers could do in statements that say, 'mine has the capability of cooking rice.' Thandi boast of her skills of rice-cooking and washing dishes. In this narrative she did not state the result. She went on a tangent and told how she would wash dishes from morning to day break. Even though she said she liked to wash dishes, the enslavement of people in this manner and extending club work to the domestic worker shows how domestic workers could be exploited through the competitions by the white settlers who were members of the colonial club.

The idea of a contest takes away the drudgery of domestic work and makes it look like a spectacular event. The use of a contest creates a different genre of the presentation of a task that might have overwhelmed the staff of the colonial club and transfers it to the maids role in a subtle manner that hid the control that white women had over the domestic workers. In most clubs I know in Swaziland, duties are

constructed along gender lines. Cooking is done by female club members. This was a way to transfer the responsibility of the white women who were members of the Club. Most clubs are a legacy of the colonial period in Swaziland. Club membership is controlled by the white people who run the club. In order to be a member they have to vote for you. That means you have to campaign by attending and befriending the white people who are patrons. This is a place where only a few Black people go. The domestic workers might have thought it was good to enter the contest because they were held at this place that is exclusively for whites. They might also have just been happy because they got a chance to wear new uniforms, which most domestic workers did not get to do.

This narrative ended in a statement that evaluates the feelings. Thandi says 'my white person liked me a lot,' meaning she appreciated the fact that she could wash dishes at the club. This evaluation also closes the contest of the dish washing and evaluates the contest to me as interviewer because I wanted to know the purpose of her telling these stories each time she talked about the contests and roles outside the home. Thandi's digression to her present-day experiences with her children can be seen as marking the end of the story. Chafe (1980) sees digressions as devices for creating boundaries in narration. He says:

> A digression from the main plot line seems to function as an extreme or strong form of episode boundary (p. 174).

Even here it a boundary that sets the narrative off and brings us to the present with the adverb 'now.' Her use of the statement 'even now' seems to be a way she wants to establish that what she is saying about her love of dishwashing is true. She

projects the past to the present and tells what happens now. She restructures the contest in her life with her children making herself a competitor against them. This was a way of bringing out how she could wash the dishes of the whole neighborhood, when they could not wash even the dishes of one home. In her reconstruction of the contest, her neighbors would act as the judges the way the colonialists did when they judged how the women performed. Contrasting the voices will show how her narrative mirrors the other one.

Voice of Announcer (Thandi)	The club announcer:
You are lazy. You are untidy.	What does your maid have the capability of
Take a wheelbarrow....	

Thandi's use of the word wheelbarrow showed how many dishes that she could wash in a way which brought out how many she used to wash when she was working at the club. This adaptation of the narrative about the skills contest brings out how Thandi transmitted the negative feelings from her job and projected them on her children. She would have liked to see them washing dishes at home the way she did at the club. Her negative evaluations of her children bring out the constant criticism that one hears in domestic work. Her attitude reflects how people who are oppressed internalize oppression and start to view situations through their oppressive experiences. The attempt to discipline through force reflects the oppression that the domestic worker internalizes when she is in an oppressive work situation.

Thandi was accusatory when talking to her children. The attitudes of white people towards Blacks were similar. For them to organize a contest did not mean that they valued the maids. The contests were organized in order to create a space

for people to do chores for them in a world where they did not enjoy the privileges of the employer. The difference between what Thandi did and what the club did was that the club got compliance from the workers because it interacted with them positively while she could not get compliance because she interacted with her children negatively.

This incident shows how Thandi relived her days as a maid and how the voices in her past became a part of her life. When she told her children to go into the community and get other people's dishes, she echoed the voice of the club members who organized the contest and said, 'what is your girl capable of.' Kamberelis and McGinley (1991) call voices that people fashion from the speech of others 'quasi personal' because they reflect the different discourse communities and 'social languages' that a person uses in the creation of the self. It could even be seen as polyphony, a case of 'multiple voices interacting in different ways at different times' (Horton, 1994, p. 29). This digression also shows how her attitude towards work was shaped by her socio-historical situation. She gets frustrated when she tries to transfer her skills to her children and calls them 'lazy' and 'untidy.' The children get to experience how their mother is a product of her own era. She also gets to experience how they are product of their own era. The abusive manner in which she talks to her children criticizing them personally shows how people who have lived in oppressive situations treat their children. Their scars live with them and get transferred on their children in everyday interactions.

The madams liked it when the success of the maid enhanced their image in a way that showed that they were good people. When the maid's success challenged the social creation of the white woman who is better than the maid, they did not like that. While the white women were 'knowers' in the work of the kitchen, maids learned tasks and became better than they were. Thandi told how she learned how to bake and became even better than her madam. When her cake won the contest at the Club, her madam did not like her. An analysis of the narrative according to Labov's analysis is as follows:

How Thandi Baked the Best Cake

Abstract:	At the show they said they wanted a cake
Orientation:	When I was at that home, something like this happened. Madams should bake. The girls should also bake. The wife of X baked. She was looking at a book, the recipe.
Complicating Action:	When we took the cakes there, mine won and hers did not.
Result:	When we got home the children said, We do not want your cake, mother. We want Thandi's cake..
Evaluation:	That was bad
Coda:	It was not good at all.

In this narrative Thandi created subjects as 'I' and 'she' and the possessives 'mine' and 'hers' in a way that shows that they were two people who had their own rights. In this contest the madam and the maid entered as different contestants not extensions of the other. They were independently constructed subjects with their own actions. The abstract brings out what and who the organizers were in an embedded

clause. She says the organizers of the show said, 'they want a cake. Madams should bake. The girls should also bake.' She goes on to say that the white woman baked and calls her 'the wife of X' in a manner she had never called her in her discourse. She states that the madam read a recipe and she did not. The complicating action brings out what the problem was. She says ' when 'we' took the cakes there, mine won and hers did not' using inclusive we for both herself and the madam because they were equal contestants. She tells what the result was and states what the consequence was in a way that shows that her success challenged the social creation of the role of the white madam as knower in society. The disappointment of the madam at the result was carried to the home. Even her family wanted the cake of the woman who was inferior. The public declaration that she was not better than the maid at baking created a bad atmosphere. She ends with an evaluation and says 'It was bad.' The coda echoes the statement with a construction that uses a positive attached to the negative adverb not. 'It was not good at all.' This evaluation summarizes the disappointment of the madam and satirizes the fact that she should feel bad about such a result. Labov's analysis of narrative is very useful in establishing the reason why Thandi told the story because its evaluative devices focus on her assessment of the situation in a way which makes it clear what her position is in relation to the issue she is talking about.

Thandi's narrative shows how objective contests which were not racially structured brought out the truth about the social construction of the white woman as a knower who is better than the maid. It challenged the very core of racism; the

construction of a white person as better. Maids were supposed to be seen as people who do not have the capabilities of madams. To even think that they could even be better was unthinkable in the colonial period. When they came home and the children wanted to eat the cake of the domestic worker, the madam felt bad because she felt rejected even in her own house. This incident shows how the fragile ego of white women was maintained by the false belief that they are better. They felt good when the success of the maid reflected positively on them. Maids were seen as their extension and not as people in their own right.

Employers of domestic workers feel that domestic workers are inferior to them because they are employees who depend on them financially. If the people in the house start to attach more value to the maid than they do to the employer, conflict results. Everything should recreate the role of the madam as superior.

The women told how conflict would result when children started to like the food of the maid. Conflict also arises when men start to show affection towards maids. This is a well known area that raises a lot of conflict. In this study, however, there was no woman who mentioned such incidents. While madams enjoy the presence of a maid in the family, they become vulnerable when the social hierarchy is disrupted in a way that makes the maids appear better.

The role of nanny shows how children learned at an early age that the maid was an inferior person to their parent. Lobutimba told how the children would threaten her with their father only to find that the father would support her. The children knew that their father was a person they could report the worker to. This

shows an understanding of the notion of power on their part. They knew who controlled behavior in domestic work. The fact that the parents did not blame the worker shows how they validated her power over the children.

> They would say, *'I am go to tell Daddy, my Daddy is going to smack you.'* I would then learn that they say their father will beat me. Sometimes the children would be naughty. The parents say when they are naughty, I should smack them so that they can stop. I would then smack them. I would not beat them hard. I would do it just to scare them. The child would cry out loud and think the father would defend him/her. the father would say, 'O.K. Lobutimba, smack more.' The children would cry, my children.

Lobutimba referred to the children as 'my children.' Her attachment to these children brought out the acceptance of other children by domestic workers who dedicate their time to raising the children of others when theirs are deprived of love.

Lobutimba also told how they would go to the store with the children. The children would use to her the expressions that their parents used to them. This shows that they had learned that she was not equal to their parents. They already knew that she was a poorer person than they were. The voices of the children show how children also have their own quasi-personal voices. Krambelis and McGinley say:

> It becomes a primary developmental task for children to take the raw materials of voice around them and to use these materials in fashioning their own quasi-persoanal voices. We call these voices quasi-personal because they always remain somewhat poylphonic, reflecting in various ways the many speech communities to which children belong. the social languages of which they are aware, and their political alignments with those communities and social languages (Kamberelis and McGinely 1992 p. 202).

Lobutimba also told of her interactions with the children at the store and said:

> I remember that they would say, *'Let us go to town, we must take a money when we go to town, go to buy some sweets for you.'* When we get to town and I have no money to buy sweets, they would say, '*You are naughty Lobutimba. You got no money. You poor. You naughty.* Something like that. I would tell their parents and they would laugh and say, 'don't call her, it's a poor.' I could hear the children, but I could not understand what they mean.

The incident at the store also shows how Lobutimba related with the children and how telling such incidents amused the parents of the children. She uses the article with the word money in a way that brings out her own understanding of the use of articles in English. This is her own way of telling what they said. Since her English was not grammatical it helps us see clearly how language was used at work by her. While we see the social languages of parents and children we also see her own social language and its own limitations. Since she learned from the children, she might have had the quasi-personal voices of children in her own speech whenever she used English. The way she says 'its a poor' might be her own creation out of what the children said.

In this excerpt the children even show that they knew the difference between rich and poor. They knew that Lobutimba was poor. Her use of the expression 'it's a poor,' also shows how the children would recreate the socio-economic issues between domestic workers from her failure to buy them the sweets at the store.

Roles and routines bring out the issues of power in domestic work. The creation of the world of work through power is brought out in the narratives of women. The power structure was maintained through roles, objects and spaces. Even children knew who was who in domestic work. The language shows, through

dialogue that the domestic worker recreates, that talk was constructed around the roles of the interactants in their daily interactions.

THE CREATION OF ROLES IN AFRIKAANER HOUSEHOLDS

There were similarities in how roles were constructed in Afrikaaner households and in British households. Mary Gama told about roles and routines in Afrikanner households in a manner that follows Lobutimba's sequencing. Her time was filled with duties from the time she woke up until the white woman and her children left for school. The sequencing of sentential structures that state the task that is followed by another task also came out in her telling. Mary says she woke up and cooked breakfast and after her employer and her children were gone, she had to clean the house. She said:

Analysis by Subjects:

Mary: I used to wake up and make fire on the stove and then
I would cook breakfast, thin porridge.
I would cook it and dish it and put it on the table.
They would eat and they would go, the woman and her children.
I would remain and clean the house everywhere and dust and then I would get R1.50 for all the work.

Mary tells how she did her everyday role at the home of the Boer in a way that is similar to what Lobutimba said in that she constructed herself as 'I' and the white people as 'they.' She used structures such as 'used to' and 'would' to bring out daily routine. She also constructs herself as the subject and produces how all the work was done by her. The only sentence in the extract just shows that, 'they would

eat and they would go.' The way she refers to them as 'they,' and then says 'the woman and her children,' shows how she differentiates them from her the way the ideology of apartheid structured the races. She states the amount of money to contrast it with her work. The use of 'for all the work' shows how she thought it was a lot of work for which she should have been paid more. Like Lobutimba, Mary was also a subject in the enactment of power.

While the social relations between the worker and the employee were interpreted racially, they were also determined economically through what one was paid. Remuneration is an indication of personal worth. The workers whose homes were built on farms were not paid in monetary terms but given rations of brown sugar, mealiemeal and soap. The women who were paid were those who did not work under the forced labor system. They constantly pointed out that they were paid very little. Most of them were paid fifteen shillings per month. The making of meaning of a role and attaching persons and designating spaces and objects is one of the prevalent themes in the life histories of domestic workers who worked for the Boers. The worker had to eat her own food just as it was in British households. Brown (1987) believes that physical objects acquire meaning as nonverbal forms of communication in rigid institutions because they communicate the social realities that prevail in the institution.

Space was also used in a binary manner that pointed out social status. It became a social code that was used to communicate who was who in the symbolic interactions that took place. The worker had her place, separate from that of the

employer. The restrictions were determined by the owner of the space. Mary Gama told how she slept in the kitchen, and had to wake up early and take her blankets to the garage where the dogs slept.

> I slept in the kitchen. I would wake up early when it is still dark, I wake up. I would take my blankets to the garage. You see, in the garage where his car was kept together with his dogs. I put my blankets there. I would then come and take his pots, the black pots, the three legged pots. Their legs were removed. I would go and cook porridge and put it on the table. Then 'oubaas' (old baas) would leave after eating.

The creation of difference through space and social objects in the colonial period was largely linked to the issue of race. It was an issue of black and white. In the cases cited, the women knew who they were according to their role and they knew their roles were constructed along racial lines because the masters were white. The understanding of a socially constructed role reflects the social creation of the individual in a society where race is a major issue. While most women told stories of interacting with women, when Lobutimba talked about one of her Boer employees, she almost always referred to the man.

In this passage she brings out herself as the subject, sleeping in the garage, where 'he kept his dogs' and 'his car.' She only mentions the man as the owner of the car, the dogs and the pots. She calls him 'oubaas' (old master in Afrikaans). The morning duties seem to have influenced her telling because this Boer was a truck driver. Associating duties with him might be a result of the fact that he went away early because he had to drive the truck to Johannesburg and back. She felt that

everything was done for him. The woman worked at the railway station, a depot that accepted goods that came in on trucks from the station in Breyten.

Thandi's life history brings out how food was used to create difference at the household of the Boers. The Boers used rules and deprivation of different kinds of food to create social hierarchy. Thandi would cook her own porridge, which she ate with brown sugar. She could also not touch the bread that the Boers ate. If there was food left on their plates, she had to eat it off the sink. The other duties were spelt out so that she would not take liberties with the fruits and eggs because they were not hers.

> There is no food. You cook your own porridge. I will give you brown sugar. The fruits that are outside are not to be eaten. If you see any eggs in the yard, you take them and bring them in....Youdo not touch our food. The bread we eat you do not touch. You do not eat out of our dishes.

Brown sugar and porridge were constantly repeated by workers who worked for the Boers. This was what the Boers who were mean gave to Black people. The creation of boundaries by employers articulated clearly who was who and who could do what in a manner that made both parties understand each other. Through language, white people created distance between themselves and workers.

The creation of difference through social objects that was done during the colonial period is still in evidence today. The building of rooms for servants is still a common feature in houses that are modelled on the colonial master's house.

Thandi's excerpt also shows how the first encounters also established the rules and regulations of each employer. Life as a domestic worker meant learning what

was acceptable and what was not. The women could not do things that their employers did not want them to do. Mary said that and employer's control extended even to whether they could get pregnant or not in a way which can be interpreted to be defeminizing the women. She said:

> The only thing that the Boers did not want was for you to get pregnant. He would say you must not become pregnant at his home. Once you became pregnant you had to leave.

What is interesting is how Mary said 'the only' thing that Boers did not want was for a woman to get pregnant. The women's stories reiterate how Boers hated Black people. They only wanted to exploit their labor. To put the expression this way ranks it high among other offenses. It was one thing for which the maids were expelled. She uses 'must not' to show that pregnancy was prohibited. This shows how the Boer employers controlled the biological functions of the domestic worker. The attitude towards pregnant women at work always shows how employers view pregnant women negatively in most places where they are employed. Since the Boers depended on Black labor on their farms, it is amazing that they did not want women to become pregnant. One has to point out that Mary worked for a Boer who was a truck driver and not a farmer. The Boers in the cities might have had different attitudes from the Boers in the farms because the farmers even visited te homes of Blacks so that they can know the children in order to demand that they work for them when they are older.

Mary Gama linked the prevalence of abortions at this time to the Boers and their hatred of workers who became pregnant. This regulation of people and their

bodies that was done by employers shows how much power they had over the worker. The woman who said this about pregnancy said that she started having children when she had left the Boer's farm and had gone back to her home. The power of employers in defining spaces and regulating how other people can relate to them resembles the power in places where people work in today's world. Negatively viewing women who give birth is still widely practiced in most places where people work. What the Boers did is no different from employers who refuse to give women who work maternity leave.

In this metaphor of society as text the women had to learn new vocabularies such as the 'kaffirpot'. This example was given by a woman who said that the three legged pot was given this name. When I asked her why, she said 'it is because it was our pot'. While she did not like the adjective attached to the pot, it was obvious that she had come to accept the meaning and saw the three legged pot as an extension of her self identity. This is because the whites had defined the pot as a pot for blacks. Acceptance of the self as a domestic worker also meant accepting the definition of the self which was made by the employers through the physical objects one found in domestic work.

In the workers' narratives we learn that the creation of people as different is done through the use of objects, spaces, and roles, of which all that could otherwise be neutral, but take on meaning because they are socially defined as that which is for a person who is Black, a 'Kaffir.' The meaning is a socially constructed meaning which both parties have to accept to a certain extent. The ones who do the defining

and naming are those who have more power. Those who have less power do not have choices when they have accepted themselves as defined by the powerful. The process of subjugation is a process that is done by dominating people through naming, definitions of the self and the creation of subservient roles for them to engage in. These are usually exploitative roles that are based on taking advantage of the fact that the poor have needs such as the needs the worker's families had for land.

The deliberate creation of difference by people who are in power is something that has marked Black people's lives since they came into contact with whites in the seventeenth century. The illusions that are created take on reality when the oppressed also buy into the social creation by observing the rules that the employers have created. The fact that most Blacks came into contact with whites through domestic work put Black people at a disadvantage in that they could not question their employers. The acceptance of difference as created through objects did not become as fair a negotiation of meaning as it could have been if people were coming into contact through jobs where they had equal power. One finds that even today Black people still fear white people even when they are not in jobs like domestic work. Most of this fear comes from the false creation of difference that was done in these first encounters. The women who worked for Black employers did not dwell on how their duties and roles were structured. One can conclude that they were similar to the roles in white households. Discrimination might not have been as it

was in white households. In the household of the missionary, Lindiwe pointed out how they would serve her tea on Wednesdays. On this day, she did not do any work.

ROLES AND ROUTINES IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

In post-colonial Swaziland, workers work for whites, Coloreds, Africans from other countries other than Swaziland and the Swazi elite. The elitist attitudes of these people mark how roles are created when they are with the workers. Their experiences are shaped as they move from home to home.

Class difference was obvious to domestic workers when they arrived in the urban areas. It was a different world, one they had not encountered before. In the colonial period all Blacks lived in the countryside or in small compounds that had small four-roomed houses; in post-colonial Swaziland the Blacks have taken over most of the houses that were once owned by the whites. Cebile said:

> I thought everything was different... the way whites do things. They told me that I had to change because I was from the country...She said this place is not like home. I have to change and do things the way they are done in the city.

The class differences between the domestic worker and the elite is expressed through her own words:'I thought everything was different. ' She likens everything to the way whites do things. The compulsion of the worker to change shows how the elitist employer dominated her after her assessment of how she did things. In the narrative Cebile used 'not' in her creation of the words of her employer. She says, 'She said, this place is not like home.' In order to fit in she had to change and do things 'the way they are done in the city.'

The contrast of the city and the rural areas brings out how cities were originally not for Black people in colonial Swaziland. Black people lived in the rural areas. The colonial grouping of the races followed the Group Areas Act of South Africa. It was with independence that the Black elite took over and came to live in the big houses that the colonial settlers occupied. They also took over the jobs that were done by the white people.

While in colonial Swaziland some white people hired nannies in addition to a maid who cooked and cleaned the house, most employers did not separate the work of a maid and a nanny. All the women who work in post-colonial Swaziland do both duties. The women who worked for white people did not bring out how they learned their duties at those homes. They tended to go into the telling as if they already knew how to do the job. The categories I will cover include working for the Chinese, English-speaking Africans, Coloreds and Swazis.

ROLES IN THE HOUSEHOLDS OF THE CHINESE

Hluphekile told how she worked for the Chinese doing housework. Her duties were like those that people do in other white people's homes. She helped the Chinese woman when she cooked. She also cleaned the house and washed clothes. These Chinese people had initially hired her to work on their farm, where she was among workers who planted rice, cabbages and tomatoes. The relationship of plantation work and domestic work keeps occurring in the lives of the workers. These were the most frequently mentioned jobs that workers did. The women who

worked for the Chinese expressed that they felt that they were different from them. They would also construct them as 'they.'

ROLES IN THE HOUSEHOLDS OF COLOREDS

The roles and routines in Colored households in post-colonial Swaziland includes both looking after the baby and cleaning the house and washing clothes. All three women who worked in the households of Coloreds stated this clearly. One of them complained that there were many children in the homes of Coloreds. A look at one of the lives brings out how the Colored woman explained things on arrival. Sibongile's story showed that the Colored woman she worked for did not give her much instruction when she first took up the job. Sibongile had this to say:

> They...did not show me much because I arrived at her place very late. She used to work in Mbabane. She would hitch hike because she did not have a car. She said I should take the child to Magevini. On the road near the Robertson's there is a bus stop on your way to SUT (Swaziland United Transport). I would drop the child there so that she can get on the Malkerns Valley bus. When I arrived she said 'auntie, you are old. You will see what you will do.' The house had three rooms, a kitchen, sitting room and a bathroom. I found a small enclosure that has a door. I opened that and found all the cleaning things, mops, brooms. scrubbing cloths and yellow dusters. There were shelves in this room. I took those things and started working. When she came back she said her house is airy and asked who showed me what to do. I told her that I found everything myself. She said, 'auntie, you are very clever. We will stay together and be happy. My only problem is that I drink. I also have a 'kobho' (temper). I have no husband.

An analysis by subjects shows that Sibongile did everything.

Analysis By Subjects

> I was late.
> They did not show me much

She used to work in Mbabane
She would hitch-hike...car.
She said I should take the child...
I would drop the child...
She said, 'Auntie, you are old..
You will see what you can do.'
I found a small enclosure..
I opened that and found...
I took things and started working.
When she came back she said, 'Auntie you are clever.
We will stay together and be happy...husband'

This analysis shows that all the woman did was talk. Sibongile did everything. Sibongile describes her employer in a very vivid manner. She tells how her employer went to work in a way that shows that she was not as well off as other members of the elite who have cars. Her 'hitch hiking to work' gives one the feeling of a troubled woman whose life depended on uncertainties. Her not giving her instructions reflects an indeterminacy created also by the fact that on this first day, Sibongile was late. The employer did not outline to Sibongile what her duties would be. She assumed that since the domestic worker was 'old' she would know what to do. This gave the worker the power to structure her duties herself. The use of 'old' by the worker in her telling shows how the 'old' is ironic when she was so new in the job. Sibongile describes how she went about doing tasks in the house. Her stating how big the house was brings out how she saw her responsibility, especially when she had to do everything on her own. She outlines tasks by listing rooms and listing objects. Strodt-Lopez (1993) argues that listing is a way of trying to bring out evidence. She says:

> Lists create a situation or a character's world by giving representative details. They present the audience with the evidence, so that the audience can join the narrator in drawing conclusions (p. 161).

Through Sibongile's lists we are able to picture what the house was like and also feel with her as she went about looking for things in a house she did not know. Being a member of the working class, she brings out how she was struck by the lifestyle of the employer in a way that engages the reader.

Her employer asked her 'who showed you' because the way she had performed was as good as if someone had shown her. Her 'you are very clever...' shows how acceptance was created in this relationship. It was based on an evaluation of of the worker's performance.

While the relationship with British colonialists was the first thing that was established before one was shown what to do, in this Colored woman's house it was established after the woman had shown her worth through her own initiative. This may be due to the fact that colonialists knew that Swazi women were not familiar with their way of life. The Colored assumed some familiarity between herself and the worker.

The telling of Sibongile's story shows how her life rotated around taking the Colored woman's daughter to the elitist school. Malkerns Valley school is a school that is for the elite in that lessons are taught in English. This brings out the social levels of who Coloreds are in relation to the ordinary Swazi. The child of Sibongile would not go to such a school.

Instead of discussing the duties, Sibongile's employer went into a self-disclosure about herself. She stated that she has a 'kobho.' Normally this means someone unpredictable, who acts like a demented person when her mood comes.

The reason for the employer to say this about herself in their first few days of knowing each other, and the reason for the domestic worker to tell what she said, prepares the listener for the way they parted when they fought and ended up at the police station. There is precedence and a sequencing in this telling that helps one in following the story of Sibongile's life and her madam as it unfolds. Language in story-telling recreates situations so that people link events with their telling.

ROLES IN SWAZI HOUSEHOLDS

While in the colonial period race was the main determinant of status, class has assumed more importance in post-colonial Swaziland. Some workers felt that their African employers wanted them to feel inferior because they were from the countryside. They treated them as outsiders. Most of the treatment was in relation to food. Cebile said that the woman she worked for would make fun of her when they had parties and say they should serve her different food because she was from the countryside. She said:

> She would say, 'this is a person from the country. She comes from the rural areas'. When they had parties, she would say 'this one will not eat meat because she is from the countryside. A servant eats fish. I would feel very bad and keep working for them because I came to work for the money. I ended up leaving because I did not like the situation.

The pinpointing of a person from the countryside in the narrative of Cebile shows that in post-colonial Swaziland there is no clear demarcation between people since most of them are Black. An employer would have to emphasize differences by pointing out the worker using a demonstrative in order to single out the person using

'this' and state through a predicate that 'this is a person from the country. 'She comes from the rural areas.' This is because people would not see the difference when looking at a group of people. The singling out in terms of pinpointing and labelling is done in order to create a feeling of inferiority in the other person so that the oppressor can feel better. Cebile also used 'I' and 'them' in a binary manner that brings out difference in her telling. She says she felt bad and kept working for them because she needed money. They were the people who had the money. She did not.

The women who worked for Swazis also outlined duties that they were told about on arrival. Their duties included looking after the child and doing the housework. Cebile told how her employers laid emphasis on the baby and told her to clean the house as if it were her own. This employer did not spell out things to the domestic worker the way things were done in some households. Cebile seemed to be happy with the way she was treated. She used 'good people' to show how kind they were to her. She said:

> When I arrived here, they asked me if I had worked anywhere and I told them where I had worked. They told me that they had also employed me to look after the baby. The woman said she needs someone to look after the baby because she goes to school. She said I should clean her house as if it was mine. The treatment here is different from the other places where I had worked. They showed me that there are good people who think for another person, that when someone is working for you, you have to treat the person nicely. I mean the way they talk to me. They talk to me nicely. They do not shout at me and gossip about me.

Cebile's story also shows how her employer started with the interview which establishes where the domestic worker is in terms of experience in the job. From her

response the employer outlines the task that she has to do. The way the woman told Cebile how to clean the house was different from the way most women were told. Most employers spelt out instructions in terms of tasks. Cebile says, 'she said I should clean it as if it was mine.' This statement empowered the worker because it brought the house to a midpoint, establishing some equality which negotiated meaning positively, even though the equality was not there. The language mediated the alienation of the worker and space as 'their space' in that the employer likened it to her house. The use of simile 'as if it was mine' created a personal attachment between the worker and the employer's house. While this statement is very vague when it comes to what is to be done, when, and how, it has its own merits in that it was empowering. In this household, the worker also lived in the house with the employers. This made cleaning the house as if it was hers meaningful in that she also lived there. Cebile brought out how these employers were good by creating contrast between them and bad employers. Bad employers shout at their domestic workers and gossip about them.

When telling about her experiences at a place where she had similar duties, she brought out how the employer had to show her how to cook the food of the baby because when she came back it had not been eaten. From her experiences it seemed that some employers assumed that the domestic workers knew what to do when they got to the job. She said:

> I got there and stayed one day and she taught me the following day. She took one day. She taught me how to cook the potatoes and carrots for the baby. I was cooking the carrots by cutting them, making them into slices yet she wanted me to grate them. She realized I did not

> know how to cook the food of the baby because when she came back, she found that the baby had not eaten the food. She said I have to peel the carrot and grate it first and then boil the potato. I then remove the water and add margarine.

The learning of roles entails learning what to do and how to do it. Cebile's telling brings out the contrast between the way she prepared baby food and the way her employer wanted it done. The embedded narrative about the baby shows how the baby was an important participant in determining how things should be done. If the baby had eaten the food, probably Cebile would have never known that she was not preparing the food the right way. The use of the embedded narratives in explanations is a way of explaining a situation (Strodt-Lopez, 1993). Her use of 'she found that' makes it easy for the narrative to blend into the explanation of what the complication was. This excerpt shows how Swazi employers tend to take for granted that domestic workers know how to do things and do not interview workers and teach them like the colonial settlers did. Since most domestic workers come from rural areas, they are not familiar with the requirements of the modern life that the elite lives. They have to be taught in order to perform according to expectations. Cebile pointed out that even though the food was the same, she did not know how to cook it the way her employers did.

Cebile also recounted a story which showed that the discrimination was very subtle when it came to food because instead of being outright stingy, the woman of the house would claim that she had forgotten Cebile when they had cooked nice food. She would remember her when she had cooked greens. Cebile was aware that it was a violation of the contract and protested to the man because he was the one

who had hired her, but it was to no avail. Cebile's narrative can be analyzed through Labov's method like this.

How the Woman Forgot Cebile

Abstract:	The man said I would eat there during the day.
Orientation:	When the woman cooked meat, she would say she forgot me. When she had cooked green stuff like 'ligusha' (a type of okra eaten in Swaziland), she would not forget to dish me... I would go and ask for food and she would say, 'I forgot you', when she had cooked meat. I would go and ask for the food because this was what we had agreed on. She would say she forgot me.
Complicating Action:	I ended up telling the man that I will eat at home and have them pay me more money.
Evaluation:	He refused to do that. I told him that his wife has the problem of forgetting me when she has cooked meat.
Coda:	Even when I asked her kids to go and get me my food, she would tell me that she forgot me.

Cebile told this narrative to show how the wife of the man used to discriminate against her. The evaluative device brings this out clearly. This story has no result because the issue was never resolved. Since the employer did not have any excuse for giving Cebile different kinds of food, she had to use an excuse and manipulate her into accepting this as a genuine answer. The exploitation comes out in the excerpt when the man had said they would not pay her since she ate their food. Not giving her good food and making excuses violated this agreement.

The subtle creation of difference in post colonial Swaziland is a result of the fact that Black people do not have a way of seeing themselves as different from workers because there is no color difference. Even though they act like the whites

when they have employed another person, they have no way of hammering into the worker's mind that they are different except by depriving the person of things and making them feel they do not belong by creating small talk to this effect.

ROLES IN HOUSEHOLDS OF NON-SWAZI SPEAKING AFRICANS

Senanile worked for Africans who are from West Africa. She said she knew how to do housework when she arrived. She said the home of her employer resembled hers in that there were cement floors at her home and they had running water in the house. Most domestic workers live in homes which have mud floors. Cattle dung is smeared on the floors occasionally to keep them free of dust and smooth. Cleaning the floor of a big cement house is completely different from cleaning a stick-and-mud-hut. This is why most workers are shown how to clean western houses.

> When I arrived here, I knew how to do most things. They had to show me how to use the things which are run on electricity. They showed me things like switching on the lights and switching them off. They do not show me difficult things like switching off the fridge. They do that for themselves. I just clean their fridge at the bottom, not the top part.

Senanile's story tells how she felt she was in control of the work when she arrived. She says she knew how to do most things. For Senanile, learning duties was learning how to use things that are run on electricity. Her life history resembles that of Lozindaba, who also stated that electricity was one of her biggest problems. Senanile also looked after children at the home of her employers. She did not outline her duties in detail.

Siphiwe reported that she had a problem with her Ugandan employer who did not say anything about what had to be done in the house. While this may be one employer's way of dealing with things, there are some cultural attitudes that prevail among groups of employers that made them different. African employers were portrayed as cruel in comparison to whites.

Women who worked in domestic work in post-colonial Swaziland grew up in the rural areas where there is poverty, and when they go to the city they encounterd a different environment from what they were used to. While the Swazis who live in rural areas sleep in huts, the people who live in the city sleep in houses. The alienation from familiar surroundings and the learning of what job a person has to do are simply similar to the experiences of the women who worked in the colonial period.

The language of the duties of the domestic worker as cook show a structure of question and answer in trying to establish levels of ability. These are questions that seek to establish knowledge. They are followed by responses that require information about what is being learned. The explanations will follow. These are explanations that impart information. The last questions are those which establish understanding of what has been learned. Pope (1995) argues that human interaction is based on consensus. Women tell how they learned what to cook and took over the role of agent and began to cook without being instructed. The designation of roles and the interpretation of the roles by the women portray them as actors who came to understand their situation as defined by the employer. In their positions as

subjects they maintain the power of the employer. They interacted in domestic work by learning their routines, which meant doing almost the same thing daily according to the designation of the roles as defined in domestic work. Blummer (1972) points out that the process of designation and interpretation is the main means of maintaining interactions in society. The role is designated and the participant interprets it for herself.

In domestic work language used in the construction of roles in domestic work is structured around the task. The power to construct the roles lies with the employer. Employers in the colonial period gave clearer instructions than their post colonial counterparts. The language consists of many imperatives that state what is to be done and questions concerning how the task was done. Domestic workers are portrayed as people who are always being questioned and sent around. Domestic workers who worked in the colonial period learned what their tasks were in terms of learning vocabularies and learning how to carry out the duties that are attached to each particular thing. If it was cleaning silver, they would learn what it is and then be told how to clean it. The learning is very interactive in the life histories of women who worked for the colonialists. They tell their stories using discursive acts that bring out the power of the people speaking. Differences between worker and settler were created through different objects. Food and spaces were a major way of creating who is who. The use of 'social decorum, (words like Nkosikazi in interactions like Yes, Nkosikazi) marks the interactions as they were during this period. Workers who worked during the colonial period recreate their experiences with a dramatic

liveliness that brings immediacy to their telling. They change voices as they imitate their employers and state their duties in clear sequences. Workers create the dialogues of their employers through the use of marking.

In post-colonial Swaziland, explanations that are given by employers are not as elaborate in the telling by the maids. The language brings out the subtle ways that the elite use to differentiate between worker and employer. The language of the workers is not as expressive of who is who as that of the colonial period. 'There is no social decorum.' Workers are demarcated as 'someone from the country.' Such expressions are not as explicit in the creation of difference as words like Kaffir are, but they do create people as different. This brings out the fact that race is no longer a feature that defines the worker as it did during the colonial period. Even white people would not use words like Kaffir. The following chapter will outline the role of language in the lives of domestic workers.

CHAPTER VII
LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND DOMESTIC WORK

Understanding women's life histories also means understanding their lives with language. In most cases women who worked in the colonial period grew up and learned language in their households and then went to work for people who spoke different languages from them. Since most domestic workers did not go to school, they did not learn the languages of the white people. Even in post-colonial Swaziland, domestic workers do not have enough competence in the English language to be able to speak with English speaking employers very well. They live as a class of illiterate people who suffer what Tsuda calls 'language inequality' (Tsuda 1986). When they are employed by Swazis, language affects workers when they have to read texts such as labels on medicine bottles and markings on irons. These problems arise when the employers are not around. Studying their lives is a way of understanding language as a part of people's social development in a specific social context. This chapter will discuss the issues of language by drawing on lives of women and their schooling and link them with language in domestic work.

Luckman (1975) posits that institutions have their own linguistic repertoires and that social positions and classes have their own linguistic codes. This means that people are socialized into the language of the social situations they find themselves in.

> The interdependence between linguistic repertoires that are determined by the social biography of the speaker, the institutionalized contexts of communicative interaction and the concrete situations of

> speaking and listening that are defined by cultural rules of meaningful use of language follows a complex pattern (Luckman p. 29).

What Luckman says is true of the situation in which the Swazi domestic workers in the study found themselves. They ended up having to use various linguistic repertoires like Fanakalo, Afrikaans and English for the first time. These languages became important to them because they learned how to use them at work. By looking at domestic workers in the different households they worked in, we can see how they learned languages and used them. Mills says it is important to look at interaction and link them with the larger issues in society. He says:

> Rather than interpreting actions and language as external manifestations of subjective and deeper lying elements in individuals, the research task is locating of particular types of action within typical frames of normative actions and socially situated clusters of motive. In effect motives serve as plot lines for social narrations. (Mills 1974 as cited in Brown 1987).

This helps in making links of causation. The education of women has a lot to do with how women ended up in domestic work. Denzin (1989) argues that people's lives are linguistic as well as economic and political. The social biographies of the domestic workers developed in a sociohistorical context that shaped their lives. Going to work meant going to the world of the employer. Workers had to learn the language of their employers in order to be able to take instructions. If the employer spoke Afrikaans, they had to speak Afrikaans. The problem for most women who worked for Afrikaaners is that they had to speak Afrikaans for the first time at work. It was not taught in the schools.

The Swazi women who went to school during the colonial period got a chance to learn Zulu and English. Zulu was learned instead of siSwati because, at that time,

the orthography of siSwati had not been established. The situation was different for the children of the whites. There was compulsory education for them and when they went to South Africa, education was free. Swazis who lived on Swazi Nation Land could send their children to school if they had money. Those whose homesteads were on the farms of Afrikaaners had to serve on the farms. They missed their chance for schooling. The situation has not changed much in post-colonial Swaziland. There are no Boers and their farms anymore. Schools are also not segregated along racial lines anymore. English and siSwati are still the languages that are taught in schools. While there is no segregation in today's Swaziland, education is expensive, it is only the rich Swazis who can afford to send their children to school. The women who end up in domestic work are those who cannot afford to pay for education and those who fall out for reasons such as sickness. Most domestic workers never get to learn language skills that can enable them to get the jobs that the elite get. When they are at work, they do their best to understand their employer. The language that is used when women have problems is still Fanakalo, as it was in the colonial period Kuper (1947).

Language in the work place, for most workers, meant the language of the employer. While this may be the usual case, it cannot be generalized to all the women as their experiences differed according to the languages that their employers knew. In cases where the workers did not know the language of the employer, Fanakalo was used. This is a language that could only be spoken if the employer knew it. It meant that the employer stooped to the level of the worker. It is for this

reason that Fanakalo is stigmatized. If it is spoken to a Black person it recreates that person as a member of the working class. The ideology of the Black person who is inferior to a Southern African white is embodied in this working class code. For Swazis, learning the code of power is learning English. Learning the language of those in power is learning a view of the world which creates the powerless through the prescriptions of those in power. Anzaldua (1990) argues that to learn a language like English for speakers of other languages is to 'learn a foreign language is to learn a language that is laden with alien ideologies which are often in direct opposition to those of our own cultures...to adopt the ideology of the people whose language it is and to be inhabited by their discourses.' Language presents a double bind for Black Southern Africans in that the languages of the colonisers are not neutral. They are value laden because of the history of the apartheid system. For workers who had to work for whites during the colonial period, the conflitcs between Afrikaaners and the British became a reality they had to deal with. It seemed from speaking to the workers that English did not seem to have the negative values that Afrikaans had. It is by looking at the situation in the different households that we can get to understand what really happened.

LANGUAGE AT WORK IN AFRIKAANER HOUSEHOLDS

During colonialism the languages of the Africans were looked down upon by white people. Knowing oneself meant knowing oneself through the lexicon of the self that was constructed through the racist policy of apartheid. Women had to put up

with being called Kaffirs. The syntaxes of the self reflect a knowledge of the self that was done by accepting degradation in a language that one was still trying to understand. It was, as Anzaldua says, learning the language of cultures that degraded the African and being invaded by the discourses of cultures that were foreign to the women.

Mary Gama said that the children of the employers were rude to them and called them 'Kaffirs.' 'They would say, 'you Kaffirtjie,' what are you doing to our dog, you Kaffirtjie?' The diminutive suffix '-tjie' is also used in derogatory expressions. Apart from the issues of language and reference the interactions also showed that the workers were powerless. They did not control how they could be referred to. On Afrikaaner farms the workers also tried the best they could to learn the language that was spoken by the employer so that they could carry out instructions. If they did not know the language of the employer, they made a lot of mistakes. Losimilo's employer spoke some Zulu and Afrikaans.

> At the farm where I worked they used to speak Afrikaans. The man also used to speak some Zulu, not siSwati. We used to understand Afrikaans because when you stayed with them you would learn. It is easy to learn when you stay with the people all the time because you will hear something and wonder what the person said. You would bother yourself because you have to know what was said.

From what Losimilo said, living with the employers made it easy for workers to learn the language of the employers. They learned the language because they heard it on a day-to-day basis.

The question of creating understanding between the domestic worker and the employer seemed to be determined by the person who appropriates power. Since

the Boers had power over the Swazis, they wanted them to speak their language. Luckman (1975) argues that learning a language means learning it in one's roles. It is learning it in situations that resemble social hierarchies that the worker has to deal with.

> The internalization of social reality through language means the subjective acquisition and grasp of taxonomies and interpretive schemes of social categories of space, time and causality, of typical motivational relations and structures of relevance, of behavioral recipes and value hierarchies, of what is taken for granted and what is considered to be problematic in the society. All this is 'filtered' and mediated by language, or more precisely, by semantic domains and syntactic structures.... It is filtered through specific varieties of language, such as class-based codes, through different linguistic repertoires and through rules of language use (Luckman, p.35).

What Luckman says about language in a social situation is true of domestic work. A domestic worker felt obliged to understand what the employer said. They felt that carrying out instruction depended on understanding what was said. Losimilo thought that it was imperative to try and understand what was said if you were a worker. This is why workers took it upon themselves to learn the languages of their employers.

> You had to hear and like to hear what was said so you would ask others what she said, what this means or you call someone who knows and ask them and she will tell you 'when she says this, she means this.' Even when you are alone you teach each other, especially Afrikaans, it was easy to learn it especially when you stay with children. Like me, I stayed with children, looking after them. You will learn and eventually start to understand a little.

According to Losimilo, those workers who did not know Afrikaans would learn from the others who knew. Her use of direct speech brings out how they would learn the names of things. This shows how workers acquired the vocabulary at work.

Losimilo said the South African domestic workers coped better because they already understood Afrikaans. The Swazis had a tough time. Losimilo told a narrative in Afrikaans to show how the woman who did not understand Afrikaans got into trouble when she made a mistake. She said they had gone to Giyani and when they came back the 'Mesisi' wanted the girl to wash her clothes and when she saw them not rinsed and hung out she was angry.

> She said 'haai', no, I said she must wash my clothes. How did she wash them....Isaid you must 'pura' them,' meaning she must rinse them. The girl took them. She thought she meant she must soak them. She took them and covered them, yet the madam had said she should rinse them thoroughly. When she came back she said:
>
> Mesisi Haai man! Kyk hier so
> (Hey man, look here).
> Wat hierdie meit het gemaak nou hier so
> (What this maid did here?)
> Wat, wat het ek het jou gese?
> (What, what did I tell you?)
> Ek het jou gese se vir haar,
> (I said to you, tell her)
> sy moet was-op en spoel-op
> (She must wash-up and rinse-up)
>
> Losimilo: *I said*:
> Ek het hom gese
> (I did tell her)
>
> Mesisi: En nou?
> (And now?)
>
> Losimilo: Ek weet nie.
> (I don't know).
> Sy het nie mooi geweet nie.
> (She did not understand.)
> I said she did not understand what you said. I told her but she did not understand what you said.

This narrative shows how Losimilo recreates the conversation between herself and the white woman. The voices of interactants are clearly indicated as they interact in question and answer. She used direct speech and speaks the language of the

woman. Strodt-Lopez (1993) sees the use of direct quotes as a useful device in bringing into focus the participants in a narrative. She says:

> All quotation...evaluates and leads to interaction of world views; direct quotation makes the interaction immediate and vivid. Deictic orientation is to the speaking character and the narrative scene, and hence the audience are at the scene, too. As witnesses, the audience members react and evaluate seemingly without narrator mediation; their view enters the field of interaction on an apparent par with the characters' views and the narrator's view (Strodt-Lopez, 1993 p, 150).

Losimilo's use of direct quotes helps us understand what the world of the workers was like. In this excerpt the white woman controls the conversation by asking questions and repeating her own words in a way that brings out who is who in their roles as speaking persons. She communicates her anger to the workers using the word 'man,' an Afrikaans expression which shows annoyance. The white woman draws the attention of Losimilo after seeing the mistake the girl has made and says, 'Haai man!' This exclamative shows that she is amazed and not in agreement with what she sees. This excerpt begins the drama of the mistake that the woman has done. 'Kyk hier so' draws the attention of Losimilo to what the maid has done. The white woman asks Losimilo what her instructions were and says, 'Wat het ek het jou gese?.' She asks her what she had said Losimilo should tell the maid. Losimilo responds by saying that she told her. The response she got was another question: En nou? (And now?). This is a question which does not necessarily need an answer because it was obvious to both of them that the domestic worker had made a mistake. The employer asked it to show her power.

The way Losimilo constructs the situation brings out the power of the white woman and the powerlessness of the woman who could not speak Afrikaans. All the speaking parties in this conversation use the first person 'I.' Losimilo takes the position of the 'Mesisi' when she repeats her instruction and the worker who is standing there does not even hear what they are saying. She is referred to as 'die meit (the maid),' as if she were not there. This depersonalizes her (Pope 1995). The white woman asked all the questions and Losimilo answered because she had become involved as the one who interpreted the instruction. This incident brings out the inherent risk in being an interpreter when you also did not know the language very well. The fact that Losimilo could be the one who instructed the woman wrongly was a possibility. She had to answer the question 'En nou' appropriately to show that she had also understood what the woman had said. She said 'Ek weet nie,' expressing that she did not know how the mistake had happened. This brings out the levels of power because while Losimilo could express herself and say she did not not know, the other woman was silenced by her lack of understanding of the language. Losimilo ended up making an excuse on her behalf. She pointed out that the woman might not have understood. From the excerpt it is obvious that Losimilo did not understand Afrikaans well herself. She uses the male pronoun instead of the female pronoun and says 'hom' instead of 'sy'. In some cases she uses the correct pronoun. My informants told me that this was not good Afrikaans. This conversation brings out the cultural aspects of the conversation of speakers.

Schiffrin (1987) also points out that language is power because it is used to dictate actions at the personal level. Her study looks at interpersonal discourse and focuses on language as power in that it dictates actions between the speaker and his/her recipient. She says:

> Action is also a property of discourse. It emerges not so much from arrangements of underlying units, as from the organization of speaker goals and intentions which are taken up and acted upon by hearers, and from the ways in which language is used in service of such goals (p. 10).

When domestic workers were at work they had to take instructions from their employers. Their duties were clearly outlined. It was important to know the language of the employer if one was to take instructions and carry them out correctly as we have seen in the narrative of the worker who was silenced by not being able to speak the language of the employer. When the women were asked to give examples of how things are said in a certain language, they would repeat the instructions of their employers. They would come up with lists of things that are said in that language and recreate situations of language and power that show that they understood the language in terms of the orders that they were given. This understanding of life as duties and obligations shows that the women had accepted the role of being subservient in the household where they worked.

In situations of work where people do not learn the language prior to their learning the roles, they learn them as they learn the role through a working grammar that becomes personalized in that their everyday tasks center around it. Through it they are able to understand how to take simple instructions from their employers and

perform at a somewhat satisfactory level. When asked if they know a certain language, the workers would say they do. I would then ask them what they know and they would give me their examples of what they know in the language. The inventory of these structures and phrases were closely linked to their work situations, which suggested that they think of the language in relation to these experiences almost all the time. This is what I call grammars of the self. To them, this was what they knew of the language. It was their understanding of what they knew to tell a person who asks them if they know the language. The utterances themselves enabled one to see them in their roles in that they were mostly utterances that have an implied addressee. It was easy to figure out that these were utterances that were often made by their employers. For the workers to know these expressions was important because they had to make sure that they carried out instructions correctly.

Brown (1987) points out that we understand issues of power within institutions in terms of the practice, motives and things. He says that language is the main agent of creating this understanding.

> Language as both social institution and political practice is the active synergy between consciousness and things; it is the agitator of both intentions and structures (p.45).

What Brown says is true in the case of the utterances produced by these workers in that they come out of the mouths of people who were constantly in a social positioning that required them to respond to the instructions of their employers.

The issue of language and power was revealed by the repertoire of the everyday expressions that the workers came to acquire. These were partly influenced by the fact that the workers did not learn everything in the language, but only what they needed to know in order to carry out instructions. Their knowledge was restricted to everyday expressions that were used in domestic work in the colonial period. The grammar of everyday life consisted of structures that were repeated as the worker is sent to do different chores around the house. From the extracts, one realizes that the workers mostly reproduced instructions which showed that they felt absolutely obliged to carry out the commands. They learned the structures so that they would not make a mistake in carrying out the commands of the employer. The power of employers comes out in these extracts in that they could never be blamed for misunderstandings that took place. It was only the worker who was seen to have made a mistake. They learned questions and commands at work.

Tryphina used imperatives to show how instructions were given to them in Afrikaans. The expression 'maak gou' which means 'do it quickly' was constantly used. She gave the following examples:

> Maak gou kofie, toe
> (Make quickly koffie.)
> Maak tee
> (Make tea)
> Annie kom!
> (Annie come!)

Directives show the hierarchical power of society in that they require a response. In these imperatives the person whom they are directed to is not mentioned. The

power of the imperative is also in ignoring the person referred to but assuming that they know who is meant. 'Kofie' and 'tee' are the objects that are mentioned. This brings out how the maids would always run around doing things for the women. The attachment of 'gou' which means quickly shows how the white woman would command the worker in a way that attaches time and the manner to the force of the imperative. The expression 'toe' is usually used by women. Directives bring out experiences because they dramatize the situation in that they are action oriented. The asymmetrical power in talk is shown in the choices the interactants have. While one has the power to make demands the other responds in action only. The directives in this extract also locate the speakers in the kitchen in that they speak of food.

The imperatives that lived on in the mind of the domestic worker called Tryphina show how she was objectified by the white woman. The imperative is a powerful structure in that the addressee is always implied. She responds by following the command. These commands show how the women existed as nameless in the minds of white women. The addition of 'toe' to the first expression shows how the woman would ask the maid to make coffee. It is rare for a man to use such an expression. This shows how the women subconsciously internalized the everyday commands of their employers. These expressions are asymmetrical because a domestic worker could never use them to a white woman. These expressions show how questions and imperatives were uni-directional (Saulinier and Simard, 1973). Social talk was controlled by the employer.

Kamberelis and McGinley (1992) argue that the talk of other people affects others through out their lives. They say:

> Indeed, the talk that people experience-their own talk as well as the talk of others-stays with them and fashions them through time. Thus, the utterances of individual people always contain traces of the utterances experienced by those people in the past, as they have interacted with others (p. 201).

Losimilo Nhleko told how she was spoken to in Afrikaans most of the time. From the expressions she uses, one learns that all she learned were the phrases for questions about where she had been. These are questions which show that once a person is employed, her time belongs to the employer. The employer had the power to ask the worker things that a worker could never ask an employer.

> Waar kom jy
> (Where do you come from?)
> Waar was jy gistermidag
> (Where were you yesterday afternoon?)

Kroeber (1992) argues that a sentence consists of interactions between identifications. It is a 'microcosmic version of discourse structure' (p. 43). In domestic work, the sentences that the women produced reflected their everyday grammar.

These questions constantly use the interpersonal pronoun 'jy'(you) to show how the maid was constructed as 'you.' They reflected the issues of power and how it is constructed daily through grammatical constructions that one learns in order to carry out the instructions in social positions of the less powerful and the more powerful person. They show how the worker was always watched by the Boers. The worker's time belonged to the master (Brown 19878).

Senteni described how she communicated in Afrikaans through phrases and lists of words. She said what they learned first was taking instructions. Her sentences depicted a wider range of everyday structures which included instructions.

1. Gee my daai ding.
(Give me that thing)
2. Gee vir my die kombers
(Give me the blanket)
3. Gaan haal die hout
(Go get the wood)
4. Bring my die water
(Give me the water)
5. Kom ons eet
(Come and we eet)
6. Bring die kos
(Bring the food)
7. Ons gaan ploeg
(We are going to plow)
8. Ons gaan plant
(We are going to plant)

The structures which are imperatives show how instruction was uni-directional in the home of her employers. The worker had to know the structures that are used in everyday commands so that she can be able to carry out instructions. These instructions bring out the everyday objects that one would be asked to get such as wood, water or a blanket. The way Afrikaans uses 'dy dang' 'the thing' to substitute things that one might have forgotten is different from the way 'the thing' is used in English. 'Dy dang' is a very frequently used structure in Afrikaans. Goodwin (1990) says directives reflect social organization in that they recreate the power of speakers and their addressees. She says they outline actions. She says:

> Directives are positioned right at the interface between language and social action; although built through speech, they are designed to make things happen in the larger world of social action within which talk is

> embedded. Indeed they provide a prototypical locus of...'how to do with words (Goodwin, 1990, p. 65).

The directives that Senteni produced bring out the voices of her Afrikaaner employers. They bring out the asymmetrical relations in society. Through them the workers recreate typical interactions that they went through when they were working at Boer homes. Directives have implied addressees. These are the women who produced them.

Directives also have an implied time built into them in that they always use a verb that is in the present tense. The direct speech employed enables the speaker to picture in the present what really happened. The present tense verb also creates immediacy for the person who has to perform the action. As a listener or reader of such a text, one becomes the witness to a drama of actions.

In producing these utterances during the interviews, the women recapitulate the experiences that they went through as everyday happenings in their lives. There is an echoing of the employers in the repetition of instructions in Afrikaans that make one wonder to what extent the internalization of the self as an other-directed person contributed to the construction of the self as a domestic worker. When people constantly have to take instructions from others they internalize their role as people who are other-directed and their abilities as self-directed people who appreciate their uniqueness ceases to grow (Saulnier and Simard 1973).

The other structures in this data have 'we' and state some actions like eating and planning. There is no reason to conclude that this is an inclusive 'we.' The maid might have picked up the structure when the Boers were speaking among themselves.

Some of the words Senteni produced depicted relationships creating a social order through language in a way that shows how she related with her employers. It showed negative ways of talking about Black people.

skepsel (derogatory word for person which means thing)
meidtjie (derogatory word for maid which means small maid)
vrou (woman)
ouma (old woman)
ou nooi (young woman)
baas (boss)

The nouns that Senteni quoted reflected the ideology of the colonial period. Some of the words are no longer used because of the derogatory symbolism that they invoke in the worker. The lives of Losimilo and Senteni show how women existed as nameless persons in the minds of their employers. They remember the language of commands and questions which shows that they internalized those structures because they were used often and also because it was important for them to know such structures because they had to carry out instructions. These structures are structures of a specific culture, the Boer culture. They bring out their racist attitudes. Ngugi (1986) says:

> Culture...is a product and a reflection of human beings communicating with one another in the struggle to create wealth and to control it...Culture transmits or imparts those images of the world and reality through the spoken and written language....This is the universality of language (p. 15).

What Ngugi says is true of domestic work. The maids acquired the language of the racist Afrikaaners and through it they reflected how they were constructed in everyday discourse. They repeat imperatives that show how they were viewed by their masters as objects. The vocabulary also includes words like 'skepsel' and

'meidtjie' which are words which Afrikaaners used to refer to Black people. The words that refer to whites are words like 'ouma' which show the asymmetry of power between the groups at that time. The internalization of derogatory selves shows the power of language in the creation of images. Language itself objectifies in the manner the Boers objectified the domestic workers. The people remained etched in their own history as disrespected selves.

Losimilo talked about the attitude of the Boers towards English and said that they would not speak to the domestic workers in English. Those who learned English when they worked for the British and later went looking for jobs in Afrikaaner households would be expelled if they spoke English there.

> The Boers did not like to speak to Africans in English. If you lost your job and they hire you. Some people would lose their jobs and if they were hired and they spoke English, they would lose the job. They would not last even one month. The Boers would say you are making yourself a white person. You speak English. Are you a white person? You would rather speak Fanakalo. Why don't you know the Afrikaans which they speak? Boers are jealous. They look down upon people. You do not hear the word which says Kaffir? It means you are a Black person. Those Black people from that side speak Afrikaans. If you speak English they expel you and say, 'I got to give you sack,' I cannot afford to speak English with you. When other Boers come they will find me speaking English with you!

Lobutimba brings out the social hierarchy and how it was translated through language. Since the Afrikaaners felt inferior to the British who were the colonial masters, they did not want Africans to recreate the social hierarchy in their households by speaking the language of their rivals. By speaking English, a Black person was making himself/herself a white person. She used questions to bring out how the Afrikaners would ask if you are a white person. All her major questions

come after statements that express how baffled a Boer would be if a Swazi spoke English. She said 'You speak English. Are you a white person? You would rather speak Fanakalo. Why don't you know the Afrikaans which they speak?' Her style recreated the reasoning of the Afrikaaners. The statement, 'I got to give you the sack,'brings out the power of the employer. He had the power to dictate what language could be spoken at his place. Afrikaaners realized the power of language in the creation of people's identities. After fighting in the Anglo Boer War (1889-1902, they became determined that their language would be a language of power in South Africa. They saw speaking English to a Swazi as making the British better. The Afrikaaner slogan 'the language of the master when spoken by the slave is the language of a slave' shows their attitude towards the languages of other white people (Thiaru, 1975).

LANGUAGE AND WORK ON ENGLISH SPEAKING FARMS

Learning language in domestic work tended to be linked to the task in all the households. In English speaking households, the language that was spoken was that of the employer or Fanakalo. For the worker who did not know English, learning language in English speaking households was also done by learning expressions used in everyday speech. These expressions had to do with what the employers asked the workers to do. The workers picked up these expressions and acquired a simple grammar that they could use at work. Lobutimba Xaba pointed out that learning English was a way of trying to understand the employer's instructions as they did

tasks such as cooking. She said that she learned all the names for different types of meat from her employer. She learned what beef steak is, what T Bone is and what frying steak is. She also learned how to cook the different types of meat from observing her employer. Since her employer could speak Fanakalo, Lobutimba could ask questions in Zulu. She says she learned phrases like 'What is for supper tonight, Nkosikazi?'. She would also ask questions in Zulu and say 'Sizodlani ntambama Nkosikazi?'

> Before the Mesisi goes at one o'clock you ask her, '*What is for supper tonight*?' She tells you and then she takes out the meat. I had started to understand English. Even in siSwati you say 'Sizodlani ntambama Nkozikazi?' (What will we eat in the evening, Nkosikazi?) noma (or) 'Yini supper ntambama?' (What is for supper this evening?.) A white person will understand. They do not say you break English as you educated people say. A white person is happy to understand you and answer you. You educated people are silly, let me say that. You think your education did not come from us your parents. You just became educated. You are like this because of your mother. She was doing this so that you cannot be like her. Yet when your eyes are opened you will look down upon us and cartoon us and say, ' did you hear this woman? She was saying broad instead of bread.' You are supposed to correct us.

In this excerpt Lobutimba shows how she took the initiative to ask the white woman what they would have for supper. She marked her words by saying them in English. She said the woman would tell her. She said she could ask in siSwati and yet she asked the question in Zulu. This brings out how Zulu and not siSwati was the language that was commonly used in domestic work in the colonial period. One of the reasons was that the white people who worked in Swaziland were from South Africa where Zulu is spoken. Another one would be that siSwati did not exist as a written language at this time. She observed that white people are tolerant of people

who do not know English, unlike present-day Swazis who make fun of people who do not speak English well. The expression 'you break English' is a common way of talking about people who do not speak English well. It has a sociolinguistic meaning that came to be attached to the use of English in the colonial period. She spoke to me directly and gave examples in English saying that when she says 'broad' instead of 'bread' educated Swazis laugh. There is a cultural thing about using the mistakes of domestic workers or even Blacks who do not know English in Southern Africa. Most people laugh because the domestic worker who did not know English became the laughing stock of the colonialist. They talked about such people at colonial parties (Hansen 1986).

Lobutimba said that employers were more task oriented in their instruction. They wanted the domestic workers to do the work. This means that they were more interested in instrumental competence.

> The white people did not care if I heard or did not hear something. What was important was that I do something well. That made them happy. They would say, 'listen here, listen here.' This 'listen here' I learned when they were speaking to their child.

Her excerpt has the marked voice of her employers telling her to listen. She uses repetition to show that they would tell her time and again to 'listen here.' 'Listen here' is also a command which shows how the employers had power to dictate to be listened to. It prepares the listener to take instructions. The repetition of this phrase shows that Lobutimba was always being told instructions. The fact that she says she learned the expression when the employers were speaking to their child

shows how the language used to her was like that of children. It also brought her to the level of the child.

Lobutimba also said she learned some expressions by listening to her employers when they were speaking to their son.

> I did not know their language. In other cases there was a boy they had. They would say to him '*Ronnie, please will you go to the bathroom. Go and fetch a soap in the bathrorom.* And then I would note that the bathroom is where they wash. Then I would 'catch' what it is. Then I would learn the names of things like that because I am the one who works in the house. When I dust I would know what the thing is and see it closely and then learn what it is. They would send their son and he would get things for them quickly. They knew I was from the royal kraal.

The way Lobutimba talked about learning objects shows how being a maid made one learn things in context. When dusting things, she said she would get to touch them and learn what they are. There was a big difference in the inventory of things that a domestic worker saw in the houses of the employers to what she was accustomed to seeing at her home. The Swazis lived a traditional life, while the employers lived a western life. Language became a way a mediating a reality that the worker was encountering for the first time. The way she said she would learn things because she is the one who worked in the house brings out how her language was linked to her role. Her telling shows that work is about the self and how it is expressed linguistically through ones role. Her work linked her to the objects that were owned by the employer through the act of keeping them clean. While she could never use them, she was the one who kept them clean.

Lobutimba Xaba also said that she learnt most of the basic expressions like 'listen here,' when the employers were talking to their daughter, Angela, the baby she

looked after. While the children were learning, the domestic worker was also learning. Together they got to develop linguistically. Senteni also pointed out that the baby that she could talk to was the one who was born after she had arrive at work. Lobutimba gave examples of expression that they used. Most of the expressions she gave were imperatives.

> They would say '*Angela! don't do this*. Then I learnt that it means you must not do this; you must not do this. And then I picked up and it helped me because even now where I work people speak different languages...I don't know English very well but I try to speak it.

It seems as if there was an advantage in being a nanny in that the language of the children was similar to the language of domestic work in that both of them seem to have consisted of a lot of imperatives. Since domestic work is about doing actions at the request of others, the workers picked up imperatives because they heard them on a

day-to-day basis. Lobutimba said she learned, 'listen here' from the employers when they were telling the children to listen to them. The similarity in the syntaxes of the self and the syntax of children's language also shows how the workers were reduced to a level that is almost like the level of the children in their interactions with the employers. Children used to help domestic workers by telling them words in the colonial period. Apart from the children, the workers who already knew the language would interpret for the others. This used to happen in the British household that Linah worked in. Linah said:

> I used to interpret for the others when Nkosikazi spoke to them when her husband was not there. I would interpret what she was saying, like when she is calling them and telling them to go and milk the cows.

Most of the domestic workers I interviewed could write Zulu. They could read the bible, having left school in the early grades. However when they were at work, they did not use writing much. Most of them could not read and write English. They often carried notes from their employers not knowing what was in the notes. Mary Gama tells how her employers wrote the shopping list which she often carried to the different stores and butcheries. She pointed out that this was done so that the employers would get the type of meat they wanted.

> The whites used to write a letter and say go and buy there and fetch meat from the butcheries. They would write and you would keep running with this thing and give it to these shop owners. You will then see them giving you if they get them. You don't know what the white person has written. Again when you go to the butcheries he has written and you will come back with those things. They wrote so that you can get the thing you want because speaking English, I did not know English...a long time ago the store-keepers were white people, Boers in the butcheries. The white man would want the type of meat he wants. Then he would write, and I will just lay it 'bhaca' (a sound word for a letter being put down) the letter. He then reads it, he reads it. He (the store-keeper) takes out what the white man wants and he reads again, and he reads, he takes the things out and they become a pile and I put them in a basket.... You were not given money. I am sure they paid at the end of the month.

The way Mary Gama used language in telling how they went from place to place with the shopping lists shows how she creates subjects between the white people and the Black people. She constantly refers to them as 'they' and herself as 'you' or 'I.' This brings out the differences in race and the capability to write. This telling brings out the silencing nature of illiteracy. The domestic worker became a silent messenger who 'runs with this thing' because she did not understand what was in the letter. She emphasizes the act of seeing to bring out how the silenced person

sees but cannot talk because of lack of knowledge. This silence is broken by the idiophone brought in by the sound the letter makes when it is put on the counter. 'Bhaca' is the sound in siSwati. After laying the letter on the counter the silence would resume. Inactivity follows as the worker looks at the things which are put on the counter. The mind then connects the contents of the letter with the inventory of things which are laid on the counter. The repetition of 'he reads and reads' shows how Mary dramatized the telling of the procedure of carrying these letters.

The silencing effect of not knowing the language of work is brought out very well in this excerpt. The objectification of the workers comes out in that one's speech could be substituted by the letter. Personhood is about presence and it is expressed through communication that is done when one affirms oneself through language. It is one's decision to be participative and actualize oneself (Heron, 1992). The inability to speak the language made the worker unable to express her personhood to the store-keeper. One was just an extension of the white person in his/her line of communication with his/her white colleagues the way an animal counld be sent to fetch something for his/her owner. The fact that this was a person who could use language to express herself does not come through because she did not know the language of the employers.

From the stories of the women, it is clear that the levels of relating were also determined by linguistic abilities of master and servant. If the worker knew the language of the employer things worked better because they could communicate. If the employer knew the language of the employee, this also worked well because they

could understand each other. Objectification of workers who did not know the language of employers was the order of the day, especially if employers did not know the language of their employees.

FANAKALO AS A SOCIAL CODE OF DOMESTIC WORK

The communication breakdown which used to occur in domestic work and other work places where the people were not educated resulted in the creation of a language called Kitchen Kaffir. Kuper (1947) says that the whites in Swaziland did not bother to speak the languages of the Swazis. She says that domestic work was the main job that workers got.

> The predominant relationship is that of master and servant, of 'civilized'and 'primitive.'Europeans who work with Natives spend their leisure hours with members of their own color group. A few missionaries and one or two administrators consider it necessary to understand the Natives, to learn their language thoroughly, grasp their laws, but most European Swazilanders are content to speak 'kitchen kaffir' and to limit their knowledge to a few 'quaint customs' (Kuper, 1947, p.40.)

What is important in Kuper's 1947 study for the sociolinguist is that she discusses the language Europeans used when speaking to Swazis. She points out that the language Fanakalo was used when speaking to the Swazis. A detailed understanding of the situation that Kuper describes can be understood through a deconstruction of colonial relations through language. Fanakalo became the social code of domestic work because of the breakdown in communication that resulted from the employer and employee not understanding each other's language. This language has now become a code that is used in most work situations in which

employers do not understand the language of workers, such as construction work and many others. Luckman sees a language like Fanakalo as an institutional language in that it developed in defined situations and acquired ways of saying things that are understood by the people in the institution. Luckman argues that there are languages that are institutional speech styles which acquire their own syntactic structures. He says that they are shortened forms that are created in different ways.

> An institutional speech style... acquires its 'own' lexical and perhaps even syntactic structure. It develops a 'shorthand' of abbreviations, cryptotypes and ellipses. Many things no longer need to be articulated in full, others are taken for granted without saying (Luckman, 1975, p. 35).

From what Luckman says about institutional speech styles, one can argue that Fanakalo is such a language. Since domestic work was one of the first places where Africans and white people came together, Fanakalo became the code through which meaning was negotiated. When asked what language they spoke at work, Losimilo pointed out that the language they spoke was a mixture of Zulu and English.

> At work we spoke what was a mixture of Zulu and English. The white people did not speak siSwati. They spoke something like Zulu, let me say that it was Zulu.

While some domestic workers said they spoke Zulu, when they demonstrated what the language that the employers spoke was, I realized that it was not Zulu but Fanakalo. Losimilo's speech uses a lot of imperatives. Each sentence that is in Fanakalo begins with an imperative. A list of these is as follows:

Losimio: 'Wena hamba lapha...
(You go here)
Hamba lapha noma lapha kamelweni.
(Go here or here in bedroom).

Wena vula lapha shelufini.
(You open here in shelf).
(Wena thatha lo, noma vula lapha wardrobini).
(You take this, or open here in wardrobe).
(Wena thatha lorogo kamina yena fana kaso kaso).
(You take this dress of mine he/she like so like so).

Since Fanakalo is about doing things its syntax reflects that. It uses declarative sentences and imperatives. An imperative has an object attached to it. The social hierarchy is brought out by the subjects and what they do. 'Wena' (you) is often used. This is the interpersonal pronoun. This means the addressee is always the one who responds by doing because the statements are unidirectional. Fanakalo depicts the social situation in Southern Africa because the addressees are almost always Blacks who are at work where white people are in charge. The objects sometimes have possessives attached to them, as in the example, 'Wena thatha lorogo kamina, yena fana kaso kaso.' This domestic worker is imitating a white woman saying she should take a dress that is like 'so.' The participants and their interactants talk about objects in a setting in which power is structured. The place where the Fanakalo is spoken is also important. Fanakalo would be inappropriate in a church. It is restricted to the work place.

Goodwin (1990) argues that it is important to study directives and their social settings because the power of participants is structured through their use. She says the structures around them are also important because the directive consists of a verb that takes an object. The data Losimilo produced shows this clearly. Fanakalo is made up of simple SVO sentences which reflect the common use of demarcating place. It is by pointing things out that one manages to get the listener to understand

what he/she is saying. Together they make meaning using a simplified code that is specifically for relating messages at work. Fanakalo was spoken in domestic work in South Africa. It developed in the colonial period as a language for communication that was used by the whites and the Blacks, especially in the mines. Its basic matrix is the Zulu language to which is added mostly English and Afrikaans nouns. The sentences are simple in structure, most of them being SVO sentences with no embeddings. The subject is always 'wena' (you) or 'mina' (I). As a language of instruction, the Zulu demonstrative 'lo' which is used in Zulu to point at objects that are close is always attached to the noun. The locative marker 'lapha' is also a grammatical feature that is common in Fanakalo because the person is instructed to move things from one place to the other. The speaker of Fanakalo does not use the whole system of the Nguni locative which are used to show distance from the speaker in terms of whether it is here, there or over there. He/she uses the locative lapha to point out things which are close to him/her. An analysis of a Fanakalo sentence taken from the excerpt above would be as follows:

> Wena (you) [subject] vula (open) [verb] lapha (here) [locative marker]
> shelufini (in the shelf) [locative]

The sentence which follows the previous one will also be almost similar in structure. Another characteristic of Fanakalo is the absence of the grammatical concords like the subject concord, object concord and adjectival concords. The possessives 'kamina' (for me) and 'kawena'(for you) are also frequently used. Fanakalo recreates the situation in domestic work because it is used to mark speakers. It brings out their social background. This excerpt show that the employer

had power because the language uses imperatives. For the worker who has to carry out the instructions, Fanakalo becomes the language of oppression. It carries the symbolism of the employer who is usually white and always talks when he/she wants something done.

> Bakhtin brings out how speaking persons are people who represent a language and its world view. He says dialogue among people is a bringing together of ideological viewpoints and groups (Bakhtin, 1981 p. 331-336).

Fanakalo also presents a world and its world view. Through its syntax it oppresses the recipient of the message. The worker is told to do something. It objectifies in that the other does not have a choice to do what they want. In it is encoded the language of the racist white person who uses it. White people never use Fanakalo among themselves. They always use it with Black people. This is not a language of self-expression because it is never used to express the emotions. People are just objects who are pushed around by those in power. That is why it is seen as a language which maintains oppression.

The only time a domestic worker, in these interviews, constructed a conversation in Fanakalo that was not about pointing at objects and getting work done was when Lobutimba Xaba told how the employer told her to lie to the person who was checking how much she was paid. He said she should say she is paid more than she is. She said:

Lobutimba:

> He says,'wena yazi manje, sikhati yena fika lomuntu,lobuyalapha (He says,'you know now, when he come person from here) Swazini, lobuya lapha kaSobhuza. Khuluma kawena mangakhi mali(Swazini come there at Sobhuza. Tell yours how many money)
> lonika kawena, wena khuluma mina lonika R25.00 ngoba uma

(this give for you, you tell me this give R25.00 because if) ungakhulumi
lokho hhayi khona lunga, azikho lungile kimi.
(you not tell that no, there right, no there right with me)
Bazangicosha lapha kaNgwane.
(They will chase me away here in Swaziland).

The use of Fanakalo in this speech was listened to by someone who was used to taking orders in Fanakalo from the employer. Knowing the employer meant trusting that he was recreating the daily setting of speaking under certain circumstances. One can assume that this employer used his power to manipulate the worker. The employer is clearly stated. Lobutimba says 'he says' and then states what he said. He uses, 'wena yazi manje,' an expression which is like the English, 'you know' in that it forces the listener to attend to what is said. 'Skhathi' is also a common expression which means 'at the time.' It us usually used with a pronoun for me and you to construct 'when I' or 'when you' thus linking the adverb of time and a pronoun. The constructions 'skhathi mina' and 'skhathi wena' recreate speakers as people doing things within specified periods that are controlled by the employer. The question 'khuluma kawena mangakhi mali mine nika kawena,' is structured as if it is a statement because it can be translated directly into, 'tell you how much money give you me.' It is the answer that makes one see it is a question because he says, 'wena khuluma mine lonika kawena R25.00,'(you tell me give you R25.00.' The employer then gives the reason why.

This excerpt depicts the political situation at the time when the king of Swaziland had started to intervene on behalf of the people of Swaziland about their wages. The employer was afraid that they would find out that he did not pay the

woman enough money. Lobutimba used Fanakalo to show time 'skhathi wenafika' (when you come). This is a typical Fanakalo expression for clauses that start with when. He states in simple structures the most important things. He says 'khuluma wena' (tells you) mangakhi mali (how much money) 'mine nika R25.00' (I give R25.00. This statement carries the gist of the conversation. He points out the reason why she should say so. At this time white people were feeling very vulnerable because of the coming of independence. They were afraid of being accused of being oppressors. If one was accused of oppressing people, he would have to go to South Africa. Those white people who did not want to live with Swazis went to South Africa.

The construction of an imperative to say what she should tell the people who come from the king means he forced her to tell a lie. The worker had a right to be told the truth. She also had a right to listen to her employer. She had a right to listen to the people who came asking and tell them the truth. If they had come, she would have lied. She said it is now that she realizes that the employer wanted to cheat her.

Lobutimba said she agreed to tell lies and say she was paid more even though she earned very little. It was only in her later life that she realized that she was cheated of her provident fund benefits. Her awareness was raised by the fact that she went to work for an institution that always paid her more thus increasing her benefits. The power of the employer over the worker is shown in that the employer

could say anything and the worker had to do as the employer said even if this was to the disadvantage of the employee.

This incident shows how employers violated the principles of 'cooperative principle.' Pope (1995) quotes Grice (1975), who says that this principle 'assumes, or asserts that normal, effective and successful communication relies upon a substantial degree of cooperation among participants (p. 126).' Pope contrasts cooperative principle with what he calls an assertive principle. He says it states that participants should

1. give adequate information	1. ask for more information
2. not tell a lie	2. expect to be told partial truths
3. be relevant	3. ask relevant to whom
4. avoid obscurity	4. look for all obscurities
5. be polite	5. be forthright and assertive

While Pope's principles of assertiveness could help the worker, her position did not allow her to be assertive because she had to obey her employers. Employers could violate rules of talk and get away with it. This incident shows how employers abused their power over workers. Knowing a language they could speak with the workers did not stop them from violating the rights of workers.

While the thinking of most people is that Fanakalo is the language of oppression, the domestic workers did not think that. They thought that it was simply a way of trying to get them to understand. Losimilo said that this was a language that was spoken so that the workers could understand what the employer was saying.

> There were many languages, let me say that. There were many languages that they had heard. It was spoken by someone who wanted to speak with you in siSwati. In order to give you an example as someone who does not understand siSwati, the employer would speak to you in this language because you also do not understand English. Because you are speaking with someone who does not understand English, you do not speak proper English. But since the one speaking does not understand siSwati, the result is a mixture. This was because you wanted to work with each other.

In the excerpts from the life histories of domestic workers, they recreate their employers, marking their speech through Fanakalo. They would bring out how they gave orders. This would recreate the social ranking that took place in the houses of the colonialists. In colonial Swaziland there was evidence of manipulation in relations between employer and employee. One story that showed that the master had the power to say anything to the worker had to do with remuneration. While the women often said they were paid little when the king intervened and sent someone to check the wages of the workers, some of the employers told the workers to say they were paid higher amounts.

WORK WITH EMPLOYERS WHO KNEW SISWATI

The language of the employers was the language of work in the colonial period. The language of the employees, siSwati, had as low a status as they had. While some employers who could speak the language used it to aid understanding between employer and employee, there is a lot of evidence that it was used to exploit the workers.

In this study there were some workers who worked on the farms of employers who knew siSwati very well. They communicated with the workers with no problem. In such cases, power still becomes the prerogative of the master. The farmer that Linah worked for spoke very good siSwati. He used to interpret for the domestic workers when they had problems understanding his wife. Linah said they were happy when they heard him speaking their language.

> We would be happy when we heard him speaking because you would be surprised that this white man speaks siSwati and you can understand. We were pleased because he spoke our language.

The speaking of the language of the workers made the workers feel that their culture had been embraced by the employer. Linah said they were encouraged in their work when their employer spoke to them in siSwati. This was seen as a form of acceptance of them. The workers were happy when the employers used their language to them in normal circumstances. Senteni said that they were scolded in their language because the employers knew they did not understand them if they used a language like Afrikaans or English.

> They knew that we did not understand if they use their language. They would scold you in your language.

This shows that the employers did not use language to the advantage of the worker. He/she always appropriated the right to be heard and made sure he exercised it well. This presents one of the biggest dilemmas of domestic work. Since the work is oppressive, language does not contribute much in that it does not take away the drudgery of work. To hear and to understand is to be efficient at taking instruction and doing things right. In a way there is the double bind of hearing so

that you can be a subject in the enactment of power. The argument for language in domestic work is about getting people to be subjects in their own lives so that they can find other options for themselves.

Linah says this farmer used to insult them in siSwati. There was one worker who would jest with him in the same manner as he did with them. While this domestic worker was portrayed by Linah as assertive and nonchalant, she almost got shot because she kept joking when the farmer was angry. A Labovian analysis of the narrative is as follows:

How Y Almost Got Shot

Abstract:	The white man we worked for used to speak siSwati. He would insult us, with terrible insults that I cannot repeat.
Orientation:	Like another girl who used to leave us and go away. When he asked her where she had been he would say: 'Where do you come from Y,' and she would say, 'leave me alone X. He would ask her again and she would say,'leave me alone.' The farmer would say 'Hey X, this thing with such a big stomach.' Y would say, 'leave me alone X with your stomach that looks like that of a frog.'
Complicating Action:	She said this when the farmer was angry and I saw him go to get his gun. I told Y and said, 'Y, this white man will kill you. There he is holding a gun,' then Y ran away.
Result:	When she disappeared round the corner the man fired and the shot went into the wall.
Evaluation:	He was going to shoot her.

Linah told this narrative to show how her friend was almost shot by the white man who could speak siSwati in order to show how he used to interact with the

workers. The discourse of this excerpt shows how two interactants, the maid and a male employer, interacted. The woman is also portrayed as an agent in her interactions. Whatever the white man said, she answered back. Their voices echo each other throughout the text. Since both the employer and the employee spoke siSwati, language was not a problem between them. The employer used language to the disadvantage of the worker. He could even have hurt her, from the way the woman put it. While employers might have used siSwati to create understanding, they could also use their position to maintain their power over the workers. This employer used to interpret for his wife when she was giving instructions to the workers.

LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN HOUSEHOLDS OF MISSIONARIES

Missionaries were another group of employers who knew siSwati. Lindiwe said that the missionaries would arrive and learn siSwati. The older missionaries who knew the language were the ones who gave them instructions. The new arrivals would study the language until they knew it before they would go into preaching. Her story reflected how the missionaries relied on language for preaching to the people. Among the Nguni languages of Southern Africa, Xhosa was the first one to be written. Since siSwati, Zulu and Xhosa speakers understand each other, the missionaries would use Xhosa. Zulu was the second Nguni language that the missionaries translated. It eventually became the language of the church in

Swaziland. Xhosa is no longer used except in the Methodist Church where the hymn books are still in the Xhosa language.

LANGUAGE PROBLEMS AT WORK IN POST- COLONIAL SWAZILAND

Language and oppression in post-colonial Swaziland resembles language and oppression in the colonial period for workers who work for white employers who do not speak siSwati. The element of race is there. For those who work for the other categories, language and oppression is more class oriented. The problem of inequality in Swaziland is recreated through education. The people who are able to get an education are those who have money to send their children to school. These people can afford to see their children through school. If their children do well in school, they can go to the universities, teacher training colleges and many other institutions. These are the people who form the elite in Swaziland. The poor people like domestic workers are those who do not have money for school. They end up getting jobs in people's homes. In Swaziland, education is a means of creating social inequality.

There is a similarity in the manner that the women who worked in colonial Swaziland and those who work in post-colonial Swaziland construct their stories about oppression at work. Just as women who worked in the colonial period faced problems of expressing themselves the women who work in post-independence Swaziland face them also. The class differences are so acute that a worker feels that she is in a strange world when she is in the house of her employer. Most women try

to find ways to overcome problems by inquiring how things can be done. The experiences of these women also show the restrictive nature of domestic work when it comes to developing oneself beyond the oppression of serving other people.

Domestic workers in post-colonial Swaziland move from household to household as they did during the colonial period. The individual differences of their employers means the work of a domestic worker is dictated by the idiosyncracies of each employer. The women related their experiences with language as they move from place to place. For the women who had never been to school, their lives with language were mostly shaped around the home, where siSwati was the main language. When they got to work they encountered other linguistic repertoires.

LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN THE HOMES OF WHITES

Today, as in the colonial period, domestic workers experience language problems and oppression when employed by English speaking whites. They still struggle with self-expression and make mistakes because they do not understand the employer. The women who are illiterate have the biggest problems.

Domestic workers still have to go about looking for jobs the way women did in the colonial period. They ask friends, and when they hear of a job they go for an interview. Hluphekile told how she got her second job in domestic work. Her story brought out one of the most important features of employment of domestic workers in post-colonial Swaziland: the use of reference letters. Advertisements for domestic workers appear frequently in the English papers. They state clearly the type of

person the employers want, the skills and sometimes the language they should be able to speak.

Hluphekile told about how she went about looking for a job after her previous employers left. When she heard that there were people who wanted references from previous employers she did not even know that the papers she had been given were references. She said:

Hluphekile and the Reference Letters

Abstract:	They gave me references for the work I had done as a domestic worker.
Orientation:	After a month I got a job. X told me that there were some white people who wanted to employ me and also that they wanted reference letters.
Complicating Action:	I did not know what a reference is even though I had them. When she explained I knew that it was the letter that my previous employers had written on my behalf. She said when your employers left they gave you papers. Take these papers to these people. When I got to the job they asked me for those letters and I gave them.
Evaluation:	They did not give me a problem because they read them and they could see that I had worked, because the letters were saying I had worked, also that my problem was in talking.
Coda:	I did not understand English.

Hluphekile's story shows how she did not know what a reference letter is. She also did not know how it could help her get a job. Her use of the word 'papers' shows that even though she knew that she had been given papers, she didn't realize their significance. The complicating action was that she did not know what reference

letters were and could even have thought she did not meet the requirements of the job. After her friend explained to her, she looked for her 'papers' and took them to the employers and got the job. The evaluation shows why she told the story. It was told in order to tell how she got a job. This story brings out the social situation in that it tells how the person who could not read could have missed the chance of getting a job even though she had the requirements for getting the job. Reference letters are new feature in domestic work. They characterize domestic work in post colonial Swaziland and how it differs from the way it was in the colonial period when most Swazis were not educated.

Hluphekile is an example of those women who do not know English in post-colonial Swaziland. Her life history tells how domestic workers went to work in the households of employers who spoke English and how they fared if they did not know it. They had to learn their roles as they also try to learn the language. This resulted in workers creating working grammars which they would rely on and also getting other people to help them. Luckman says that people who get into institutions learn the language of the institution. He says:

> A person is institutionally and positionally socialized in the course of his social biography to one or several linguistic repertoires and to one or several speech styles simultaneously or consecutively (Luckman 1975, p.21)

Having left school in Grade II, Hluphekile Hlanze also reported how not being able to speak English affected her at work. Everywhere she worked she had

problems with English. She told about the problems she had when she was working for a Swiss man.

> What gave me problems was that I did not understand whatever he said. I did not understand...I asked X. Like when he was sending me to the shop, he had to write down what he wanted. Then he would take the paper to another neighbor and then that person would explain to me that he says I must go to the shop. Then I would go to the shop with the paper and give him the things.

She recreates the incident by stating herself as the subject 'I'and her employer 'he.' This brings out the social hierarchy in the home. He would 'send' her. Hluphekile is the subject in this sentence and the employer is the object. Her friend is better than her in that she could read. She explained to her what to buy.

This telling of Hluphekile's story brings out the difficulty the uneducated Swazis face when they are working for employers who speak English. They are objectified as workers at work, always being sent. They are also objectified as Black people being sent around by white people. Their inability to speak good English does not allow them to get the good jobs that white people do in Swaziland. Language brings out its capacity to divide members of society.

Hluphekile's narration brings out the silencing of illiteracy that Mary experienced in the colonial period when she had to move from place to place with the letter written by the Boers she worked for. This shows how post-colonial Swaziland is no different from colonial Swaziland in this respect. The way Hluphekile told about her problem brings out how the employer helped in solving the problem by writing out what she had to buy when she went to the store. She would ask a

friend (X) to explain to her. This means that at this time, she did not have even a basic vocabulary of things one needs in the house.

Hluphekile said that things started to improve when she went to Sebenta, the literacy program. She also said that the arrival of the sister of her employer helped because she bought her books and started to teach her.

> After some time I came across Sebenta classes at Khoza. I started to learn English...Luckilyhis sister X also came to visit and I also gave her problems. She is a person who likes to talk. She bought me books, the books that have one word. She gave me an exercise book and a pencil and rubber...I would often go to Sibongile after lunch and I would pass at her place and she would show me what 'this' means; and say to me 'come' and then tell me what it means. She would explain many words and even at Sebenta I was learning English. It really became better.

She uses the past tense in her construction of what used to happen at the home of her employers. She spells out how her helpers taught her English. She points out how she bought her the 'books that have one word.' Through getting help from different people, Hluphekile improved her English to the point that she is able to communicate with her present employers. She explains how the man's sister told her how to read by marking the words 'this' and 'come,' which are basic words in communicating with people.

The problems of the women show how the contexts that they work in shape their experiences with language. They struggle in their situations in a way that shows that struggles of social development and the self are inevitable when one is trying to earn a living.

Brown points out that there are 'grammars of selfhood' which link the self to the polity. These show how the self goes about recreating experiences with language

in socially constructed ways of speaking that are beyond one's understanding in the case of the women who did not understand English. While the employers had expectations from the women, there was no way they could carry out the instructions well if they did not understand the language in which the instructions were given. Women struggled making meaning of their situations as best as they could.

The women's grammars of the self also revealed experiences with language that can be looked at from a structural level that shows the grammatical features they have a problem with. The domestic workers' responses showed that there were structures that they would not understand in everyday conversation. Sometimes from the analysis, one realizes that if the worker had picked out the right noun, she would have carried out the instructions correctly. Sibongile told a narrative that demonstrated this. Instead of washing the baby, she ended up washing the car, because she thought that was what she had been asked by her employer to do.

How Sibongile Washed the Car Instead of the Baby

Abstract:	One day he said to me, when he left to go to work, I should wash the baby so that when he comes back at lunch time he can take her to the hospital at the Mbabane Clinic.
Orientation:	I thought that he said I should wash the car. I washed the car.
Complicating Action:	When he came back he found that I had not done anything to the baby. He asked why I had not washed the baby. I said he did not tell me.
Result:	He said he told me.

Evaluation: I said 'It means I made a mistake.

Coda: I heard as if you were saying I must wash the car because when you come back we are going to the Mbabane Clinic.'

In telling this narrative Sibongile uses an expression that focuses the story and demarcates the period in which it took place. Expressions like, 'one day,' indicate that a story is going to follow. The evaluation of this narrative tells how Sibongile washed the car instead of the baby. It brings out how Sibongile uses language to show relations in society between herself and her employers. The employer is constructed as 'he' and he is the one who gave her the instruction. This shows he has the right to ask her to do things. Sibongile is the object and he is the subject in the abstract of a narrative that is embedded in a sentence that has the laminator verb 'said.'

This narrative shows that even though Sibongile used context and common sense she could not carry out the instruction because she missed the most important word. The complication was that she attended to the car instead of the baby. All she could do was apologize to her employer. Sibongile also constructed her employer as 'he' bringing out the difference between herself and him. She refers to herself as 'I' throughout the incident. This story shows how the domestic workers were always taking instructions from their employers. She had to take them correctly. Her apology, 'It means I made a mistake,' is followed by an explanation of the misunderstanding that took place. This anecdote brings out clearly how one thing could be mistaken for another. The use of Mbabane Clinic and the mention of the

car shows that Sibongile's employer was rich because it is only the rich who go to Mbabane Clinic. This story brings out how inferencing as a strategy for working out meanings can create problems for workers.

Hluphekile Hlanze pointed out that the structure that bothered her most was the question. She felt that after she had learned some English, she could understand. However when it came to asking questions, she would have a problem. She gave an example of a time when she would have liked to ask her employer a question that was important to her and failed.

> Like one day, he told me that I had to fix the house nicely because his girlfriend was going to visit. This was before he got married, I heard what he was saying and I did not know how to ask a question because I wanted to ask when, and I chose to keep quiet.

Hluphekile also told a narrative that shows how she failed to carry out the instructions of her employer. She began hers with the expression, 'like one day,' and then told a very succinct narrative that brings out the rights of the participants and how they relate to each other socially. She said she heard what he was saying, but she could not ask the relevant question that would help her attend to the task according to the instructions given. Hluphekile also pointed out how her limited vocabulary was a problem when she was at work because she could not explain her personal problems to her employers. She told of an incident when she had to relate how her property had been burned at her house and did not know how.

> When I have to explain... there are words I still don't know. Like right now, when my things got burnt in Khoza. I tried to explain to her and told her that my things got burnt and then we went to see... You find that there are other words I do not know. I cannot explain.

Sibongile brought out how language is about words. At this point she could talk to her employers but felt frustrated when there were things she could not explain.

The women responded to their problems in different ways. They sought help from friends, attended adult literacy classes, got help from their employers and also their children. Hluphekile pointed out that the children of her employer help her when she is reading by having her read to them, during the day and at bedtime.

> They like to have me read to them and then when there is a difficult word, they tell me what it says. At times it is necessary for me to stay with them. When they go to bed, it is necessary to take a book and go and read to them before they sleep. Sometimes the parents go away for a whole week and I stay with them.

The relationship that Hluphekile had with her employers was unique in that they did a lot for her. She told how her employer taught her how to count.

> I am saying she helped me to learn to count because I do not know how...I cannot count, add and subtract and multiply. I cannot divide. My employer helped me after washing the dishes. We would sit down and learn....Even with writing she was helping me.

The experiences of women who work in post-colonial Swaziland show that not only do they have problems performing their duties, they also feel alienated from the rest of the people who can speak English. While the women do a lot to learn to be able to follow instructions, in some cases, it was obvious from what they said that they felt they needed to know English.

LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN THE HOMES OF THE CHINESE

Hluphekile worked at a farm that was owned by the Chinese. She started off working in the fields and later went to work in the house as a domestic worker. She said the language she spoke there was Fanakalo.

> When I worked for the Chinese I had a problem because I did not know English. But it was not a language they speak often. They usually spoke what is called Fanakalo. That is almost easy to understand. Maybe when she is sending you, she would say 'Skhathi mine tjelile wena thatha lo bekile lapha' (the time when I told you, you take this and put here). She used to use it. This does not mean that they spoke to all the people in Fanakalo. Those who understood English spoke it. There were those of us who had a problem. We spoke Fanakalo. It was not my first time to hear Fanakalo. When I visited my mother in Carolina, I would hear it. They used to speak it, especially the Indians in Carolina. Indians generally use Fanakalo. That is where I heard that this language is Fanakalo.

In her narrative, she brings out how Fanakalo was spoken by those who did not know English. This structured the workers according to their ability to use language. English is regarded as better than Fanakalo in Swaziland. Even people like the Chinese speak English. They learn to use Fanakalo so that they can communicate with their employees. Hluphekile said she heard Fanakalo from Indians in Carolina, a small town in South Africa. Her observations bring in one important group of Fanakalo speakers in South Africa. Indians use Fanakalo when they do business with Blacks.

LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN NON-SISWATI SPEAKING HOUSEHOLDS

Senanile worked for a Nigerian family. She said she did not understand English very well. Senanile's problem was with answers. She said she would forget to do things that she had been told and not know how to express her forgetfulness. She solved this problem by learning the phrase for expressing her forgetfulness. She said:

> I learn from another girl. I asked her how to say, 'I have forgotten.'... I asked her because there were some things they asked me to do only to find that I have forgotten. I did not know how to tell them that. Sometimes there are things they asked me to do and I forget. There were things I would forget and when they asked me I kept quiet.

The silencing effect of not knowing how to say one has forgotten meant that the worker could not fully express why she had not done something. While this was an expression that did not particularly help her do her work better, it was necessary because it was explanatory. It could help the woman explain away situations in a much better way than she did before she knew it.

Senanile said she found her employer helpful in that she explained using her hands when she pointed out things and said, 'like this,' when she wanted something done. However, there were times when the words she used were different from the words Senanile was used to. She gave an example of the word sponge. She said her employer used the word foam, which was unfamiliar to her. She also thought that her pronunciation of words was different. Being a Nigerian, the way her employer pronounced the word candle also made it difficult to understand. Sibongile felt that she understood her employers most of the time, although she also told of one case

when she felt she did not carry out the instructions to the full because she had not understood.

> I understand sometimes and sometimes not. When I started they said I must take out tomatoes from the fridge. I did not understand. The woman went away, and I did not take them all out. I took out a few, yet she wanted all of them taken out.

From the women's explanations, one realizes that there will always be things they do not understand. Their voices echo the voices of women who worked during the colonial period. They struggle to learn structures the way women who worked in colonial Swaziland struggled to learn.

SYNTAXES OF THE SELF IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

Examples of grammars of the self from post-colonial Swaziland also show that workers learned language in order to understand the actions that were dictated by the speaker. Since Swaziland was a British colony, English is the language that the workers have to struggle with at work. There is a similarity in structures in that the workers also listed phrases that are used to give instructions.

Senanile pointed out that she found it easier to understand the children. She said their immediate needs were something she always had to attend to on a daily basis. Her inventory of everyday expressions was also limited to their basic needs. They included the following:

> I want to 'wee-wee'
> I want to 'poo-poo'
> I want a bath
> I want rice

The structures that children use often have the same pronoun and verb. They are structures that are in the active voice. They are made out of somebody's direct speech. They are also simple SVO statements that state what the baby wants. The structures show that children see the world in terms of their needs. These structures could not mean anything when said by an adult but because they are said by children they have a different impact on the listener. They are structures that demand a response from the listener. In their own way they stand between the utterance and an action, the way imperatives do because a baby minder cannot ignore them. The nouns attached to them become the inventory of their everyday vocabulary in terms of verbs in a simple form of English that can be understood by both. The expression 'I want a bath' may be Senanile's own creation because the children seem to be able to use the infinitive in the first construction. Using the verbs that double the stem like 'poo-poo' and 'wee-wee,' Senanile brought out how children use these words which are euphemisms for defecate and urinate.

Placing this discourse in space brings out that these are structures that she could only hear at a certain place, the place of her employers. The objects they call out belong to that particular setting. This is not a language the worker uses all the time. It is restricted to a certain time in her life. In Senanile's life it was used between the hours of seven o'clock to five o'clock. It is just a language of a special group even in the home. Only the children use it. She said she found it better to talk to the children. This implies that the simpler language of the children is easier to understand. Recreating this list of structures Senanile brought out the social relations

between the children and herself. They are relations of a dependence that has its own hierarchy in that they echo what a nanny does in the way she is told when the instructions for her job are given out. She is to mind the babies.

The case of Senanile shows that she also recreated her knowledge of the English language around the everyday structures used by the children she looked after. She wanted to make sure that she responded to them and met their needs. The repertoire of the self of a person who works in an institution reveals the ideology of the institution. The women started to understand themselves in relation to the institution of domestic work and the roles they played in it. They wanted to be able to understand what their employers said because this gave them a feeling of confidence in that they carried out the tasks dictated to them. This way language became an extension of themselves and it became a part of their everyday experiences at work. Brown points out that we constantly create ourselves linguistically as we go about everyday work. These syntaxes of the self become our identities as we go through our lives.

LANGUAGE PROBLEMS IN THE HOUSEHOLDS OF SWAZIS

The women who worked for the Swazi elite do not have communication problems with their employers because they can all speak siSwati. It is when they encounter the gadgets that are owned by the elite that they get into problems. Their telling of their experiences reveals how class difference is recreated in the houses of the Swazi employers when the worker has nobody to ask about using things like irons

and stoves. The affluence of the elite is evident when the worker gets into the households of the elite. She comes across things such as telephones and irons, all which are not there in her everyday life. The struggle to get the work done when one cannot even understand how to use the gadgets makes life difficult until they get used to the situation.

The women discussed how they struggled with language at work in a way that shows that language is part of one's everyday manner of interacting at work. If people are not linguistically equipped to cope in the environment they work in they experience problems of lack of understanding and confusion. Lozindaba was one woman who had never been to school at all. While all the women had gone to school for a few years she knew absolutely nothing about English or written language. She could not even write her own name while the others could. The world of work was strange to her in that most things she saw there, she had never seen anywhere else. Lozindaba found that she had problems with most of the electrical equipment such as the stove and the iron.

> When I started, my problem was electricity when ironing or cooking. I worked where I looked after the baby. When I had to cook for the baby, my brain would think that if I touch this, then something happens. This used to give me a problem. I would think that if I touch something there would be a problem.

Another main problem for Lozindaba was listening to someone on the telephone, getting messages right, asking questions and responding appropriately. Most women who are domestic workers come from poor homes where there are no telephones. Having to attend to one and find that the person speaks English brings

out that it is not the telephone that is a problem but language. Class differences are played out in the houses of employers in that the domestic worker is silenced since she does not know the language.

> When the phone rings and someone who speaks English is on the line, I cannot answer. Even when the person comes in speaking to me directly. Even if this person is not on the phone, I cannot answer because I don't know English.

Lozindaba's inability to read numbers made it impossible for her to set the iron correctly. As a result some clothes were burned. She also pointed out that her failure to read figures made it difficult for her to give the baby medicine because she could not determine whether to give the baby a tablespoon or teaspoon.

> What I do is I count the numbers and then fail to determine if it is three or I should give the child the medicine three times a day. It is difficult to also determine if it is a teaspoon or a spoon.

Lozindaba said that she could read the figures after attending the literacy program when a woman she worked for allowed her to go to Sebenta, an adult literacy program.

Hearing about the experiences that the workers have had at work makes one realize that language is a problem. The alienation that results when the worker does not know the language was expressed by Hluphekile when she was asked how she felt when people spoke English when she was around before she knew what was being said.

> I felt bad because I could see people talking and not hear what they were saying. I had serious problems, so that when they were talking among themselves I used to leave them alone and not sit with them.

The alienation that Hluphekile felt shows how working class people feel in Swaziland, mainly because they cannot speak English. They feel left out. They feel as if they do not belong. The divisive nature of language is brought out in the alienation that the workers feel when they are at work. They feel excluded in the social circles of the elite.

In this chapter we have looked at the issues of language and the lives of women and how they used language at work in colonial Swaziland and how they use it today. In colonial Swaziland women interacted in the languages of their employers just as they do today. Afrikaans and Fanakalo were commonly used. The women create structures in these languages that are typical of this period. These bring out the power of the employers over them. In post-colonial Swaziland, English is widely used. Fanakalo is not as widely used as it was in colonial Swaziland. Even in post-colonial Swaziland workers acquire syntaxes that become a part of their everyday vocabulary as they did in colonial Swaziland. Language is not a problem between worker and employer in the households of Swazis. It is when the workers are by themselves in the house that they get frustrated. Many things that they need to use have instructions that are in English. Unless they are told how to carry out the instructions, they run into problems. In the telling of stories, women show how language is a part of their lives at work that recreates the social order daily. Inequalities are brought out as they fail to communicate and even as they do the task itself. The work itself objectifies them. The following chapter will look at conflict resolution at work and how it is constructed through the narratives of women.

CHAPTER VIII
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN WOMEN'S NARRATIVES OF DOMESTIC WORK

This chapter is about the narratives of women and how they talk about conflict in their experiences with their employers. When people relate to each other, they bring about their understanding of the task and create rules that shape the expectations that they each have of the other. In the lives of domestic workers, the worker engages in exchanges that create positions through the hierarchy of employer and employee on a day-to-day basis. The creation of selves in conflict resolution is an important part of one's creation of the self through language because it brings out the issues of power in a way which allows us to see how the employer and employee handle the realm of the emotional. Life is lived in relation to others. How people construct themselves when in conflict with employers shows how they see themselves as people who have the right to self expression especially when they do not agree with what an employer says. In domestic work the employer has the power to construct the rules that govern how the work is to be done. The worker listens and does what he or she is told. This is a rule of thumb. If a worker did not perform according to the employer's expectations, there had to be sanctions. In this chapter we will look at domestic workers' stories on conflict resolution and self-actualization through language.

The use of narrative in the study of conflict brings out clearly how women construct themselves in relation to their employers. Harkins says:

> the primary function of a narrative is not simply to report a temporal sequence of events but rather to provide a perspective on actions and events that create a comfortable pattern of themes selected from one's own cultural traditions. This evaluative element of a narrative provides meaning to objects and events during story construction and is created through linguistic devices that signal the relationship among characters, objects, and events. These linguistic devices indicate the narrator's purpose, feelings, sociocultural values and opinions about these relationships and shape the structure of the story (Harkins 1993, p 63).

What Harkins says is true of the narratives of workers which are about conflict. Domestic workers tell narratives which bring out their conflicts with employers in a very focused manner. Different women have different reasons for telling their narratives. They frame them so that they create meaning with the rest of the text in a way that can illuminate this study of issues of power in domestic work. In this chapter I will look at their narratives and focus on how they are structured. Employers see themselves as the dominant group. A dominant group behaves in predictable ways. Some of these are outlined in Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver and Surrey (1991, p. 183). They say:

1. It tends to act destructively to subordinate groups
2. It restricts the subordinate groups range of actions-and even reactions to destructive treatment
3. It does not encourage subordinates' full and free expression of their experience
4. It characterizes subordinates falsely
5. It describes this as normal situation-usually the 'natural' situation, ordered and ordained by higher and better powers, ranging from God to'biology.'

Most of the qualities of the subordinate groups could be observed in both the colonial and post-colonial groups in this study. Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver and Surrey say that subordinates are people who usually rely on the dominant group economically, socially and politically. What these scholars say about subordinate

groups is true of domestic workers. They come and look for jobs and encounter situations that they did not expect. This investigation of the situatios they find themselves in will focus on conflicts in both colonial and post-colonial experiences.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN AFRIKAANER HOUSEHOLDS

In Afrikaaner households there were conflicts that arose when a worker did not perform a task well. The employers would be very angry and make the worker aware that they were angry. Meanness and shouting became a trait that the Afrikaaners were known for. Mary stated that this was the 'only thing' that she could say about their treatment.

> The only thing is that they were very mean these people. They used to shout. Their shouting! Especially when there is something you have done, say maybe you broke a cup or a glass broke. They would shout and there would be no, 'sorry,'no 'sorry.' What can you say because you came to them and said you wanted a job, my child. There is nothing you can say, Nkhosi.

Mary's use of 'their shouting!' and the way she clearly states when they shout with the construction, 'especially when there is something you have done' shows how the Boers dominated the worker into silence. In this extract Mary said Afrikaaners would shout if someone had 'done something'. The expression of having done something reflects the way Swazi culture sees 'doing something.' When I say to someone there is 'nothing you have done (kute lokwentile)' I do not mean that you have not performed anything. I mean that you have not done wrong. The opposite is also true. To have done something means you have done some wrong. She gives an example of the type of offense that would elicit such a response from the

employer. Breaking a cup or a glass would result in shouting. She says the Afrikaaners would shout and there would be no 'sorry.' This means the worker would not have a chance to express regret about the offense. The employer exercised his/her power by shouting at the worker. How Mary says this is the consequences of coming 'to them' and asking for a job, and brings out how the dependence of the worker was created by the fact that she felt bound because she came to ask for a job.

Mary does not make the difference between requesting to be hired and requesting to be treated meanly. Her final, 'There is nothing you can say, Nkhosi,' brings out the helplessness of the worker. Saying there is nothing you can say limits the choices of the worker. The racist policies of the Afrikaaners made people feel there was nothing they could do about the political system. This closes the possibility for seeing oneself as an agent. It is a mentality that perpetuates the intentions of those in power. The silence that was created by shouting ended with the worker 'silenced' in a powerlessness that left the anger of the employer in the worker's head. It spelt out who had the right to say anything in this situation. In looking at the issue of emotions and discursive acts, Perinbanayagam (1991) argues that the emotions of people who are viewed as powerless are not acknowledged by those who are in power and yet the latter want their emotions to be acknowledged. The asymmetrical way in which emotions are linked to issues of power is brought up in male-female interactions. Feminists have pointed out that in male/female situations when men

shout, they are seen differently than women. A woman is said to be emotional when she shouts. Her shouting is sometimes interpreted as being irrational.

The lack of an avenue of self expression at work resulted in very subtle forms of communication. It resulted in covert ways of expressing dissent. Women developed many ways of communicating how they felt in those situations. In relationships of master and servant refusal by the servant is virtually unknown. Women had to think of ways they could say 'no' nonverbally because of the relationship they were in.

While the theme of the powerless and silenced worker was prevalent in the life histories of the women, there was evidence that silence was used differently by some women. While they did not talk they expressed their objection in covert ways. Thandi told how she got the most cruel Boer to like her by doing what she wanted. How she reacted when the Boer asked her to do a job repeatedly mirrored the actions of the Boers. The way she told the story seemed to imply some subversive laughter, a silent ridicule of the manner in which she was treated. Radner (1988) points out that women use a number of codes when they have to express objection to the forms of oppression they are subjected to by doing domestic work. She defines codes as ' a set of signals-words, forms, behaviors, signifiers of some kind- that protect the creator from the consequences of openly expressing particular messages.' Taking her data from slavery she points out that the American slaves used codes so that the master could not understand what they were saying. These enabled them to plan their escape routes and also to express objection without the master getting

an inkling of what their signals were. Such codes may include imitation, indirection, trivialization and many others.

In her telling of the self Thandi made it obvious that she resorted to such covert expression instead of pointing out how frustrating it was to have to do a task many times. Thandi's narrative outlines how polishing the floor was an ordeal at her employer's place. Her narrative can be looked at through Labov's Analysis:

How Thandi Got the Cruel Boer Woman to Like Her

Abstract:	She showed me how to polish the floor....
Orientation:	She would go and visit her friends and when she comes back she would ask if I have finished. She would say,'I want to see if it is shining in siSwati. She would spread her legs where I have cleaned and then speak in English and say, 'why can't I see myself?' Do the floor again.I would smile and do it again. I said to myself, 'I will fix up this Boer. I would start afresh. I had told myself that I would do the best I can. There were no machines. We would kneel on the floor, which is why we have diseases today. I would then spread my legs after I finish because she was not there. If I see my panties, I would say 'sharp, my madam will also see herself.'
Evaluation:	By being patient that Boer ended up liking me.
Coda:	My friends would not believe that I was still working there.

The subversion of language in the search for the self in this narrative result in a narrative that has no complicating action because there was no confrontation. The evaluation tells why Thandi told this story. She told it to show how by being patient, the Boer ended up liking her. The role of her cynicism in imitating the

employer is never clearly stated by her. It alludes to trying to liken herself to the employer and showing that there was nothing she was that she was not behind closed doors.

Another issue that is raised by this narrative is that of mimicry in the self actualization of the self that is done by the colonized. Bhabha (1994) discusses mimicry as a problem that is faced by the colonized. He sees mimicry in a way that can explain some of the signification that is done by the employer and employee in this narrative as they construct the racial struggles around the task of cleaning the floor. The floor becomes the site of political struggle where the racial configurations of selves are as articulated by the colonizer are imitated by the colonized. Bhabha (1994) says:

> Almost the same but not white: the visibility of mimicry is always produced at the site of interdiction. It is a form of colonial discourse that is uttered inter dicta: a discourse at the crossroads of what is known and permissible and that which though known must be kept concealed; a discourse uttered between the lines and as such both against the rules and within them.... Those inappropriate signifiers of colonial discourse-the difference between being English and being Anglicized; the identity between stereotypes which, through repetition, also become different; the discriminatory identities constructed across traditiona cultural norms and classifications....(p. 90)

What Bhabha says about mimicry is brought out in Thandi's narrative in that it recreates the colonized as imitative in responding to the situations where domination is experienced. The whole realm of the associations with the colonizer are recreated by the colonized and accepted as ways of shaping expressions of the self. The culture of the colonizer ends up adopted by the colonized without any changes. Bhabha (1990) sees the colonized as people engaged in the dissemination

of the culture of another. They are not symbols of nations but seminations which constantly remake themselves through the nations that hold them cultural hostages (p. 305).

Thandi uses voices very effectively in this incident. Since she was supposed to clean the floor, she portrays herself as silently obeying instruction. The woman wanted to prove that she had done her work and then decided to engage in the mockery by looking at herself on the floor. This shows how difficult the requirements of the task were. To have to polish the floor until it shines like a mirror is not even possible. The narrative has a command, 'Do the floor again.' There is a finality about this command. The employer had the final say. The worker had to obey. She says she would smile and start again. Smiling was her way of hiding her annoyance at what the Boer was saying. It was her mask behind which she hid her pain (Anzaldua, 1990). She points out how 'they would kneel on the floor' and what the consequences of kneeling on the floor has been. These brings the whole incident to focus on how the space of the employer's house interacted with the body of the worker. She says they have diseases from that. When she was done she decided to be the one who checks if the floor was clean in the madam's way. She said she would spread her legs because the woman was not there. There is some play of bodies signifying, trying to find themselves on this shining floor on both sides. The madam wanted to find out how effective her authority was and the other wanted to find out if she was like the other.

The orientation brings out many themes. There is a sense of a lost sense of self, a lack of self-actualization that is brought about by such work in that it creates dependency. The domestic worker might have wanted to reclaim her dignity in replaying the role of the one who humiliated her daily by making unnecessary demands. There is the theme of the dilemma of the oppressed worker all over the world. Work is an essential part of a person's life. However when takes so much away from one's sense of self that one remains a mask that carries its labor where it is constantly objectified.

The women recreated the power struggle at two levels. There is the struggle between employer and employee and the racial struggle. Making the maid repeat the duty was imposing one's power on the part of the employer. The white woman's power was to get the maid to repeat the actions of polishing the floor. The mimicking that goes on brings out the lack of self actualization of the Black person because she could not talk back as the employer did. She became a disempowered self that has to obey commands that signify in secret spaces.

The act of doing this mimicking when the madam was gone brings out how the woman feared her employer. In her absence she could recreate her in all her cynicism and reinstate herself in the spaces that were cleaned by her hands. By being silent to the employer, talking to herself, and doing the task again and imitating the employer, she was able to do what she wanted and not give up on the task. This shows how people internalize powerlessness when they are in positions of the dominated. They submerge themselves in their struggle because it becomes a part

of their being. In this struggle for being the oppressed become oppressor at the same time as they are the oppressed (Freire, 19995).

Thandi uses direct speech to recreate the speech of the Boer in a way that makes us see the scenario and its players very clearly. Thandi says by recreating the persona of the Boer she was fixing up the Boer. Her saying 'I will fix her up,' shows us how determined she was to stay in this job. Her interpretation of what the Boer made her do was that she wanted her to give up in frustration. By not giving up and doing the task she felt she had been victorious. I got the feeling that Thandi told this story because it showed how her 'enduring self' could not be affected by what the woman was doing to her. It told how mean the situations she had been through were and how she had survived it all. When she says, 'My friends would not believe that I was still working there,' in the coda, she brings out the pride she felt when they expressed surprise.

Strangely, this incident shows how a person who does as she is told can see herself empowered by her perseverance. Thandi says she will 'fix up this Boer' by doing exactly what the Boer wants. There is a tendency for people to hide their emotions and do as they have been asked and not show any emotion. This is seen as a way of empowering themselves. When the one in power feels they have done something that really puts down the person, they come up even stronger and ready to go on. This is what I think was happening here.

There is a cultural understanding about shining floors that was created by employers. Even today, when the floor is well-polished people say that it is so shiny

that they can see themselves. If one considers the fact that Africans came from homes which did not have cement floors, one can say that the only way colonialists could explain what shining the floor meant was by saying they should be able to see themselves on it.

While Thandi did not show her hatred for what the Boer was doing to her, she found ways of hitting back. Her bitterness towards this employer was expressed in the way she left when she had found a new job. Cock points out that the only way workers could say 'No,'was to 'vote with their feet,' meaning that if they did not like what an employer did, they had to leave. Thandi says:

> I then heard that there was another job. There was a white man who worked with telephones. I went there. I said I will fix up this Boer. I will move my things and I will tell her that my father is sick. She was very sad. I think she could see that I would not come back. That is how I left that Boer.

This narrative tells how she left the Boer. It concludes her life of torture. The secrecy of her leaving and the lying is typical of people who are powerless. They do not strike back powerfully at their enemies. The biggest blow that a domestic worker could inflict on an employer was to leave without giving any notice. The subversive laughter of the worker as she wondered what her employer would do when she had left marked the telling of this narrative.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN BRITISH HOUSEHOLDS

Lobutimba's life tells how situations where work was not done to the expectations of the employer were handled in British households. She recreated

situations where her showing of emotion produced a soft response from the employer.

> They would say, '*wena yazi,* today, *wena yazi pheka lo*-oxtail (you know today, you know today. Cook this oxtail). They meant the meat that comes from the tail. *'Oxtail is a very hard meat, suppose to cook slowly and slowly and slow. Wena yiva?* (Do you hear) Answer me. 'Yes mnumzane, Yes Mesisi.' Then I would cook the tail. It would burn. If it burns they would find me crying. I would cry because I have made a mistake. I think they will chase me away. Sometimes I would put the heat very high, very high! There was no reason why it would burn if the heat was not high. They would say they will not do anything. Even the plates, the ones which break, if they broke, they would find me in tears. I say, 'oh my god! I have wasted this. This white man will not pay me or maybe even expel me.' They come and say in their language, 'O.K. mama. *OK mama, stop crying, mama. OK Baas is going to buy one. Baas is going to fin another one.* They did not say they would deduct money. I would get my pay. I thought it would be better if they deduct money than for them to expel me. I was in that state of mind.

An analysis of voices in Lobutimba's story:

They: '*wena yazi*, today, *wena yazi pheka lo*-oxtail (you know today, you know today. Cook this oxtai). *'Oxtail is a very hard meat, suppose to cook slowly and slowly and slow. wena yiva* (Do you hear, answer me.

Lobutimba: '*Yes mnumzane, yes Mesisi.* 'oh my god! I have wasted this. This white man will not pay me or maybe even expel me.'

They: 'OK mama. OK mama, stop crying mama. O.K. Baas is going to buy another one. Baas is going to find another one.

Lobutimba started off by telling how the employers would give her a task, explain to her what to cook and how. The explanation is given in all the languages they used with her. They used both Fanakalo and English. In her English she brings out that she understood everything that was said. She knew it should be cooked slowly. The speech has the noun, the adverb of manner. These link to explain how

the task was to be done When she was asked if she understood, she responded to show that she understood what was said. She uses social decorum like 'Nkosikazi.' Her employers also used social 'decorum' to her and said 'mama.' When instructions are clear and they are accompanied with an explanation on how to do the thing, there is no reason why one should make a mistake. However, the oxtail would burn. She says herself, 'There was no reason why it would burn if the heat was not high.' This means she knew her mistake. If a mistake that is made by someone who has been told what to do and agreed that they would do it, and then did not do it, there was no way this could be explained to the employer. She cried.

The voices in the narrative is hers and that of the employers responding to her crying. She was the one who mediated conflict through crying. She is the one who initiated the action by crying. Her evaluative devices, 'They did not say anything. I would get my pay.' These show that she told the story to show that they did not react with anger to her mistakes. Her mention of the reason why the oxtail should not have burnt and mention of the plates indicate that she often cried after making a mistake and then she would be forgiven.

Her crying could be interpreted as a way of showing her dependence on the white people. This is a way of displaying weakness, where a woman displays her dependence through crying. It is a way of showing that she is at their mercy. Her crying also seems to have been a way of saying she was sorry that she had made a mistake. This showed acknowledgement of the power of the employer. The employer got the feeling that the worker regretted the action.

The response of the employers shows how the British reacted to the faults of their workers. They were not mean to their employees. Lobutimba expected the worst, only to be told that 'Baas is going to buy another one.' Her use of 'Baas is going to find' shows how the power of the employer was acknowledged. He was a man who could replace anything. The voice that says 'Baas.' If the voice that said 'Baas' was the man's, it reflects how the man talked about himself to her. Her repetition of the resolution of the conflict also shows how this was a habitual thing.

The response of ignoring the employer was also used by workers when they did not want to do something. Thandi told how she used silent messages in communicating with the wife of her British employer. She says when the baby was born she expected them to hire a nanny. When she realized that they expected her to do the job of the nanny she simply ignored all the signs and continued doing the cleaning and housework that she was hired for. Labov's Analysis of this narrative is as follows (Labov 1972):

The Woman Who Washed the Baby in the Sink

Abstract: The wife of this man gave birth to a baby. I thought that she would employ someone else because I could not cook, wash, iron and clean the house. A baby is special. It needs a nanny who can wash and take care of it.

Orientation: This woman did not hire someone. She would take chances and she would go to the kitchen when I am still cleaning the bedrooms. She would take chances with me. She would undress the baby in the sink and wash the baby there. I would just cast my eye at her when I come into the kitchen to put glasses that were in the bedrooms. She would undress the baby and wash it in

	the kitchen sink and put the nappies there, thinking I will wash them.
Complicating Action:	I said, 'I will show this white woman. She doesn't know Blacks.' I would keep quiet and smile as I go about my work. I would simply take out the baby's clothes and take the dishes and put them in the sink.
Evaluation:	She would find that I have taken out the clothes of the baby and they would be over there.
Result:	She ended up hiring a girl to look after the baby and wash its clothes.
Coda:	She would take them and go and wash them herself.

In this excerpt Thandi states what her expectations were and argues why it is necessary for a baby to have a nanny. She uses language like 'cast my eye' to show how she took note but did not say anything. She tells how the woman would 'undress the baby and wash it in the kitchen sink.' Since this was a violation of a norm that everybody knows which makes it clear that babies are undressed in the bathroom, she says she would smile to herself and continue with her work. She responded by acting. This made her a subject because she would 'take out' the clothes of the baby and put them aside. This was an action of opposing without being confrontational. She reversed the actions of the woman by 'taking out' what she had 'put' in the sink. These verbs relate to each other because their subjects focus on the same object. The evaluation shows how this issue was resolved. It comes in 'she would take them and go and wash them herself.' She ended up hiring a girl to look after the baby and also wash the clothes. This evaluation brings out why Thandi told the story. She told it to show how she refused to comply with the silent tricks of the woman.

She calls the employer's attempt to get her to wash the nappies 'taking chances with her.' She decided to 'show this white woman.' When she says 'she does not know Blacks,' she is stating her own race and makes a statement that points out that whoever fools around with Blacks does not know them.

There is a silent duelling that goes on in this incident. The use of bodies is very interesting. She would 'cast an eye' 'smile' and finally take out the clothes. The only voice used in the excerpt is Thandi's when she speaks to herself and says, 'I will show this woman. She does not know Blacks.' It is interesting that Thandi interpreted her employer's actions as a form of 'talk' that was meant to get her to wash the baby's clothes. She says:

> She did not talk much. She just talked by putting the washing in the sink thinking that I would wash it when I wash the dishes.

From the way she told the story it was obvious that she was disgusted with the woman washing the baby's nappies in the sink in order to get her to do the work. She could have expressed how gross it was, and pointed out that she would not come to the rescue of the woman even though this was the case.

This incident shows that Thandi's success depended on the power of silence. Since the other woman was doing something unaccepatable, Thandi did not question the 'wisdom' of putting clothes in the sink. As a maid she could not question the madam. She made a choice not to react to the provocation by not attending to what the woman was doing. One gets the feeling that if they had used their voices, there would have been a real confrontation. Since losers are almost predictable in such situations one can argue that Thandi decided to play safe by not saying a word and

acting in a way that shows that she cannot do what is implied by the action of the woman.

Rather than express dissent openly she chose not to do what she was asked in a way that showed the employer that she saw what the employer wanted done, but would not do it because she did not think it was right for her to do it.

This interaction shows how Thandi interpreted what her employer was doing and decided to respond likewise. While she observed that the employer did not talk, she also did not talk. She calculated actions of the employer and realized what she thought of her and then responded in order to 'show' her because, 'she does not know Blacks.' Her reasoning brings out how domestic workers always felt that they were a collective of Black people when white people were mean to them. They relied on 'Black wit.' I have coined this expression from a general observation of how Black people see their dehumanization by whites as an underestimation of their intelligence. They always feel they have to 'show' the other by reacting in subtle ways that show that they are fully aware of what is happening even though they may not show it openly. There seems to be some 'maid wit,' expressed when a maid uses subversive action in a way that says, 'I will fix this employer. She does not know maids.' This is what Thandi's utterance reflected. Since this is silencing oneself, it has its own contradictions. While the colonial era gave the employers power over their employees, there is evidence that the employees also appropriated some of the strategies of the employers and empowered themselves. Language as talk has to be looked at differently in that a number of ways of communicating existed between the

women and their employers. Learning to work together also meant learning the other person's way of expressing herself.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN POST-COLONIAL SWAZILAND

Post colonial Swaziland is the world of the Swazi elite. The Swazi elite interacts with the employees in ways which are similar to those of the colonialists. The feelings of workers are trivialized. They told stories that showed that they were treated as victims at work. There were no workers who reported victimization in white households. The stories that reflect conflicts at work were in the households of Africans who speak English, Coloreds and the Swazi elite. The self hatred that people who have been oppressed internalize is brought out in how they inflict hatred on their own people. There develops a blindness about brotherhood as one lives out the hated self that is inculcated in the racist world.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN HOUSEHOLDS OF COLOREDS

The three workers who worked for Coloreds told stories of victimization. They told of being accused of doing things they had not done and the use of physical violence. Sibongile's attempt to make the employer aware of their agreement about staying overnight at work resulted in a fight that resulted in her leaving the household. It was one of two stories of physical violence that led to her leaving the households that she worked for. The fight between Sibongile and her employer shows that the worker could not just take being beaten by the woman just because

she was an employer. She hit back with an even harder object. Sibongile's narration first starts with a summary of the whole incident and then goes back to the details. This was due to her having to retell the story for the police to hear her evidence.

Strodt-Lopez (1993) argues that narrative is a good device for making issues of conflict very clear. She says:

> Narration makes things accessible, first of all, because combats are a familiar item in the cultural repertoire. Indeed, we view a great deal many real-life problems as struggles or combats on the narrative model (p. 76).

In her telling Sibongile brings out clearly the reason for her being in conflict with her employer. She said:

How Sibongile Left the Colored Woman

Abstract:	I worked there for three years then we quarrelled.
Orientation:	She came back from work drunk and then she said I must spend the night and I said, 'I told you auntie that you must tell me the day before if you want me to spend the night because I also have children.
Complicating Action:	She then took a tomato and hit me with it and I took a wooden spoon and hit her with it. She then went to the police and filed a case against me.
Result:	They kept me there and said I should pay R50.00 fine. I hit her with the wooden spoon and she went to the police station and when she got there I had left her place. I ran away and went home and she followed me. She found me at home and when she got out of the car and said 'here she is.'When I explained to them she was quick to argue with me because she is a Colored. They said we should go and talk at the police station. I put my baby on my back and went to the police station with them. My brother in law followed me. The police talked to him and said I would sleep in jail because they would discuss our case the following day. My brother in law

asked them not to make me sleep there because he would bring me back in the morning. They agreed. She left. She insulted me at the police station. She said,'you poes'. They said leave this thing alone because it has two brains. We went back on Tuesday and they said I was wrong because I had hit back. They said I should have come to tell them with the dirty overall.After that they said five months in prison or R50.00. My brother paid the money. The woman was there when they passed the judgement.

Evaluation: I could not just stand there.

Coda: I wanted to hit back.

Sibongile's narrative can best be analyzed through both Polanyi's and Labov's analysis. Polanyi looks at narrative differently from Labov (1972). She emphasizes that a story is a story because it tells the listener the point the story-teller wants to emphasize. The story-teller negotiates her point by pointing out why her story is worth telling. She breaks down a story into proposal for meaning, introduction and support from the text and evaluative devices. Proposal for meaning for this story would be the fact that the story-teller wants to conclude her life history and tell how she left or even why she left this employer. She says before she begins the telling, 'I worked there for three years and then we quarrelled.' I also felt that in her second telling she wanted to justify why she she fought back.

Her introduction is the sentence that is an embedded clause in which she says 'She came back from work drunk and then she said I must spend the night and I said, 'I told you auntie that you must tell me the day before if you want me to spend the night because I also have children.' By saying this, the domestic worker was

reminding the employer what her terms for working were. She was creating herself as a person who has her own self reference, which makes her the subject. This produced a violent reaction in the employer. She tells the consequences of experiences in combat with her employer- hitting back when her employer hit her with a tomato. The support tells how the story moved from place to place as each participant took different directions and how it finally resulted in a conversion of participants when the police caught up with her. The evaluation comes in the judgement in the words of the policemen:

> I could not just stand there. I wanted to hit back. After that they said five months in prison or R50.00. My brother paid the money. The woman was there when they passed the judgement.

Her telling revealed how the police were not impartial in judging the case. They did not consider the circumstances. They looked at her role and put her in the wrong. Issues like who was first to do the hitting that produced the reaction in the worker were never considered. This shows how the justice system still favors employers. The fact that the woman was a Colored might also have contributed. The structuring of society that was created by colonialists still exists in the minds of most Swazis.

Sibongile was insulted by the Colored woman. She uses the metaphor 'poes' (pussy in English) which means a woman's private parts. Since the word is in Afrikaans, the woman must have had an Afrikaans background. Insults create tension in discourse. The worker marked these words in order to bring out the speech of the Colored woman. In the whole story the voice that is heard is that of

the Colored woman. This shows how women reflect their own self hatred in the language they use. The police seemed to condone the use of such language and said the Colored woman is a two-brained thing. This incident illustrates how unprotected by the law domestic workers are. This domestic worker had only her family to rely on. The abuse of domestic workers continued unabated because Swazi Law sees the household as a private place. I once attended a seminar where legal advisers stated this clearly. Such laws may be a legacy of the colonial period. The maintenance of these divisions makes it difficult for workers to seek protection under the arm of the law.

The cases that are tried by the police at the police station also leave much to be desired. Their attitude towards domestic workers might be due to the elitist ideas that the police also want to maintain. If they are members of the community who rely on domestic workers, there is no way they can try the case of a domestic worker fairly. The other place the worker could have gone was the labor office. Since in this case it was the Colored woman who took the case to the 'law' the worker could not do that. The frustration of the worker in this incident shows how employers who have no respect for their workers get away with abusing them. To fine a worker money when she has been beaten is to strike her with a double blow. This is a person who does not earn much compared to he employer.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN HOUSEHOLDS OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING AFRICANS

The main cause of conflict among domestic workers and their employers seems to arise when things are not well spelt out. Some workers reported that some of their African employers did not tell them what to do. This made them ignorant of what their expectations were. Siphiwe reported that she did not like the fact that her employer did not tell her what to do. She always cooked what she wanted and ended up asking the children what they wanted to eat. When I asked her why this was a problem she said:

> Let me make an example with cooking. I just cook. I don't know what they want to eat today. That is what makes my mind think a lot....Iask the woman and she says 'I don't know 'sisi.'You can cook what you want. Sometimes like yesterday, I asked the children. 'Should I cook porridge or rice or 'chapati.'

Siphiwe uses an expression which focuses the talk when she says, 'let me make an example with cooking,' and then tells the 'story of yesterday.' This story was told for a specific purpose. The point of the story is to show how the employer does not care. The dialogue between her and the children is its support. The evaluative device is 'I just cook. I don't know what they want to eat today.' This narrative does not have a result because the result is known before the story unfolds. One makes the conclusion from the time Siphiwe says, 'let me make an example with cooking.' This is because she has been trying to find a way to explain what she meant when she said her employer does not tell her anything. Her use of the present tense shows that this was a habitual thing. The woman would say 'I don't know,' in a way that frustrated the domestic worker.

This woman felt that her employer did not care. It made her 'think a lot,' to have to decide for the family what they should eat. She felt that the wife should have told her what to do. What this woman said linked up with what the other women said when comparing Black employers to white employers. They felt that Blacks did not express how they felt about things the way whites did. The mention of 'chapati' in this excerpt brings out the fact that the employers were from East Africa. Swazis do not make 'chapati.'

Lack of frankness among Blacks was also a subject that some domestic workers raised. They felt that it was a problem because they did not know what to do. Nokuthula compared white employers with their Black counterparts and said:

> A white person is frank. He/she tells you if you do this thing like this, I don't like it. You are spoiling it. They are straight forward. Black people are indirect. You learn from the indirect talk that this person does not like what I am doing.

It is interesting that Nokuthula made this observation regarding Black people in general because it is inclusive of domestic workers themselves. I observed that domestic workers are a silenced group in Swazi society. Even though it is the situation that silenced them, I felt that this silence was pervasive in the Black community in Swaziland, as Nokuthula observes. The subversive laughter of maids when they leave their employers is evidence of their silence.

The woman who made this generalization had worked for white people as a domestic worker all her life. She had only worked for Africans at a dry cleaners. The workers did feel that Black employers were not frank. There are many reasons which may cause Black people not to be frank with their employees. The use of

power by Black and white employers needs to be investigated. One felt from the social talk that workers thought that they were better off with white employers in that they always knew what was expected of them. Living in Swaziland, one notices that Black employers are somewhat embarrassed by constantly giving instructions to workers like white people and then complaining about what has been done so they tend to opt for clandestine ways of doing the same thing to the detriment of the relationship. Blacks might also just not know how to use power in such a relationship since it is about copying what the whites do and trying to be like them. Since the openness of interactive power is not a part of the lives of Black people, especially women who are always in subservient positions, they may not know how to assume roles of the powerful in relationship with maids. If Black women are powerless at the place where they work, they may reproduce the powerless strategies of talk that are a part of a woman's life in the social setting. Coming home and having to play the role of master is a shifting of roles that demands a lot from people who are living under the subordination of men.

Individuals use narratives, especially anecdotes about themselves, to reinforce their stance and share it with others. Goffman says:

> a narrator is providing evidence for the fairness or unfairness of his current situation and other grounds for sympathy, approval, exoneration, understanding, or amusement (Goffman, 1974, p. 503)

There were cases of miscarriage of justice where employers made a mistake and said the women had done things when they had not. Siphiwe told how an

employer said that she had stolen the trousers of her son when she had not. When they were found she did not even mention it. Siphiwe recalls:

How Siphiwe was Accused of Stealing Trousers

Abstract:	I remember one time the other child...losthis trousers at school on a Wednesday.
Orientation:	On Wednesday he would wear a white pair of shorts and bring this one on top. It was cold. I remember. On Fridays she would fold their things and check if they are all there. I did not report it because she used to scold me a lot.
Complicating Action:	She called me and told me that she does not see a pair of trousers. She does not want me to take things she has not given me.
Evaluation:	It made me feel bad. I cried because there was nothing I took. I told her I did not take the trousers. She kept quiet.
Result:	Then she found it. She did not tell me that she found it.
Coda:	She did not say sorry because she made me feel bad.

The evaluation of this story according to Labov is 'It made me feel bad. I cried because there was nothing I took' and 'She did not say sorry because she made me feel bad.' It shows how the worker felt bad about what the employer said. The point of telling the story is to show that the employer accused her falsely and did not apologize after she found the trousers.

The woman uses the past tense to bring out that this event is in the past. She indicates the words of people through reported speech. She brings out subjects through the use of 'she' and 'I' in a way which points out that she was the accused, who plays defendant throughout. Her explanation for not reporting the lost trousers

is that the woman used to scold her. The employer dominates the action as she calls the worker, accuses her of stealing. In this narrative, the worker constructs herself as victim.

The powerlessness with which the woman handled the situation is typical of people in subjugated positions. Instead of taking the opportunity to express herself, she decided to make herself a victim and cry instead of placing her case before the person involved. While this woman expected her employer to apologize to her, when she did not apologize, she did not take it upon herself to raise the question and point out that she should consider apologizing.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN SWAZI HOUSEHOLDS

For women domestic work meant getting into the household and learning who the people are by what is acceptable to them. While in colonial Swaziland pregnancy of domestic workers was an example of what was not acceptable in post-colonial Swaziland the younger women pointed out that their boyfriends were not allowed to visit. Zanele reported that she was told by the children that in their home boys were not allowed. This made her keep to the regulations and do things that were expected of her:

> Children were helpful. They would tell me that in their home they do not want boys to visit. Constructing the self as a domestic worker meant adhering to the regulations of those in power.

Children were seen by workers as an advantage in a lot of situations. They helped workers perform better, not just with stating the rules of the home clearly, but

also in pitching in with work. This reflected the teachings of the home about the role of the maid. In some homes, maids were assisted and in some they were not. Defining the expectations of the home to the domestic worker helped her to be in good standing with employers.

Sibongile told how she became a victim in an incident between husband and wife. She used direct speech, and subjects in a way that shows that the main participants were the woman and her husband. How she got caught in their struggle was sheer victimization. Strodt-Lopez says narrative has a structured pattern that brings out issues of time, plot and meaning. She says:

> Narrative is accessible because it is structurally focused and transparent. It is focused in that it has a strong linear backbone corresponding to the plot trajectory; discourse time and depicted time correspond. It is transparent in that its surface structure correlates very clearly with its underlying semantic structure Strodt-Lopez 1993, p. 76).

This narrative was told in sequence as she told her life history and stated all the places where she had worked. Sibongile said:

How Sibongile Got Beaten Up When the Man and His Wife Quarrelled

Abstract:	I worked there and worked there and then the man and his wife quarrelled.
Orientation:	When they quarrelled the wife took pepper and poured it into his eyes. After she poured the pepper on him it did not get into his eyes. The woman said I must boil water. I plugged in the kettle. When I plug the kettle the water boils. She says I must pour it in a jug. I pour it in the jug in the veranda. The husband was in front of the car. I gave her the water and the man said 'where is the water going.' The wife said 'Foetsek' to the man. He was a very humble man. She poured the water on him and he got burned in front, from the stomach down. He went

to the police station. They came back and found that the woman had run away.[Auntie said that I should tell the police that she is not around. She had not run away. She had locked herself in the bedroom. Auntie was hiding in the bedroom. To these women we say 'auntie.' They also say 'auntie' to you. The police came with the man in bandages. They asked where the woman is and I said I don't know. The man said he will beat me because I am the one who brought the water. The police asked me, 'You brought water, where did you get this water?' I said 'Auntie said I should plug the electric kettle and pour water into the jug which is outside.' The man had left the jug there and not picked it up. He left it there. The police found it there where the water had spilled. The woman said I should take the water and give him and he said, 'what is the water for?' She insulted him, yet she had started with the pepper. The police said, 'where is the pepper?' and I went to get it. They asked the man if he used pepper and he said he did because he used to drink.

Complicating Action 1. The other policeman said,'you girl we have to go and lock you up. If we don't lock you up we should beat you up until you tell us where this woman is.' I told them where she was]. The man went because in his car keys, there were keys for the bedrooms. He went and opened the door. When he opened he found her under the bed.

Result 1. The police went with her to Malkerns and the man fined after they talked out their family matters, you see. They talked and he came back and dropped her at home.

Complicating Action 2. When he had dropped her she took a shoe and beat me because she said I am the one who told the police where she was.

Evaluation: That is how I left. She said she had told me that when the police arrive, I should say she is not around.

Orientation 2. I was in the kitchen mixing the children's sour milk and then she came in.

Result 2. I collected my things and went back home.

Coda:	My money was brought by the man. He came to home to pay me.

The Story of Sibongile and her employer (the woman)

Abstract:	Auntie said I should not tell them she is around. The policeman said:
Orientation:	I was in the kitchen mixing the children's milk when she came in.
Complicating Action.	When he had dropped her she took a shoe and beat me because she said I am the one who told the police where she was.
Evaluation:	That is how I left.
Coda:	He came home to pay me.

The story of the pepper is in the abstract and orientation of the story of the man and his wife. It establishes why they fought. The narrative has two complicating actions (Labov 1972). This is because there are two major narratives in this story. There is the narrative of the man and his wife and Sibongile and the wife of the man's narrative. There is also a narrative which is partially told, the narrative of the pepper. The first complicating action is: She poured the water on him and he got burned in front, from the stomach down. The second one is: When he had dropped her she took a shoe and beat me because she said I am the one who told the police where she was.

There are also two evaluations. The first one is: They talked and he came and dropped her at home. The evaluation of Sibongile's narrative on how she got beaten is 'That is how I left.' Sibongile and the wife's narrative has a coda: My money was brought by the man. This narrative is well told. She uses direct speech very

sparingly, just for the words of the man, the woman, and the police. The main narrative spirals when the police come. This breaks it into the actual narrative that is told to the interviewer and the one which begins again to retell what she said to the police as a witness. In both cases where she could do nothing but respond to an action that was crucial to both complicating actions, she brings out her role in the story by embedding the compelling voice. She uses 'said' to bring out that everything she did was in response to what the woman (she) and what the 'other policeman said'. This shows how she was dominated by the people talking to her in both narratives. The police threatened to lock her up. The woman had power over her. She had to do what she was told by her.

Sibongile showed how the woman answered the man's question when he said, 'where is the water going,' by marking her words. She tells how she said 'Foetsek' to her husband. This was an obvious sign that there was a problem. 'Foetsek' is a taboo word in Southern Africa because it is mostly used by Afrikaaners to Black people. It brings out the background of the speaker in that it is marked. She must be someone who associated with Afrikaaners. It is a word that is used to send a dog away. When one uses 'Foetsek' they bring the person down to he level of a dog. For a woman to say 'Foetsek' to a man in Swaziland is unthinkable. Even to a maid one would not use such a word. This response creates tension between the speakers in a way that everybody knows that the woman is either a rude person or a woman who is too angry. The word 'going' is my direct translation of the siSwati word for questioning 'ayaphi' which is different from 'where is the water being taken to.' The

man spoke as if the water was taking itself. This construction focuses the action on the object and not the doer. It is not a passive but a use of the stem 'phi' for questioning the place, and 'y'for 'go'and 'a'the class pronoun for water. This means this question was not directed at any specific subject that is taking the water to where the man is. The woman made the choice to answer the man. This signals to everybody who were really in conflict in this story. The woman poured the boiling water on him. It ignores the subject in a manner that can be construed to mean that the man did not address his question to the girl, but to his wife because she was the one who had asked the girl to bring the water. As a result one cannot be sure who this question was addressed to. The answer tells us that the woman chose to answer this question. Sibongile uses 'was' in reference to the man. She brings out how the telling was done after the man had died. Sibongile tells the narrative from the beginning to show how the question about evidence forced her to bring out everything. She notes all the pieces of evidence, the jug and the water, the pepper, and how the police asked her about it. The second telling brings out that the woman took the water where the girl had put it and poured it on the man. It is interesting how she uses repetition when she gets to changing and calling the woman 'auntie.' She says:

> Auntie said I should say she is not around. She had not run away. She had locked herself up in the bedroom. Auntie was hiding in the bedroom. To these women we say 'auntie.' They also say 'auntie' to you.

She creates the woman as 'auntie' and repeatedly mentions that, she had locked herself in the bedroom. 'Auntie was hiding in the bedroom.' She satirizes the

woman who is hiding in the bedroom by calling her auntie. Her saying 'to these women we say auntie,' brings out how the maid shows respect to this woman who is hiding in the bedroom; the robust woman insults her husband, pours pepper at him, burns him with water and then is found under the bed. The construction of all the events and the final refer to her as the woman. When she is found under the bed she is called auntie. Sibongile brings out the contrast in the actions of the woman by telling that she was scared of the police. Even her victimization of the maid was due to treating her as the underdog. This was a woman who knew how power is constructed. She feared the police because they represent the law and yet she abused everybody else. There is a stylistic contradiction in that the maid first says the woman had run away and then says she was hiding. This could be her way of creating the story. When she says 'to these women we say auntie' it brings out how language is used to create normality. Manners bring out how society creates its hierarchical order (Brown 1987). Brown says ideology 'normalizes, codifies and reifies,' people's actions by stating how things should be said. For a worker to have to call a woman who is rude like this one auntie when she is no relative of hers shows how language is power in people's lives and also how the elite construct social reality.

The second complicating action shows that when the woman was dropped at home by the man she took a shoe and beat the maid. The reason for beating her was that she had not done what she told her. This shows how the maid was caught between two authority figures when the police arrived. She could not keep her word to the woman when she was threatened by the police. She did not hit back this time.

She did not even try to go to the police. Since this incident of physical violence came after the one where she had been fined for hitting back one feels that her unfair treatment resulted in her accepting the fact that she should not hit back. Rather than go to the police station for another case, the alternative was to leave.

The lack of dialogue between employers and their domestic workers marks the situations where physical violence is used. There was no talk to establish what the maid had done. The employers seemed to abuse their power over the maid for reasons that could not be established. Their own frustration about their circumstances seemed to be the only reason.

MASOCHISM AND DOMESTIC WORKERS

The self-presentation of powerlessness that is brought out by the telling of women's narratives is the main cause of victimization. The women perceive themselves as people who have no say in what is happening to them. Acceptance of victimization by people who are constantly criticized and made to feel worthless has been investigated by psychologists who look at the psychology of women. Shainess (1978) looks at 'masochism' which she defines as the acceptance of suffering that is done by women who live with violence. She says such women make themselves vulnerable to violence because they have learned behaviors that are internalized and that repeatedly create the self as worthless. Even though she cites examples from mother daughter relations, Shainess shows that the psychopathological feelings that are cultivated by a person who is under constant criticism result in a an inadequacy

that makes it impossible for such a person to defend herself. Shainess (1978) says that the women's acceptance of the role of the victim comes from how they are raised.

> This shapes the quality of emotional dependency in the human being, and the masochistic person is, therefore, afraid to resist, refuse, offend, or insist on limits. ..Her feeling of guilt is all-pervasive. As one patient put it: 'I know I haven't done anything bad, but I am constantly expecting an accusation.' An accusation or a criticism will, like a magnet acting on iron filings, pull all kinds of unpleasant feelings about the self to the surface.... The all-pervasive feeling of badness and of guilt is so easily triggered in masochistic persons that they are magnetized into self-abasing behavior, into victimization. In threatening interchanges, they buy others off by submission and settle for living marginally in order to 'survive'.While it is recognized that a threatened wolf may save its life by offering the jugular to the near-victor of a battle, humans often fight (symbolically) to the last, so that the submissive efforts of the masochistic style are prone to failure (Shainess, 1978 p. 68).

Women who have worked in domestic work are so constantly blamed for not doing work correctly and they end up accepting blame for things they have not done. The woman could have defended herself instead of making herself a victim. The injustices that women experienced at the hands of their employers were told in many narratives. The powerlessness of the women was expressed in the way they talked about their reactions. Siphiwe says she just cried when the woman accused her of stealing the trousers. Even when they were found she did not say much about the fact that the woman did not apologize to her. The acceptance of employers' practices of injustice by workers who work in the post-colonial period seems to stem from their creation of their employers as all powerful, a creation of the employer that

dates back to the colonial period. One did not question an employer in the colonial period and one does not question an employer in today's Swaziland.

While some workers experienced the cruelty of employers, some had employers who were extremely kind. Hluphekile's Dutch employers loaned her money to build a house. Her employers deduct R50.00 from her monthly salary for the repayment of the loan. What this worker told me showed that some employers do care for the people who work for them. While the relationship that they are in with their employees may be exploitative, there are also relationships of interdependence in which the parties show they can negotiate better terms among themselves.

Through narrative the women are able to bring out how they created themselves as people at work. The interactions bring out creations of selves that are powerless and submissive because they are in jobs in which people who are workers are seen as different. The creation of difference dates back to the colonial period. If there is to be change in domestic work, it has to address issues of equality between people.

The narratives teach us that there is a great need for dialogue in domestic work. Narratives of women who work for Black employers pointed out the need for dialogue on a daily basis. Leaving the workers to do the work without spelling out clearly what needs to be done causes problems. The worker feels that the employer does not care.

There is also a need for dialogue in the cases where physical violence seemed to be a solution. If the employers had entered into dialogue with the worker, there would have been no fights. In both the cases cited, the employer was the one who hit the worker first. Employers have so much power over the worker that they choose the form of punishment. Physical violence becomes one form of expression through with an employer can exert her power over the worker. The injustices committed by such employers have to be taken into consideration. The avenues for initiating a code of ethics between employers and employees are obstructed by the legal system which makes the home a private place where the employer can do what he/she wants.

This study shows that there were conflicts between workers and employers in the colonial period. These were handled by employers in different ways. Afrikaaners are portrayed as people who liked to shout. The British are portrayed as employers who would listen to the worker's plea. The use of violence marks domestic work in households of Coloreds and households of Swazi employers. While both stories of violence happened to one woman, it was interesting to note that they were from these groups. The need for dialogue between worker and employer is necessary. Workers would benefit from seeing themselves as people who can say something and speak out when there are problems.

In this chapter I have looked at how narrative and its structure is a device that women use to tell how they were treated in domestic work. They recreate stories that show domination using devices such as direct speech, subjectivity and many

others. The construction of the stories was done in linguistic texts that bring the teller's ability to use language. It was a dramatization of experience, and a construction of others in ways that enable women to bring out their own personal perspective to the construction of the other person and themselves. It gives the women a chance to tell about the self instead of being submerged in the situation as a victim. It is a chance to reveal what the powerless see and feel, a chance to reverse roles and use language with a freedom that brings one to life in a way that one had never done before. The next chapter looks at the transformation of experience through narrative.

CHAPTER IX
TRANSFORMING THE SELF IN DOMESTIC WORK

Belief in the ability to change one's social situation is what gives people hope when they are in situations where they are dominated. People have the capacity to create culture (Brown 1987). This means they have the capacity to create the language that shapes how they are viewed in society. People who are in situations where they are dominated can change their situations. Looking at how domestic workers changed their situations is done in order to bring out that even people who grow up with oppression do have a capacity to bring about change in their lives. The narratives of the women who changed their lives show that they were able to become subjects and give themselves a voice. Brown (1987) points out that to be a human being as opposed to being an object means to be able to 'symbolically construct reality.' Some women brought about 'turning points' in their lives. Strodt-Lopez says narratives can show how people bring about turning points in their lives. Strodt-Lopez says:

> Narrative concentrates and dramatizes meaningful crises; events are culturally established turning points in individual life and/or social development Strodt-Lopez 1993, p. 76).

In these cases where change was brought about the workers appropriated the right to say 'No'. While workers did not have much of a choice in the lives they lived, there is evidence that they could rise above the problems that silenced them and create ways of looking at their lives as lives that could be changed. In this chapter we will look at how women brought about meaningful change in their lives. The

journey of transformation is very long. Women will tell how they were able to evaluate their situation and decide to engage in a dialogue with their oppressors.

The awareness of workers of their own power to change their situation came much later in life. Their awareness grew from being silenced to learning to talk. They also changed from being afraid and having no fear and looking at people in the eyes. I will look at how the women constructed their inability to express themselves and then show how women who expressed change told how it came about. Linah had this to say about work and interacting with employers:

> We were suffering because we were not talking. A long time ago you could not talk to a white person. They would chase you away. There was nothing you could talk to a white person about. You would be expelled. If something is difficult for you, you would go and look for work somewhere else. It was the law. Whites were above Blacks.

This excerpt polarizes subjects into 'we' and 'they.' It states that workers did not have any choice. If they attempted to talk, they would be expelled. Linah's excerpt shows that the Black people had no way of expressing themselves. Her saying 'there was nothing you could talk to a white person about,' brings out the irony of her personal interpretation in that when there was so much to talk about, to her it was seen as nothing. The silencing of workers nullified everything they had to say. It made them to not try to initiate talk because they already felt that anything they said would be ignored. The disempowerment of the oppressed by people in power who do not consider the complaints of workers renders them powerless. They start to devalue their ideas by thinking of them in the language of the employer. The employer becomes the one who has something to say. The language of Linah shows

clearly who set the agenda in domestic work and why workers would not talk. They feared expulsion. To say that racism was a law reveals how the Blacks interpreted the racism that was the order of the day. The way she states 'whites were above Blacks' shows that they accepted the state of 'being ' as shown in the verb 'were' as a given. The laws of the colonial period so oppressed Blacks that any form of oppression to them was 'the law.' Inequality was the law.

It is ironic that Linah should be the one to state that questioning anything that the employer said resulted in expulsion because she worked for about eighteen years for a farmer who did not pay her anything. If the farmer had expelled her, that would have meant her freedom. I wondered if she included her own experiences in saying what she said in this excerpt. Does it mean that she did not talk to the farmer in all those years because she was afraid of expulsion? The fact that she was and still is afraid of whites was stated openly by her. She said:

> I am still afraid of white people. Even though I have lived with a white person for twenty years I am still afraid. I still remember what happened to us a long time ago.

The irony of Linah's life is that after all the oppression, she ended up married to a white man. Her fear of white people still continues up to this day. The fear of the enemy is a stumbling block to change in the lives of the oppressed. One often feels that familiarity breeds understanding so that Linah would come to terms with her fear. How she links her fear to the past shows how her experiences created lasting trauma in her life.

Lobutimba's discourse reveals that since the worker came to ask for a job, she should be quiet and obey everything she is told. While she knew she was supposed to be free to leave on Saturday afternoons, if her employers wanted to go out, she had to stay. She said:

> There were no problems in this job because I used to have a day off on Saturdays at two o'clock. I would leave after washing the dishes and making sure that the kitchen is clean. Sometimes when you are ready to leave, they would ask you to stay and say,'No, you know what Lobutimba, this afternoon, I suppose to go to Casino.' You could not go even when you had told your lover that you knock off at two o'clock and he is there waiting for you. You could not even cry. This is your own time. You do not say anything because you are begging them for a job. These days when people complain at work I even join them and complain because I see others doing it. Even though I am not educated and I have no certificate, I join and yet I do think that I am spoiling my chances at my job.

The way Lobutimba began this excerpt contradicts what she said a bit later: after saying 'there were no problems' she goes on to state a problem which seemed to occur frequently. She brings out how the feelings of workers were not expressed when she says, 'you could not even cry.' They lived a superficial life with masked faces and did what the white people wanted when they worked for employers in the colonial period. Lobutimba's telling shows how employers were the one's who dictated how time could be used. Only the employers had a right to feel. If they felt like going out, they could just infringe on the rights of the worker. Workers always felt that they were 'begging them for a job.' The plans of a worker could be spoilt by an employer who would decide to appropriate the worker's time for him/herself. The way Lobutimba linked her experiences of the past and the present shows how

she learned that one has to speak out in order to be a person. This shows how changing people's beliefs about work is a difficult thing to accomplish.

Lincoln (1989) argues that change comes not when individuals use 'knowledge' to challenge ideological mystification, but rather when they employ thought and discourse as instruments of struggle. Change in the lives of domestic workers is brought about when they look at their behaviors and see that they make themselves powerless. He says:

> Yet discourse can serve members of subordinate classes in their attempts to demystify, delegitimize, and deconstruct the established norms, institutions, and discourses that play a role in constructing their subordination (Lincoln, 1989, p 5).

While Lincoln argues that people can 'demystify'the enemy through discourse, one is amazed by the way language traps people into powerlessnes. The extract from Mary Gama's life history showed how the siSwati language 'mytyfies' the white person. Mary said:

> The woman used to say 'Do this thing,' and you would be frightened because the person is white. I get scared because this is not a person, this is a white person. When she is talking there is some fear. It is as if I should run away and go home. You could not get used to these people.

Mary's excerpt shows how white women would command Blacks and they would comply because of fear. She says, 'I get scared because this is not a person, this is a white person.' She brings immediacy and puts us in the situation. Using 'this' she points at the people and polarizes in a sentential structure that is repeated. The structure has an explicative 'because' because she wants to show why she is afraid. She creates her situated self and said there is some fear. Her use of 'there

is' made fear something real that she had to flee from. She uses a structure that likens the state of being afraid to something. 'It is as if I should run away an go home'. In her expression she used the words 'umuntfu' and 'umlumbi' saying: this is not 'umuntfu' this is 'umlumbi.' In her excerpt these two words belong to different generic groups. While they all use the class prefix for Class 1 in siSwati, the stems have different meanings. This excerpt brings out how being Black, she sees white people differently. 'Umuntfu' is a normal human being to her. One does not have to fear 'umu-ntfu' (person) 'Umlumbi' is not a person (-ntfu). He/she is 'umlumbi.' The word 'umlumbi' has the root 'lumb' which means to 'perform a mystical act.' The word reflects the socio-cultural construction of white people by Swazis when they first encountered them. When they fought with spears, white people fought with guns. Seeing a weapon that could kill so many people could be why white people came to be called 'belumbi'(those who do mystical acts). Ngugi argues that language shapes how people see the world. He says:

> Our capacity to confront the world creatively is dependent on how those images correspond or not to that reality, how they distort or clarify the reality of our struggles. Language as culture is thus mediating between me and my own self; between my own self and others....Language is mediating in my very being (Ngugi, 1986, p 15).

In order for a woman like Mary to see a white person as similar to her, language has to 'mediate' reality in a way that brings out that both Black people and whites are ordinary people. Language and ideology that makes one to be above the other is what makes her afraid. The acceptance of inferiority by Mary is also a result of language and this is what creates people historically to their social situations.

Lobutimba expressed how Swazi culture also perpetuates some of the powerless strategies of communication that workers practiced. Lobutimba said that a long time ago she would hide her anger. She said expressing anger is something that has come with old age. Her discourse brings out how Swazi culture does not encourage the expression of emotions.

> We did not get angry even though we were laughed at. When I grew up, we did not get angry. This thing of getting angry is old age. Even when you talk and you are really making me angry, I would go into hiding, go into the toilet and cry there, wipe my tears, pour some water on my face and come back to the person singing because I do not want to show my anger. You are not supposed to show your anger. That is disobedience even in siSwati. SiSwati says you are disobedient, you do not want to be chastised, because at times a person may be advising me.

Lobutimba showed how she would hide her anger. She used the toilet as a place where there is privacy. Her hidden anger shows how she put on a mask in the presence of adults (Anzaldua, 1990). Anzaldua says women put on masks. Going into privacy when angry shows how the woman wanted to put on a face for the public. People who are dominated by others are not given a chance to show their emotions.

The transformation of women seemed to come with age. Lobutimba also pointed out how looking at people in the eyes is also a new practice that they did not do when they were young. Her excerpt also shows how they were afraid of going to the store and how they looked down to show respect to people who owned shops. All the fears left her when she got older.

> When we grew up we did not look at old people in the eyes when talking to an old person. That was a practice. Look down, look down.

> When I look down I am showing respect. Even in the shops, we would look down. We were afraid to go there. We would send others. We would look down even when speaking to the person who owns the shop. We respect him. These days I am not afraid. No matter what. Even when I go to O.K. (a supermarket chain in Swaziland) I stand and wait and keep quiet. I stand and say, ' my child, I get tired of taking stock of all the things in the store. Show me where OMO (a brand of washing powder) is. The person will tell me. I cannot read for myself. I have to be told where something is. I am not afraid to ask. If there is a problem, I just leave things at the till when I am tired of shouting and walk out. I don't care. I am no longer shy. I don't care. The shyness is gone.

Lobutimba's speech shows how her transformation came with old age. She tells the part about her past behavior in the past tense and then changes to the present to bring out how she behaves these days. Her telling contrasts her behavior in the shops a long time ago and what it has become 'these days.'

The fact that Lobutimba felt that she could just leave things on the counter shows how she feels that she has options. This is a big change from what she used to do in the colonial period. The fear, shyness, and looking down when talking to people went with her getting on in years.

The workers expressed feelings of being silenced in most cases when they thought of talking to their employers because of the ideology of the time. The colonial period was a time when whites were in power. They were unapproachable on issues of work. The regulation of talk between masters and servants in domestic work can be traced to the Masters and Servants Act itself. The law was designed so that it could regulate the lives of people in domestic work. Most of the time it worked to the advantage of the employer (Kuper, 1947). Hansen argues that this law made talk in domestic work a prerogative of the employer.

> Under the Masters and Servants Ordinance, breaches of contract were considered criminal offenses for which servants were punished with fines or imprisonment with or without hard labor. Breach of contract was an inclusive legal term encompassing absenteeism, drinking, careless or improper work performance, use of property without permission, damaging property, refusal to obey commands, insulting language or behavior, and disruptive behavior when in or on the employers premises (Hansen, 1989, p.51).

The fact that talk was appropriated by the employer in domestic work rendered women powerless. Most of them talked about their lives as if they could not do anything about their situation. Those who entered domestic work when they were young always refer to being 'taken' by the white man. Even though the feeling of being silenced was pervasive, women struggled in their situations and changed their lives. Linah, the woman who was bitten by a snake asked to leave after she had worked for many years without seeming to cover the money for the artificial leg.

When one studies the building of consciousness about oppression one realizes that it develops over a long period of time. It is triggered by incidents that happen around a person. According to MacAdams (1988), it is in the telling of narrative that turning points in people's lives are revealed.

> As we construct our identities through narrative, we confer upon certain experiences in our lives a salience or centrality which denotes they are very, very special. These incidents [nuclear episodes] may be highly positive or negative. They may mark perceived transformations of the self-identity turning points-or they may affirm perceived continuity and sameness (p.133).

Examining the lives of women shows that the changes that they made, moving from one place to another, were made after experiences that raised their consciousness about the self. These are major changes for women like Linah and

Senteni that brought them out of the slavery of domestic work to freedom. Linah's story is about her leg and Senteni's is about leaving the farmer's place.

THE SEVERING OF THE BODY AND DOMESTIC WORK

Entering domestic life at a young age, Linah grew up at the farm and came to accept her life as it was. Her life presents many turning points in how she came to question why she was not allowed to leave. Seeing other people leave and return to their homes made her wonder. When she was told that she had to pay for the artificial leg, she realized that her life would become one long life of being enslaved. She had to change it. Her severed limb became the source of arguments that she had to work hard to change. Her leg became an icon of experience. Weiss (1994) points out that looking at a scarred body is looking at an icon.

> The scar turns the body into an icon. The intensity of the knife's passage and the memory of the blood's flow are transformed into a symbol-the mark of passage into society and its regulated systems of value and exchange. These marks transform lived time into historical destiny, where the past (as memory and the unconscious) ordains the future. This passage into culture is the inscription of the phantasmatic upon the symbolic: it is sublimation. Ritualistic tortures are but signs of this 'civilizing'process, indicating the 'use of value' of the symbolic as a psychic force which instills meaning within us' (p.16).

What Weiss says about scars and the body is true of the experiences of Linah. She would stretch out her leg and look at it and talk about the day she was bitten by the cobra. This event affected her future in many ways. After her leg was amputated Linah went back to her home. The white people came from South Africa and asked her to go and work for them. That is how she ended up in South Africa,

living on their farm somewhere near Pietermaritzburg. When they were in South Africa they bought her an artificial leg. She worked for the artificial leg and never got paid for all the years she spent on the farm. Since the farmer had left Swaziland, he was no longer giving her mother mealiemeal, which was one of the conditions her parents laid down when they allowed her to go and work for the farmer in her childhood. When Linah inquired about going home, they told her that she could not leave unless the rest of the money that had been used to buy the artificial leg was paid up.

> I remained because I could not pay back their money for the artificial leg...It is because I had grown up under them....they bought me the artificial leg because they took me as their child, someone who had grown up under them...but, they were oppressing me because they were not giving me even a five-cent piece so that I can give my mother, yet they had said they would buy her mealiemeal if I go to work for them. When we were there they were not giving my mother anything yet my mother was having problems. I was like someone who works for the 'plaas' (farm in Afrikaans).

When a Swazi man, a tractor driver who worked for the same family, left the farm and returned to Swaziland, Linah also wanted to leave and go home because they both felt that life was very difficult for them since they were working long hours for very little pay. Since the employers allowed the man to leave, Linah presented her case to them.

> I said who will support my mother because I am not in school? Since the other children are in school, I should be supporting my mother and giving her a little bit of money so that she can give the other children who are younger than me...

Linah made herself the subject in most of her sentences in this extract. She created herself as a speaking person who is making herself heard. She repeats her

own words in an embedded clause and asks the question she asked the white people. The response she got from her employers was that she should pay them for the artificial leg. She decided to write to her uncle. Her uncle paid the employers forty five pounds. 'My uncle then sent the money. That is how I became free. I came back to Swaziland.' Linah says that what her employers did was not fair.

> It was not supposed to be like that because all my life they were not giving me anything. Even my mother, they sometimes did not give her anything.

Linah used the adverb 'not' to point out that the agreement the farmer had made with her parents was for them to give her mother something. While Linah said there was no way one could talk to the employers, it is obvious that in this case she mustered up her courage and talked to them about something that was a big problem to her and got the employers to address her problem. She became a speaking self and placed her case before her employers as a subject.

The building of consciousness about oppressive situations takes time. It takes realizations about the self and the need to change one's situation. A lot of reflection on the happenings in one's life and the need to change the language of the self are what bring about change. Examining the lives of women shows that the changes that they made, moving from one place to another, were made after experiences that raised their consciousness about the self.

LEAVING FAMILY IN SEARCH OF ONE'S FREEDOM

Senteni is one woman who left the Boer farm and went to settle on Swazi Nation Land. She was the only woman who decided to break away from the domestic system and go and struggle on her own. While she also entered domestic work when she was young, she grew up and realized that one could bring about change in one's life. Senteni expressed herself as a feeling person when she told how she felt about her employers. She said 'I felt deep down,' using an adjective 'deep' to express how and 'down' to locate her feeling within herself. They came from a deep sense of self.

> I remember them for what they did. Even the homes I did not like when I was older. I remember that I did not want to be enslaved by a white person. I did not like it. I felt bad deep down because even if there was a small thing that I had to talk to them about I would look at the white person in the eyes.

She also expresses how looking at the white person in the eyes was important in expressing her feelings. Even for 'a small thing,' she says, she would look at the white person in the eyes. In her telling Senteni brought out through the adverbial 'deep down' her feelings and was able to locate them within her being. By so doing she defined what Flanagan (1996) calls 'the center of narrative gravity.' He says:

> The self that is 'the center of narrative gravity' is the self that answers questions about who a person is, what that person aims at and cares about ...It is both expressed and created in the process of self presentation. The self in this sense, what I call 'self represented identity,' is a causally efficacious part of the whole system, and it affects both the cognitive content and the qualitative character of new experiences (p. 69).

This centering of one's experience is necessary for one to undertake change in one's life. It is necessary to feel in one's 'deep down' a proper identity that enables one to bring about a self transformation. For people who were domestic workers talk was controlled by laws of domestic work. While the Masters and Servants Ordinance seems to have bound people to slavery, Senteni broke away from the farm system and left. Her life shows resistance to oppression that was unusual in the other women's lives. Sifting through her experiences on the farms, it becomes clear that there were incidents that led to her realization of the fact that one could resist the oppressive situation and get out. She broke away from the system, leaving her husband and the cowife on the farm and went to live on Swazi Nation Land.

The life history of Senteni shows that there were experiences which were 'transformative' in her life in that they were 'given a central role within a self narrative in causing, catalyzing or symbolizing substantial lasting changes' in her view of the self and what she could do about her situation (Palus, 1993, p. 39). When her master decided to withdraw all her children from school, Senteni decided that she could not take it anymore and moved to Swazi National Land.

> There was a small school at Mkhitsini that they went to and the white man took them out. I was obviously hurt by that. I said, 'this thing of living on the farm is difficult for me.' That is when I started to get away from the farm. I left and went and looked for land on Swazi Nation land. Our husband remained.... He did not want, but after I talked to him, there was nothing he could do.

Polanyi's analysis states that a narrative has a proposal of meaning. Senteni told this story in order to explain how she left the farm. She states her cause for leaving in the first sentence. She states her feelings. In this speech she is the subject.

She talked to her husband. She says 'there was nothing he could do.' This shows how she clearly expressed what she felt. Nobody could convince her to stay.

The way Senteni constructed the self in her narrative showed that she found this experience pivotal in her attitude towards living on the farm. A closer examination of the building of consciousness about the situation on the farm shows that this woman had a block of experiences that flowed together to enable her to develop a self awareness that could result in a total rejection of oppression in the manner she did. In her life story, one can pick out experiences that show how the awareness of what was happening in the system developed over time. One can identify connected blocks of oppressive experiences which Senteni correlated over a period of time. She started off by expressing her feelings about situations she was not happy with.

> I remember that at Mabhahane's farm they sent me to go and carry two big containers of paraffin....I went there and it was very painful to get there.....Icame back and delivered the load. And one day they sent me two heavy containers of sugar. I shouted at them that day...I said, 'you see, I do not want to be given such a heavy load again.' I spoke to the woman. She kept quiet and said nothing.

Senteni traces her development to Mabhahane's farm, an adverb she constructed using the employer's African name. She tells a narrative and says they sent her a heavy load. Senteni said that she spoke to her employers after she realized that it was necessary for her to speak up for herself if she were to change the way things were run. She said this realization came when she was much older. In this excerpt, Senteni stated what she did not like openly. Her use of, 'you see,' brings how she made the employer focus on what she was going to say. By telling

how the employer responded, she brings out that telling someone one's feelings openly silences the listener.

> It just came to my mind that they are just people like me. I did not have to lay myself down in front of them until I die.

Senteni's expression shows that she had to demystify the myth of white people being different from herself and decide to create herself as an agent. She expresses lack of agency as 'laying myself down in front of them until I die.' She brings out the image of the doormat in her expression. She relied on her own thinking in order to do this. Her awareness of the importance of self expression came in a sequence of events that can be called blocks of experience (Palus, 1993). As the blocks are built they lead to the event that focuses the reason to transform one's outlook. She said:

> I started speaking about that heavy load. I talked about that heavy load. That was the first thing I talked about; I mean to face a white man and speak strongly to him. Then there was a time the cattle got into my field and spoilt my crops. I spoke to them again. I faced them and said, 'I don't like this thing. I mean this.'..I spoke to the owners of the cattle myself and said 'the cattle are spoiling my crop over there. I spoke to Mabhahane's son because he was running the farm at that time.

She expressed the importance of looking at her oppressor in the face and facing the person face to face. Once again she created herself as a subject to her oppressor and stated what she did not like. The experience with the children came after she had realized that she could not take things lying down. She had to fight for what she wanted. That is why she told her husband that she was leaving.

> I told him that I no longer want to be enslaved by the Boers because there is nothing they can do for me.They would chase us away for the slightest mistake and yet I will have taken my children out of school for

them. He failed to argue further. I went and built a home near my people on Swazi Nation Land.

Even though Senteni had experienced being chased away from the farms and the difficulty of getting land on Swazi Nation Land, rather than take her children out of school and stay on the farm, she was courageous enough to brave the hardships and keep them in school. One of her children became a university professor. The lives of the women showed that to transform one's life was something that they could also do over generations by making sure that their children did not become domestic workers. Women often pointed out that they would like their children to learn English so that they would not be like them.

In this chapter we have looked at how narratives can be studied for experiences in a way that shows a transformation in women's lives from a powerless person to an empowered person. The women were seen as people engaged in the maintenance of a fixed symbolic order and in later life they learned to articulate themselves in struggles towards freedom. It was a process of changing from being an object into becoming the subject of one's actions in one's life. The language of creating choices for their lives developed in situations that were difficult. Through their experiences they found 'the center of narrative gravity' that gave them selves that could bring about change. These situations challenged workers into thinking into the future and planning for a future they did not know. The choices they made are looked at today as the best choices for them and their children.

CHAPTER X
WOMEN AND THEIR RESPONSES TO THE LANGUAGE SITUATION OF SWAZILAND

This chapter looks at the experiences of women with language in society in general. Linking the lives of women who work under authorities who give instructions everyday may provide useful insights in how change can be brought about. This chapter creates a link with the broader society by taking women into the other speech communities that exist in Swaziland. Through their words they talk about their encounters with people in hospitals, churches, the radio and other areas where language is used. This is an attempt to create a broader understanding of the lives of workers in society. The lives of women are not just restricted to the kitches. As living beings, they walk about and see things and evaluate them for themselves. The responses of the two groups, colonial and post-colonial, are lumped together because these are opinions on what goes on in everyday life. Since oppression marks the lives of women in both these generations of women, giving them a voice is a way to find out where problems lie outside the world of work.

There is a need to create a shared and connected text between all the levels of the population in Swaziland. Creating a future together means evaluating our experiences and finding solutions that allow everybody a voice. Maxine Greene says:

> Human beings, of course, devise their life projects in time-against their own life histories and the wider human history into which those histories feed. They do so by means of language or a series of symbol systems that provide a mode of articulation, of ordering and expressing what is lived. To be aware of authorship is to be aware of situationality and of the relation between the ways in which one interprets one's

> situation and the possibilities of action and of choice (Greene, 1988, p. 23.)

What Maxine Green says about people and change can be said about Swaziland. There is a need to create a common dialogue about things that divide society. Language is one of them. It recreates us as subjects and objects on a day to day basis. In this part of the study, I report opinions of women on the language situation of Swaziland. The women were asked about language and how it affects them in their everyday lives. They were also asked what language they think should be spoken in Swaziland. Looking at women's lives also meant looking at their linguistic lives and how they are affected by the present linguistic situation of Swaziland. Social texts as lived experiences are sources of information that can be used by language planners because the linguistic lives of women show that there is a need to move away from colonial languages to a language of the majority of the people. Since domestic workers are a low-income group, their opinions are useful in assessing how the underprivileged are affected by language.

Labov (1972) points out the importance of making inquiry that brings in the ideas of the underprivileged groups in language planning and policy studies. He points out that language planners are obliged to do this. Many writers discuss issues of language in Africa in a way that shows that people who do not speak the language of the colonizer are among the underprivileged.

Le Page (1964) argues that many people in the world are subject to laws and other social arrangements in languages they do not understand. He points out that it is the bilingual who is familiar with one of the local languages and also the

language of government who becomes a necessary go between. He says such a person may be a lawyer, a civil servant or a professional contact man. He points out that this gives this person a lot of power over the individual whom he is representing. The situation that Le Page describes is true of Swaziland where the languages of the ex-colonizers is still the language used in making most laws to the frustration of the majority of the people. Language planning is a way to solve some of these problems. The women in the study were asked questions on their lived experience and how language impacted them in their daily lives. Their answers showed the importance of doing research that relies on lived experience because it shows how people struggle with language in their different domains.

LANGUAGE USE, WOMEN AND SOCIETY

Looking at women's lives revealed that as people who live in the society they interact with other people through language in ways that can be useful for studying language and the problems that the society experiences. The women had different experiences which enable one to make conclusions based on a number of important domains of language.

Macovski (1994) argues that social texts are interactive in that they are a 'composite of voices' that bring together not only individual voices, but also other voices that make up a community of speakers. These bring out the discourses that come from the historical, the religious and the political. Individuals invoke all the aspects of their experiences in bringing out the past, present and future that makes

up their lives. The creation of a text is done by relying on multiple experiences. He calls it 'a convergence of vocative perspectives.'

Rubin points out that there are domains of language use that language planning should focus on in order to influence the way language is used in society. She outlines domains of language use like the work place, the school, the mass media and the like. People think about language in the way it affects them directly. While language is very important for self-expression, very few people realize that there can be change. A lot of the problems which occur are seen as givens to most women. There seemed to be a culture of acceptance of things when women talked about language issues. This acceptance made me wonder if people who are objectified ever think about changing their situation. Even when asking the questions I realized that I was introducing a thought that was far removed from the women's minds. Linking women's texts and the domains of language use enabled me to see how language affects women in Swaziland.

LANGUAGE AND WORK

Most women thought about the issue of language in terms of work. The issue of language focussed on employers who speak English because where the employers speak siSwati there was no problem. Most Black employers of domestic workers are Swazis. There is no communication breakdown in that they understand the language.

The problems of language and work in post colonial situations can be understood by looking at the literature that has been written on language in bilingual

situations. Tollefson (1991) addresses the importance of language at the place of work and how it dictates who gets jobs and who does not.

> Language is one criterion for determining which people will complete different levels of education. In this way language is a means for rationing access to jobs with high salaries (Tollefson 1991, p 8-9).

Language, therefore, determines the socio-economic relationships of people in society. While these arguments look only at the questions of language, their arguments can be linked to studies in literacy. Stuckey (1991) argues that it is the social practice of literacy that dominant groups decide on that determines the fate of those who have not attained certain levels of literacy. Linguistic competence is an important factor in determining levels of literacy. This is especially true of Swaziland. The problem with this thinking is discussed by Tollefson. He says it is amazing that while most work in language accessibility is aimed at getting more people to learn the languages of power the same languages are used to deny people the very accessibility to jobs because most people fail to attain the required competence and thus end up relegated to lower paying jobs. He says this is due to the fact that it is not in the interest of the majority of non-English speaking countries to learn a language of power such as English. The language of the people should be the one that should be developed so that the people become literate in a language they can understand. This way the language rights of people would not be violated because the inequalities created by language would not be there. He recommends looking at people's situations and allowing them to express their concerns about language and how it affects their lives.

Tollefson argues that teaching people language so that they can get a job is not 'ideologically neutral' in that the people end up in the oppressive situation at work.

> Language education professionals must reject the notion that learning a language is an ideologically neutral act intended simply to develop an employment skill. That some people must learn English to get a job is a result of unequal relationships of power - not a solution to them (p. 207).

Tollefson argues that if this were not the case speakers of dominant languages would learn the languages of minorities if they were just interested in communication. Since they are only interested in maintaining their power they insist that those who are not speakers of the dominant language learn their language. He says that a commitment to democracy means a commitment to use of the mother tongue at work so that the language rights of all people can be protected.

English is not the language of the majority in Swaziland. When it is spoken to people who do not understand it, it evokes sentiments of estrangement to those who do not understand it. The few who understand it form a separate group. The women in the study expressed how they felt alienated in different situations which include the church and hospitals to mention a few.

It is interesting that the women think that the English language is necessary for them to carry on their work when it is one of the means by which the oppressive neo-colonial situation is maintained.

In their thinking the women believed that the person who has a problem when two people interact is the worker. The employer seemed to have no problem. This understanding of the worker's position distorts reality in that even the employers

have a problem when the worker does not understand their language. They also want to be understood. The employers could also make an effort to learn the language of the employee so that the worker also feels accepted. Khabonina thought of language problems as a problem when talking to white people.

> People who don't know English...Ifa white person says do this for me or if he/she talks to you. You find that you want to answer. You do not understand but you understand. It is difficult to answer. You think the white person is saying this and you are surprised. When you have learnt some English you understand. This white person is saying this. You have a problem.

Tollefson (1991) argues that the fact that employers insist on their languages being spoken at work does not address the issues of subjugation of people at the work place in that the people who do not understand the language have to deal with the failure to take instructions on a day to day basis.

The issue of language and the place of work among low-income groups in Swaziland is one which needs to be investigated. The reliance on workers who understand English to be the ones who are supervisors is still prevalent in most places of work where a lot of people are employed by employers who understand the English language. Fanakalo is still widely used. This gives a lot of power to the employee who can speak English. Most people who can write are the ones who get the better jobs. They keep records of the workers and what needs to be done. Fikile pointed out that when picking oranges in the plantations, the people who have literacy skills do not weed in the sun. They record absentees and check registers, which is a job the women seemed to think was much better than weeding. The women who had to do the picking only existed as numbers which were called out

when they had to go and work. The dehumanization that occurs through numbering that is expressed when people are in an institution is another area which needs to be researched in studies of language and work.

LANGUAGE AND THE CHURCH

While this study focussed on the work place, the women gave a lot of opinions about language in other domains that affected them apart from the work place. In studying language and the church in Swaziland, one has to look at the issue of language as used throughout the service. Since Christian religions came from the western world, many texts which are used in churches are in English. SiSwati as a standardized language is new. The translation of the Bible into siSwati is still being done. This means Swazis read the bible in Zulu or English.

The fact that there are Swazis who do not speak siSwati means that some churches conduct services in English. This division tends to mirror the social hierarchy when Swazis choose to go to churches where services are conducted in English.

In this study only one woman raised the issue of language and its use in church. The way Senteni talked about people who use English in church showed that she was among those people who felt left out when English was used in her church. She used the pronoun 'they' in a way that immediately showed that she felt that Swazis who use English are different because they are displaying their knowledge of

a language others do not know. The messages in hymns they sang about left people who do not understand English baffled.

> In the churches, the way they speak! They speak English even if it is not white people. You find that they speak English a lot. Even the songs, the English ones are sung. They are always sung. Those of us who do not understand just have our eyes wide open. There is nothing we understand.

Senteni seemed to speak for all the women who do not understand English in that she uses 'those of us.' Her depiction of the situation showed that there is a need for change in the way people shift from English to siSwati in churches where the services are in siSwati. Consideration has to be made for those women who do not understand English so that they can also feel that they are a part of what is going on. This brings out the divisive nature of language in that the people who do not understand English end up feeling left out. People who know English use the language without thinking about the fact that there may be people who do not understand what they are talking about.

LANGUAGE AND HEALTH

In the area of language and health a lot of work is done by the Ministry of Health in order to make sure that people understand what is said to them. Symbolic language such as signs that show the sunrise, mid-day, and sunset along with diagrams of the numbers of teaspoons to be taken are indicated on bottles that contain medicine.

The problem of making sure that information is well communicated was linked to the fact that some doctors do not speak siSwati. The women felt that they could not convey information about their symptoms and feel that the doctor knew what was wrong with them. Telling a siSwati-speaking nurse who writes down information in English and then tells it to the doctor herself leaves the patient wondering if the information conveyed is the same as what she said. Senteni expressed the concern about doctors and the fact that she had to speak through an interpreter.

> Even in the hospitals. Isn't it in the hospitals you find that a doctor is black, but he speaks English. He has an interpreter. You speak to this one and she tells this one. Now, you do not understand well whether that person can hear what you are telling him. You do not know.

She said that she could not understand doctors who spoke English and had to rely on nurses to interpret for her. The research that has to be done in this area has to look into dyads between nurse and the patient and between the nurse and the doctor for whom he/she translates information about the patient. The translation process is very difficult because in the area of health there are no languages that have equivalent expressions. A lot of information is lost in doctor-patient conversations even when the doctor and patient speak the same language. In Swaziland, usually, the nurse and patient speak the same language. The distortion that inevitably goes on between them is followed by the distortion that will arise when the nurse translates the information directly to the doctor. It is common knowledge that nurses do not even ask patients if they can speak English so that they can express themselves to the doctor. Nurses' positions as people who know English give them power over patients to the point where the patients' freedom is curtailed.

LANGUAGE AND GOVERNMENT

Khabonina also linked language problems to parliament. She thought that people who are in parliament should know English because they need to discuss papers that are written in that langauge in order to contribute to the discussion.

According to the constitution of Swaziland, English and siSwati are official languages of Swaziland. This is a vague statement that is not clearly defined in that one never knows where and when English or siSwati will be used. Most government documents are kept in English. SiSwati is rarely used for official documents. Even in addressing parliament the King of Swaziland speaks English. English and siSwati are used interchangeably depending on the situation. In gatherings that include diplomats, the king resorts to English. When addressing the nation in the traditional meetings, he speaks siSwati. There needs to be some clarity on how the languages will be used because people end up confused by this.

English is the language used in parliament in Swaziland. Members of parliament have to understand English in order to be able to contribute. This assumes that Swazis who do not understand the English language have nothing to contribute. Khabonina raised the question of using English in parliament and pointed out that the people who do not speak English do not have much to contribute.

> In parliament you have a problem. Most things are spoken in English. Like when you are elected. You have to know English. Which opinion will you make? Even when papers are brought in there is nothing you will understand. You will not enjoy. You can know siSwati, but English is very important.

What Khabonina expressed is a major concern; in a country which has its own language, the English language should not be the language that should be spoken in parliament since the majority of the people do not speak it. Siswati should be the language of parliament so that Swazis can express themselves.

LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION

The domain of education is one which most of the studies on language and education have focussed on (Mkhonza, 1990). Since English is the medium of instruction in school, most parents want their children to learn it well. They will go to all lengths to make sure that their children speak English well. English medium schools introduce English from first grade. Most of these are schools that were for white students in the colonial period. The rest of the schools start education in siSwati and introduce English gradually. The use of English in education was another problem that the women thought should be solved. They felt that from nursery school, children's education focussed on English and not siSwati. Thandi felt that there was a need to restore pride in siSwati so that it can be spoken by everybody.

> siSwati is not encouraged even in the nursery schools. Our children speak English. I don't know what we can do. We need to restore pride in siSwati.

Thandi's lack of solution reflected how most people felt about the language situation. They felt that there was nothing they could do. The experiential view of language made women think about themselves as language users in their everyday experience. This was a section on which they seemed to have difficulty in answering

questions. I realized that even though women experience problems with language, they are not preoccupied with language problems. They are preoccupied with the challenges of making life for their families on a day to day basis. It sometimes took a long time for them to come up with answers. It seemed as if they have accepted the linguistic situation as a given.

LANGUAGE AND THE HOME

Rothstein (1991) argues that the work of creating the social self takes place in the family. The life histories of women also revealed that the work of creating the social self with language begins in the family. Since 'individuals are socially constituted in the family' that is where they learn who they are. The socialization of children as speakers of a particular language is a socialization of selves who are to grow up and understand themselves as people within a specific linguistic context. The fact that Swazi children grow up speaking English is viewed as a problem by some of the domestic workers. Nokuthula was concerned about the way her grandchildren spoke English. She blamed herself for teaching her own children English when she was a domestic worker. She felt that there was a need for children to learn siSwati because this is the language that they speak when they are with other children.

> Many things confuse children. My grandchildren do not understand. They speak English a lot. I taught my children English. There was too much English in the home. A child...you can speak to him/her in English for some time, but he/she should know his/her language because if you speak to the child in English a lot his/her language gets out of his head. Yet outside he/she will find that there is a lot of siSwati. He/she has to use siSwati. In the home both languages should

> be spoken and not say only English should be spoken. SiSwati should also be spoken.

A lot of parents feel that their children should know English because it is the language of work. Only one woman said she wanted her children to know siSwati; most of the other women said that they wanted their children to know English because it is the language of work. Rothstein calls the amount of money that parents spend on the language education of their children 'language capital.' He says one has to take the economic situations of people into account when thinking about language and socialization in the family.

> Language cannot be isolated from the social and economic system within which it is used, nor can its historical context be ignored (p. 110).

The value the woman put on English reflects how the language has become a feature of Swaziland that people feel they cannot do without.

CODE SWITCHING

Myers-Scotton (1993) discusses the social issues that determine the use of code switching. While her examples focus mostly on Kenya and Zimbabwe, the issues she raises could apply to any country that was once a British colony. She argues that people make choices when they use code switching. These may be affected by a number of factors.

The women spoke about the use of code switching by the youth. They felt that the younger generation liked to use English words instead of siSwati. They often changed from one language to the other. While code switching may involve more

than just one word, all the examples the women gave focussed on one-word examples. Thandi felt that they are spoiling the language by mixing it with words that are from other languages. She also thought that some people thought it was prestigious to borrow words from other languages. While she did not exclude herself from those who use code switching, she felt that code switching was particularly common among the youth. She compared the siSwati that is spoken now to that of long ago and suggests that it is code switching that spoils the language today.

> It was still siSwati, not what exists today. There is no siSwati, my sister. You hear these children speaking and find them adding siShangane. You hear them speaking and then they add Zulu. I don't understand what is happening...We spoke siSwati. When you spoke, you did not add other words until you got to the end. There was no, 'but' or any other word...Ialso mix work.

She felt that people spoke siSwati that was mixed because it was a time when people did not take pride in who they are.

> It is the time. Our children think English is a pride. They think if they speak siSwati, they would be looked down upon. When they speak it, they throw in English words...They do it to show they are educated...They are civilized.

When asked what advice she would give to the youth about language she said:

> I would tell them that our language is our pride if we can speak it well so that when you get to Zulus, they still hear you saying things in siSwati, because they don't change.

The arguments of the women showed that they value siSwati. They felt that their sentiments were not shared by the younger generation.

THE ROLE OF FRENCH

French was introduced in Swaziland schools in the eighties. English medium schools were the ones that were among the first to adopt French. The major mistake in the introduction of French was that it was made an alternative to siSwati. This resulted in a situation where some children would learn English and French and never formally study their own language. This deprived these children of the right to learn and develop intellectually in their own language (Mkhonza, 1990). Losimilo was surprised that the French language was the only subject that her grandson passed. She expressed surprise in a way that showed that she does not think French is the language that should be spoken in Swaziland. She wondered if Swaziland was a land where French should be spoken.

> I laughed two days ago. They say my grand-child goes to school at S.O.S. He failed every subject except French. I said, is this the land of French? The languages are many.

Losimilo's response reflected the fact that French is not used in Swaziland. People do not see the need for it to be taught in the schools.

THE ROLE OF SISWATI

The role of siSwati has to be looked at because it is used by the majority of the people. While the few who speak English are at an advantage because the language they speak is the language of power, the people who do not understand it are at a disadvantage. Much work needs to be done in planning to make people feel included in Swaziland. Khabonina expressed how she feels the language should be

used by looking at her situation and the situation of her friend, a woman who could not understand English at all.

> In my opinion, we are Swazis, siSwati is OK. But much more than anything, because there are those who did not go to school...even myself, there are words I learned from working. There is a friend of mine who likes this job. She also says it is difficult because when they scold her they scold her in English. She doesn't even hear what they are saying. I feel if you don't know English, you ...Ifind that painful. You can just find your fellow Swazi and work for him/her. They asked me to find them a person and I found this girl and I did not know she did not know English. I feel it is not OK when they know that you do not know like me here. They know there are some words I do not understand. I think if they speak difficult words I do not know, it is not OK. I don't like it. I think that our siSwati is OK.

When asked which language should be spoken in Swaziland the women's arguments showed that while they favor siSwati, they did not think that it should replace English. They wanted both languages to be spoken. The responses of some women reveal that they thought highly of siSwati and felt that it should be spoken since it is the language of Swaziland. Khabonina felt that Swaziland is the country where siSwati should be spoken.

> This is the home of siSwati. This is the land of Ngwane. When people come from other countries, they must know that they are going to Swaziland. The people speak siSwati.

Khabonina felt that both languages could be spoken. She thought that people who speak English should understand that there are people who do not understand English and speak so that they can understand.

> People should understand that we do not understand English and speak so that we can understand. Like a child when you teach it English. They should speak so that we can understand.

The ambivalent feeling about having English spoken was summarized by Losimilo. It summarizes the way the women felt about English. They did not realize that one thing that kept them down was inability to speak English. Losimilo showed that most of the people who say English should be spoken are thinking about jobs.

> I would say the language which must be used is English and siSwati because this is our culture. It is the culture of our land. This English became our culture because whites came. The British came and they spoke it...When the white people come to start businesses, they do not speak siSwati. We cannot work together.

Some women expressed statements that showed that the dominance of English was something that had come to be accepted. They did not question its dominance. Thandi said:

> English is a chosen language. It was brought because it is a language which unites nations of the world.

Fanisile said:

> I prefer siSwati and English. English unites the whole world. Even when someone comes and they don't know English, you should know it. People who come can speak. If you speak siSwati you cannot hear outsiders.

When the women were asked about the language they would teach their children, they all pointed out the importance of English. This unquestioned acceptance of English is a problem that is faced by many African countries that were colonized by the British. The African elite benefits from the jobs they get because they know English. They have not come up with policies that can change the situation. People like domestic workers have accepted the status quo in a way that bothers people who are critical of the situation. There is a need for a re-education

so that the people can realize the oppressive nature of situations where there are two languages which are used in the way English and siSwati are used in Swaziland. It is a dual relationship of inequality because siSwati plays the subservient role yet it is spoken by the majority of the people. This is a case of what Tsuda calls language inequality, 'a situation where a few people speak a language of the colonizer and the rest of the people remain speaking the language of the colonized.' There is a need for centering the texts of Swazi people. This is revealed in the responses of women. This would create a country where all people's identities would be articulated in a language that carries the culture of the society. In the next chapter we will look at ways to bring about a centered text by looking at the rights of people and how they can be achieved through narrative and language.

CHAPTER XI
CONCLUSION-LANGUAGE AND THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLE IN SWAZILAND

In this study I have looked at the narratives of women and how they were shaped by social domination. Through narratives, women construct themselves through language and bring out how their consciousness of their lived esperiences were socially constructed in situations of domination through forms such as racism, gender, colonialism, and post colonialism. I have brought out that from the time when Swazi women were young in the colonial period they did not get a good education mainly because of child labor in the households of white people and also in their own homes where they were discriminated against. They struggled in oppressive situations even when they got to work because they were not well educated. Language was a problem for them at work, as much as the work was oppressive. The women were dominated by employers when in work situations. They create themselves as objects in the service of their employers. The period of self actualization, for some of them, was experienced in later life. They realized that they need to give themselves a voice. They need to construct themselves as subjects. While some struggled and were able to free themselves, some are still trapped in their positions of being objects in society. They still struggle under oppressive situations to this day.

Women construct their objectification at work in colonial Swaziland by using the binary pronouns such as I-they, I-she, I-he, which bring out how they saw their employers as different from them. They use social decorum and repeatedly refer to

the white women as 'mesisi' (Mrs.) or Nkosikazi (madam) or Baas (boss in Afrikaans) and Mnumzane (man of the house in Zulu) for the men. They use marking in a way which brings out the social background of their employers. Their use of language shows that they could understand instructions. They repeat texts in Fanakalo in a way that shows that this was a language that they were instructed in at work. The nature of conflicts that resulted show that the employer had the upper hand.

The situation in post-colonial Swaziland is not that different. Domination by employers still takes place. Women who work in post-colonial Swaziland show how they are dominated by their employers. While they cannot mark their words differently as the women who worked in the colonial period did, they still create themselves as objects in the service of another. They are still as silenced. The fact that the elite in Swaziland are not addressed with social decorum does not mean that they are not seen as better. Ideology has made oppression more acceptable through the use of such words as 'auntie' and 'sisi.' Language has become a tool with which the elite oppress the people. In the post-colonial data class is more important than race. Women reported being discriminated against because they were from rural areas. There is evidence of the use of physical violence. This shows that there is need for dialogue among employers and employees.

'Language-as-consciousness-and-act' that constructs self-determined identities in Swaziland can be achieved through creating a collective of experiences where all Swazis can see themselves as people who are able to be a creative force together as a nation (Bhabha, 1990). The split-selves that are created by post-colonialism and

personal identities that result from using the language of the ex-colonizer create alienation in the lives of both the Swazi elite and the ordinary people. The need for intellectual and cultural foundations that are built on the people's texts could be the beginning of an end to the political domination and dependence that is created by an elite that looks to the west for answers (Bhabha, 1990). There is a need for the creation of harmony in the self-individuation of the once colonized Swazis. Language is a means of creating self-identities about the world. The use of a foreign language hinders the social development of people; the creation of a history of selves through one's language on a day to day basis in all places like schools, hospitals, churches and many areas where the women cited alienation through language. The importance of lived experience as a centered whole is discussed by Moustakas (1956). Although Moustakas looks at life from a psychological perspective what he says is important for language studies of people's experiences because it brings out how the person's core is based on a view of the self and the world. Moustakas (1956) says:

> The harmony and emergence of one's own life seem to come from the increasing capacity to find in the world that which also obtains within the depths of one's being. The self emerges in appropriate patterns of experience or being, which incorporates truth, the inherent truth of organism. Being refers to this concrete, holistic patterning of self in immediate living, as well as the unyielding, absolute, and unique qualities for the individual person. The individual self, or being, is an ultimate core of reality which remains unchanged throughout changes of its qualities and states. To be, a person must be true to himself; not in terms of others, but only to his inner nature in real experience. The sources of human potentialities are deep within the personal experience of the one who asserts them. And one can discover his real self only in true experience as an autonomous and self governing entity....True experience is the natural expression of one's inner self in interaction with meaningful people and resources. As such, all expressions in true experience are creative....The individual is engaged

> in leading his life in the present with a forward thrust in the future. This is the concept of becoming, with its implication of change and transformation. The world while it is being perceived, is being incessantly created by an individual who is a process not a product (p. 272-273).

What Moustakas says brings out how being is about creativity. When looking at the situation in Swaziland, it calls for social transformation through language because it is one of the resources through which people make meaning of their lives. In order to achieve a self transformation that mediates at the core of one's being I advocate change from using the English language to siSwati because this would 'center' the displaced Swazi text and also modify the level of oppression among speakers (Ngugi, 1993). It would take away the privilege that the educated Swazis have and bring about a form of equality. Swaziland needs to get to a stage where deliberate decision making and economic commitment can be made so that actions towards reshaping the language situation can be taken. Matters are at a level of discussion which still needs to be structured carefully in order to create a realistic agenda that can lead to solving the problems of the workers.

My argument is that a change in language would bring about a centering of the displaced Swazi text that are recreated by the domestic workers. It would give all people, including women such as domestic workers a common language with which to construct themselves as subjects of their own lives. They would articulate reality and construct their lives together with the class that speaks and writes its texts in the English language. This would be one way in which women would also become

subjects of their own lives. This is a point that is also stated by Roof and Wiegman (1995). They say:

> For women and other marginalized groups, subjectivity and its possibility of legitimated 'experience' must be achieved; subjectivity and experience are made, not born. To be a recognizable subject of history and knowledge is to be permitted - indeed, expected - to have rage, anger, desire, a history, and speech, all of which are human features forbidden to marginalized people (129).

I believe language planning would bring about levels of speaking that would result in a common understanding between people since it would reinstate the common language, siSwati. A common history begins with language. Creating centered identities means centering the Swazi text by making siSwati the dominant language. This would bring about a creation of cultural values that are holistic and centered in the Swazi nation itself. This would be a move away from the controlled text that alienates the person from him/herself. Ngugi (1993) says that capitalist systems create situations that alienate the people from themselves. He says:

> Such groups try to construct a picture of the universe which bolsters their conception of their place and role in society and in the universe; their conception of the place and the role of all the other people in that universe; and furthermore they will try to sell, by every ideological, educational and cultrual means at their disposal, that picture as the eternal, unchanging truth about the nature of the universe (p. 129).

There can be no move away from domination in Swaziland unless a properly planned policy of cultural transformation is put in place. Life for the elite will always be created in the west through subordination of the Swazi life. Self actualization can only be achieved by people taking their destiny into their own hands. Bhabha (1994) sees the 'I' as the vowel with which the post-colonial subject can create history in

his/her own terms. He sees the 'I' as a pronominal that can be used to inscribe agency. He says:

> The I as vowel, as the arbitrariness of the signifier, is the sign of the interstitial difference through which the identity of meaning is made. The 'I' as a pronominal, as the avowal of the enslaved colonial subject is the repetition of the symbolic agency of history, tracing its name on the shifting sands, constituting a post-colonial... (p. 234).

Post-colonial agency in the creation of Swaziland's language policy would begin with structured status planning. In the case of Swaziland the level of status planning has not been accomplished because siSwati is not the language that is used in most areas. English is still the language of power. The example given by Khabonina summarizes how English is still the language of government. Since most Swazis are not educated, they cannot express themselves well in English. This means only the few who know English know how to argue issues that affect the running of the country. The rest of the people are left out. As Khabonina put it:

> In parliament you have a problem. Most things are spoken in English. Like when you are elected. You have to know English. Which opinion will you make? Even when papers are brought in there is nothing you will understand. You will not enjoy. You can know siSwati, but English is very important.

There is no reason why a country like Swaziland cannot arrive at a policy that can make siSwati the language of parliament because almost all the parliamentarians are Swazis. For people to discuss issues in a language that the majority of the people do not understand shows that Swazis have clung to the colonial model to the point where they fail to see what they can do to change the situation. There is a need for status planning so that siSwati can be elevated to its position and be the language

that is used in all spheres of life. Rubin outlines domains and points out that there is a need to plan language so that people can participate in the 'citizenship participation domain' (Rubin, 1984). In the American situation, she identifies two areas that can be looked at by planners. In this domain the two areas that have been identified are the need for forms that will serve all the language groups when they vote and also in censuses. In African countries, issues of participation in politics are complicated by the fact that the majority of the population is illiterate. Symbols should be used when voting so that people associate their party with a symbol they can recognize when they go to vote. Citizenship participation is important for people because they voice their opinions. It should be done in ways they understand.

Fishman points out that language planning has to happen at the level of corpus because a writing system has to be created. He outlined that the stages of decision-making, codification, elaboration, implementation and evaluation have to be undertaken. The standardization of the language is the first thing. After that language academies have to codify the language. In the elaboration stage the nomenclature of the language is created. The evaluation of the corpus means finding out which of the results of the elaboration stage have been successful. This means going out into the field to check by looking at the real lives of people. While Fishman presents language planning as a process which can be done and finished, one notices that language planning is a continuous process as evaluations have to be done every now and then. Bamgbose (1989) points out that the stages that Fishman

outlines are a simplification of the language planning process because there is a lot of overlap in planning.

Swaziland has already done some planning in that the language has been standardized. The siSwati Panel has done a lot of work in standardizing the language for the purposes of teaching it in school. What has not been done is making sure that the use of siSwati permeates all society. The creation of a nomenclature is something that is happening haphazardly. Once in a while one will hear an advertisement for people to come up with a word. An example is a radio announcement asking people to come up with the word for 'computer', where people responded and came up with the word 'nqgondomshini.' What is lacking is an organized way of working on the nomenclature of different subject areas so that the language can really develop. Coming up with one word in a whole language system that involves computers is not even trying to address the problem because the people end up reverting to using English because there is no systematic naming of things in the subject area. The siSwati Panel needs to consider getting together with scholars in different subject areas and asking them to diligently address the problem of not using siSwati to talk about knowledge in all areas of Swazi life. This requires a panel that has linguists who are transformative intellectuals who can see their role as agents of change in bringing about changes in the way the language is used so that Swazis can move away from using English in their lives. This way English can cease to be the medium of instruction in schools. It can be substituted by siSwati easily in most spheres of life.

Language and power issues are a part of people's everyday lives. The women outlined areas in which language is a problem for them in a way that shows how people's rights are violated when they do not speak the language of power that is used in the country. Language and work was a major area of focus for the women in that they have experienced language problems at work. Their interpretation of language and work reflected their experiences. It is interesting that while they are the people who suffer because they do not know the English language they still feel that English should be the language of work. Khabonina linked language to speaking with white people at work. She pointed out that it is people who know English who understand. Her answer reflected the uncritical look at English that was conveyed when they say English should also be the language of Swaziland.

Since some domestic workers have suffered because they do not know the English one would expect them to choose siSwati. This shows that people think about language in relation to their personal experience. The language of work will never become siSwati as long as Swazis think like Khabonina.

> People who don't know English...If a white person says do this for me or if he/she talks to you. You find that you want to answer. You do not understand but you understand. It is difficult to answer. You think the white person is saying this and you are surprised. When you have learnt some English you understand. This white person is saying this.

The internalization of power structures and the acceptance of the status quo as the only way of solving the problem makes people fail to see that they can bring about change in their lives. People who have been colonized look at situations as givens and fail to see their role as agents of change. The lives women live as people

who are always directed by others do not equip them with much capacity for changing situations in their own lives. Planners should step in and create policies that can end jobs like domestic work.

Senteni pointed out that in hospitals she is spoken to in English even when doctors are Black. While it was not clear from her excerpt if these doctors were Swazis, doctors generally get information on patients from nurses who speak to them in English in a way that excludes the patient from the conversation. It is in these scenarios that Senteni says she does not understand what they are saying.

> Even in the hospitals. Isn't it in the hospitals you find that a doctor is Black, but he speaks English? He has an interpreter. You speak to this one and she tells this one. Now, you do not understand well whether that person can hear what you are telling him. You do not know.

In looking at the health domain, Rubin (1984) points out that the main function of this domain is to provide health services to the population. The question of looking at how people are affected in this domain is to make sure that staff is able to speak to people to provide them with medicines and explanations on how to use their medicines in a language they can understand. She points out the importance of providing interpreters, taking her examples from the program designed to help Spanish speakers in San Francisco General Hospital.

While in San Francisco there was a need to get interpreters, in a country like Swaziland there is no need for interpreters. SiSwati is the language that the nurses and the patients understand. It should be the language that they should speak. Doctors who are Swazis can also speak siSwati.

Churches are places where people gather and communicate. This makes it imperative that policies which are drawn sure that people communicate in a language that is understood by everybody. Senteni's experience shows that language and the church affected her life as pointed out earlier.

> In the churches, the way they speak! They speak English even if it is not white people. You find that they speak English a lot. Even the songs, the English ones are sung. They are always sung. Those of us who do not understand just have our eyes wide open. There is nothing we understand.

The situation that Senteni is talking about is one which can be addressed in a short-term plan that involves people speaking out about how language inconveniences those who do not understand English. Churches are interested in people hearing the message that the songs are presenting. Language planners should speak out about such issues and create a discourse that can lead to change.

The workers outlined the domains of government, health, the church and school and pointed out how their lives are affected by language in these domains. Linking what they say with what Fishman's model comes up with enables us to use language planning and bring it down to the lives of people. Since women point out that they have problems when English is used in all these domains, it is necessary to change and use siSwati because it is the language of the people. In some of these cases English is used even when the speakers know siSwati. Even people who speak only English can learn siSwati when they know that the people they have to interact with do not know English. There is a need for change in the way language is used in Swaziland. This can come about through different levels of planning. A lot of

corpus planning can be done in the church. Some of the English songs can be translated into siSwati. Even in hospitals doctors can speak to the people in siSwati.

It is obvious from this discussion of the language domains that language planning has to take place in society at large. In Swaziland all the language planning that has been done is at the level of status. Even in this area, the role of siSwati still needs to be raised because it is the language of the majority.

DOMESTIC WORK AS A DOMAIN FOR LANGUAGE STUDIES

The nature of the social construction of domestic work in the world makes it difficult for corpus planning to take place. The fact that domestic work is presented as the private versus the public sphere of policy making affects the extent to which the law can influence the lives of domestic workers. This is the case in Swaziland and many other countries (Gill, 1994). In 1994 I attended a workshop in Swaziland and listened to legal advisors speaking to employers of domestic workers and realized that as much as people were interested in regulating the way domestic workers were treated, the lawyers pointed out to them that they had to make their own choices. The law would not interfere in the private lives of people.

Fasold points out that through domains we can get down to the level of individuals and change the way they create themselves through language. While this may be the case, I feel that a lot will have to be done before we can get to this point. Without the help of the law, there is very little that planners can do. Making known the injustices that take place in domestic work is not sufficient if we cannot make

public the whole area of domestic work so that employers and employees can know what is expected of them. Wages could be regulated, and even issues such as protective clothing. Most women reported that they earn very little. They would show one their hands and point out how strenuous the work is.

This requires the Swazis themselves to look critically at domestic work and think about changes that will affect the lives of people positively. This implies doing away with oppressive institutions such as domestic work. This can be done when people are all accorded equal rights, especially the right to an education.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

The United Nations human rights charter points out that work is a right that the state should provide. Citizenship means the ability to be responsible and be productive and to work. Governments in Africa have not done enough to address this problem. While it is clear that there are problems with planning everywhere, it is high time that low-income work like domestic work be made part of the agenda of work as a right. This way the issue of domestic work as the private business of employers would be seen in its true light, namely, that it leaves the worker at the mercy of the employer. Kannyo, (1980) discusses the plight of people in Africa and the specifications of the Human Rights Charter. He points out that there are many problems that make it difficult to address this right.

> Economic and social underdevelopment makes it difficult for African states to fulfill the rights prescribed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights such as the right to work (Article

> 6); the right to a fair wage (Article 7) ...and a host of other social rights set out in the covenant.

While African governments subscribe to the Human Rights Charter, they fail to meet its requirements so that jobs like domestic work will be around for quite some time. Africans should develop a critical awareness and know that domestic work is a form of slavery that should be done away with. There is a need for policy makers who are transformational to do the best to change things in the area of literacy and work. Linking policy and work is necessary so that a dialogue that looks at society holistically can develop in Swaziland.

LITERACY AND THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN

Finegan (1981) argues that issues of literacy should be looked at from broad perspectives if we are to understand how they are a part of sociocultural practice that subjugates people and relegates them to the level of the oppressed. She sees oral and written language as a part of literacy that needs to be included in this broader perspective. She says:

> Literacy events must...be interpreted in relation to the larger sociocultural patterns which they may exemplify or reflect. For example, ethnography must describe literacy events in their sociocultural contexts, so we may come to understand how such patterns as time and space usage, care giving roles, and age and sex segregation are interdependent with the types and features of literacy events a community develops. It is only on the basis of such thorough-going ethnography that further progress is possible towards understanding cross-cultural patterns of oral and written language uses (Finegan, 1981, p.34).

While Finegan's study is on the use of the oral and written text in society, what she says applies to issues of literacy and language in general. From what Finegan says it is obvious that the issues of the literacy of women are directly tied to an understanding of the liberation of the underprivileged. Stuckey (1991) points out that literacy is used as a form of social violence against those who are left out in countries where there is no education policy that provides for the majority of people. Swaziland is such a country. Only those who can afford the exorbitant school fees are able to go to school and learn. The majority of the people are left out in the cold. A country such as Swaziland has to consider the future of the country and its development and work towards the provision of universal primary education. Since the women turned to adult literacy programs, investigations should focus on how these can be made a part of

the everyday lives of women who work.

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AS AN ASPECT OF WOMEN'S RIGHTS

The life histories of women reveal that the deprivation they experienced in their childhood had a lot to do with how they ended up in domestic work. Women had this to say about how they were raised. The rights of the child as noted in the United Nations Association of the United Kingdom spell out that children have the following rights (Readorn, 1995, p. 48)

1. The right to equality, regardless of race, color, sex, religion, or national or social origin.

2. The right to develop physically and mentally in a healthy manner.
3. The right to a name and a nationality.
4. The right to adequate nutrition, housing and medical services.
5. The right to special care if physically or mentally challenged/
6. The right to love, understanding, and protection.
7. The right to free education and to play and recreation.
8. The right to be among the first to receive relief in times of disaster.
9. The right to protection against all forms of neglect, cruelty, and exploitation.
10. The right to be brought up i a spirit of tolerance and peace and as a member of the universal human family.

The discrimination against the women meant that they did not get right to equal treatment, the right to free education, the right to protection against all forms of neglect, cruelty and exploitation and the right to adequate nutrition and housing affected women when they were young. The stories of women like Sibongile who says that they ate food that is given to dogs and pigs show how women's lives are lived in deprivation. For women to be self-determining individuals, Swazi society could improve lives of women by making sure that the conditions under which children grow up safeguard their future.

Every person has a capacity to be creative and to transform themselves. It is by creating situations that can help women be self-determining individuals that society

can empower its people. It begins with the right to an education and in the case of women in this study it was when they were children that their rights were violated. The capacity to become a self-actualizing person begins in childhood.

LANGUAGE AND THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Bakhtin (1992) argues that every speaking person is not just an individual. He/she represents a world and its language. He says dialogue among individuals is interaction among 'social and ideological viewpoints (p. 331-336).' Swaziland is a country where language is used to structure society. The stratification along linguistic lines that takes place in Swaziland should be done away with. It is the rights of all speaking persons that should be upheld, not just the few who can speak the language of the colonizer.

What has to be made clear is that language is an individual right which should not be withheld by state policy. The importance of language rights as the key to economic and social justice cannot be over emphasized. While these may be simple statements to make, many people are frustrated by inequality caused by language in many countries. One cannot stop asking why this is the case and wondering what is being done to alleviate the situation.

The issue of language rights is discussed by Tollefson. He argues that language is a right that people cannot do without. Depriving people of language skills is a violation of their rights as individuals. The Association Internationale pour le Developpement de la Communication Interculturelle, which was held in Recife,

Brazil in October 1987, stated the main points about these rights in the summary of its proceedings:

> Mindful of the need to arouse and foster awareness, within and across cultures, of the recognition and promotion of the linguistic rights of individuals and groups,
>
> Asserting that linguistic rights should be acknowledged, promoted and observed nationally, regionally, and internationally, so as to bring about and assure the dignity and equity of all languages,
>
> Aware of the need for legislation to eliminate linguistic prejudice and discrimination, and all forms of linguistic domination, injustice, and oppression, in such contexts as services to the public, the place of work, the educational system, the courtroom and the mass media,
>
> Stressing the need to sensitize individuals, groups, and States to linguistic rights, to promote positive societal attitudes toward plurilingualism and to change societal structures toward equality between users of different languages and varieties of languages,...(Tollefson, 1991, p. 171.)

If the deliberations of this conference were implemented as pointed out and if these issues were brought to the awareness of the United Nations, even the situation which exists in Africa could be discussed and the pertinent issues brought to the fore-front. If the present situation is left as it is there will be more of what Bamgbose calls 'language planning by decree,' which would result in what one can call revolutionary language planning. The reason why individuals have to be dominated by the people who speak the languages of Europe in Africa is because the African elite have power and insists on doing things the way that suits the elite best.

The Swazi elite are caught up in a double bind, of having to use the English language in the courts, schools, business, and the like, but live with the fact that they are non native speakers of the language. Very few people realize that siSwati is their

heritage, and it is with siSwati that they will be able to liberate themselves socially, economically, politically and otherwise from the hostages of the colonizer. They fail to see that speaking English is accepting domination by English in their lives when they really do not have to. The ideology that it is English that can better express things in the world of the civilized will always be there unless the Africans who are educated change their minds. Since this is an old question which has been raised by many writers one tends to feel that it will never be resolved, unless the majority gains power.

Looking at the colonial situation in Africa makes one realize that the situation that exists in Swaziland is no different from that which prevails in most African countries.

The discussion shows that the situation which exists in Swaziland requires changes that will serve the post-colonial Swazi. The post-colonial Swazi is no longer inhibited in expressing himself by the shackles of colonialism. The post-colonial era has to become reality for the people of Swaziland, and one of the ways this can be done is by a cultural revolution through language.

Language studies should focus on the language situations and make people feel that they are living in a country where they can express themselves freely, at all times, without being hindered by unnecessary language barriers. The experiences of individuals should be brought into the picture and used to illustrate situations. This, if done with caution and with the aim to help the people, might be the best way to overcome the limitations that end up making governments ignore the language issues

which prevail. Individuals who are disadvantaged by language should not be portrayed as 'cases' or 'samples' in lifeless data because the issues raised are generalized. Research should lend power to the problems of language by giving the necessary leverage to the people it claims to be helping, because they will feel there is support for what they are saying. The lives of domestic workers illustrate this. One feels that if the people are represented as people who can speak for themselves they will have more power.

CHAPTER XII
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Studies of narratives of people are necessary because they bring out clearly how the discourse of the day recreates people in ways which disempower them. Recreating experience and language as part of a specific domain links people's lives in a way that shows socio-economic issues interlink and impact on people. There is need for work that focusses on people's experiences at work. The narratives of women bring out that women's lives are structured socially by ideologies of class, race and gender. Future studies of language and social interactions should look into narrative and use it to understand how women are affected in Swaziland. Studies on language policy should address the questions that these women raise. There is a need for studies on how language affects people in Swaziland so that work on policy can be more focussed.

WOMEN AND THE VIOLENCE OF LITERACY IN SWAZILAND

In this study we have looked at how women suffer at work. Narrative helps in looking at people's lives in that the women bring out linguistically how their experience was shaped. Through language they tell of selves that have been oppressed from the colonial period to the post-colonial period in Swaziland. The women who were illiterate did a lot to improve their situations through different means. The importance of adult literacy programs cannot be overemphasized. The social development of women should allow them to acquire reading and writing skills.

Language should link with literacy studies in the way it happens in the everyday experiences of people. Learning to read and write is important for someone who wants to go to work, even in low-income jobs. Research on language use in Swaziland has not linked language planning with adult literacy in a way that shows how the two come together and impact people's lives.

The recreation of experience using narrative has limitations that policy makers need to look at. One could not get conversational data from the actual situations except that which is recreated by the workers. Studies in language and social situations that rely on the actual data from the exchanges that take place can be a part of work on narrative in that they can provide actual evidence of the experiences of workers. People would be seen as talking selves in actual experiences.

There are many situations that can be observed without the sensitivity that comes with domestic work being a private place. Work sites where the working class labors daily for low income wages are examples of these. These studies could reveal the issues of language and power in interactions at work.

Most language planning studies in Africa all point out the need for language change. There is a need to center the displaced text that was shifted by the imposition of colonialism. Centering the displaced texts means doing language planning that will reinstate the language of the countries and make them languages of power so that all people can express themselves through the same language. There was a lot I learned from the women when they talked about their lives using the language we both know, siSwati. This gave them a right to speech that they do

not have in a Swaziland where English is the language that is spoken by the few who have been to school. This made me realize how language rights are important to all speakers within the polity. There is a need to incorporate language rights in the constitution of Swaziland. In Swaziland, even though the constitution mentions the right to language, the only citings are in connection with the law. Practice shows that the law does not necessarily follow what is said in the constitution. The people also seem not to be aware of what should happen. Future studies could look at language and the rights of individuals and how they are spelt out in the different constitutions in Africa.

Language planning needs to be considered as an important part of policy in Swaziland. At the present moment, decisions are taken haphazardly and yet they affect people throughout their entire lives. The introduction of French in the schools is a good example. Researchers should focus on the existing problems and point out how these can be solved.

Most studies have focussed on the African elite and how they pose a problem in creating change. The legacy of colonialism serves many people who benefit from the status quo apart from the African elite. If the elite cannot give up their power it is time we looked at other ways to empower the majority. Researchers should be critical in their discussion of problems and make recommendations that can help people in these difficult situations.

TOWARDS A PROPOSED PLAN FOR SWAZILAND

There are very few studies on language planning in Swaziland. A lot of work needs to be done. All the domains of language in which people use language need to be considered. The women mentioned the domains that include health, religion and education. The domain of education is one in which a lot of work has to be done because educational policy affects all other areas. Language planning should play an important role in education. At the moment the English language plays an important role in the lives of most Swazis. They cannot go on to institutions of higher learning if they have not passed it. This needs to be looked at by policy makers so that people cannot be disadvantaged by the language that it is a legacy of colonialism.

From the women's views on the language situation of Swaziland it is obvious that there is a lot of work for language planners to do in order to improve the situation of people who live in Swaziland. By looking at all the domains of language use, we are able to see that corpus planning is very important in that it touches people's everyday lives. The goal of language planning is to involve the whole population of a country in communication about the language problems that exist and then arrive at solutions. This process arises from the realization that language is seen as a weapon with which people can join together in the struggle for existence. The intentions of governments should be to create unity, equality and fraternity among their people through language, the main means by which social reality is created. Rubin outlines other domains that the women did not mention. These include:

1. The Legal Domain

2. The Communication Domain

3. The Social Welfare Domain

4. Citizenship participation and Representation

6. The Commercial Domain

7. The Domain of Science and Technology

Swaziland needs to do corpus planning in all these domains. A brief analysis of the situation as it exists in these different domains is necessary.

The Legal Domain

In Swaziland there are two legal systems, Swazi Nation Law has its own Courts which are administered through traditional Swazi law In these courts siSwati is the language that is used. In the western system which uses Swaziland's own version of Roman Dutch Law, and the Statutes of Swaziland, English is used. When ordinary Swazis are tried in the High Court of Swaziland where English is used, they experience problems because they cannot express themselves. They have to do so through interpreters. This is a situation which needs to be changed because the majority of the people are left out. Only people who can speak English are able to express themselves in these courts. SiSwati needs to be made the language of the law. The dual system which exists has to be interpreted in a way that brings the people together.

The Communication Domain

Swaziland has newspapers that are in English. Papers that are in siSwati have never been able to survive because they are not bought. If all papers were in siSwati, people would not have the option of choosing English papers. The survival of siSwati depends on creating a readership in the country by making most things to be in the language of the people. Even in the mass media, one woman pointed out that she always listens to the radio station that broadcasts in siSwati. This suggests that there should be a national program in siSwati instead of having the English program and a siSwati program because this maintains the dualism which ends up cementing class differences. A lot of investigation needs to be done on how change can be brought about in this area.

The Social Welfare Domain

Even in social welfare, the quantity and quality of services depends on communication. This is an area in which one needs to do research. While there are social welfare places in Swaziland, one can not argue that they do not avail services to the people in their language.

The Education Domain

In the area of education the women pointed out that they had been to schools where they learned the English language and left before they could understand it well. The use of English as a measure of education is felt when students leave school. If they do not pass English they cannot be accepted into the university and some of the training colleges. They have to repeat or live frustrated lives without

much of a chance to further their studies. The elevation of English to this role has been looked at by Ngugi (1986). He argues that in most cases students are frustrated with the English language when it is not essential for the subjects they are studying. He cites agriculture as a case in point and argues that students do not need to know English in order to understand the ideas about crops.

Even Rubin points out that this is a difficult domain because of the issues involved. It is issues such as bilingualism in the classroom that one can focus on. In this area, the planners realize that the first language of the child is very important to the child in starting him/her off in the lower grades. In the lives of the women, it is obvious that the way they learned English needs to be looked at. The use of physical violence such as beating needs to be studied carefully. Learning does not have to take place through the use of force. Teachers who have lived lives which make them powerless might not think that there are other ways to teach students apart from using force. This is an area that needs to be investigated. Rubin points out that teachers need to take into consideration the languages of minorities in the United states. The Ann Arbor case (The King Case) is an example of a case in which Judge Joiner ruled in favor of the Ann Arbor children who were said to be verbally retarded just because they spoke African American Language.

The Commercial Domain

In Swaziland people who work in commerce need to make sure that labels on all the goods that are provided are in the language of the people. As it is, most of the goods that are available in Swaziland use the two languages of South Africa:

English and Afrikaans. It is only a few products that are produced in Swaziland that have Swazi labels. This is an area that needs to be investigated.

In the banks siSwati and English are used on most forms.

The commercial domain has to do with providing goods that are labelled in all languages, so that all people can read how a product is used, as well as providing information in banks, on monetary exchange notes and coins and all the exchange that is done in commerce. This is in recognition of the fact that people need to buy in order to survive.

The Domain of Science and Technology

There is very little information that Swaziland has in the area of science and technology. Most of the information would come from some of the advanced countries. This information has to be made available to people in the language the majority understands. In a time when information is becoming important countries like Japan translate printed material into their language in seventy two hours, which makes most information available in a language they understand. While Swaziland might never have such facilities, it is important to plan for a future in which information will be available in the language the majority can understand. This means a lot of serious investment into availability of information that should be made by government.

The domain of science and technology is another one in which language is important. This is due to the fact that knowledge of science and technology is not equally available in all countries. In order to get knowledge of science and

technology, people need to be exposed to the issues in languages they can understand. The tendency is for the few who have knowledge of the languages in which most technological information is available to know what is going on. This leaves the rest of the people unaware of what is going on. Thus inequalities in access arise because only a select few are linguistically able to understand and keep up to date with new technologies. Since development is best enhanced in a system where knowledge is easily available, the majority of people who do not have knowledge are left out of the development process. This affects the country which has such problems because most of the people cannot catch up with science and technology. It is important to develop a nomenclature for the sciences so that people can talk about technology in their own language and be involved in the development process. In African countries industrialization will always lag behind because the majority of the people cannot understand the languages that most technology is available in.

The workers outlined the domains of government, health, the church and school and pointed out how their lives are affected by language in these domains. Linking what they say with the model that Fishman comes up with enables us to use language planning and bring it down to the lives of people. Since women point out that they have problems when English is used in all these domains, it is important to come up with policies that address the problems they raise.

In Swaziland, siSwati and English are used without clear demarcations of use in that one can never really say when English should be used and when it should not. The fact that using English affects people is shown in the lives of the women. As

long as the majority of the people do not understand a language, that language should make way for the language of the majority in order to avoid what Tsuda (1986) calls language inequality, a situation where the majority suffers because it cannot communicate in the language used in most spheres of life. The women pointed out areas in which language is a problem for them. These areas are the church, work, hospitals, government and also in interchanges when people use code-switching. There are practical things that can be done to address the problem in these areas. Some may be short-term goals and others may be long-term.

In order to arrive at a solution there has to be a strategy for solving the problems. I would like to propose Fishman's model for the situation in Swaziland. Although his model deals with macro issues, one can argue that it is adaptable to micro issues as well. A number of scholars support what Fishman postulates: that there are two major sub-divisions in language planning: status planning and corpus planning (Fishman, 1968; Bamgbose, 1989). Fishman states that these are usually engaged in jointly. Status planning is a decision that points out what functions a particular language will play in a society. According to Fishman this is an attempt to control the formal, public functions of the language. The stages of status planning that Fishman outlines are :

1. decision-making
2. codification
3. elaboration
4. implementation

5. evaluation

The decision-making stage is a stage where political authorities, after serious deliberations, resolve what to make of the language or languages of a country. Debates of this kind may take a very long time but they eventually result in a decision that when looked at from all angles reflects the aspirations of the majority of the people.

The second stage is codification. This is a stage in which a statement of purpose that reiterates what went on in the decision-making period is written.

Elaboration, the third stage, is one in which the rules for carrying out the codified law are formulated.

The fourth stage is implementation, a stage in which decisions are 'put into action through the allocation of resources.'

The last stage is that of evaluation. In this stage the goals of the plan are looked at in order to determine if they are effective. This also means looking into whether they are being carried out. Using Fishman's model can enable Swazis to get down to the level of discussing and working towards a plan for having siSwati as the language of the people. Laitin (1977) discusses how the Somali government decided to have Somali, the language of the country. In this case the government simply made a declaration that Somali would be the language of Somalia. One would argue that in Swaziland there is still room for negotiation on the issues of language. The elite need to get involved in the problems of the people and move towards discussions of having siSwati as the language of power in Swaziland. Swaziland is one

of those few countries where people speak one native language, siSwati. Discussion should center around promoting the language by doing appropriate planning.

This study has focussed on creating a language debate that draws from people's lives, thus bringing in multiple voices that include the voices of the powerless. It has focussed on domestic workers so that they can be heard. What Tollefson (1991) says about language planning moving towards bringing in people's lives is illustrated in this study in that we have heard the voices of women speaking of linguistic situations that are limiting them in their everyday lives. Reflections on the voices of women give any person involved in planning ways to get into interactions with other voices in the society so that a holistic social discourse can be arrived at. Further questioning of the language situation in Swaziland is necessary.

The questions that one can ask about language planning in Swaziland are largely linked to the different domains. One constantly wonders why there is no change in language policy in most African countries. The questions that further research could address include the following:

1. What are the attitudes towards language policy changes that would make siSwati the language that is used in all domains in Swaziland?

The research that would answer this question would focus on language attitudes. It would solicit information on what officers in policy making departments think about language and power. It would focus on the role of siSwati in Swaziland and how it can become the language of power in domains like education, commerce and the like.

2. How do people cope with language in domains such as health, education, commerce and the like?

This question could be answered by asking officials in health who deal with patients who need to understand how to use specialized equipment that only has pamphlets that are in English how they cope with it. In 1987 I was involved in a project where we were translating information on hearing aids for some officials in the hospital in Mbabane. I would like to know if there are other areas wich have the same needs and how they cope with them.

How do people cope with language in health, seeing that it is very important for them to understand how to take doses of medicines or use things like hearing devices since most of these come with English labels. What decisions have been made about language, since it plays a big role in this domain?

3. What makes it difficult for language issues to become the main part of the agenda in the different ministries?

I would address ministry officials and ask them why there has been no change to siSwati. One tends to think it is just the elitist attitude of the people in the different ministries. One might find that looking at the problem closely brings out other issues.

4. How do lower class men cope with language at work?

Studies that focus on construction sites might reveal other ways of understanding language and work. I would do qualitative research at the places where people use language and find out which languages are spoken and how people

cope with their situation. I am still interested in finding out if Fanakalo is widely used as a social code at work.

5. To what extent do the ex-colonizers control language use in the ex-colonies?

This question would look at the dominance of English. I would like to discuss with officials in the British and American embassies to learn how they feel about changing to siSwati in a country like Swaziland. I have always felt that the structuring of financial assistance from these countries hinges on the maintenance of English as a language of power in former British colonies.

Studies of language planning in Africa have to address the question of an elite that use the languages of Europe and to arrive at new visions on how the problems created by this group can be solved. It is by looking at all people's situations that effective planning can be done. Bringing in narratives of people enables researchers to enhance the questioning of situations and gives an authenticity to the word of the oppressed in language planning. A holistic look at society and how it is affected by language and a proper planning using the domains that Rubin focuses on would be a step in the right direction.

CHAPTER XIII
AN AFTERWORD: A PERSONAL SOCIAL TEXT

Writing narratives of women has left me asking questions that I have had to reflect on constantly. I have found myself constantly reflecting on what I have done, wondering if I have done justice to the task of telling about women in a way that the reader could picture in his/her mind what it is I am trying to say and why. For this reason I have decided to write a response to my questions on who am I and what I have learned in interactions with the women I am writing about. I hope this chapter will further illuminate what the whole process of interviewing entailed in a personal reflection that can help the reader get a better understanding of what writing narratives of women meant to me.

In this study, the way the workers addressed me personally was very interesting. I ceased to be just a listener and took on all my roles as a younger person to those who were older, and also as a member of the Swazi elite. My position at the institution where I work became a point of reference to those who knew I worked there. They would give examples referring to people I knew and situations that were common to both of us. When Lobutimba refers to working for a Zambian and speaking English with him, she is recreating her experiences with the Zambians who work where I work.

> English is OK. It is the language we speak when we want jobs. If I speak English, a Zambian can employ me so that I can wash clothes for him and earn money.

This was a situation I knew existed.

I did a lot of personal reflection on how Blacks use power, especially when workers compared Blacks with whites. One worker said that Blacks will even ask the workers to wash their underwear when she had never worked for Black people. I wondered how true what the women said was. I realized that in my report, I will report what the women told me.

Authors cannot remain anonymous interviewers who are objective in a study such as this one. This is because the self is also a social construction in that we are products of the worlds that we have lived in. Our language is a language of a self that has gone through experiences that can be linked to the experiences of those whose lives we interact with. Our language of the self is shaped by similar circumstances in one way or another. Understanding ourselves is understanding selves that are constructed in socio-economic backgrounds that are similar to those whose lives we seek to understand.

A PERSONAL SOCIAL TEXT

Lingis (1994) points out how difficult it is to use words to represent the experiences of another. He says the way we live life allows us to interact in ways that allow the telling of the self to be limited to verbal exchanges. He says this is because a person can never occupy the place of another and really take part in a transformation and be the other. We can only approximate this. We can see the other temporarily as we listen to what the person is saying. Later it is words that must be used to relate everything.

Interacting with women who have suffered brought out the limitations Lingis discusses when it came to retelling and authoring how they felt. I still do not feel that I can do justice with my words to the emotional interchange that went on using words. Lingis expresses this lack of confidence in feeling that as a writer you have said everything right. He says:

> To see the sensibility and vulnerability of another is to see not the inner diagrams, but the substance of the body. It is to see opaque skin, lassitude and torpor, into which the expressions form and vanish. It is to see the might of eyes, on which forms of the world leave no trace. It is to see the spasm of pain that agitate the substance of flesh....Itis to see wrinkles and wounds (Lingis, 1994 p235).

The interviewer is still left feeling that he/she has seen the surface of things and not the inner turmoil that social violence produces. Linking the experience of Swazi women with my own experience as a Swazi woman is trying to get at creating understanding and speaking about the silenced through their own words. It is trying to enter the world of the other and live with the other as she recreates herself. Lingis says that

> 'one can know the other as another one parallel to, equivalent to, and interchangeable with oneself. One occupies a place another has vacated and one will leave it for another to occupy (p.234).

The experiences that I went through in colonial Swaziland and those that these women went through cannot be compared because growing up at the end of the colonial period shaped my life differently from theirs. The privilege of an education also made life much easier for me. Knowing the other, for me, meant breaking class barriers and entering a world that I knew existed, but one I could have afforded to shut myself out of for life.

I am a Swazi woman, black, and educated in Swaziland and in American universities. As a member of the Swazi elite I can speak English, the language of the colonial masters. I am privileged in that I am employed to teach English at the University of Swaziland. Due to involvement in language planning, I started to have questions of my own about people's lives and how they are affected by language, especially women in low income brackets.

I have employed a number of domestic workers since I am a working mother. I also have relatives who have worked as domestic workers. I have wondered what the experiences of these workers were at work and how these could be incorporated into studies on language in society. I have also had questions about how domestic workers dealt with issues of language, race, and class during the colonial period because most employers did not speak siSwati. I did a sociohistorical construction, reading books on domestic work during the colonial period and came up with information on male domestic workers in Zambia, Zimbabwe, South Africa, but very little information on women, especially women in domestic work in Swaziland. Investigating language and experiences through the life history offered me a way to answer some of these questions.

As a listener, I am reporting what the workers told me. I cannot be sure if they told the truth. I cannot be sure of the different 'masks' they wore when talking about their experiences (Saulnier and Simard, 1973).

Using narrative allowed me to be there and listen to people as they shared their experiences, thus gathering knowledge from people who were there. Since I

had worked along with domestic workers in my family, sometimes doing the same work they did, I could relate to what they were talking about. The women who worked in post-colonial Swaziland were almost the same age as I was or even younger. This gave me a chance to share experiences with people who have lived different lives and gave me a feeling of what I could have become if I had not had a chance to get an education. Through the experiences of the workers I was able to understand how people's lives are social constructions that are created through policy. I realized that literacy and language policies can be violent. Stuckey (1991) argues that literacy is shaped by those who are in power because it protects their interests.

> Literacy education begins in the ideas of the socially and economically dominant class and it takes the forms of socially acceptable subjects, stylistically permissible forms, ranges of difference or deviance, baseline of gratification. Becoming literate signifies in large the ability to conform or, at least, to appear conformist (Stuckey, 1991, p 19).

Realizing that if I had never acquired the English language I would have been like these women, I saw how the deprivation of education is a way of limiting people; a way of exercising what Stuckey calls social violence (Stuckey, 1990). I listened to the women's stories of how they left school and later went into low income jobs and realized that some of their lives were social constructions that had taken place at a time when language and race were used as means of creating social violence.

UNDERSTANDING THE BODY AS A SOCIAL TEXT

As a writer, analyzing the texts of the women became a transpersonal experience which linked my experiences to theirs. It was not only a chance to hear

voices, but also a chance to encounter the people as bodies of the oppressed. The experiences of Linah became experiences of the woman, language and the body. As she sat there talking about how the cobra bit her and how her leg was eventually amputated, I recreated the scenes in my own mind and engaged in the other's experiences.

It was an experience in engaging in the articulation of the body as 'classed, gendered, fragmented' and engaging in the experience using sight as a 'preeminent body sense' (Lingis, 1994). The physiological presence of the severed intersection of the artificial leg and the rest of her body left me stunned. I listened with shock to how her employers insisted that all her life she had worked for the artificial leg. Weiss (1994) argues that looking at a scarred body is like looking at an icon. The experience of the severing comes alive as it happened in the past. It stays recorded in the body, bringing out the frustration and pain that the other went through. It becomes a means of recreating history and looking into the future. The place where the artificial leg and the actual leg met was a point of focus that we kept looking at as we talked. It left a picture of the experience of being a domestic worker that was permanent. Weiss (1994) says we should not divorce the body from the spoken word because it is a part of the social text. He says

> 'we cannot dissociate the textual description of torture from its physical inscription on the body, as we would, in the abstract, sever a signified from a signifier (p. 12)'.

He sees the body as the repository of memory of social inequalities. It is a symbol that can be analyzed, a text to be read by looking at the 'catalogue of torture' that is inflicted on each part of the body (p. 16). By 'reading' the catalogue of torture on people's bodies we are able to understand how a society uses these means to 'disarticulate the body, destroying its form, and turning sensation into a monolithic manifestation of pain, a sign of power (p. 17)'. He says the catalogue of torture includes things like whipping, flaying dismemberment, disembowelment, beheading, beating, which can be done with saws, whips, scourges, pincers; head-crushers, skull-smashers, mortification belts and many other tools. Though his list does not include being sent out at night and being bitten by a cobra, the oppression of having to work for the artificial leg for life shows how Linah becomes a person whose body became a 'corporeal inscription' of the social order. It became a symbol of the scars of domestic work that she would bear all her life. It was a major event through which she remembered her life in domestic service. Weiss (1994) says:

> The body is memory, where the wounds inflicted in initiatory ceremonies and vindictive punishments become the scars that remain the trace of one's own suffering, a suffering that creates both self-consciousness and its ethical double, social consciousness (p. 15).

I started to link my own scars with my social world as I listened to her. I got to understand, looking at my own major scars on my legs and remembering how they had been etched into a body which would carry them into the future.

I thought about the invisible scars that were inflicted on the women. I realized that the emotional scars that are inflicted are not as easy to see. I was bothered by the invisibility of the harm that is done on the psyche of people who are subjected

to torture like domestic workers. I wondered about the hidden scars in women's lives including my own. Weiss discusses the nature of modern torture and says that it is done so that it should be invisible. I realized that the power to torture people in insidious ways further 'disarticulates' the body and its suffering (Weiss, 1994). Linah's scar became a reference point to many events. She helped me work out when I was born by referring to her scar. 'Had I already been bitten by the snake? Yes, I was because...' A lot of her questions about time relied on this incident to the point that one realized that it was an inscription in her understanding of the past and the future that would always be there. It was an event that created meaning to her in that it changed her life drastically.

I observed that she did not raise the question of compensation for being injured at work because they made her pay although the accident took place at work. I realized that she did not think like a worker who works in today's world. Hers had been a world where women had a level of consciousness that did not allow them to think that way.

Using the interview as a research method still needs to be examined. It is a way of interviewing that I found very interesting because it brings out a deep understanding of the interviewee's understanding of life from a personal perspective. Studies in language that involve interviewing might bring out many ways of finding out about people that can inform scholarship in ways that can broaden knowledge.

Linking lives of low income women enables one to learn the language of the underprivileged, how it is shaped sociolinguistically. The purpose is not to engage in

a linguistic exercise, but to link lives so that people can communicate at the level of the transpersonal. It is an attempt to incorporate the political and the economic in a way that brings out the motivations that direct people in every day life. Lingis (1995) expresses the need to enter into people's worlds and study their pain. He says:

> It is not in elaborating a common language and reason, in collaborating in transpersonal enterprises that the human community takes form. It is in going to rejoin those who, fallen from time of personal collective history, have to go on when nothing is possible or promised (Lingis p. 236).

The power of lives to transform their experiences is the main thing that gives hope in writing about the pain that the silenced endure. The lives of women show people who struggled and used all the resources they had to make of life what they could. Knowing these people and giving them a voice is important. When all is said and done the speaker goes back to her silenced world, leaving a testimony of the world and its language that cannot be erased.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A
LIFE HISTORIES

Losimilo Nhleko	08.30.93.
Moors Dlamini	09.02.93
Linah Maseko	09.11.93
Lobutimba Xaba	08.06.93.
Mary Gama	09.15.93.
Senteni Dludlu	11.04.93.and 11.05.93.
Lindiwe Hlatjwako	09.13.93.
Thandi Shongwe	10.15.93.
Nokuthula Simelane	11.03.93.
Fanisile Mamba	12.04.93.
Cebile Mlambo	11.15.93.
Hluphekile Hlanze	12.10.93.
Lozindaba Madlopha	10.11.93.
Senanile Msibi	10.19.93.
Sibongile Sibiya	12.07.93.
Thoko Nhlabatsi	12.05.93.
Khabonina Jele	11.06.93.
Sphiwe Ndlela	12.11.93.
Zanele Gamedze	11.02.93.
Fikile Ndzinisa	12.10.93.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B
QUESTION PROFILE

PART A BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

NAME

AGE

PLACE OF BIRTH

MARITAL STATUS

LEVEL OF EDUCATION (LAST CLASS ATTENDED)

1ST LANGUAGE

OTHER LANGUAGES SPOKEN

TOTAL NO OF CHILDREN

NO OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL AND LEVELS

NO OF CHILDREN NOT IN SCHOOL

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF CHILDREN NOT IN SCHOOL

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF SPOUSE

OCCUPATION OF SPOUSE

LIST OF PREVIOUS EMPLOYERS

TIME WHEN YOU WORKED FOR THEM

LANGUAGES THEY SPOKE

LANGUAGES YOU WANTED TO BE SPOKEN TO IN

REASONS FOR LIKING THEM

LANGUAGES YOU DID NOT LIKE

REASONS FOR NOT LIKING THEM

PART B-CONVERSATIONAL INTERVIEW

1. Tell me about your whole life a) your home, where you were born

   b) the schools you attended, churches

   c) where you started to work

   What language(s) did you speak at home; your mother, father and siblings?

   In your area what languages did you speak?

2. At school, what languages were spoken?

   Did you go to school? If you did not, how did you learn to speak at work?

3. How did it come about that you ended up working as a domestic worker?

4. Tell me about your life at work, where you started to work, especially how you talked the languages that were used.

   a) Where you were hired and started working and so on and so on.

   b) The languages that were spoken at work, what were the languages you spoke.

   c) How did you try to understand what was said? Give me examples on how you spoke.

   d) What did you do to understand better what was said?

   e) If you look back what did the employers do or could have done to enable you to understand better what was said?

f) What stories can you tell me about language which are related to failing to understand things that are done at work and what is said by the employer.

5. Tell me about employers how they tried to talk to you.

a) When they were alone what did they speak?

b) What happened that showed the employees did not understand what was said? Give me an example like a story about what happened.

c) How did they try to be understood? How did you feel when they spoke siSwati or their language?

d) Give me an example, the madam is sending you. What will you do?

6. Who else worked with you?

a) Did they have any problems with language when speaking with the employers? Give me examples.

b) Who had problems? Tell me a short story?

c) How did a person who had problems get help?

d) What was done to help people hear what was said?

e) What did employees do to make sure that they hear what is said, especially the new ones who have just arrived?

7. When you were with the children of employers what did you speak?

When the children were with their parents what did they speak?

What do you remember that you can use as an example about the speech of children with the employees, the employers and their employees?

8. Here we are at this present moment, independence has come you live under a government of Swazis, did you see any change with independence in the way your life with language has been?

9. What language should be spoken in Swaziland today?

   In which areas do you see any problems with language for people who do not know the languages spoken in Swaziland, in your opinion?

   What about you, are there any areas where you have problems with language? Give me an example by telling me a short story telling about something that happened on a specific day.

10. Today when you prepare your children for a future with language, which language are you preparing them to know? What about your grandchildren?

11. How did you use writing and reading at work when you were working?

    How did the employers use it?

    How about other workers, did they read and write, those who were educated and even those who were not?

12. If there was anything you could change in your life what would it be?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anglican Church. 1981. *Guidelines for Inclusive Language.* Unpublished Document.

Anzaldua, Gloria. 1990. *Making Face, Making Soul.* San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Apter, Terri, and Garnsey, Elizabeth. 'Enacting Inequality: Structure, Agency and Gender. *Women's Studies Interational Forum.* 17. 1. 19-31.

Ardener, Edwin. 1971 *Social Anthropology and Language.* Tavistock Publications.

Ardener, Edwin, The Problem Revisited. in Ardener, Shirley ed. *Perceiving Women.* Malaby Press.

Ardener, Shirley ed. 1975 *Perceiving Women.* Malaby Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balibar, Etienne, and Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1992. *Race, Nation, Class Ambigous Identities. London: Verso.*

Bamgbose, Ayo. 1991. *Language and Nation.* Edinburgh University Press.

Bamgbose, Ayo. 1989. 'Issues for a Model of Language Planning.' *Language Problems and Language Planning.* Vol.13. No.1

Baldauf, Richard and Allan Luke. 1990. *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and South Pacific.* Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baxandal, Roslyn, Elizabeth Ewen and Gordon, Linda. 1976. 'The Working Class has Two Sexes.' *Monthly Review, 1-9.*

Bender, M. L., Bowen, J.D., Cooper, R. L., and Ferguson, C. A. 1976. *Language in Ethiopia.* Oxford University Press.

Berelson, Bernard. 1952. *Content Analysis in Communication Research.* New York: Hafner Press.

Berger, Peter and Luckman, Thomas. 1966. *The Social construction of Reality.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Bernstein, Basil. 1971. *Class Codes and Control 1: Theoretical Studies towards a Sociology of Language.* London: Routledge & Paul Kegan.

Bhabha, Homi, 1990. *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Bischoff, Paul. 1990. *Swaziland's International Relations and Foreign Policy*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Blummer, Herbert. 1972. 'Symbolic Interaction: An Approach to Human Communication' in Budd, Richard and Rueben Brent.

Booth, Alan. 1983. *Swaziland: Tradition and Change in a Southern African Kingdom. Hampshire: Hamphshire: Westview Press.*

Bozzoli, Belinda. 1991. 'Explaining Consciousness: The Case of Mrs Molefe.' *Cahiers D'Etudes Africaines*, XXXI.

Bozzoli, Belinda. 1991. *Women of Phokeng*. London: Heinemann

Brown, Anne and Gooze, Maroanee. 1995. *International Women's Writing*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Brown, Richard. 1987 Society As Text. University of Chicago Press.

Budd, Richard and Ruben Brent. 1972. *Approaches to Human Communication*. New Jersey: Spartan Hayden.

Bull, Esme. 1991. *Aided Immigration from Britain to South Africa 1857 to 1967.* Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Bundy, Colin. 1979. 'The Abolition of the Masters and Servants Act.' in Hare, Paul; Wiendieck, Gerd and Von Broembson (eds).

Burch, Hobart. 1991. *The Whys of Social Policy*. New York: Praeger.

Butturff, Douglas and Epstein, Edmund. 1978. *Women's Language and Style*. University of Akron Press.

Cebik, L. B. 1984. *Fictional Narrative*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1980. *The Pear Stories*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing.

Cixous, Helene. 1980. 'The Laugh of the Medusa in Marks and de Courtivron. *New French Feminisms.*

Cleary, Linda. 1991. *The Other Side of the Desk.* Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.

Coates, Jennifer. 1986. *Women,Men and Language.* London: Longman.

Cock, Jacklyn. 1989. *Maids and Madams.* London: The Womens's Press.

Corson, David. 1990. *Language Policy Across the Curriculum.* Cleveland: Multilingual Matters.

Cooper, Robert. 1989. *Language Planning and social Change.* Cambridge University Press.

Coultard, Malcolm. 1985. *An Introduction to Discourse Analyses.* London: Longman.

Coulmas, Florian. 1989. *Language Adaptation.* Cambridge University Press.

Culler, Jonathan. 1982. *On Deconstruction.* Cornell University.

Davis, Alexander. 1903. *The Native Problem in South Africa.* London: Chapman and Hall Ltd.

de Graaff, J.F. , W, Louw and M. van de Merwe. 1988. *Farm Schools in the Western Cape: A Sociological Analysis.* University of Stellenbosch. Department of Sociology.

Deem, Rosemary and Craeme, Salaman. 1985. *Work, Culture and Society.* Open University Press.

Demick, Jack; Bursik, Krisanne and DiBiase, Rosemarie. 1993. *Parental Development.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Denzin, K. N. 1989. *Interpretive Biography.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Dlamini, Makhosini. 1972. *The Philosophy, Policies and Objectives of the Imbokodvo National Movement.* Mbabane: Ministry of Education.

Downing, Pamela, Susan Lima, and Michael Noonan (eds). 1992. *The Linguistics of Literacy.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co.

Dubose-Brunner, Dianne. 1994. *Inquiry and Reflection: Framing Narrative Practice.* State University of New York Press.

Eastman, Carol. 1983. *Language Planning: an Introduction.* San Francisco: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.

Fabian, Johannes. 1986 Language and Colonial Power. University of California Press.

Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Fannon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks.* New York: Grove Press.

Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Fields, Barbara. 1990. 'Slavery, Race and Ideology in the United States of America.' *New Left Review.* May-June.

Finegan, Ruth. 1970. *Oral Literature in Africa.* Oxford University Press.

Fishman, Joshua. 1968. *Readings in the Sociology of Language.* The Hague.

Flanagan, Owen. 1996. *Self Expressions.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Flynn, Elizabeth and Patocinio Scheichart. 1986. *Gender and Reading: Essays on Readers texts and Contexts. New York:* John Hopkins.

Fowler, Roger; Hodge, Bob; Kress, Gunther and Trew Tony. *Language and Control.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Freire, Paulo. 1921. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

Gaganakis, Margaret and Mary Crewe. 1987. *Farm Schools in South Africa.* Braamforntein: Institute of Race Relations.

Gates, Henry. 1985. *'Race' Writing and Difference.* University of Chicago Press.

Gergen, Mary and Gergen Kenneth. 1984. *Historical Social Psychology.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Elbaum.

Giglioli, . 1972. *Language and Social Context.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gill, Lesley. 1994. *Precarious Dependencies.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie. 1990. *He Said-She Said.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Greene, Maxine. 1988. *The Dialectic of Freedom.* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Grimshaw, Allen. 1990. *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations.* Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, John, and Dell Hymes. 1986. *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* New York: Basil Blackwell.

Halden-Sullivan, Judith. 1991. *The Typology of Being.* New York: Peter Lang.

Hall, James. 1994. *Sangoma.* New York: Putnam's and Sons.

Hanson, Karen. 1989. *Distant Companions.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hare, Paul; Gert, Wiendieck and Max Von Broembsen. 1979. *South Africa: Sociological Analyses.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Hare, R. 1976. *Life Sentences: Aspects of the Social Role of Language.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Harkins, Debra. 1993. *Parents Goals and Styles of Storytelling.* In Demick, Jack, Krisanne Bursik and Rosemarie Dibiase. *Parental Developmen.* New Jersey: Larence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Harris, Betty. 1993. *The Political Economy of Southern African Periphery.London:* St. Martins Press.

Herbert, Robert. 1992. *Language and Society in Africa.* Witwatersrand University Press.

Her Majesty's Stationary Office. 1887. *Parliamentary Papers.* Dublin: Adam and Charles Black.

Heron, John. 1992. *Feeling and Personhood.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Hill, Allette. 1986. *Mother Tongue and Father Time.* Indiana University Press.

Holleman, J. F. 1964. *Experiment in Swaziland; Report of the Swaziland Sample Survey 1960. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.*

Horton, Andrew. 1994. *Writing the Character-Centered Screenplay.* Berkeley. University of California Press.

Jackson, Robert H. and Carl Rosberg. 1982. *Personal Rule in Black Africa.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jackson, Stevi. 1992. 'Towards a Historical Sociology of Housework: A Materialist Feminist Analysis. Women's Studies International Forum,15 (2), 151-172.

Josselson, Ruthellen, Lieblich, Amia (eds). 1995. *The Narrative Study of Lives.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Jordan, Judith, Kaplan, Alexander, Miller, Jean, Siver, Irene and Surrey, Janet. 1991. *Women's Growth in Connection.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Kannyo, Edward. 1980. *Human Rights in Africa: Problems and Prospects.* A Report Prepared for the International League for Human Rights.

Karambelis, George and William McGinley. 1992. 'One Writer's Construction of Text and Self: The Role of Voice.' In Kinzer Charles and Donald Leu. 1992. *Literacy Research, Theory, and Practice: Views from Many Perspectives.* Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Kedar, Leah. 1987. *Power through Discourse.* Ablex Publishing.

Keegan Timothy. 1986. *Rural Transformations in Industrializing South Africa.* Braamfontein: Ravan Press.

Kegan, Donna and Deborah Tippins. 1991. 'How Teachers' Classroom Cases Express Their Pedagogical Beliefs.' *Journal of Teacher Education,* 42, 281-291.

Kelly, Verocica and Von Mucke, Dorothea. 1994. *Body and Text in the Eighteenth Century.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kerster, Gunilla. 1995. *Writing the Subject.* New York: Peter Lang.

Kinzer, Charles, and Leu, Donald. 1992. *Literacy Research, Theory, and Practice: View from Many Perspectives.* Chicago: National Reading Conference,Inc.

Krippendorff, Klaus.1980. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology.* London: Sage Publications.

Komekana, April. 1988. 'Autobiography As a Sociolinguistic Resource: Maxine Hong Kingston's *The Warrior.* International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 69, 105-118.

Kotey, Paul and Der-Houssikian, Haig. 1977 *Language and Linguistic Problems in Africa.* Hornbeam Press.

Kramarae, Cheris. 1980. *The Voices and Words of Women and Men.* Pergamon Press.

Kramarae, Cheris. 1981. *Women and Men Speaking*. Newbury House.

Kramarae, Cheris; Schulz, Muriel and O'Barr, William. 1984.*Language and Power*. Beverly Hills. Sage Publications.

Kress, Gunther. 1989. *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice*. Oxford University Press.

Kroeber, Karl. 1992. *Retelling Reading*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Kuper, Hilda. 1947. *The Uniform of Color*. Johannesbrg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Laitin, D. D. 1977. *Politics, Language and Thought: The Somali Experience*. University of Chicago Press.

Laitin, David. 1992. *Language Repertoires and State Construction in Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Labov, William. 1972. *The Logic of Non Standard English*. in Giglioli. *Language and Social Context*.

Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.*

Lakoff, Robin. 1976. *Language and Women's Place*. Octagon Books.

Le Page, R. B. 1964 *The National Language Question*. Oxford University Press.

Lincoln, Bruce. 1989. *Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification*. Oxford University Press.

Lingis, Alphonso. 1994. *Abuses*. University of California Press.

Littlejohn, Stephen. 1989. *Theories of Human Communication*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lober, Fudith, and Susan Farrell. 1991. *The Social Construction of Gender*. New York: Sage Publications.

Loram, Charles. 1917. *The Education of the Native in South Africa*. London: Longman.

Luckman, Thomas. *The Sociology of Language*. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill

Macovski, Michael. 1994. *Dialogue and Literature.* Oxford University Press.

Maley, Yon. 1987. 'The Language of Legislation'. *Language in Society, 16, 25-48.*

Markovitz, Irving. 1977 *Power and Class in Africa.* Princeton Hall.

Marks, Elaine and Isabelle deCourtivron. 1980. *New French Feminisms.* University of Massachusetts Press.

Martin-Baro, Ignatio. 1994. *Writings for a Liberation Psychology.* Cambridge. Havard University Press.

Matsebula, J. S. M. 1972. *A History of Swaziland.* Cape Town: Longman.

Mazrui, Ali. 1975. *The Political Sociology of the English Language.* The Hague.

McAdams, D. P. 'Self and Story.' in A.J. Stewart, J.M. Healy, and D. J. Ozer. Perspectives in Personality: Approaches to Understanding lives. Greenwich: JAI Press.

McCartney, W. J. A. 1971. *Readings in Boleswa Government: Select Documnts on the Government and Politics of Botswana Lesotho and Swaziland.* Roma: UBLS Printing Unit.

McMahan, Eva and Rogers, Kim. 1994. *Interactive Oral History Interviewing. New Jersey:* Laurence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Mesthrie, Rajend. 1992. 'Fanakalo in Colonial Natal' in Herbert, Robert. 1992. *Language and Society in Africa.* Witwatersrand University Press.

Meyers, Diana. 1994. *Subjection and Subjectivity.* New York: Routeledge.

Mitchell-Kernan. 1986. 'Signifying and Marking: Two Afro-American Speech Acts.' in Gumperz, John, and Dell Hymes. *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* New York. Basil Blackwell.

Mkhonza, Sarah. 1990. 'French or siSwati: A Case for Language Planning in Swaziland. *Uniswa Journal, 3, 22-34.*

Mkhonza, Sarah. 1993. 'I Speak Siswati,' Bhozongo Explodes: Language Rights and the Individual in a Swazi Court.' in Prinsloo, Karel, Peeters, Yvo, Turi, Joseph and van Rensburg, Ghristo (eds). *Language, Law and Equality.* Koedoerspoort: Sigma Press.

Mkhonza, Sarah. 1995. 'Life Histories as Social Texts of Personal Experiences in Sociolinguistic Studies: A look at the Lives of Domestic Workers in Swaziland.' in Josselson, Ruthellen and Lieblich, Amia. 1995. *The Narrative Study of Lives.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Moustakas, Clark. 1956. *The Self.* New York: Harper and Brothers.

Mungazi, Dickson. 1991. *Colonial Education of Africans.* New York: Praeger.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1988. *Social Motivation for Code Switching.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nalbantian, Suzanne. 1994b. *Aesthetic Autobiography.* Wiltshire: Macmillan.

Ngugi wa Thiongo. 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind.* Nairobi: Heinemann.

Ngugi wa Thiongo. 1993. *Moving the Centre.* Nairobi: Heinemann.

O'Barr, William and O'Barr Jean. 1976. *Language and Politics.* Mouton and Co.

Ogundipe-Leslie. 1994. Recreating Ourselves: African Women & Critical Transformations. Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc.

Olrik, Axel. 1992. *Principles of Narrative Research.* Indiana University Press.

Olsen, Tillie. 1976. *Abuses.* New York: Dell Publishing.

Paulus, Charles. 1993. 'Transformative Experiences of Adulthood: Anew Look at the Seasons of Life.' In Demick, Bursik and DiBiase.

Penelope, Julia. 1990. *Speaking Freely.* Pergamon Press.

Perinbanayagam. R. S. 1991. *Discursive Acts.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Phillipsen, Gerry. 1992. *Speaking Culturally.* State University of New York Press.

Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford University Press.

Polanyi, Livia. 1979. 'What's the Point,' Semiotica, 25,3/4,1979.

Pope, Rob. 1995. *Textual Intervention.* London: Routledge.

Prinsloo, Karel, Peeters, Yvo, Turi, Joseph, van Rensburg Christo. 1993. *Language, Law and Equality*. Koedoespoort: Sigma Press.

Radner, Joan, Newlon. 1993. *Feminist Messages*. University of Illinois Press.

Reardon, Betty. 1995. *Educating for Human Dignity*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Roe, Emery. 1992. 'Applied Narrative Analysis'. New Literary History, 23, 555-

Rossi-Landi, Ferrucio. 1983. *Language as Work and Trade*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers Inc.

Rothsteirn, Stanley. 1991. *Identity and Ideology: Social Theories of Schooling*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Rubin, Joan. 1984. in Kramarae, Schulz and O'Barr eds. *Language and Power*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Sarbin, Thoedore (ed). 1986. *Narrative Psychology*. New York:Praeger.

Saulinier, Leda and Simar, Teresa. 1973. *Personal Growth and Interpersonal Interactions*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, Josef. 1991. *English in Africa. London:* Longman.

Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs Report. 1932. *Financial and Economic Situation in Swaziland*. H. M. Stationary Office.

Seidler, Victor. 1994. *Recovering the Self*. London: Routledge.

Seidman, I. E. 1991. *Qualitative Research*. Teacher's College of New York.

Shainess, Natalie. 1987. 'Vulnerability to Violence.' in Walsh.

Simelane, Nomthetho. 1987. 'Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Domestic Workers in South Africa.' *CEAPA Journal*, 1, 2, 14-22.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1988. Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins (eds.) *Minority Education: From Struggle to Shame*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Smith, Larry E. 1981. *English for Cross Cultural Communication.* London: Macmillan.

Smitherman-Donaldson, Geneva and Teun van Dijk. 1988. *Discourse and Discrimination.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Socha, Thomas and Stamp, Glen. 1995. *Parents, Children and Communication.* Jew Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Spindle, George and Spindler, Louise. 1994. *Pathways to Cultural Awareness.* Corwin Press Inc.

Spradley, James. 1980. *Participant Observation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

St. Clair, Robert and Giles Howard. 1980. *The Social and Psychological Contexts of Language.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Steinberg, Erwin. 1992. *Plain Language.* Wayne State University Press.

Stevens, John. 1992. *Language and Ideology in Children's Fiction.* London: Longman.

Stewart, A.J., J.M. Healey, and D.J. Ozer. *1988. Perspectives in Personality: Approaches to Understanding Lives. Greenwich: JAI Press.*

Street, Brian. 1984. *Literacy Theory and Practice.* Cambridge University Press.

Strodt-Lopez. 1993. *Word Choice and Narration.* Norwood: Ablex Publishing.

Stuckey, Elspeth. 1991. *The Violence of Literacy.* Bonyton/Cook.

Swaziland Government. 1968. *Gardner-Brown Report: Salary Scales and Conditions of Employment and Service.* Mbabane:

Swaziland Government. 1969. *Post Independence Development Plan.* Mbabane:
Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking Voices.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, Deborah. 1992. 'How is Conversation Like Literary Discourse.' in Downing, Pamela, Susan, Lima, and Michael Noonan. *The Linguistics of Literacy.*

Thiaru, Kihumbu; 1975. *The African Civilization.* Nairobi: East African Literature Bureau.

Thorne, Barie and Henley, Nancy. 1975. *Language and Sex.* Newbury House.

Thorne, Barrie; Kramarae, Cheris and Henley, Nancy. 1983. *Language, Gender and Society*. Newbury House.

Tollefson, James. 1991. *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*. Longman.

Townsend, Leslie. 1990. 'Out of Silence: Writing Interactive Life Histories in Africa.' *History of Africa, 17, 351-58.*

Towson, Michael. 1992. *Mother-tongue and Fatherland.* Manchester University Press.

Trifonovitch, Gregory. 1981. 'English as an International Language: An Attitudinal Approach. in Smith, Larry.1981. *English for Cross-Cultural Communication.* England: Macmillan.

Tsuda, Yukio. 1986. *Language, Inequality and Distortion in Intercultural Distortion in Intercultural Communication.* Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing.

Underwood, Robert. 1984. Ideology of English and Education in Guam. *Educational Research Quarterly,* 8,4, 72-81.

Van Manen, Max. 1990. *Researching Lived Experience. Ontario: University of Western Ontrio.*

Vetterling-Braggin, Mary. 1981. *Sexist Language.* Littlefield Adams and Co.

Walker, Cherryl. 1991. *Women and Resistance in South Africa. New York:* Monthly Review Press.

Walsh, Mary. 1987. *The Psychology of Women.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Walvin, James. 1992. *Slaves and Slavery.* Manchester University Press.

Ward, Irene. 1994. *Literacy, Ideology and Dialogue.* State University of New York Press.

Watson, Lawrence, and Maria Barbara Watson-Franke. 1985. *Interpreting Life Histories.* Rutgers University Press.

Weiss, Allen. 1994. *Perverse Desire and the Ambiguous Icon.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

West, C. and Zimmerman, D. 1983. in Thorne,B. Kramarae, C and Henley, N. *Language and Society.* Newbury House.

White, Eugene. 1992. *The Context of Human Discourse*. Columbia: University of Carolina Press.

Worton, Michael and Judith Still. 1990. *Intertextuality*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.