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Abstract

This study investigates the impact of Family Language Policy (FLP) on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Family language policy is a newly emerging sub field of language planning and policy which focuses on the explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members. The study is therefore predicated on the view that the conservation of any minority language largely depends on intergenerational transmission of the particular language. Intergenerational transmission is dependent in part, on the language practices in the home and therefore on family language policy. To understand the nature, practice and negotiation of family language policy in the context of minority language conservation, the study focuses on the perspectives of a sample of 34 L1 Kalanga parents and 28 L1 Tonga parents, who form the main target population. In this study, parents are considered to be the ‘authorities’ within the family, who have the capacity to articulate and influence language use and language practices. Also included in this study are the perspectives of language and culture associations representing minority languages regarding their role in the conservation of minority languages at the micro community level. Representatives of Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association (KLCDA), Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO) as well Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA) were targeted.

This research takes on a qualitative approach. Methodologically, the study deployed the interview as the main data collection tool. Semi structured interviews were conducted with L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents while unstructured interviews were conducted with the representatives of language and culture associations. This study deploys the language management theory and the reversing language shift theory as the analytical lenses that enable the study to understand the mechanics of family language policy and their impact on intergenerational transmission of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Language management theory allows for the extendibility of the tenets of language policy into the family domain and specifically affords the study to explore the dialectics of parental language ideologies and family language practices in the context of minority language conservation in Zimbabwe. The reversing language shift theory also emphasises the importance of the home domain in facilitating intergenerational transmission of minority languages.

Findings of the study demonstrate that family language policy is an important aspect in intergenerational transmission of minority languages, itself a nuanced and muddled process. The research demonstrates that there is a correlation between parental language ideologies and parental disposition to articulate and pursue a particular kind of family language policy. In particular, the study identified a pro-minority home language and pro- bilingual family language policies as the major parental language ideologies driving family language policies. However, the research reveals that parental language ideologies and parental explicitly articulated family language policies alone do not guarantee intergenerational transmission of minority languages, although they are very pertinent. This, as the study argues, is because family language policy is not immune to external language practices such as the school language policy or the wider language policy at the macro state level. Despite parents being the main articulators of family language policy, the study found out that in some instances, parental ideologies do not usually coincide with children’s practices. The mismatch between parental preferences and their children’s language
practices at home are a reproduction, in the home, of extra familial language practices. This impacts family language practices by informing the child resistant agency to parental family language policy, leading to a renegotiation of family language policy. The research also demonstrates that parents, especially those with high impact beliefs are disposed to take active steps, or to employ language management strategies to realise their desired language practices in the home. The study demonstrates that these parental strategies may succeed in part, particularly when complemented by an enabling sociolinguistic environment beyond the home. The articulation of a pro-Tonga only family language policy was reproduced in the children’s language practices, while the preference for a pro-bilingual family language policy by the majority L1 Kalanga parents was snubbed for a predominantly Ndebele-only practice by their children. In most cases, the research found out that language use in formal domains impacted on the success of FLP. Tonga is widely taught in Schools within Binga districts while Kalanga is not as widespread in Bulilima and Mangwe schools. Ndebele is the most widespread language in Bulilima and Mangwe schools. As such; children of L1 Kalanga parents tend to evaluate Kalanga negatively while having positive associations with Ndebele. All these language practices are deemed to impact on family language policy and therefore on intergenerational transmission of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The desire by parents for the upward mobility of children results in them capitulating to the wider socio political reality and therefore to the demands of their children in terms of language use in the home.

The study therefore concludes that family language policy is an important frontier in the fight against language shift and language endangerment, given the importance of the home in intergenerational transmission of minority languages. The study therefore implores future research to focus on this very important but largely unresearched sub field of language policy. The study observes that most researches have focused on the activities of larger state institutions and organisations and how they impact on minority language conservation, to the detriment of the uncontestable fact that the survival of any language depends on the active use of the language by the speakers. The research also recommends that future practice of language policy should not attempt to promote minority languages by discouraging the use of other majority languages, but rather, speakers should embrace bilingualism as a benefit and a resource and not as a liability. The interaction between the top down state language policy and the bottom up micro family language policy should be acknowledged and exploited, in such a way that the two can be deployed as complementary approaches in minority language conservation.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

There has been a general proliferation of scholarship on minority language conservation worldwide, particularly after the publication of international conventions and guiding principles detailing the importance of promoting linguistic and cultural diversity. Such conventions as the Cultural Charter for Africa (Organisation of African Unity, 1976), the Language Plan of Action for Africa (OAU, 1986), the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO, 2001) and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO, 2003) have enthused researchers to invest intellectual effort not only in understanding the phenomena of language endangerment and language shift, but also to proffer strategies aimed at the conservation of minority languages. Within the African context, the increasing interest in the fate of minority languages has seen a resurgence of studies that identify endangered minority languages as well as those that seek to interrogate ways by which the same can be developed and promoted (Nyika, 2008). Scholarship on minority language conservation has been unanimous in that the core element on which minority language maintenance depends is intergenerational transmission of the language from parents to their children at home, as well as maintaining it as a language of informal communication in the community (Fishman, 1991). To that end, the role of the family institution is paramount. However, the role of the nuclear family on the conservation of minority languages has been given minimal attention in language policy research.

This study therefore focuses on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Family language policy can be defined as explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members (Schiffman, 1996; Shohamy, 2006; King, Fogle and Logan-Terry, 2008). Family language policy, an extension of the classical language planning approach, is a recent phenomenon that has turned its attention to language policy at the family level (Schwartz and Moin, 2011; Smith-Christmas, 2014; Spolsky, 2012), and seeks to understand how “languages are managed, learned, and negotiated within families” (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry, 2008:907) especially in
“the presence of at least two languages in the child’s immediate sociocultural environment” (Smith-Christmas, 2014:511). Within the context of multilingualism, the question of language choice in particular domains is indispensable; as such, the choice of the language to be used at home becomes one of the contestations under family language policy.

The role of family language policy in the conservation of minority languages has been given minimal attention in language planning studies until recently (Schwartz, 2008). Spolsky (2009) concurs that family language policy has raised considerable interest and curiosity from researchers in the past ten years, mostly in countries where ethnic minorities are found, especially as researchers seek:

... to understand questions such as: why (and how) do members of some transnational families maintain their language while members of other families lose their language? How is it that some children, growing up in a largely monolingual society, become bilinguals while other children, growing up in a bilingual environment, become monolinguals? What policies and practices do parents implement to promote or discourage the use and practice of particular languages? And how are these language policies and practices negotiated in private domains, and concomitantly, related to broader ideologies of language and language education policies? (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013:1).

This study therefore investigates the potential impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, especially considering the importance of family language ideologies, language practices and language management in intergenerational transmission of minority languages. As such, the study invests keen interest in the role of parents as ‘authorities’ within the family who can potentially articulate, direct or influence the family language policy to the benefit of the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The study’s interest in the parents of minority language families derives from the view that parental language ideologies and beliefs are influential factors that underlie the formation and articulation of family language policy (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016) Therefore, parental decisions regarding language use in the home can impact on whether or not they “provide continuity for intergenerational transmission and resistance to language shift” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013:3). Further, since intergenerational transmission is dependent on the acquisition of the language in question by younger speakers, family language policy demonstrates how language acquisition is more than just a
“neutral and uncontested state of private affairs” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013:1) but is related to broader economic, political as well as cultural and ideological variables

1.2 Statement of the problem

Of the close to seven thousand languages of the world, (Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams, 2007), a significant number of them are in a poor state of health and are in danger of extinction, mostly succumbing to competition for domains of usage with global and other stronger endoglossic languages (Batibo, 2005). Zimbabwe is home to a host of languages spoken by ethnic minorities mostly domiciled in the Matabeleland North and South provinces where Ndebele language is dominant, in terms of status and use in official domains. Of the sixteen “officially recognised languages” in the new constitution (Government of Zimbabwe, 2013), twelve of these can be classified as endangered minority languages, preferably referred to as marginalised languages (Ndhlovu, 2009; Ndlovu, 2013). However, in this study, the term ‘minority languages’ is adopted throughout. This is because the meaning of ‘minority language’ is universally understood, while ‘marginalised’ may be a relative term. Batibo (2005:51) explains thus:

Sociolinguistically, a minority language is defined not only by its relative demographic inferiority but also, and more so, by its limited public functions. Thus, a minority language can be identified horizontally by looking at its weak or non-dominant position in relation to other languages in the region or nation, and vertically on the basis of its low status and absence of use in public or official areas.

Therefore, in the face of tendencies of hegemonic tendencies of the major, more vibrant endoglossic languages such as Shona and Ndebele, these minority languages are under ubiquitous threat of perennial subordination and subjugation, and at worst, extinction (Maseko and Ndlovu, 2013). As a result of the diminished and diminishing status of their languages, minority language speakers are compelled to abandon their languages in favour of healthier alternatives, thereby posing a threat to the life of the minority languages. In the case of Zimbabwe, minority language speakers are enticed by the promise of access to better opportunities in education as well as various other spheres to capitulate to the dominance of the Shona and Ndebele to the extent of adopting either of the two as a primary means of communication in the home. This state of affairs; whereby the home is intruded by a language other than the mother tongue sets the minority languages in a negative
trajectory as far as intergenerational transmission is concerned, and is therefore detrimental to linguistic and cultural diversity.

There has been a lot of debate regarding the course of action to take in order to revitalise and conserve these endangered minority languages in light of the UNESCO declaration which views a people’s language as part of their intangible cultural heritage, in addition to a plethora of other regional and international conventions on cultural and linguistic diversity. In most of the debates, the role of the family institution (which is critical in intergenerational transmission) and family language policy (which can shape the trajectory of intergenerational transmission) has featured marginally or oftentimes totally ignored. King, Fogle and Logan-Terry (2008) concur that nearly all work on language policy, both theoretical and empirical, has examined language policy in institutional contexts, such as the state, the school, or the work place (for example Nyika, 2008; Kadenge and Nkomo, 2011; 2012; Nkomo, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2008; Ndlovu, 2013), while very little attention has been paid to the intimate context of the home. This study therefore attempts to understand the mediating impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in the context of multilingual Zimbabwe.

1.3 Aims of the study

This study is situated against a background of societal multilingualism in Zimbabwe. By deploying insights afforded by the notion of family language policy, the broad aim of the study is to highlight the potential role of the family institution in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The study seeks to demonstrate, through its analysis of language ideologies, practices and preferences in the home domain, that language planning should not be limited to the more formal, usually legislatively codified paradigm where government is seen as the major player, but should also permeate the lower rungs of the society to the more closely knit domains like the family, especially in the conservation of minority languages. While government may be more powerful in the overall decisions about language use at the national level, mother tongue speakers at the nuclear family may aid the success or impede against it through language ideologies and practices that may be inconsistent with intergenerational transmission. The present study therefore seeks to investigate the nature of family language policies among minority language
speakers, and how language beliefs or ideologies, as well as to demonstrate the mutual interaction between family language policy and the national policy. Overall the study aims to assess the impact of the established family language polices among minority language speakers on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

1.3.1 Objectives

i. To explore the nature family language policy among speakers of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

ii. To investigate the interface between language ideologies and beliefs of minority language speakers on family language policy, language practices and preferences in the home domain.

iii. To examine the potential mutuality between micro-family and macro-national language practices on the articulation and direction of family language policy among minority language speakers in Zimbabwe.

iv. To discuss the implications of the established family language policies and language practices in the home domain on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

v. To identify strategies deployed by minority language speakers to attain preferred language practices in the home to achieve intergenerational transmission of minority languages.

vi. To proffer alternative strategies that will feed into the overall fight against minority language endangerment at the national level.

1.3.2 Research questions

i. What is the nature of family language policy pursued and encouraged by minority language families in Zimbabwe?

ii. How do language ideologies and language beliefs impact on language practices, language preferences and the articulation of family language policy in the home domain among minority language speakers?

iii. How do language practices at the macro national level impact on the language practices and preferences of minority language speakers at the micro family level and on the articulation and direction of family language policy?
iv. How do family language policies impact on the conservation of minority languages?

v. What kinds of strategies are deployed by minority language speakers in their attempt to achieve preferred language practices and intergenerational transmission of minority languages in the home domain?

vi. What strategies can the notion of family language policy proffer in the overall fight against minority language endangerment?

1.4 Definition of Key terms

Language planning- According to Mkanganwi (1992) it is defined as the conscious, predictive approach to language and language use, which is based on a more general government policy.

Language policy- Has to do with decisions (rules, regulations, guidelines) about the status, use, domains, and territories of language(s) and the rights of speakers of the languages in question http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/polintro/polintro.html.

Family language policy - Can be defined as explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry, 2008).

Minority language - According to Batibo (2005) a minority language is defined as that language which is lacking in language vitality and has its use limited to a few domains. Sociolinguistically a minority language is defined not only by its relative demographic inferiority but also, and more so by its limited public functions. Thus, a minority language can be identified horizontally by looking at its weak or non-dominant position in relation to other languages in the region or nation, and vertically on the basis of its low status and absence of use in public or official areas.

Language shift - Fasold (1984) defines it as a situation whereby a group of people collectively and gradually give up their language in favour of another that is not their mother tongue. It is a long term result of collective language choice.

Language maintenance – This term denotes continued usage of a language, usually a minority one, in the face of stronger, more favourable alternatives (Wardhaugh, 2002).
Language revitalisation - Also referred to as language revival or reversing language shift, is an attempt to halt or reverse the decline of a language or to revive an extinct one. Those involved can include parties such as linguists, cultural or community groups, or governments (Wardhaugh, 2002).

Domain - Spolsky (2009) defines a domain as a social space such as home or family, school, neighbourhood, church (or synagogue or mosque or other religious institution), workplace, public media, or governmental level, city, state or nation.

Language management - According to Spolsky (2009) this refers to conscious and explicit efforts by language managers to control the choices of languages to be used in various domains.

1.5 Rationale for the study

There is a considerable body of literature focusing on language planning and language policy in Zimbabwe. Within this extant scholarship, significant effort has been invested in understanding the role of language planning and policy in the conservation of minority languages. To that end, most studies have focused on language policy at the macro level of the state (cf. Nyika, 2008; Kadenge and Nkomo, 2011; 2012; Nkomo, 2008; Ndlovu, 2008; Ndlovu, 2013) and have largely ignored the mechanics of language policy at micro grassroots institutions such as the family. In Africa generally, the field of language policy is still in its nascent stages, conceived in early 1960s with the advent of independence of the first African states from their colonial masters (Berry, 1968; Fishman, 1968; Ricento, 2000). It has therefore tended to focus more on the on the selection of languages to assume the role of national and or official languages to replace the colonial languages (Bamgbose, 1991). Consequently, “nearly all work on language policy, both theoretical and empirical ,has examined language policy in institutional contexts, such as the state, the school or the work place” (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry, 2008:908) while marginal attention has been paid to language policy within the micro level of the family.

As a newly emerging field (King et al, 2008) family language policy has not been given enough scholarly attention to understand its potential contribution to the conservation of minority languages in general. The scope of language policy has
thus far been more focused on macro issues and less on how speakers at the micro level of the family articulate, direct and negotiate their family language policies in the context of widespread bilingualism and multilingualism. Most available studies on family language policy have focused more on the how immigrant families, particularly in Israel and America have articulated and negotiated their family language policies for the maintenance of their heritage languages (see for example Seloni and Sarfati, 2013; Hua and Wei, 2016; Kasatkina, 2011; King, 2016; Altman et al, 2014). Within the African context, family language policy has not been given nearly as enough attention as it has been beyond Africa. Kamuangu (2006) is one of the few scholars who has explored family language policies and practices of selected DRC immigrant families in South Africa, and their implications for children’s schooling and for relations within the family and the DRC immigrant community in South Africa at large.

Within the Zimbabwean context in particular, there seems to be no published work that specifically focuses on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages. This is despite the fact that family language policies, language ideologies and language practices have a huge bearing on which language(s) are to be maintained in the home (King et al, 2008). Most studies have rehashed the same views regarding what the government’s obligations is in supporting the maintenance of minority languages (cf. Chimhundu, 1992; Nyika, 2008; Kadenge and Nkomo, 2011; 2012; Nkomo, 2008; Ndhlouvo, 2008; Ndlovu, 2013). As a result, the grand narrative has thus far been formulated around the state’s failure to articulate a comprehensive language policy that empowers minority languages to withstand the pressure exerted by the major endoglossic languages in Zimbabwe. The potential agency of the speakers of the minority languages in conservation of their languages has been largely ignored.

The culpability of colonial government policies, especially at the recommendations of Clement M. Doke (see Ndlovu, 2009; 2006; Msindo, 2005) and the present government’s lethargic approach to language planning and policy issues (Maseko and Dhlamini, 2014; Kadenge and Mugari, 2015; Nkomo, 2008; Ndhlouvo, 2008) have been cited as complicit in the resultant negative trajectory that characterise minority languages today. While much literature has lamented the government’s non-committal approach to the promotion and development of the minority languages in
the more formal domains such as education and the media (Maseko and Dhlamini, 2014), very little effort has been devoted to understanding the language ideologies, language practices and language preferences by minority language families that could potentially impact and be impacted by language policy at the national level. Given the importance of family language policy and the centrality of the home in the intergenerational transmission of minority languages (King et al., 2008), this study’s focus on family language policy among minority language speakers is likely to lend more insight into this dynamic, muddled and nuanced process of intergenerational transmission of minority languages within the family (King et al., ibid).

The recent officialising of sixteen languages in the new constitution (Government of Zimbabwe, 2013) has not only been seen as the first major step towards the reclamation and recognition of minority languages since the country attained independence in 1980 (Maseko and Dhlamini, 2014), it has also added a fresh impetus to the debate on language policy in Zimbabwe. The present study is therefore a contribution to this debate, however with more focus on the views of the speakers regarding their family language policies which have largely been ignored in previous studies. This study foregrounds family language policy in the conservation of minority languages rather than macro level policy because the family is seen as a site in which language ideologies are formed and articulated through parent-child interactions (King et al., 2008). Further:

It is within the family unit that, and particularly bi- or multilingual families that macro and micro processes can be examined as dominant ideologies intersect and compete with local or individual views on language and parenting (King et al., 2008:914).

Understanding of family language ideologies and language practices is an important aspect in minority language conservation as these predispose parents and family members to choose whether they maintain or shift from their home language. It is in this light that family language policy merits serious attention, particularly as far as it impacts on intergenerational transmission, the basis for language maintenance (Fishman, 1991).

The main thesis of the study is anchored in the philosophy that extinction of a language is tragic as it also extinguishes insights that it carries as well as the medium for cultural maintenance and renewal (Fromkin et al., 2007). On the other
hand, the maintenance and survival of minority languages has a democratising potential as it allows speakers to freely participate in the cultural life of their community (Maseko and Ndlovu, 2013). In this light, each language is very important to its speakers because it provides “new evidence on the nature of human cognition through its poetry, literature, ritual speech and word structure” (Fromkin et al., 2007). All efforts at conserving minority languages therefore need to be consolidated and sustained by deploying nuanced approaches and perspectives. The study therefore acknowledges family language policy as a more recent approach (King et al., 2008) that presents language policy scholarship with a paradigm shift from the conception of language policy as a top-down state activity in which speakers of the languages concerned are only considered reactive consumers of state engineered policies.

The present study is also unique in the sense that attempts to understand the interaction between language policy at the level of the state and family language policy in the context of minority language conservation. No other study known to the researcher has invested a keen interest in this. Although some studies have acknowledged the role of the speakers at the family level (see for example, Ndlovu, 2015; Nyota, 2015), none of them have investigated the dialectical relationship between family language policy and national language policy. At worst, most studies have chosen to give very little or no attention to family language policy (Smith-Christmas, 2014).

The findings of the study are expected to be useful to various government departments and N.G.Os; particularly those with a vested interest on language policy issues, minority language advocates, and language planning experts as well as to the minority speakers in particular as it will bring in a fresh paradigm in the fight against language endangerment and language shift. As a pioneering study, especially within the Zimbabwean context, the findings of this research are expected to enthuse and motivate further interest and research within the domain of family language policy in general as well as to proffer new insights regarding future language practice and policy in Zimbabwe, both at the family and national levels.

1.6 Literature review

Most studies on family language policy have tended to focus on heritage language maintenance among immigrant communities (see for example Schwartz, 2008;
From the studies reviewed, it is apparent that most scholars working within the FLP tradition do not foreground language conservation as their concern, but are rather interested in the bilingual development of children in immigrant families. The researcher could not locate many studies that focused on family language policy among indigenous people in the context of minority language conservation and language revitalisation. Where mentioned, FLP is marginally treated and generalised, moreso within studies focusing particularly on Zimbabwe. In most cases, FLP is inferred than explicitly foregrounded as an important approach as far as understanding intergenerational transmission of minority languages is concerned.

As intimated in the rationale section of this chapter, there is a glaring lacuna as far as studies on family language policy in general are concerned, and particularly those focusing on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages. However, this appears to be changing. Curdt-Christiansen (2013) particularly notes that the field of family language planning has begun to enthuse researchers, as attested to by the considerable increase in attention in recent times. Focus has been revolving questions such as why (and how) do members of some transnational families maintain their language while members of other families lose their language as well as understanding the policies and practices that parents employ to promote and discourage the use of certain languages in bilingual communities (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). Other studies have sought to understand and relate the dialectics of language policy and language practice in the negotiation of FLP in private domains especially in relation “to broader ideologies of language and language education policies” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013:1). A lot of literature has therefore been devoted to the understanding of language policy in general, at the broader national level. Such studies will also be reviewed here as they undoubtedly have the potential to shed light on the current subject.

Schwartz (2008) focused on the family policy factors affecting first language (L1) maintenance among second generation Russian-Jewish immigrants in Israel in light of Spolsky’s (2004) model of language policy. Participants in the study included 70 Russian-Hebrew speaking children with an average age of 7 years, 2 months (Schwartz, 2008). “The results attested to the crucial role of teaching literate L1 in
both family and non-formal educational settings and to the children’s positive approach toward home language acquisition” (Schwartz, 2008:400). Like the present study, it was anchored in Spolsky’s (2009) approach in language policy that emphasises that language policy can be understood in relation to language practices, beliefs and management. Schwartz (2008) considered the family or home domain to be an extremely important frontier for studying language policy because of its critical role in the child’s linguistic socialisation. The present study is also grounded in the same general approach. However, the present study seeks to extend the understanding of family language policy by relating it to the broader macro factors and other extra familial language practices. Further, the present study attempts to make conclusions on the impact of FLP on intergenerational transmission of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

Schwartz and Moin (2011) studied Parents’ assessment of their preschool children’s bilingual development in the context of family language policy in Israel. Their study was predicated on the notion that Parents’ assessment of their children’s language development is a significant component of parent-child communication, and therefore a significant component of family language policy. The study was carried out in the context of bilingualism, necessitated by immigration of Russian speakers into a predominantly Hebrew speaking territory (Schwartz and Moin, 2011). Like many other studies such as Schwartz (2008) above, the family is considered a critical domain which is central in determining child language acquisition and socialisation. Clearly, Schwartz and Moin (2011) concentrated on family language policy within the context of immigrant families in Israel. While their study lends important insights to the present research, the present study focuses on family language policy among indigenous linguistic minorities in Zimbabwe. That informs the present study’s point of departure.

Kasatkina (2011) studied the process of language shift and maintenance among Russian immigrants from the former Soviet Union living in the United States of America. Kasatkina’s study focused on the resolution of the language question among the Russian immigrants. To that end, she sought to understand the various dispositions towards the maintenance of Russian among Russian immigrants. In other words, her study was motivated by the desire to understand how some immigrants are able to maintain their mother tongue in a country that does not
support multilingualism especially for immigrants (Kasatkina, 2011). Deploying the Integrated Public Microdata Series (IPUMAS) (Kasatkina, 2013:35), she discovered that weak dispositions towards the maintenance of Russian by Russian immigrants in America was linked to “the influx of Russian speaking immigrants to the United States between 1990 and 2000, when opportunities Russians/Russian speakers to communicate in their language sharply increased” (Kasatkina, 2011:35). As such, she explains the loss of Russian within the context of the year of immigration, suggesting that susceptibility to abandon Russian is not only determined by the number of speakers but also by the conditions in the host country during the period of immigration. In her study, Kasatkina (2011) analyses language choices and practices in the home in an attempt to understand how the language practices among minority immigrant families impacted on the loss of Russian. Without explicitly mentioning ‘family language policy,’ her analysis of language use among Russian families is done within the confines of family language policy. The present study profits from Kasatkina (2011) in the sense that it is affords a window into understanding how language practices in the home can potentially impact on language conservation, especially among minority language speakers. The present study however differs from Kasatkina (2011) in that the present study assesses the impact of family language policy on the conservation of indigenous minority languages, while the study under review, like Schwartz and Moin (2011) and Schwartz (2008) above focuses on language maintenance and shift among immigrant families, whose home languages are not indigenous to the host country.

Moore’s (2015) study focused on family language policy in the context of religion. The study observed that the families’ policies with regards to children’s religious education were situated within the larger linguistic, social, and cultural context. To that end, the study found out that family language policies were impacted by the broader changes in Islamic education and Arabic learning in the community, in the wake of the Islamic resurgence (Moore, 2015). Focusing on “a language socialisation study of seven young Fulbe children into three languages (Fulfulde, Arabic, and French) at home, Qur’anic school, and public school in northern Cameroon” (Moore, 2015:1), the study demonstrated how changes in the religious, linguistic, and educational landscape interacted with FLP. Moore’s study, much like the present research is an attempt to situate language planning in the micro domain.
The present study however goes beyond that by investigating the impact of FLP in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe whereas Moore’s study is focused on family language policy and its impact on religion in Cameroon. Although the contexts and scope of the two studies differ, it is noteworthy that the present study benefits from Moore’s since it is one of the few researches in the African literature that looks at language policy from the view of the micro sphere of the family.

Kayam (2013) studied heritage language maintenance among native speakers in Israel. The research focused on the family language policy experiences, strategies, and outcomes of native English speakers raising children in a Hebrew dominant environment in Israel. Like the present study, Kayam (2013) focused on language ideologies, practice and management by minority groups in a bilingual setup. However, Kayam’s study is restricted to language policy within the family and does not attempt to find interaction between the micro and macro issues impacting on the articulation and direction of family language policy and how these influence intergenerational language transmission. The present study seeks to fill that lacuna.

O’hlfearnain (2013) studied family language policy, particularly focusing on how first language Irish speaker attitudes impinged on community based responses to language shift. His research, much like the present study was informed by Fishman’s (1991) view that core element on which successful minority language maintenance depends is intergenerational transmission of the language from parents to their children in the home (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry, 2008; Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). Among his findings was that the children’s linguistic competence alone does not guarantee intergenerational transmission of minority languages unless the parents are also motivated to do pass on the language. He also observed that bringing up children to speak Irish in a bilingual context dominated by English; a powerful global language was a big challenge. The present study, like O’hlfearnain’s also focuses on minority language maintenance by linguistic minorities in a predominantly bilingual setup. The target population of the present study, the first language speakers of Kalanga and the first language Tonga speakers, are found in a bilingual environment of Matabeleland North and South provinces, dominated by the more powerful Ndebele language. It is therefore expected for O’hlfearnain’s (2013) study above to shed more light regarding the importance of language ideologies and
practices by linguistic minorities in cases of language shift. The present study however goes further by trying to marry FLP and National Language planning with a view of getting to a holistic understanding on how these two approaches can speak to each other to help planners to come to a comprehensive understanding of language conservation and revitalisation.

Chabata, Muwati and Mashiri (2014) focused on language revitalisation strategies among the Tonga in Zimbabwe. They acknowledge that the theme of language maintenance or revival has attracted a lot of scholarly attention in the last three decades, with most studies mainly focusing on the manifestations of language shift by linguistic minorities and the efforts aimed at reversing them. In their study, they concentrate more on the role of language specialists, the government, the education sector as well as the role of funding organisations in Tonga language revitalisation. The role of family language policy is marginally treated in their study. They only acknowledge in passing that the family domain has also been under noticeable threat as far as language use is concerned. This, they argue, is a result of the low prestige associated with minority languages leading to younger speakers opting for the more viable alternatives in the form of Ndebele, shona and English. These languages, unlike Tonga provide the younger speakers with opportunities as they are used widely in education and in all public domains. The present study on the other hand, seeks to gain a deeper understanding of the family dynamics and language ideologies that influences the language management preferences in the home by engaging the speakers of the languages concerned. The current study also goes further by attempting to marry family language policy to the language policy of the country by suggesting ways by which the two can be in a mutually beneficial relationship.

Smith-Christmas (2014) studied family language policy (FLP) in the context of an extended bilingual Gaelic-English family on the Isle of Skye in Scotland. Deploying an ethnographic approach, the study drew data from two week long recordings which gave rise to a ten hour corpus (Smith-Christmas, 2014). The research demonstrated how certain family members, for example, the children’s mother and paternal grandmother negotiated and gravitated towards a strongly Gaelic-centred FLP, while also noting how other extended family members such as the children’s father, his sister and brother occasionally participated in this Gaelic-centred FLP, but at the
same time, participating in language shift by maintaining English as their peer group language and responding in English when addressed in Gaelic (Smith-Christmas, 2014). The study concludes that these language practices in the family socialise children into the norms of language shift, precipitating in children’s impoverished repertoire and use of Gaelic (Smith-Christmas, 2014). The study observed the negative impact of the father’s use of Gaelic when disciplining his children.

Smith-Christmas (2014) above informs the present study in a number of ways. Firstly, it recognises the role of the family domain in the process of language shift. Secondly, it sheds light on the impact that language ideologies of parents may have in the subsequent shift or maintenance of minority languages. However, Smith-Christmas, like O’hlfearnain (2013) above, concentrates on the family domain but does not attempt to link the mechanics of FLP may to the wider language practices at the macro level. Theoretically, Smith-Christmas (2014), like O’hlfearnain’s (2013) and indeed the present study is influenced by Fishman’s (1991) views regarding the importance of the family institution in encouraging intergenerational transmission of endangered languages.

Altman et al. (2014) studied family language policy of Russian-Hebrew speaking children in Israel. They were interested in correlating reported language use patterns to levels of proficiency in children, with a view of making conclusions on language maintenance and language shift. Their study demonstrated the relationship between family language policy and language choice, language use, proficiency in Russian and Hebrew in bilingual preschool children. Deploying the interview as the main data collection tool, the study focused on 65 parents who were classified to form families with strict-Russian, mild-Russian and pro-bilingual language ideologies. Preschool children from the targeted families were asked to respond to questions about language use, language choice, proficiency in Russian and Hebrew (Altman et al., 2014). Although also grounded within the field of family language policy, Altman, et al. (2014) focused more on making conclusions regarding bilingual development of preschool children than on language conservation. This has been the gap observed in the generality of reviewed studies.

1.7 Theoretical framework
This section introduces and provides an overview of the theoretical underpinnings that inform the present study.

**1.7.1 Language management theory (LMT)**

This study is anchored within a triangulated theoretical toolkit pivoting on the Language Management Theory (LMT) in the tradition of Spolsky (2004; 2009) and Fishman’s (1991) Reversing Language Shift theory (RLS). Spolsky (2004; 2009) theory of language management is predicated on the argument that:

Language policy is all about choices. If you are bilingual or plurilingual, you have to choose which language to use. Even if you speak only one language, you have choices of dialects and styles. To understand the nature of this process, one needs an ecological model that will correlate social structures and situations with linguistic repertoires. Any speaker or writer is continually selecting features – sounds or spellings, lexical items, or grammatical patterns (Spolsky, 2009: 4)

For Spolsky therefore, language policy is intended to account for individual language choices within the confines of the beliefs and consensual behaviours of the members of a speech community (Spolsky, 2004; 2009). Spolsky’s approach to language management conceives language policy as understandable within the context of three interrelated but independently describable components – language practices, language ideologies or beliefs and management (Spolsky, 2004; 2009). Language practices are the observable behaviours and choices that people make regarding language use or what people actually do with their linguistic resources, including the choice of particular linguistic features or language varieties in particular domains or interactions. For Spolsky, any form of language policy should be understood in relation to language ideologies or what speakers believe about, or the value that they attach to their language. Language management is the third component of Spolsky’s concept of language policy and is understood broadly, as any sort of activity aimed at language as a communication tool or as a system as well as at language use (Spolsky, 2009). In other words, language management relates to the explicit and overt efforts by someone or some group that has, or claims, authority over the participants in particular domains to modify or conform to their language practice and ideology (Spolsky, 2009).
Since family language policy is to a large extent influenced by family language ideologies, language practices and language management, Spolsky's (2004; 2009) views on language policy illuminate the present study quite significantly. In the context of multilingualism, minority language speakers in Zimbabwe are compelled to make a number of choices regarding language use. These choices have a bearing on the intergenerational transmission of their home languages. As such, Spolsky's approach to language policy enables the present study to account for the choices that are made by individual speakers of minority languages in Zimbabwe by making reference to language use patterns and practices in their respective communities (Spolsky, 2009). Some of these choices are a result of language management that reflect conscious and explicit efforts by language managers to control the choices. In the same vein, family language policy can be influenced by language managers (parents) as informed by their language ideologies.

Since intergenerational language transmission depends on children's language acquisition, language ideologies and language practices can potentially impact on conservation. Intergenerational language transfer will also depend largely on the family language policies informed and determined by language management practices (Kopeliovich, 2006). A detailed discussion of the language management theory is presented in chapter 3.

1.7.2 Reversing language shift theory (RLS)

As intimated earlier, this study is in part informed by the reversing language shift theory (Fishman, 1991). Fishman's reversing language shift theory (RLS) has informed a lot of scholarly works on minority language conservation and revitalisation (Darquennes, 2007; O'hlfearnain, 2013). He is viewed as “an early proponent of proactive language research” (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). For Fishman, the RLS theory is designed to offer linguists and language revivalists a rational and a systematic approach to minority language maintenance. He argues that the RLS framework is an attempt on the part of the authorities that are recognised by speakers and supporters of threatened languages to coalesce around efforts deliberately calculated to fight language shift or extinction (Fishman, 1991).

For the present study, one of the important aspects of Fishman's RLS theory is the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS). Fishman proposed the GIDS as a
measurement of the “extent to which a particular language is endangered and serves as a heuristic device to assist communities in targeting their efforts” (King et al., 2008:917). The GIDS is therefore presented as a scale of disruption akin to the Richter scale (Darquennes, 2007). In these terms, the GIDS suggests that the higher the stage representing a particular language, the greater the degree of endangerment. Fishman (1991) submits that language revitalisation is therefore not a one size fits all, but rather, specific strategies should be targeted for specific languages depending on their degrees of intergenerational disruption.

Among other things, Fishman’s (1991) theory foregrounds the centrality of intergenerational transmission of minority languages as the single most important prerequisite for the survival of any threatened language. To that end, stage 6 of the GIDS is given the most prominence in his theory. It represents a crucial point in the life cycle of a language whereby “the threatened language becomes the everyday language of informal, spoken interaction between and within all three generations within the family” (King et al., 2008:917). The extent of importance ascribed to intergenerational transmission as represented by stage 6 of the GIDS speaks directly to the importance of family language policy in the conservation of minority languages. As such, Fishman’s (1991) reversing language shift theory lends important insights into the understanding of the home domain as an important frontier in minority language conservation. A detailed discussion of the RLS theory is afforded in chapter 3.

1.8 Research methodology

This section introduces and provides a general overview of the methodological concerns of the present study.

1.8.1 Design

The study deployed a qualitative research design. Qualitative studies are concerned with collection and description of naturalist data in explaining humanistic phenomena (Berg, 2001; Ruane, 2005). This study is essentially humanistic as it investigates the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. For a study with this orientation, it is imperative that a qualitative approach be deployed. The option for qualitative research approach is also informed
by the arguments put forward by Gilham (2000) who submits that qualitative research allows the researcher to investigate situations where little is known about what is going on and explore the complexities that are beyond the scope of more controlled approaches. The study opted for a qualitative research design given the nature of the phenomenon that the study investigated.

A qualitative research design was deemed appropriate for the present study for a number of reasons. It is essentially descriptive in the sense that it allows the researcher to describe the phenomenon under study from the point of view of the participants experiencing the phenomenon (Berg, 2001). This study seeks to understand the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe by engaging the speakers of Kalanga and Tonga languages, which are some of the minority languages of Zimbabwe. This is in consonance with Butler-Kisber (2010) who avers that qualitative researches are narrative inquiries which ‘live the story’ from the view of participants, as researchers record personal and social interactions through detailed field notes, available documents, and interviews. Overally, a qualitative approach allowed the researcher to describe the nature of family language policies pursued by minority language families. It also afforded the description of language ideologies, practices and management and how these potentially impact on intergenerational transmission and conservation of minority languages.

1.8.2 Strategies of inquiry

The nature of the phenomenon under investigation dictated that appropriate strategies of inquiry be adopted for this study. As has been pointed out, this study is humanistic in nature as it seeks to understand the mediation of social phenomena (Mpofu, 2013). The study focuses on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Family language policy is essentially a humanistic phenomenon that cannot be understood beyond the context of the people experiencing the phenomenon (Groenewald, 2004). As such, this influenced the study to adopt strategies of inquiry that are consistent with the investigation of humanistic phenomena. To that end, the study adopted the case study approach, phenomenology, and the historical research approaches.

1.8.3 Data collection tools
This section provides a sketch of the data collection tools and procedures deployed by the study.

1.8.3.1 The interview method

The study relied on the interview method as the main data collection tool. According to Robson (1997) an interview is defined as a conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee with a purpose. Cohen and Manion (1989) observe that the interview is initiated by the researcher with the main aim of obtaining data that is relevant for the research. Nieuwenhuis (2007) considers an interview to be a two-way communication in which the interviewer asks the participants questions to collect data precisely to learn more about ideas, beliefs, views, opinions, practices and behaviours of the participants.

In this study the researcher deployed the semi-structured and the unstructured interview techniques. Semi structured interviews were deployed as the data collection tool among the L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents who were the main target population of the study. An interview guide (appendix A) was employed to direct the interviews. Semi structured interviews were mainly preferred for their flexibility as adaptable and open ended ways of collecting data that offer the possibility of modifying the researcher’s line of inquiry as they allowed the researcher to easily make follow-ups and probe interesting items that emerged during the interviews (Berg, 2001; Cohen and Manion, 1989). The semi structured interview also allowed “much more space for interviewees to answer on their own terms than structured interviews” (Edwards and Holland, 2013:29).

Unstructured in depth interviews were conducted with representatives of language and culture associations. A guide (Appendix B) was also employed to provide a general direction to the interview process. Edwards and Holland (2013:30) submit that “in the unstructured interview, the researcher clearly has aims for the research and a topic of study, but the importance of the method is to allow the interviewee to talk from their own perspective using their own frame of reference and ideas and meanings that are familiar to them”. The unstructured interviews were open ended and sought to elicit views from language association representatives concerning the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The use of unstructured open ended interviews was motivated by the
observation by Nieuwenhuis (2007) who avers that open ended or unstructured interviews can help the researcher to explore the participants’ views, ideas, beliefs and attitudes about certain events or phenomena. Since minority language advocates and activists are normally change oriented and change driven, seeking particularly to influence the policy makers at the macro level of government to enact deliberate policies that empower minority languages, their views were considered to be illuminating in understanding the dialectics between the bottom up and the top down efforts in minority language conservation in Zimbabwe. Open ended interviews were also preferred as they allowed the language advocates to even propose solutions or provide insight into events or phenomenon being studied (Nieuwenhuis, 2007).

1.8.4 Target Population

Within the social sciences, researchers are mostly interested in learning something about larger groups of people. As a result of the sheer numbers of the people within these larger interest groups, it is next to an impossibility to involve every member in the study (Ruane, 2005). The larger aggregate group is what is termed the research population and is usually too large to study it in its entirety (Ruane, 2005). While the findings of the study are intended to be generalisable to minority language speaking families in Zimbabwe, it was impossible to involve all speakers of all minority languages. As such, this study targeted L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents as the main research participants. Also targeted were representatives of language and culture associations. As such, to get a glimpse or a “taste” of the larger entity, sampling techniques had to be employed (Ruane, 2005). Sampling therefore refers to the identification and selection of participants for the study from a selected target population (Berg, 2001).

1.8.5 Sampling techniques

In this section, an overview of the sampling techniques employed in the study is provided.

1.8.5.1 Purposive sampling

The study mainly relied on a sampling toolkit pivoting around purposive and snowball or chain referral sampling (Ruane, 2005). In choosing the cases, that is the L1
Kalanga and L1 Tonga language groups, the study deployed purposive sampling, also known as judgemental sampling (Marshall, 1996) or convenience sampling (Ruane, 2005). Purposive sampling was also employed in choosing the initial primary participants from the main target population. Since this a qualitatively oriented study, purposive sampling was deployed because it allowed the researcher to handpick supposedly typical or interesting cases (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2001). It afforded the researcher freedom to select participants of the study from the target population, because of some defining characteristics that made them the holders of the data needed for the study (Ndlovu, 2013). The Kalanga and the Tonga language groups were selected as the focus cases of the study for a number of reasons. Kalanga is mostly spoken in Matabeleland South province of Zimbabwe while Tonga is mostly spoken in Matabeleland North province. The two provinces mentioned above are the enclaves of minority language speaking groups in Zimbabwe (Ndlovu, 2009). As such, the sample was deemed to reflect that fact. Further, the two languages are some of the most visible in terms of language activism and advocacy activities.

To gain entry into the field, purposive sampling was deployed to select the initial primary participants (Groenewald, 2004). The purposive sample was based on the researcher’s judgement and the purpose of the research (Groenewald, 2004). As such, the study targeted those who had lived experiences of the phenomenon under study. To this end, the researcher used his networks with L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga speaking students from the department of languages of Lupane state University as well as some contacts from previous researches in Kalanga and Tonga speaking communities. These formed the primary purposive sample. Purposive sampling was also employed in selecting participants form language and culture associations. Representatives were chosen on the basis of accessibility to the researcher.

1.8.5.2 Snowball sampling

Snowball sampling was used to further penetrate the research sites in order to trace additional participants from the L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga target population. This is a sampling method that is used to expand the sample by asking one informant to recommend others for interviewing (Ruane, 2005; Babbie, 1995; Bailey, 1996; Holloway, 1997). Snowball sampling is built around chain referrals (Ruane, 2005).
whereby the researcher begins the sampling process by contacting a few individuals for inclusion in the sample. "These people will then be asked for names of additional people who might be willing to be part of the research project" (Ruane, 2005:117). To this end, the primary participants in the purposive sample were asked to provide names and contact details of other L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents who could possibly be included in the sample for interviewing. The process was repeated with successive participants until the data saturation (Ruane, 2005) was achieved for both population segments. At the end of the fieldwork, 34 L1 Kalanga parents and 28 L1 Tonga parents had participated in the study.

1.9 Scope of Study

This study is grounded in the newly emerging field of family language policy. Specifically, it investigates the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Although drawing on insights afforded by the field of language policy in general, it attempts to situate family language policy within this broader field by attempting to explore how family language policy can be deployed as a new frontier in fighting language extinction and language shift particularly among minority language speakers. To that end, it attempts to relate parental language ideologies, language practices and language management to the muddled and nuanced process of intergenerational language transmission in the home. In that endeavour, the study proceeds in the following manner:

Chapter one is the introduction of the study. It outlines the background, statement of the problem, the aims of the research, the study’s objectives, the research questions and the rationale of the study. A sketch of the literature review is also provided in this chapter, including a brief overview of the theoretical and methodological concerns of the research.

Chapter 2 is the comprehensive literature review of the study. Chapter 3 then presents a comprehensive discussion of the theoretical underpinnings that guide the present study. Chapter 4 is a comprehensive outline and discussion of the methodological concerns of the study. In Chapter 5, the findings of the study are presented and analysed, while chapter 6 is the penultimate chapter that discusses the research findings. Finally, chapter 7 is the conclusion of the study.
1.10 Conclusion

This chapter is the general introduction of the study. It outlined the general research area, focusing on issues such as the background of the problem under study. It also concerned itself with the exploration of the problem statement. The researcher outlined the state of the art in the area under investigation vis-a-vis the focus of the present research. The aims and objectives of the study were also outlined. Research questions of the study were also spelt out and they clearly showed what sort of questions the present research seeks to answer. The significance of the present study was discussed under the rationale section. The chapter also provided a sketch of the literature review, an overview of the theoretical concerns of the study as well as a brief insight into the methodological approaches employed by the study. The next chapter provides a comprehensive literature review.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter was a general introduction of the study. It introduced the general research area and situated the present study within its methodological and theoretical perspectives. The previous chapter also provided a sketch of the literature review. This chapter provides a comprehensive literature review of the study. As has been acknowledged in the rationale section of this thesis in chapter 1, family language policy (FLP) is a very recent development in language policy studies, as such there is still a dearth of studies focusing on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of ethnic minority languages in general and Zimbabwe in particular. However, Curdt-Christiansen (2013) notes in the past decade, FLP has been gaining momentum and has been receiving considerable attention as scholars seek to understand questions such as why (and how) do members of some transnational families maintain their language while members of other families lose their heritage language. FLP studies have also sought to understand the policies and practices that parents employ to promote and discourage the use of certain languages in bilingual communities (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013).

Further, FLP studies have frequently sought to understand how these language policies and practices are negotiated in private domains and concomitantly, related to broader ideologies of language and language education policies (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). A lot of studies have been devoted to the understanding of macro language policy in general, at the broader national level. Such studies are also reviewed here as they undoubtedly have the potential to shed light on the current subject. In the Zimbabwean and African context, there is a conspicuous lacuna of scholarship within the FLP tradition. Discussions on the role of the home domain as a micro planning sphere in language management have hardly been specialised and comprehensive. Many scholars working within the language revivalist conservationist paradigm do mention, albeit in passing the importance of the home and family domain in the intergenerational transmission of minority languages. However, no empirical studies have been done to ascertain the impact of
FLP on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. This research is undoubtedly groundbreaking in that sense.

Most studies on family language policy have tended to focus on heritage language maintenance among immigrant communities (e.g. Schwartz, 2008; Schwartz and Moin, 2011; Kayam, 2013; Altman, Burstien Feldman, Yitzhaki, Amarn Lotem and Walters, 2014). From the studies reviewed, it is apparent that most scholars working within the FLP tradition do not foreground language conservation as their concern, but are rather interested in the bilingual development of children in immigrant families. The researcher could not locate many studies that focused on family language policy among indigenous people in the context of minority language conservation and language revitalisation. Where mentioned, FLP is marginally treated and generalised, moreso within studies focusing particularly on Zimbabwe. In most cases, FLP is inferred than explicitly foregrounded as an important approach as far as understanding intergenerational transmission of minority languages is concerned.

This chapter begins by locating the study in the field of language policy by reference to definitions and approaches to language planning. The top down and the bottom up dichotomy in language planning are elucidated and clarified by reference to literature on the subject. This is done with the intention to locate the preferred approach on which the present study is grounded. The instrumental and the sociolinguistic approaches are also discussed and the preferred slant which informs this study is clarified. Literature review is presented using the funnel approach. World literature on FLP and minority language conservation is reviewed first, followed by the review of literature from the African stage in general. The review finally narrows down to literature focusing on Zimbabwe, which is the context to which the findings of the present study are intended to be generalised.

2.2 Language planning and policy: Definitions and approaches

This section provides a review of literature that relates to the definitions of the concepts of language planning and policy as well as the various approaches to language planning and policy.
2.2.1 Definitions of language planning and policy

In much of the literature, the definition of language planning is contested for a number of reasons. Different scholars with different intents and purposes have different conceptions of language planning. Deumert (2000) notes that the term language planning was first used by Einar Haugen in the late 1950s to refer to all “conscious efforts that aim at changing the linguistic behaviour of a speech community” (Deumert, 2000:384). While language planning can also be summarily seen as a deliberate human intervention to language issues with a view to solve language related problems (Rubin and Jernudd, 1971; Das Gupta, 1973; Fishman, 1974; Karam, 1974), “there is no clear-cut or water-tight definition of language planning that is universally accepted” (Mutasa, 2009). This is because of the scope of language planning can vary from person to person, from time to time and from place to place (Darquennes, 2013) especially when considered as “a problem solving activity concerned with deliberate language change for specific aims, which may be social, political or educational (or a mixture of all three)” (Kennedy, 1983:1). Mutasa (2009) exclaims that the more than twelve definitions of language planning which appeared after the publication of Haugen’s (1959) article are testament to the problematic nature of defining language planning in a universally accepted sense.

However, a more comprehensive definition is given by Haugen (1987) who relates language planning to any deliberate, human initiated effort to alter a language(s) in terms of use, structure or acquisition and may even range from “proposing a new word to a new language” (Haugen, 1987:627). For the present study, the term can be appropriately understood as it relates to “deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language orders” (Cooper, 1989 cited in Viriri, 2003:5). This definition augurs well into the scope of the present study. The present study seeks to understand the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The significance of this definition is that it affords the concept of language planning to be extended to the family domain, where human actors, in the form of parents can deliberately initiate efforts to enforce or discourage the acquisition of particular languages within the family. Within the scope of the present study, language planning is also taken to refer to “the formulation and proclamation of an explicit plan or policy, usually but not necessarily written in a
formal document about language use” (Spolsky, 2004:11). Because of its attempt to relate language practices, language beliefs and language management within the family to the broader language practices at macro level, the present study also interacts well with Mkanganwi’s (1992:222) views that:

Language planning reveals language as one more object of human manipulation—not only by language specialists but also by persons who may change its basic nature through their attitudes, their myths about language and their subjective reactions to language. Language planning may be defined as the conscious, predictive approach to language and language use. It has as its central focus the identification of language problems that are related both linguistically and socio-politically.

The above is also premised on Gernuud and Das Gupta’s (1971) idea that language is a resource that has to be planned in the same manner that other natural resources are. The planning therefore should culminate in a language policy, itself defined by Bamgbose (1991) as a programme of action on the role or status of a language in a community in relation to other languages in an essentially multilingual community. In the same vein, Spolsky (2004:11) opines that a language policy may take “the form of a clause in a constitution, or a language law, or a cabinet document or an administrative regulation.” Conceived this way, the concept of a language policy would be limited to official, formal decisions articulated at the government level regarding the use, status and promotion of language(s) (Kadenge and Mugari, 2015).

As intimated earlier, the notion of FLP in this study affords the concept of language policy to be extendable to more localised planning spheres such as the home domain. Some scholars nevertheless tend to use the two terms, language planning and language policy interchangeably (Deumert, 2000). However, although the two are sometimes used as synonyms, language policy precisely relates more to the general linguistic, political and social goals that underlie the actual planning process (Deumert, 2000). In other terms, a language policy would refer to a course of preferred action that is likely to bring remedy to a problematic situation. Depending on the situation, language planning may take different forms (Mkanganwi, 1992). Bamgbose (2003) argues that language policy is sometimes overt in terms of pronouncements, laws, regulations and constitutional provisions but sometimes may have to be inferred from observed practices. In other words, absence of a definitive
policy statement does not mean absence of a policy; in fact, language policy is ever present in different forms (Bamgbose, 1991) in different spaces. Within the domain of the family, language management strategies deployed by parents can be “powerful mechanisms for affecting language practices, as they are supported by penalties and sanctions and can therefore ensure that policies carried out and turn from ideologies into practice” (Shohamy, 2006 cited in Kadenge and Mugari, 2015:3).

Language planning is normally determined by, and is reflective of the general government policy preferences. Noos (1971) cited in Bamgbose (1991:111) notes that:

There are three types of language policy: official language policy, which relates to languages recognised by the government and for what purposes; education language policy, which relates to the languages recognised by education authorities for use as media of instruction and subjects of study at the various levels of the public and private education; and general language policy which covers unofficial government recognition or tolerance of languages used in mass communication, business and contacts with foreigners.

The quote validates the point that any human effort aimed at influencing language use and choice in the domains identified would inform the language policy in the respective domains. However, in the whole scheme of things, family language policy is not given any form prominence. In fact, this is symptomatic of most literature on language planning and policy that does not give much attention to the importance of the home domain as a language management sphere whose language practices may impact on intergenerational transmission of minority languages. Although the types of language policies identified by Noos (1971) cited in Bamgbose (1991) are usually discussed in a mutually exclusive manner, it should be noted that these can potentially impinge on each other. For example, official language policy may affect language in education policy, while the general language policy may affect and be affected by family language policy. In a way, the different types of policies may not successfully be understood in isolation. It is this thinking that thesis is premised on. It is also the contention of this study that language planning is not confined to the more formal, public institutions on a macro scale but can also be practised in the family at the micro level. The language practices at the family level can also be taken as reflective of language policy within the broader context of language management.
2.2.2 Types of language planning

There are broadly three recognised types or dimensions (Deumert, 2000) of language planning in the literature. These are status planning, corpus planning and lastly acquisition planning. The first two are easy to elaborate on as they are largely visible and overt. Acquisition planning may not be easy to define and characterise as it is normally covert and undeclared.

2.2.2.1 Status planning

Status planning refers to all efforts undertaken to change the use and function of a language or language variety within a given society, and this type of planning is responsible for prescribing official and national languages (Kadenge and Mugari, 2015) or the role of a language in a country at any level (Bamgbose, 1991). Status planning is usually a political activity as it involves the selection of a hierarchy of national and/or official languages (Bamgbose, 1991; Ndhlovu, 2009). The language that is spoken by the ruling elite is usually the one that is chosen to occupy the upper stratum in the hierarchy. It is inconceivable that ruling elite can choose a language that is not their own to be the official or national language. The official or national status usually bestows prestige upon the selected language as it becomes the language of government and all official business in the state. As such, the languages of the rulers are more likely to be chosen (Fasold, 1984). As argued by Mkanganwi (1992), although governments may be powerful (especially in the selection process); it is difficult for them to force people to adopt certain linguistic habits. This is partly due to the fact that there could be an existence of certain sociolinguistic factors that may militate against the preferred choices, albeit unbeknown to the planning authorities (Mkanganwi, 1992). In some instances, planning authorities may have simply chosen to ignore the sociolinguistic factors. The present research proceeds from the realisation that although the government articulated language policies are likely to succeed, partly because government has the power to enact legislation to compel implementation, in isolation government initiated policies in may not really be the best panacea for minority language conservation and maintenance. This is so because the macro policies may be in conflict with the micro preferences at the family or community level. In this regard, this thesis seeks to integrate the macro and
the micro spheres of language policy into a complementary language management currency.

2.2.2.2 Corpus planning

Corpus planning on the other hand is concerned with all efforts that are aimed at altering the language itself, or its structure through prescriptive interventions for the norm. As such, corpus planning activities include processes such as standardisation, terminology unification; language modernisation as well as graphisation (Deumert, 2000). These aim at interfering with the internal structure of the language corpus hence the term corpus planning. In the same light, Kadenge and Mugari (2015); Hornberger (1990) also identify language purification, standardisation unification and modernisation to be among some of the broader goals of corpus planning. Mutasa (2009:27) therefore gives a précis of corpus planning thus:

… Corpus planning involves the development of a language that includes lexical development, the codification and standardization or harmonisation of a language, the creation and updating of terminology as well as the production of dictionaries and glossaries. In broad and general, it denotes planned changes to the structure of a language so that it may meet certain specified requirements, typically those of the standard language used in official domains and domains of higher education and in philosophical, scientific and technical discourse.

From the above, it is quite evident that status planning, because of the specialised nature of activities undertaken, is the business of language specialists, although political influence may also be felt. It is normally the language variety spoken by the elites that is likely to be standardised or that can be used as a reference point in coming up with the version of the language to be considered as the ‘norm.’ However, the technical nature of activities in corpus planning demands the indispensability and involvement of linguists and other language specialists.

2.2.2.3 Acquisition planning

Acquisition planning is a more recent addition to the types of language interventions (Deumert, 2000) that aims at increasing the numbers of speakers in a particular language (Fasold, 1984) through promoting its spread and learning (Deumert, 2000). Here, “the focus is on increasing the number of speakers, possibly for national imperatives set in the relevant documents as unity and education” (Kadenge and
Mugari, 2015:3). Because it is not effective to coerce people into acquiring a certain language, acquisition planning is normally carried out in a covert manner, where state institutions are used to further or promote the acquisition of a language. Since educational institutions are key apparatus of a nation state especially in the articulation and inculcation of state values, they are also deployed as gatekeeping tools (Ndlovu, 2013) to prop up preferred practices within the wider state. For example, when a foreign language is prescribed to be the medium of instruction in schools, every child of school going age is compelled to learn it. In fact, Ndlovu (2013:13 citing Cooper, 1989:33) uses terms acquisition planning synonymously with “language in education planning.” This is likely because the use of a particular language in education ensures that the numbers of speakers of that particular language, never mind the varying degrees of proficiency in it, will increase. Ndlovu (2013:33-34) concurs that:

Acquisition planning is achieved by the creation or improvement of opportunities or incentives to learn a language. It is unlikely to succeed if the concerned language serves no useful function for the target population. Very few people prefer to teach or acquire a language or its literacy only for its own sake. Acquisition planning is not likely to succeed if the target language is not useful or has no instrumental value for its speakers. An increase in the economic value of a language will mean that such a language become essential in the work-place. Knowledge of that language will be demanded for access to job opportunities, especially for particular occupations that promote its teaching and learning.

As argued earlier, language planning at the macro level of government usually is reflective of the general government policy. During the colonial era in Africa for instance, the Portuguese, the Spanish and the French colonies were subjected to ideology of assimilado, a form of colonial governance system that encouraged assimilation to a common political and cultural destiny, that deployed linguistic and cultural qualification as the key determinants of citizenship (Mkanganwi, 1992). As such language policies responded to and mirrored this kind of colonial ideology. Typical examples in southern Africa would include colonial era Mozambique where the indigenous languages were de-emphasised and people were hegemonically assimilated to the Portuguese culture, language and ideology. The authorities thus encouraged the use of Portuguese at the expense of indigenous languages to the extent that Portuguese was the only language permitted in education (Mkanganwi, 1992). Resultantly, “if one or two dominant language(s) are emphasised in the
school curriculum, speakers of other languages are forcibly assimilated into the dominant languages because education through the medium of the dominant language is decisive in this assimilation” (Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar, 2010:11 cited in Ndlovu, 2013:20).

The Mozambican example therefore was an overt case of acquisition planning, as it was in most African colonies. In other regions however, acquisition planning may take a different form. The incentivising of knowledge of a particular language may as well be seen as a subtle case of acquisition planning as more and more people may be compelled to learn the language so as to gain social or economic advantage as argued by Ndlovu above. The case of English in colonial and post-colonial Africa can be seen as one such example. Benefits tend to accrue for any speaker who is fluent in English, as such; acquisition of English has become indispensable for upward social mobility and in scaling the ladder of success. Former English colonies find themselves in this dilemma. English is the official language in most if not all of these colonies, and is thus the medium of instruction in schools as well as a prerequisite for further study and employment. I argue that this is a form of subtle acquisition planning.

Aspects of acquisition planning are considered key in the current study. Family language policy can be understood as within the context of the desire by language managers in the home domain to encourage or discourage the use and acquisition of particular languages in that sphere. As such, the language practices in the home domain may be viewed as an implicit policy that may promote the acquisition of one language or the other. There are a number of studies that have looked at the family as a microcosm of the community and the extent to which preferred language policies in the family impact on language proficiencies of successive generations. For intergenerational transmission of a language to be possible, it sounds correct to argue that family policies must deliberately support the acquisition the home language.

**2.2.3 Mutual interaction of types of language planning**

Although the types of language planning can be delineated and explicated independent of each other, in actual language planning practice, the three are mutually inclusive and tend to interact. For example, the allocation of a new status to
a language (status planning activity) will require changes in the linguistic system (corpus planning activity) such as the development of new styles (Deumert, 2000). When a language has been allocated a status hitherto reserved for another, the need for that language to be able to cater for the new functional expectations may also mean language has to be modernised so that it can be able to deal with functional diversification. Also, when a language has been standardised and modernised (corpus planning activity), it is more likely to be elevated to functional roles previously deprived of (status planning activity). Languages that have a prestigious status are most likely to be acquired by more people than a language with a lower status. While one is involved in acquisition planning, it is also important that the language being forwarded for acquisition is standardised so as to reduce the variations in the written form as the same language is likely to be the official language or language of instruction in schools.

The current study is cognisant of the fact that the types of planning discussed above potentially impinge on each other. Although the main focus of the research is on the impact of family language policy on conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, there are potentially other language management practices outside the home that may affect the language practices in the home and FLP. The home domain is not considered exclusively of the other language management spheres.

2.3 Approaches in language planning

This section focuses on different approaches to language planning.

2.3.1 Bottom-up approaches as alternatives to top-down language planning

Language planning has for some time been conceived as a state initiated activity, whereby decisions about language use and language status are handed down to the population, without much proactive involvement of the speakers in the decision making process. Packaged in this sense, language planning will therefore be seen as a top down affair (Ndlovu, 2013), whereby local communities are expected to implement policies they did not help craft, policies which might even contradict local preferences. This kind of planning potentially leads to antagonistic behaviour at the local grassroots implementation. Top-down language planning contrasts with bottom-up planning. Resistance to macro level policies at the micro level implementation
may be a result of uninformed macro level planning that does not consider the views held by language speakers at the lower level of society. In this light, top-down planning is likely to be unsuccessful contrasted with bottom-up planning. According to Ndlovu (2013:54) bottom-up approaches are also referred to as:

... local context planning, bottom-to-top language planning, micro level language planning, community-based language planning, grassroots planning or initiatives, democratic language planning, language planning from below and non-governmental language planning.

This study views FLP as an overt manifestation of bottom up planning as it has its agency at the micro level. This research also considers FLP to potentially affect and be affected by macro level planning at government level. Contemporary focus on agency in language planning has shifted from the macro sphere to the micro sphere. This paradigm shift has can be explained by the belief that success of any language policy should have the buy in of local stakeholders, for whom the language policy is intended. The family domain, which is the focus of this study, is one local sphere where language planning takes place.

Most people would acknowledge that the impact of language planning and policy depends heavily on meso and micro level involvement and support (Kaplan and Baldauf, 2003). There are a number of studies that have looked at micro support for the implementation of macro language planning and policy. These have proven that the two, macro level planning and the micro level planning should be complementary to ensure success (Ndlovu, 2013). If the two are antagonist to each other, this poses a threat to the success of language planning initiatives because elites in the top down or counter elites in the bottom-up planning are not likely to embrace the language planning initiatives they do not perceive to be in their own interest (Cooper, 1989). In bottom-up planning, the agentive role of lower levels of the community is considered pivotal. Ndlovu (2013:54) notes that:

Bottom-up planning is where lower levels and even communities make an input to language planning or initiate language planning. Matters that require a decision will be considered by the community, likely to be affected by the decision and initiatives, to make changes to the policy. Change will originate from individuals, organisations and other non-governmental institutions or organisations that represent the speakers.
The present study focuses on family language policy as a bottom-up approach to language planning. There is a high likelihood of success if grassroots support of language policy is initiated by the speakers of the languages than if policy is crafted by the elites. Grassroots language planning efforts are essentially language cultivation approaches in that speakers of the language are primary agents of the planning process and that increases the likelihood for the maintenance of the cultural and linguistic heritage (Hatoss, 2008). Language management principles applied in bottom up planning are largely influenced by local needs although they can also be influenced by the macro policy. The above point resonates with the present study in a variety of ways. The present study seeks to ascertain how local planning at the level of the family can influence decisions about minority language conservation at the macro scale. In this study, the role of the family institution is foregrounded as an important sphere for intergenerational transmission of minority languages. Therefore, family language ideologies, language practices and management are considered to be important aspects of FLP that are likely to give direction to conservation efforts. When speakers of minority languages become aware of language related threats to the interests of their communities (Ndlovu, 2013), this may add impetus to revitalisation and conservation efforts. The threats may be involuntary assimilation to the dominant language, marginalisation, and (or) exclusion of their language in higher domains, threats to the community’s linguistic identity and ethno linguistic vitality or intergenerational language shift (Romaine, 2002). Grassroots initiatives are by their nature intended to seek redress on social inequality, injustice or inequity. It also actively defends identity (Ndlovu, 2013).

Micro level planning potentially challenges the dominance of hegemonic languages since it is based on collective community ideologies that may be tailor made to resist dominance of any kind (Baldauf, 1994; 2005). Language becomes a rallying point for such communities. Recent studies strongly suggest that bottom-up approaches may potentially be more successful than top-down approaches and are thus touted as the most promising in terms of community commitment and sustainability of language planning and policy (Alexander, 1992; Adegbija, 1993; Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer, 1998; Webb, 2002; 2009) hence the focus of the present study.
2.3.2 Instrumental versus sociolinguistic approaches in language policy

Success of any language policy depends largely on whether or not the approach employed is relevant to the specific context it is carried out in. According to Deumert (2000) the degree of acceptability of changes bestowed upon a language status or corpus corresponds to the degree of success of the language planning activity. Haugen (1966) identifies the acceptability criterion as a hallmark of good planning. The instrumental and the sociolinguistic approaches are the two widely distinguished approaches that influence the degrees of acceptability of a language policy. These approaches are also recognised by Haugen (1971); Fasold (1984); Ray (1963) and Tauli (1968). The instrumental approach views language as a mere tool for communication which is imperfect in its natural state (Deumert, 2000) and hence scholars working in this paradigm are continually obsessed with the improvement of the corpus. Their preoccupation therefore is with the improvements to the aesthetic qualities of a language, linguistic efficiency, communicative adequacy as well as its beauty and uniformity (Deumert, 2000). Under this approach, language is considered in isolation from its symbolic value and its symbiotic relationship to the generality of its speakers. There is documented likelihood of failure of any language policy that does not consider the relationship between languages and their speakers. Instrumental approaches are essentially top down in nature as language attitudes which may run counter to the acceptance of proposed linguistic improvements or status changes are believed to be easily changeable by propaganda and the exercise of political power and authority (Tauli, 1968). Language planning is therefore taken to be a technical linguistic exercise.

On the other hand, a more speaker oriented approach is tenable. The sociolinguistic approach stresses the social and symbolic context of language use and language attitudes (Deumert, 2000). This approach is based on the belief that language is embedded in the social life of its speakers and therefore any language planning activity that does not take this into account is likely to be met with futility. A comprehensive understanding of the social, historical, political and cultural context and variables is likely to result in informed decision making. Language planning therefore is not seen only as far as linguistic factors alone are concerned, but also seen as a social, political and cultural enterprise to some degree (Deumert, 2000).
The present study is therefore informed by the sociolinguistic approach in that it does not consider the minority languages in isolation to the conditions under which they exist. Local conditions as well as the national conditions are given due consideration as these are seen as largely affecting family language policies of minority language speakers. The current language policy situation at the macro national level is inescapably complicit in the perpetuation of minority language marginalisation in Zimbabwe, and the view held in this study is that redress is only achievable when the micro, the meso and the macro level language planning start to intercourse and interact.

2.4 Family language policy and the conservation of minority languages

This section focuses on the review of literature that relates to family language policy and the conservation of minority languages.

2.4.1 World literature

According to Spolsky (2009); Curdt-Christiansen (2013) family language policy has raised considerable interest and curiosity from researchers only recently, and mostly in countries where ethnic minorities are found. FLP can be defined as explicit and overt planning in relation to language use within the home among family members (Schiffman, 1996; Shohamy, 2006). As an extension of the classical language planning (King, Fogle and Logan-terry, 2008), FLP is a recent phenomenon that has turned its attention to language policy at the family level (Smith-Christmas, 2014).

As intimated earlier, language planning in the traditional sense has been viewed as a government initiated and government spearheaded activity, aimed at altering language use patterns and the formal interventions to the structure of a language with the aim of solving language problems within the nation. According to Bamgbose (1991) this conception of language planning is largely seen as alien to African realities as it considers government or the state as a major driver of the language planning process, thereby ignoring the role played by other agencies and institutions that may affect the success of the larger planning process. The family institution is one such domain where language planning occurs, albeit outside the direct control and influence of the government controlled language policy, but potentially affecting and being affected by it. In most language planning scholarship, the impact of FLP
on the conservation of minority languages has been given marginal attention, moreso within the African context.

Spolsky (2008) argues that the loss of natural intergenerational language transmission is recognised as the key marker of language loss, and it occurs within the family. Thus, the family should be considered as a domain relevant to language policy, though seldom until recently studied independently. It is therefore expected that understanding of language choices by ethnic minorities at the family level may contribute to language revitalisation and conservation efforts as well as aid the comprehension of the processes of language shift from a broader language planning perspective at societal levels (Spolsky, 2009). Schwartz (2008) argues that minority language maintenance, conservation and family language policy are inextricably linked. From its inception, research in the field of language maintenance and shift has underscored the critical role of the family in the preservation of ethnic minority languages (also referred to here as L1; home language, or heritage language). According to King et al. (2008:907) this newly emerging field of FLP “provides an integrated overview of research on how languages are managed, learned and negotiated within families.”

Kasatkina (2011) studied the process of language shift and maintenance among Russian immigrants from the former Soviet Union living in the United States of America. Kasatkina’s study focused on the resolution of the language question among the Russian immigrants. To that end, she sought to understand the various dispositions towards the maintenance of Russian among Russian immigrants. In other words, her study was motivated by the desire to understand how some immigrants are able to maintain their mother tongue in a country that does not support multilingualism especially for immigrants (Kasatkina, 2011). Deploying the Integrated Public Microdata Series (IPUMAS) (Kasatkina, 2013:35), she discovered that weak dispositions towards the maintenance of Russian by Russian immigrants in America was linked to “the influx of Russian speaking immigrants to the United States between 1990 and 2000, when opportunities Russians/Russian speakers to communicate in their language sharply increased” (Kasatkina, 2011:35). As such, she explains the loss of Russian within the context of the year of immigration, suggesting that susceptibility to abandon Russian is not only determined by the number of speakers but also by the conditions in the host country during the period
of immigration. In her study, Kasatkina (2011) analyses language choices and practices in the home in an attempt to understand how the language practices among minority immigrant families impacted on the loss of Russian. Without explicitly mentioning ‘family language policy,’ her analysis of language use among Russian families is done within the confines of family language policy. The present study profits from Kasatkina (2011) in the sense that it is afforded a window into understanding how language practices in the home can potentially impact on language conservation, especially among minority language speakers. The present study however differs from Kasatkina (2011) in that the present study seeks to assesses the impact of family language policy on the conservation of indigenous minority languages, while the study under review looks at language maintenance and shift among immigrant families, whose home languages are not indigenous to the host country.

Hua and Wei (2016) discussed the experiences of three multilingual and transnational Chinese families living in Britain in dealing with bilingualism and multilingualism. They also sought to understand how different individuals and different generations in the same families perceived social relations and social structures within the construction and presentation of their own identities. Among some of their pertinent findings was that “different generations and individuals within the same family have vastly different sociocultural experiences” (Hua and Wei, 206:655). As such, these differences not only impacted on family relations but also on family language policy. Hua and Wei’s (2016) study illuminates the present study in a number of ways. Firstly, it lends insights to the present study on how generational and sociocultural experiences may impact family language policy. It also shows that family language policy may be mediated by extra familial experiences. The study also reveals that family language policy is influenced by different ideologies and beliefs based on “experiences, histories, imaginations, why they (speakers) feel the way they feel and why they do things the way they do” (Hua and Wei, 2016:656). This speaks to the nature of language ideologies and how they influence language practice, also a key concern of the present study. The present study is informed in part by the language management theory, which puts at the fore, the importance of language ideologies in understanding practice and management. However, the present study’s point of departure is that it mostly focuses on parental
views on language ideologies practices and management within selected minority language speaking families in Zimbabwe. In the present study, language ideologies are considered from the point of view of minority language parents, who are considered key in the formulation and direction of family language policy, and are therefore the key participants in this research.

De Houwer and Bornstein (2016) engaged thirty one bilingual mothers to solicit for their self reports on what language(s) they spoke with their children in the context of family language policy. Their point of departure was that parental language choice in bilingual families is an important aspect of family language policy, yet very little is known regarding the factors that affect it. Their study established that most mothers addressed their children in the same single language. Relying on videotaped mother-child interactions within the various levels of children’s linguistic development, “observational data confirmed mothers’ use of mainly a single language in interactions with their children, but also showed the occasional use of the other language in over half the sample when children were over 20months” (De Houwer and Bornstein, 2016:680). They argued that these language practices impacted on children’s overall language development as well as demonstrated the difficulty of parental adherence to the ‘one parent one language’ policy. While grounded within the family language policy paradigm, De Houwer and Bornstein’s study sought to make conclusions on how child directed speech within the context of bilingual families impacted on the overall child’s bilingual development. The present study however, while seeking to understand the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages, foregrounds children’s language development in their minority home languages. The present study focuses on the impact of family language policy in aiding intergenerational transmission of minority home languages in Zimbabwe, especially guided by Fishman’s (1991) view that the survival of any minority language is dependent upon its transmission to the younger generation by the parents in the home. While De Houwer and Bornstein specifically focus on mothers’ language choice in child directed speech, the present study goes beyond merely looking at mothers, by considering language choices, language preferences, practices and ideologies of minority language parents in general. As such, in this study, the target population is not just limited to ‘mothers’ but ‘parents’ in general. However, the two studies are in mutual conversation to an extent in that they are
both carried out in the context of multilingualism and they also consider parental language choices and language ideologies especially in the home to be paramount in the articulation of family language policy, and therefore on language use and language development of their children. As such, De Houwer and Bornstein’s (2016) study lends important insights to the present study regarding parental language choices and how they impact on FLP.

Deploying a case study on two Chinese–English bilingual families in Singapore, Ren and Hu (2013) demonstrate the importance of incorporating family language policy and family literacy practices in understanding early children’s language and literacy acquisition within the family setting. Through comparing how the two families “drew on language practices from multiple resources to involve their children in an array of bilingual/illiteracy activities” (Ren and Hu, 2013:63), they demonstrate the importance of language socialisation processes such as prolepsis, syncretism and synergy in facilitating children’s bilingual development at home. To that end, Ren and Hu (2013) show that children’s language development is impacted by family members’ cultural background, educational beliefs, and parental aspirations for their children. They also demonstrate the centrality of language ideologies in shaping language practices and management in the home. The present study, much like Ren and Hu’s takes also employs a case study approach in trying to understand how parental language ideologies, beliefs and practices impact on language management and therefore on family language policy. Having said that, it must be acknowledged that the present study also puts parental language ideologies at the centre of family language policy among the minority language speakers. It views parents as conscious language managers who have the capacity to drive and give direction to family language policy for the conservation of minority language in Zimbabwe. Ren and Hu’s (2013) study therefore illuminates the present study in more ways than one. It sheds light on how parental language ideologies can influence family language policy. It also lends insights into how other extra-familial actors can potentially impact on FLP and how literacy practices in extra familial domains such as the school can influence children’s language practices at home. Moreover, their study provides a window into the different intervention strategies that parents may employ in the realisation of their preferred language practices in the home especially by the children. Most pertinently, the study also shows the importance of the
interaction between the different language management spheres, and different individuals who are at the centre of language socialisation of children such as the grand parents in the realisation of desired language competencies among the children. The present study also seeks to locate the synergies between the top down and bottom up planning authorities in the conservation of minority languages, in the context of FLP. Theoretically, both the study under review and the present study are predicated on Spolsky’s (2004; 2009) language policy framework to understand “what and how factors within and external to the family domain can influence language ideology, practices and/or management at home” (Ren and Hu, 2013:65).

Perez Baez (2013) investigated family language policy among speakers of San Lucas Quiavini Zapotec (SLQZ) in diaspora in Los Angeles. The researcher was particularly interested in how interactional patterns in the home domain related to parental ideologies concerning the relationship between language and place of birth impacted on language acquisition (Perez Baez, 2013). By reference to data collected through the use of interviews and participant observation, the researcher discovered that parental decisions on FLP were influenced by issues that went beyond their own language ideologies. She also found out that family external language intervention factors promoted the shift from SLQZ especially where parents had weak impact beliefs regarding their potential to influence their children’s acquisition of the minority language. The present study similarly puts emphasis on language practices in the home domain as paramount in the intergenerational transmission of minority languages in Zimbabwe, with particular focus on the Kalanga and Tonga speakers. Pertinently, the concept of Family language policy is foregrounded in both studies as being able to provide an understanding into the language choices, language practices and language management within the home to the benefit of minority language conservation. As such, Perez Baez study speaks to the present study quite sonorously. While Perez Baez (2013) concentrates on non-native Mexican immigrants in Los Angeles, the present study explores the impact of family language policy on the conservation of native/indigenous minority languages in Zimbabwe.

Similar to Perez Baez (2013) reviewed above, Seloni and Sarfati (2013) investigated the diminished use of Judeo-Spanish among Jews living in Turkey in the context of family language practices. Much like Perez Baez (2013) and indeed the present study, Seloni and Sarfati sought to understand how language ideologies and
practices contributed to the demise of Judeo-Spanish. By deploying a “life history inquiry based on two oral history archives documenting elderly Turkish-Jewish community members’ lived experiences in Turkey” (Seloni and Sarfati, 2013:7), they noted the reciprocity and interaction between macro and micro level language management. To that end, they discuss how macro level national policy impacts on micro family level language practices in the context of negative attitudes towards Judeo-Spanish that are reproduced in the family and in specific language practices, mirroring the broader societal monolingual language ideologies. In their study, Seloni and Sarfati argue that “family language policy is embedded in larger socio-political realities” (Seloni and Sarfati, 2013:8). For them therefore, language shift can be fully comprehended by examining the conversation between family external language ideologies and language practices within the family. As an example, they cite the monolingual national policies of the 1920s and 1930s in the Turkish Republic that promoted French and Turkish as desirable languages to the detriment of Judeo-Spanish which in turn transformed language practices within Turkish-Jewish families (Seloni and Sarfati, 2013).

The present study, just like Seloni and Sarfati (2013), Perez Baez (2013) above has some degree of interest in the interaction between the macro and micro level language practices and the articulation of FLP in the context of minority language conservation. Broadly, the present study is fixated in investigating the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. To achieve that, the present study uses the interview as the main data gathering tool while Seloni and Sarfati deployed the life history inquiry. Kalanga and Tonga speaking parents were the target population whose views regarding their language ideologies, their beliefs about language and how they impact on language management were solicited for. The present study together with Seloni and Sarfati (2013), Perez Baez (2013) all note the centrality of parents and parental ideologies in the articulation of FLP. In that light, the present study profits from the reviewed studies in important ways. While the present study triangulates Spolsky (2004; 2009) language management theory with Fishman’s (1991) reversing language shift theory (RLS), Seloni and Sarfati triangulated Spolsky’s (2004) and other critical approaches that foreground the effects of nationalism, transnationalism and cultural globalisation in the conceptualisation of FLP (Seloni and Sarfati, 2013). Their study therefore
lends important insights on how theoretical eclecticism can be profitably deployed to understand how different language practices and ideologies, together with sociocultural processes impact on FLP and therefore on intergenerational transmission of minority languages.

Curdt-Christiansen (2016) investigated conflicting language ideologies and contradictory language practices among three multilingual Singaporean families representing three major ethnic groups, namely, Chinese, Malay and Indian (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016). Drawing on family language policy as a theoretical framework, she observed language practices among the three families, noting the conflict between language ideologies and language practices. Curdt-Christiansen noted how power inflected language ideologies tended to become the source of antagonistic behaviour at the educational and social levels which in turn shaped family language practices (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016). For instance, she cites the conflict between the bilingual policy that recognises mother tongues and the educational policy that establishes English as the medium of instruction in schools in Singapore. She concludes that English is viewed as having an instrumental value while the mother tongues are viewed as having cultural functions. Language choices and practices within family domains in Singapore are thus “value laden in everyday interactions and explicitly negotiated through FLP” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016:694). Her study is important for the present research, not only for its theoretical insights, but also because of its potential to shed light on the relationship between language ideologies, language practice and language management in the context of FLP. It also demonstrates how parental expectations regarding language use within the family are important drivers of FLP. Further, it demonstrates how inconsistencies between ideologies and practices are manifested in parental expectations regarding their children’s language practices. In a way, the study also lends insights into the nature of problems likely to be faced in reconciling the need for intergenerational transmission of a minority language and the articulation of FLP. The present study likewise, is conducted within the realities of societal multilingualism, where there is a hierarchical ordering of languages based on functionality. As such, the present study capitalises on insights provided by Curdt-Christiansen (2016) regarding the problem ridden process of intergenerational transmission within the family, especially keeping
sight of the potential interaction between FLP and the wider national language policy at the macro level.

O'hlfearnain (2013) studied family language policy, focusing on how L1 Irish speaker attitudes affected community based responses to language shift. His research, much like the present study was informed by Fishman’s (1991) view that the core element on which successful minority language maintenance depends is intergenerational transmission of the language from parents to their children in the home. Among his findings was that the children’s linguistic competence alone does not guarantee intergenerational transmission of minority languages unless the parents are also motivated to do so. He also observed that bringing up children to speak Irish in a bilingual context dominated by English; a powerful global language was a big challenge. The present study, like O'hlfearnain’s also focuses on the home language maintenance by linguistic minorities in a predominantly bilingual setup. The target population of the present study, selected speakers of Kalanga and Tonga lineages are found in a bilingual environment of Matabeleland north and south provinces, dominated by the more powerful Ndebele language. It is therefore expected that O'hlfearnain’s (2013) study can shed more light regarding language ideologies and practices and preferences among linguistic minorities and their impact on language conservation in the context of language shift. The present study however goes further by attempting to marry FLP and the wider language policy at the macro level with an intention of arriving at a holistic understanding of the conversation between the two approaches in minority language conservation in Zimbabwe.

Smith-Christmas (2014) studied family language policy in the context of an extended bilingual Gaelic-English family on the Isle of Skye in Scotland. The ethnographic study, which drew data from a two week long recording, gave rise to a ten hour long corpus (Smith-Christmas, 2014). The research demonstrates how certain family members, namely, the children’s mother and paternal grandmother negotiated and reified a strongly Gaelic-centred FLP (Smith-Christmas, 2014). She also noted how other extended family members (the children’s father, his sister and brother) occasionally participated in this Gaelic-centred FLP, but at the same time, also participating in language shift by maintaining English as their peer group language and replying in English when addressed in Gaelic. The study argues that these linguistic practices socialise the children into the norms of language shift, resulting in
the children’s low use of Gaelic. The study observed the negative impact of the father’s use of Gaelic when disciplining his children as a source of negative attitudes towards Gaelic which further reproduces unpleasant associations of Gaelic with a disciplinary context. The study illuminates how indexicality of language use can impact on intergenerational transmission of Gaelic. The present study therefore profits from Smith-Christmas (2014) in a number of ways. Firstly, Smith-Christmas demonstrates the role of the family domain in the process of language shift. Secondly, she sheds light regarding the impact that language ideologies of parents may have in the subsequent shift or maintenance of minority languages. However, Smith-Christmas (2014), like O’Hlfearnain (2013) above, restricts the focus of her study to the locus of the family, without attempting to establish the conversation between FLP and the wider extra familial practices and language policy at the macro state level. Theoretically, Smith-Christmas’ study is predicated on Fishman’s (1991) view that the family institution and language practices in the home have a bearing on language revitalisation, maintenance and shift, in the same manner that the present study is.

Luykx (2005) argues that in situations of language shift, children may act as socialising agent on their parents with regards to language choice. In a study conducted with vernacular speaking migrant parents living with urban raised children in Cochabamba in Bolivia (Luykx, 2005), the findings demonstrated that parents can be influenced by the aspirations by their children to speak a non-native language in place of their mother tongue. Luykx’s (2005) study shows that contrary to popular belief that family language policies are normally articulated and enforced by parents who act as language managers in the home, there are instances where parents are placed in a linguistically subordinate position in the home (Luykx, 2005). He argues that parents are sometimes influenced by their children’s desires to conform to the wider national currency that places their L2 in a superior position as it is used in education and other official domains. Parents are therefore sometimes compelled to capitulate to the aspirations of their children, thereby demonstrating that FLP can also be forged and negotiated among parents and children. This study puts into perspective the fact that national policies potentially impinge on family language policy. The present study benefits from Luykx (2005) study in the sense that the impact of the national policy on the family language policy is illuminated. The study
also demonstrates how the family domain can, as a result of the tendency by parents to adopt children's language practices, be an agentive sphere perpetuating the process of language shift. It is therefore not cast in stone that family language policies are always respond positively to the call to conserve minority languages, but may, depending on the forces at play at the macro level, and parental impact beliefs, be an antithesis to the very process of language conservation. The present study is carried out in a similarly bilingual environment, where minority languages exist alongside majority and more prestigious languages. Luykx's study demonstrates that the articulation of strongly pro-minority FLPs are oftentimes impacted by the macro national policy which may place the minority languages in subordinate positions in all official domains. Unlike Luykx (2005) who foregrounds the children's role in the articulation and direction of FLP, the present research considers language management within the context of parental ideologies. In a multilingual setup, conscious beliefs about the value of one's language are effectively cultivated within the nucleus of the family despite the presence of forces militating against it at the macro level. The cultivation of an appreciation of the symbolic value of a people's language is rarely successfully realised on a national scale. At the macro scale, it is the instrumental value that takes precedence.

Kheirkhah (2016), like Luykx (2005) above also explored family interactions in five bi/multilingual Iranian immigrant families in Sweden, particularly focusing on the language socialisation processes and FLP in the context of family multilingualism (Kheirkhah, 2016). Much like Luykx (2005), the study found that parental language policies focused on the maintenance of heritage language are not cast in situ, but are negotiated and instantiated in parent-child interactions (Kheirkhah, 2016). The study also noted the role of child's resistance agency in influencing parental language practices and FLP. The significance of Kheirkhah (2016) study to the present research is in relation to its potential to shed light on the various language management strategies that parents deploy in the realisation of FLP especially among children. The study also put parents at the centre of intergenerational transmission of minority home language, just as the present study does. Moreover, the study under review also sheds light concerning how parental language ideologies do not always coincide with preferred language practices and expectations in the home. It also demonstrates how extra familial language practices may influence
children to have other preferences that run counter to parental beliefs and expectations.

Altman, Burstein Feldman, Yitzhaki, Amarn Lotem and Walters (2014) studied family language policy focusing on Russian-Hebrew bilingual preschool children in Israel. Altman et al. (2014) interests pivoted on their attempt to relating parental language ideologies and reported language use patterns to levels of proficiency in children, with an intention of making conclusions on children’s bilingual development. Preschool children from the targeted families were asked to respond to questions about language use, language choice, proficiency in Russian and Hebrew. The study observed that there is a relationship between FLP and language choice, language use and proficiency in Russian and Hebrew in bilingual preschool children. The conclusions of the study were based on interviews with sixty five parents who were classified to form families with strict-Russian, mild-Russian and pro-bilingual FLPs (Altman et al. 2014) in relation to parental language ideologies, beliefs and management. The categories for the description of FLP types in Altman et al. (2014) lend important insights for the present study, which essentially deploys the same criteria in the description of the nature of FLP among minority language families targeted for this study. Although grounded on the family as a domain of language practice and use, the study by Altman et al. (2014) appears to have been focused more on the ways in which FLPs of Russian speaking parents related to their children’s perceptions of language use and proficiency as well as their children’s actual performance in Russian L1 and Hebrew L2 (Altman et al., 2014) than on how the school system and other extra familial spheres impacted on FLP and intergenerational transmission. This has been the gap observed in the generality of reviewed studies. FLP appears to be studied as divorced from the overarching macro national language policy, a paradigm that the present study attempts to explore. Altman et al’s study seeks to theorise about language proficiency and children’s bilingual development rather than language policy perse. It is therefore from an acquisitionist rather than a revivalist, conservationist perspective, an approach that the current study seeks to entrench. However, issues relating to language acquisition and language development are not totally ignored in the present study because intergenerational transmission of minority languages depend largely on their acquisition by younger speakers.
In a manner almost akin to Altman et al. (2014) above, Schwartz and Moin (2011) focused on parents' assessment of their preschool children's bilingual development in the context of family language policy in Israel. Their study was premised on the notion that parents' assessment of their children's language development is a significant component of parent child communication, and an integral part of family language policy (Schwartz and Moin, 2011). Their study sought to examine the degree to which bilingual parents' reports of their children's language knowledge were “similar or different to their children’s actual language knowledge in Russian and Hebrew” (Schwartz and Moin, 2011:2). The study also focused on understanding the domains of language knowledge that parents related to or ignored in their own assessment of their children’s development as well as to understand “how parents’ assessment of their children’s bilingual language development is linked to the family’s language policy, and in particular, to their choice of bilingual versus monolingual preschool education” (Schwartz and Moin, 2011:2). Much like the present study, the research was conducted in the context of societal bilingualism, necessitated by immigration of Russian speakers into a predominantly Hebrew speaking territory in Israel. However, the point of departure for the present study does not only lie in its attempt to relate FLP to intergenerational transmission of minority languages, but also it does so within the context of indigenous languages, while Schwartz and Moin’s (2011) study focused on immigrant heritage languages. Schwartz and Moin (2011) also limit their primary attention to parent-child communicative paradigm within the locus of family while ignoring other extra familial factors that may indirectly affect the children’s language development and therefore impacting the realisation of FLP.

Schwartz (2008) looked at the family policy factors affecting first language (L1) maintenance among second generation Russian-Jewish immigrants in Israel in light of Spolsky (2004) model of language policy. Participants for the study consisted of seventy Russian-Hebrew speaking children with a mean age of 7, 2 (years, months) (Schwartz, 2008). The focus of the study was on how FLP, within Spolsky's model of language management influenced bilingual children’s L1 vocabulary skills (Schwartz, 2008). By deploying structured questionnaires to collect data from parents and children regarding language policy at home, the findings of the study validated the important role of teaching literate L1 in both family and non-formal educational
settings and to the children’s positive approach towards home language acquisition (Schwartz, 2008). Much like the present study, Schwartz (2008) study is anchored on Spolsky (2009) views that distinguish the three components in the language policy of a speech community as:

- Its language practices, the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire; its language beliefs or ideology, the beliefs about language and language use; and any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning or management.

The family is considered as an extremely important domain for studying language policy because of its critical role in forming the child’s linguistic environment. The present study although grounded in the same general language management theorising, also goes further by attempting to establish the mutuality between FLP among minority language speakers and the macro level of the state in language conservation efforts. The present study focuses on the selected minority language parents who are considered to be the authorities who are likely to influence the direction of FLP in the home.

Kayam (2013) studied heritage language maintenance among native speakers of English in Israel. Using the online questionnaire and the personal interview as research tools, the research focussed on the family language policy experiences, strategies, and outcomes of native English speakers raising children in a Hebrew dominant environment in Israel. To that end “the participants were allowed to speak freely on any aspect of heritage language maintenance and family language policy that interested them. They were also asked directly to address their feeling towards speaking Hebrew (the parents) and speaking English (the children)” (Kayam, 2013:309). The study demonstrates the importance of FLP, and especially the role of parental ideologies in the conservation of heritage languages. In this light, Kayam (2013) lends important insights to the present study in so far as it demonstrates the profitability of using the interview in gathering data relating to FLP. The interview is the main data collecting instrument deployed by the present study. Like the present study, Kayam’s (2013) study focused on language practices and experiences of minority groups within the family milieu in a bilingual setup. However, the study limited its scope to understanding language policy within the family without attempting to find the interaction between FLP and the general state language policy,
a key concern of the present research. The present study seeks to fill that void. Kayam’s study also focuses on English L1 families. English being a known global language which may have unassailable positions elsewhere beyond Israel, the dynamics that impinge on the conservation of English are expected to be different when compared to those likely to characterise minority African indigenous languages. The present study therefore differs from Kayam (2013) in that sense.

Grenoble and Whaley (1998) identified and discussed the external and internal micro and macro-variables which combine to increase or decrease language vitality. Using a framework developed by John Edwards (Grenoble and Whaley, 1998), they attempt to take into account the entirety of variables which can interact to precipitate language shift in a community. They also discuss the centrality of economic variables as in adding impetus language abandonment, especially by linguistic minorities within the context of multilingualism. The present study is carried out within a similar context where due consideration of non-linguistic factors that may impact on family language policy is key. Essentially, Grenoble and Whaley’s (1998) study demonstrate that language policy does not take place in a vacuum, but rather is influenced by the broader socio-political factors. However, Grenoble and Whaley do not comprehensively discuss the impact of FLP in revitalising those minority languages ‘sapped’ of their vitality. This present study attempts to integrate and understand the macro and the micro levels of language policy and their interaction in the articulation of FLP for the conservation of minority language in Zimbabwe.

Dorian (1998) discusses what he terms the “ideology of contempt” (Dorian, 1998:9) as a key factor that adds an impetus to the process of language shift. This ideology is viewed as compounded by ignorance about the complexity and expressive capabilities of African indigenous languages leading to some sort of linguistic social Darwinism which equates to “a correlation between adaptive and expressive capacity in a language and that language’s survival and spread” (Dorian, 1998:10). This attitude cumulatively leads to the lowering of prestige of minority languages, even to the minority language speakers themselves. Dorian’s work is very telling for this study as it demonstrates how particular languages, especially those that experience political success as national languages end up dwarfing those that do not. Further, Dorian’s work is also illuminating in the sense that it discusses the very important subject of self-worth and self-image among the minority language
speakers themselves, who are viewed as potential agents of the destruction of their languages. Their own negative view of their languages puts the process of language extinction on auto pilot in self-destruct mode. However, the ideological and language dynamics at the level of the family are not given prominence in his study. As such, the present study seeks to build from the insights provided by Dorian by engaging the minority language speakers themselves, in the attempt to understand the local dynamics, at the community level that affect language preservation and intergenerational transmission efforts. This study does not just end there but goes further by attempting to understand how the FLP dynamics are affected by, and can affect language policy at the national level.

Related to Dorian (1998) reviewed above, Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1998) discuss the emotional and psychological variables those accelerate language abandonment. They point out that the internal emotive issues that contribute to indigenous language abandonment may include unpleasant memories and fears, shame and embarrassment, and even the sense that “God does not like indigenous languages” (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer, 1998 cited in Hinton, 2000:289). These, as they argue, are internal reactions to the external ideology of contempt as explained in Dorian (1998). They demonstrate that conflicting messages to young people about the value of the language opposed to the anxieties and lack of real support by community members may lead to avoidance and a general unwillingness to learn the language, hence directly impacting on intergenerational transmission. In a pertinent way, the present study profits from (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer, 1998) in the sense that it demonstrates the net effect of language ideologies in the intergenerational transmission of languages. However, for (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer, 1998) it is evident that their preferred course of action for language revitalisation revolves around formal intervention strategies and formal teaching and learning. The home as a language management sphere that could potentially impact on revitalisation of minority languages does not feature significantly as part of the community based intervention strategy in their plan. Their study is nevertheless illuminating for the present research as it demonstrates the vital role that minority language speakers can play in the language conservation of their languages.

In examination the linguistic and social correlates of early language shift in a Garifuna community in Belize, Ravindranath (2009) analyses the externally-
motivated change in the status of the sociolinguistic variables as evidence of language shift to the dominant language in the community. He demonstrates the importance of parents’ language ideologies for the children’s linguistic socialisation. Although he does not mention the term ‘family language policy,’ these parent language ideologies are discussed within the context consistent with the major dictates of FLP. In the context of FLP, parents are usually regarded as the language managers who have the potential to influence language practices in the home and therefore in the articulation of FLP. Essentially, Ravindranath’s study informs the current study from a conceptual standpoint. It shows the extent of parental agency in intergenerational transmission of minority languages. However, Ravindranath’s study is informed by variationist theories. The present study is informed by language revitalisation and management theories. This is the point of departure for the present study. Further, the present study seeks to understand language conservation from a policy perspective.

2.4.2 African literature

Generally, the role of family language policy in the conservation of minority languages in Africa wide literature has not been given enough scholarly attention. However, as also attested by the present study, considerable interest is arising. Moore (2015) echoes Spolsky’s (2009; 2004) argument that family language policy is a space that has received limited analytic attention from language policy researchers in the same manner as religious language policy (RLP). Moore (2015) therefore attempts to locate her study at the intersection of family language policy, language education policy as well as religious language policy in a Muslim community in West Africa. In the study, Moore (2015) examined the religious education choices of four Fulbe families in northern Cameroon, paying particular attention to what their choices meant for children’s Arabic learning and what they say about families’ orientations towards Arabic (Moore, 2015). The study sought to examine how private choices are connected to forces in the public sphere, giving rise to changes in the ways faith; language and learning are practiced and conceptualized.

Moore’s (2015) study observed that the families’ policies with regards to their children’s religious (language) education were situated within the larger linguistic, social, and cultural context, domiciled on the broader changes in Islamic education
and Arabic learning in the community, in the wake of the Islamic resurgence. Focusing on “a language socialisation study of seven young Fulbe children into three languages (Fulfulde, Arabic, and French) at home, Qur’anic school, and public school in northern Cameroon” (Moore, 2015:1), the study demonstrated how changes in the religious, linguistic, and educational landscape interacted with FLP. Moore’s study, much like the present research is an attempt to situate language planning in the micro domain. The present study however goes beyond that by investigating the impact of FLP in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe whereas Moore’s study is focused on family language policy and its impact on religion in Cameroon. Although the contexts and scope of the two studies differ, it is noteworthy that the present study benefits from Moore’s since it is one of the few researches in the African literature that looks at language policy from the view of the micro sphere of the family.

Kamuangu (2006) investigated language policies and practices of selected DRC immigrant families living in South Africa, paying particular attention to how their language policies impacted on children’s schooling, on family relations and on relations outside of these (Kamuangu, 2006). Methodologically, his study deployed observations and semi structured interviews with parents, children, principals, teachers and peers of two children from each family (Kamuangu, 2006). Deploying Spolsky’s (2004) theory of language management, he sought to analyse language use and language practices in the immigrant families, on the backdrop of a broader interaction between family internal and family external forces and how these mediated the articulation of FLP. One of his main findings was that gender and the patriarchal ideology, coupled with ethnicity and family external forces, played a pivotal role in FLP (Kamuangu, 2006). The study also noted how FLP was influenced by speakers’ feelings of marginalisation and exclusion in their quest to fit into the host society and to acquire material resources (Kamuangu, 2006). The study under review interacts with the present study in a number of ways. It potentially sheds light on the importance of family language ideologies in the articulation of FLP. Through its deployment of Spolsky’s (2004) language management theory, the study resonates with the present study in important ways. It shows how FLP can potentially be influenced by external language practices, such as language use in the school. However, the present study’s focus goes beyond merely analysing language
ideologies and practices in the home. Essentially, the present study seeks to make conclusions, based on language practices and language ideologies, about the potential impact of FLP on the intergenerational transmission of minority indigenous languages in Zimbabwe while Kamuangu (2006) is mainly focused on the relationship between immigrant languages and South African languages in the context of FLP. However, it is noteworthy that both the present study and the study being reviewed appreciate the interaction between the macro level and the micro level language influences in the realisation of FLP.

Batibo (2009) investigated the role of community based language documentation in the empowerment of the minority languages of Africa. In supporting the UNESCO ACALAN advocacy for accelerated documentation activities in Africa (Batibo, 2009), he demonstrates how collaborative activities with other institutions, such as non-governmental organisations and Church groups can enhance the process of documentation of the most endangered languages. Batibo also observes the high impact that collaborative research undertakings can create as a result of combined expertise, experience and resources. By drawing examples from Botswana, Batibo demonstrates how various ethno-linguistic communities of Botswana have helped to preserve the linguistic and cultural wealth of their respective communities as well as revitalize the respective languages and the traditional way of life of the people (Batibo, 2009). He contends that this is because the relevant communities have been involved in the various research undertakings, thus building a sense of participation and ownership. Batibo’s work illuminates the present study in a number of ways. Firstly, it reveals the importance of Community based language reclamation initiatives as bottom up approaches in language planning. Similarly, the present study is a bottom-up oriented study as it seeks to demonstrate the potential of community and grassroots initiatives in the conservation of minority languages. He argues that community based approaches in language conservation have the advantage of involving the cooperation and goodwill of the language speakers (Batibo, 2009). In the absence of the buy in of the speakers, communities may become hostile or resentful to researchers as they see them as coming to take away their indigenous knowledge without the community benefiting from such research endeavours. He cites instances in which researchers have had “to pay big sums of money just to appease un-cooperating villagers, such as the case of the Khoesan
groups in Botswana who consider themselves to be exploited by foreign scholars” (Batibo, 2009:202).

Secondly, it explicates the importance of collaborative efforts by communities and various stakeholders for successful reversal of language shift. The present study profits from Batibo’s views as this study also seeks a multipronged approach to the conservation of minority languages. Although there are striking similarities in approach, Batibo does not comprehensively and explicitly discuss the role of family language policy as an important avenue for the transmission of minority languages through generations for posterity. Documentation as a strategy may be futile if not supported by the speakers through the intergenerational transmission of the language. Language management strategies in the home can impinge on the continued use of the language. These views, marginally treated in Batibo (2009) form the points of departure for the present study.

Batibo (2005) continues in his quest to document the various factors that have led to language endangerment in Africa. He demonstrates that the triglossic relationship between colonial languages, major African languages as well as minority languages is responsible for the negative prognosis that characterise minority languages. He singles out the limited roles that minority languages are expected to play in Africa and locates his explanation for this state of affairs within negative beliefs and attitudes toward the same. Batibo seems to be of the view that comprehensive language policies that put all languages at par are an imperative and governments should expedite their implementation. He identifies different stakeholders that should complement each other in minority language revitalisation. Among these are governmental and non-governmental institutions, civic organisations, language associations as well as researchers. In all his suggestions, Batibo does not mention the need for proactive grassroots participation by the language speakers if all these efforts are to yield any fruits. He however demonstrates the important point that the predicament of minority languages is in most cases exacerbated by the fact that speakers of these languages may not be interested in their own languages as they do not guarantee upward social mobility. Armed with insights from Batibo (2009), the present study seeks to demonstrate the importance of FLP in the arresting the cumulative process of language shift. It is the contention of the present study that negative attitudes by speakers towards their languages are changeable by engaging
the speakers at the grassroots. This should involve language management practices at the family level that seek to instil a sense of pride among language speakers. Beliefs about the value of the minority languages can easily be manipulated at the family level. The present research’s orientation is informed by this view.

2.4.3 Zimbabwean literature

While there is generally abundant literature on minority language marginalisation, language revitalisation and conservation worldwide, there is a conspicuous lacuna as far as specific studies on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages are concerned, especially within the Zimbabwean context. A lot of studies have tended to focus on the macro level, in which the preoccupation has been on how general language policy at the government level has impacted on minority language maintenance in Zimbabwe. To that end, most studies have tended to revolve around the critique of official documents and policies such as the education act, as well as the review of the constitutional provisions as purveyors of linguistic injustices in Zimbabwe. Particularly, focus has been inclined towards understanding the predicament of minority languages in a country which because of its history and the present politics of language has seen a perpetuation of minority language marginalisation. Resultantly, the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages has not been copiously discussed. Family language policy is seen as part of localised planning that if supported by national policy and ideology is essential and likely to enhance the success of language conservation efforts (Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; Liddicoat and Baldauf, 2008). Community based responses to the problem of language shift, cultural and linguistic assimilation and homogenisation are considered as key to grassroots interventions as they have the potential to involve the speakers of the languages themselves.

In their study on the Tonga language revitalisation strategies, Chabata, Muwati and Mashiri (2014) acknowledge that the theme of language maintenance or revival has attracted a lot of scholarly attention in the last three decades, with most studies mainly focusing on the manifestations of language shift by linguistic minorities and the efforts aimed at reversing them. In their study, they concentrate more on the role of language specialists, the government, the education sector as well as the role of
funding organisations in Tonga language revitalisation. The role of family language policy is marginally treated in their study. They only acknowledge in passing that the family domain has also been under noticeable threat as far as language use is concerned. This, they argue, is a result of the low prestige associated with minority languages leading to younger speakers opting for the more viable alternatives in the form of Ndebele, Shona and English. These languages, unlike Tonga provide the younger speakers with opportunities as they are used widely in education and in all public domains. The particular study however lacks the empirical backing as it appears to be a more of a review paper. The present study on the other hand, seeks to gain a deeper understanding of the family dynamics and language ideologies that influences the language management practices in the home by engaging the speakers of the minority languages themselves. The present study also goes further by attempting to find the interaction between family language policy as a bottom up approach and state language practices as a top down approach as well as suggesting ways by which the two can be in a mutually beneficial conversation.

Nyota (2015) examined the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Tonga community of Mkoka in Gokwe. Her study mainly focused on the extent to which the Tonga people utilised their linguistic resources in their daily interactions with their Shona speaking neighbours (Nyota, 2015). The study established that language choice and language use by the Tonga in different domains was governed by a number of factors. Among these factors is lack of institutional support that results in the low use of Tonga in formal domains. Further, Nyota (2015) also established that language attitudes and self-perceptions among the Tonga influenced language choice. However, language use in the home domain is given peripheral attention as is the case with most studies in language policy. Although not explicitly mentioning family language policy, Nyota notes that Tonga as a minority language in Gokwe is under threat of extinction since the home is being intruded by the Shona language. However, Nyota does not invest much intellectual effort in understanding the family dynamics that impact on family language policy. The present study profits from and builds on Nyota (2015) by focusing on the nuclear family to investigate the language ideologies and practices that impact on the articulation of family language policy within the context of minority language conservation.
Nyika (2008) focused on the efforts regarding minority language revitalisation in Zimbabwe. His study analyses the role played by civil society organisations and grassroots organisations formed by speakers of minority languages in the revitalisation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. He considers in particular, the technical and financial benevolence of such NGOs as Silveira House and Catholic Commission for justice and peace in Zimbabwe (CCJPZ) in the formation of the Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA), an advocacy organisation agitating for the revitalisation of minority and indigenous languages as a turning point in that endeavour. He argues that such collaborative efforts collectively aimed at the conservation and revitalisations of minority languages are likely to have an impact on the revitalisation of minority languages. The study in a way speaks to the present study in that minority language conservation seems to be the main concern in both studies. Fishman’s (1991) reversing language shift theory, the core theoretical base of Nyika’s study fits well into the area of the present study as this study also concerns itself with efforts on reversing language shift. However, Nyika’s study ignores completely, the role family language policy in the fight against language endangerment, language death and extinction. The present study devotes itself to the marginally treated domain of family language policy, which is essential for intergeneration transmission of minority languages.

In a study similar to Nyika’s (2008) above, Maseko and Moyo (2013) focused on the fundamental considerations for Tonga language revitalisation in Zimbabwe. They identified the inadequacies of government support initiatives, low degree of standardisation, poor resourcing of schools and training institutions as some of the factors militating against the efforts aimed at revitalising and conservation of Tonga language in Zimbabwe. In particular, Fishman’s (1991) reversing language shift theory was used as an analytical framework. Although Maseko and Moyo focused on minority language revitalisation, their interest was mainly on how official policies at the macro level of the state aided or impeded Tonga language conservation in Zimbabwe. To that end, they analysed language practices in education, government and other public institutions and how these language practices impacted the success of Tonga language conservation efforts. Although the study above notes the importance of a multi-sectoral approach in language revitalisation, it overlooks the importance of the home domain, and specifically trivialises FLP a key denominator in
the intergenerational transmission of minority languages. As such the present study seeks to contribute to the nascent shift away from studies that predictably holds the state as culpable in the demise of minority languages by also adding a fresh impetus to the growing interest in what the speakers of the minority languages at the family level actually do to conserve their own languages, given the increasing importance of the home domain in intergenerational transmission. Although Maseko and Moyo (2013) acknowledge the contributions of language advocacy by grassroot organisations such as the TOLACCO, they overlook the fact that advocacy without the by in of the language speakers at the cellular level of the family is also key. Maseko and Moyo’s (2013) study, typically like most preceding it seems to emphasise the involvement of government, through the articulation of policies that take into consideration the need to promote minority languages. While the present study also concedes to that imperative, it however goes further by delving into the unfamiliar territory of family language policy, which is a very critical yet seldom traversed course in minority language conservation studies. The potential contribution of family language policy to the success of the macro level policies in conserving minority languages is not given prominence by Maseko and Moyo (2013). The present study however attempts to cover that lacuna.

Maseko (2004) studied patterns of language use by linguistic minorities in an urban bilingual setup. In his study, Maseko’s focus was on the language choices made by L1 Kalanga speakers in Bulawayo in different domains. The focus was on three domains, that is, the home, the work and the leisure domain. Maseko’s (2004) study was grounded on Crystal’s (1991) observation that in multilingual communities, language use is not haphazard, but is patterned in some way. Maseko’s study is a typically macro sociolinguistic one, that uses the domain analysis of language use to make conclusions about the processes of language shift. His study established that L1 Kalanga speakers are slowly shifting to Ndebele as shown by the dominance of Ndebele in most domains. He also noted that the encroaching of Ndebele language into the home domain can be taken as a sign that Kalanga speakers are abandoning their language in favour of Ndebele, a language that has more prestige because of its history, status, and its widespread use in official domains. The study by Maseko uses Fishman’s domain analysis as a theoretical framework as well as Ferguson’s (1959) notion of Diglossia to understand language choices and practices by linguistic
minorities in an urban environment. The present study profits from Maseko (2004) in a number of ways. Maseko (2004) sheds light regarding the influence of language ideologies on language practice. It also demonstrates how language practices within the home can be mediated by other factors outside the home domain. However the present study focuses on the views of minority language parents regarding their FLPs. The present study gives prominence to home domain as a language management sphere that can be used to negate the course of language shift. Essentially, the present study looks at language use in the home by linguistic minorities from a language policy, or language management point of view. Both studies use Kalanga speakers as a sample. However, the present study also includes Tonga language speakers as part of the sample population. From a language management perspective, the present study goes further than simply investigating the language choices by minority language speakers by attempting to analyse the implications of the choices towards the conservation and maintenance of the same as well as making recommendations for national language policy. The present study, just like (Maseko, 2004) is conducted within the context of societal bilingualism.

Mushunje (2001) investigated patterns of bilingualism in Harare, mostly focusing on the diglossic relationship between English and Shona. Her study, like Maseko (2004) above also uses the domain analysis as well as diglossia as analytical tools. Her study demonstrated that the patterns of bilingualism in Harare reflected the diglossic relationship between shona and English, such that, there are domains were English seems to be dominant. These domains are mostly the official and formal ones, and as a result, English is conferred the (H) status while Shona is relegated to the (L) status according to Ferguson’s (1959) descriptions. Although Mushunje’s study looks at the relationship between two of Zimbabwe’s major languages, it is noteworthy that the present study has some theoretical and analytical commonalities with Mushunje’s. However, Mushunje fails to relate the patterns of bilingualism to the micro context of family language policy which the current study does.

Moyo (2002) investigated the lexical metamorphosis of the Kalanga language in the context of the Ndebele dominance in Bulilimamangwe district encompassing Dombodema, Nguwanyama and Plumtree areas in south western Zimbabwe. Moyo laments the rate at which the Ndebele language has influenced Kalanga language at
the lexical level. In attempting to situate language change within the broader sociolinguistic situation, she observes that a significant percentage of the younger generation within the Kalanga lineage are more at ease using Ndebele in place of their Kalanga mother tongue. The preference for the use of Ndebele even in the home domain is seen as a telling sign that Kalanga are slowly shifting to Ndebele. Moyo (2002) identifies both sociolinguistic and psychological factors as adding an impetus to the loss of intergenerational transmission of the Kalanga language. Moyo (2002) warns of the need for the home domain to be reserved for the use of the Kalanga language if it is to survive. The present study gains useful insights from Moyo’s study, especially considering that both the present study and the one being reviewed are situated within the area of minority language conservation, as such, they share methodological and conceptual commonalities. Although Moyo (2002) does not explicitly mention Family language policy, her recommendation for the need to reserve the home domain for the use of Kalanga to achieve intergenerational transmission speaks directly to the deliberate need to influence language practices in the home, and thus calling for language management and language intervention strategies within the family.

The present study’s point of departure is also domiciled in the thinking that the family is one of the important domains that cumulative process of language shift can be effectively tackled. Moyo (2002) above seems to be in consonance with the recommendation for a deliberate policy shift in national institution such as schools, the media as well as the religious domain that will accord partiality to the Kalanga language for its conservation. However, Moyo does not go further to show how the deliberate affirmative action in national institutions is to be complemented by the grassroots participation of the mother tongue speakers of Kalanga. Such action can be expected to culminate in the eradication of negative attitudes and stereotypes that have an undesirable effect of relegating Kalanga language to the peripheries of the language politics in Zimbabwe. The present study attempts to ascertain the extent to which family language policy at the grassroot level can potentially influence national language policy to the benefit of minority language conservation. Along with Tonga speakers, Kalanga speakers are used by this study as a sample. As such, Moyo’s study adds valuable insight on the linguistic behaviours of the Kalanga in the context of societal multilingualism.
Nyathi (2015) studied the effects of family language policy among the Kalanga speakers in Tokwana village in Bulilima district in Zimbabwe. Much like the present study, the main thesis of her study was that in the absence of a comprehensive language policy that deliberately seek to promote and conserve minority languages in Zimbabwe, it is incumbent upon the speakers themselves to spearhead all language conservation efforts. Nyathi submits that pro-minority language policies in the home domain are critical in ensuring intergenerational transmission of the Kalanga language. Like the present study, Nyathi’s research is carried out within the context of multilingualism, where in addition to Ndebele, Kalanga language is spoken along with Shona and English. The present study not only uses Kalanga as a sample, it also includes Tonga in the matrix to get a fairer picture of the relative language ideologies, practices and management among linguistic minorities, with a view to demonstrate the importance of FLP on minority language conservation. Although the study demonstrates that FLP alone may not be enough to guarantee language preservation in the absence of complementary government efforts, Nyathi does not go further to look at the possible ways in which the micro level planning at the family could potentially feed into and be fed by general macro language policy in the fight against language shift and language extinction. However, both studies view the family as an important domain for language conservation, and as such, the two studies somehow speak to each other. Nyathi’s (2015) study potentially sheds light on how minority language speakers may influence the success of language conservation efforts.

Viriri (2003) studied the conservation and management of indigenous languages as intangible heritage in Zimbabwe. In his study, he is of the view that comprehensive language planning is paramount in the conservation of indigenous languages in Zimbabwe. Deploying a theoretical cultural framework informed by negritude movement (Viriri, 2003:1), he laments the colonial ideology that obliterated the African cultural and linguistic authenticity. He singles out the agency of missionaries in the vilification of the indigenous languages in Zimbabwe as responsible for the present predicament of indigenous languages in Zimbabwe. He argues that:

Missionaries played an important role here since they aggressively condemned African cultural values as barbaric and sinful. Our languages were looked down upon as inferior to English…(Viriri, 2003:2)
For Viriri above, the net effect of the colonial legacy was to create an African bereft of any African values, one who could only view himself in relation to the white colonial master and one whose success in life was relative to his or her mastery of the English language. In a way, Viriri faults the colonial ideology for the diminished standing of indigenous minority languages in Zimbabwe. Viriri’s research is important to the present research for a variety of reasons. Firstly, it foregrounds language planning as the panacea to redress the current lamentable predicament that indigenous languages find them in. Secondly, it, to some degree demonstrates the complicity of the post-colonial government in perpetuating language marginalisation by trivialising language issues. However, it is worth noting that although Viriri sees language planning as important in the conservation of minority languages, his lenses only see as far as the macro level planning is concerned. Predictably, he only implores the Zimbabwean government to be at the forefront of language conservation efforts. What he advocates for is a typical top down approach to language planning and policy formulation, an approach that has thrashed by a number of scholars (see also Ndlovu, 2013) including the present study. Viriri (2003:3) suggests that:

> Our government effort should be to try and consciously change the generality of the Zimbabwean people’s behaviours. This involves influencing people’s attitudes towards the realisation that our indigenous languages are even superior to the foreign language of the elitist minority-English.

Evidence on the drawbacks of overreliance on government to come up with policies that ensure the survival of minority languages has been presented in varied literature. Viriri does not discuss the importance of grassroots participation by language speakers, especially at the family level for successful language conservation to materialise. Armed with this insight, the present study attempts to ascertain the contributions of FLP in the conservation of minority languages as a quest to fill the gap left by studies such as Viriri’s. As such, the present study resonates with Ndlovu’s (2013:56) view that for successful language conservation efforts to take place:

> … concerned communities need to take their destinies into their own hands and be involved emotionally, intellectually and mentally. Maximal successful and effective bottom-up approaches are locally or internally motivated and perpetuated. Those who speak the language have to show an active and
dynamic interest to plan the existence, development, teaching, learning, promotion and survival of their language.

Since bottom-up planning is locally based, tailored to meet specific community needs, originates in and evolves according to the desire of local people, its impact depends on the communicative and socio-political needs of the speakers of the language (Ndlovu, 2013). FLP is thus presented as an alternative to government initiated language policy in which speakers of minority languages have some form of ownership over. The present study reverberates with the intellect expressed by Ndlovu (2013) above. However, the present study does not lose sight of the fact that as a micro language management sphere, FLP initiatives are somewhat inextricably bound to government and non-governmental policies. This view is also shared by (Nahir, 1998; Paulston, 1988; Fishman, 1991; Shohamy, 2006; Chriost, 2008; Webb, 2009; Spolsky, 2009).

Mpofu (2014) analyses the mediation of multilingualism, localism and the nation in the multilingual broadcasting policies of the ZBC as subsumed in the Broadcasting Services Act (2001) and the Broadcasting Services Amendment Act (2007). Mpofu investigates the choices of language in the programming in light of ZBC’s local content policy. His study, mainly informed by an eclectic approach within the critical theory tradition disapproves the domination, marginalisation and exclusion of the indigenous African languages in the ZBC as a public sphere. Mpofu (2014) therefore agitates for the promotion of linguistic diversity and indigenous African languages in the ZBC. He laments the hegemonic preponderance of English over the indigenous languages in the broadcasting services. He further observes that Shona and Ndebele also have a hegemonic dominance over the minority languages, a relational situation that Mkilifi (1978) refers to as double overlapping Diglossia or triglossia. Although Mpofu’s work relates to the use of indigenous languages in broadcasting, in his analysis, he includes use of minority languages in broadcasting, which are a preoccupation of this study. His study demonstrates the importance of the media as a domain for democratisation of the linguistic space in the context of multilingualism. However, he does not look at the family as a domain in which language ideologies and practices can have an effect on the overall language policy in the nation, and therefore on democratic principles, nationalism and identity formation. The present study nevertheless benefits from Mpofu’s as far as theoretical grounding is
concerned. His use of the linguistic hegemony principles is found to be enlightening for the present study in the sense that it shows how linguistic minorities are made to accept other languages as the norm in a society where the hierarchical ordering of languages is symptomatic of the power relations between the speakers of the respective languages. Further, although situated within the media field, Mpofu’s (2014) study illuminates the present study in the sense that it demonstrates the importance of language ideologies and how they influence practice in various language management domains. Moreover, Mpofu also shows how language practices at local levels can be influenced by wider macro politics of language. Mpofu’s study seems to proceed from a nation building and an identity formation perspective in that it seeks to answer question to do with those notions while the present study proceeds from a policy formulation and implementation angle with an inclination toward understanding the impact of FLP in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

Nhlovu (2009) examines the omission of minority languages from the mainstream domains of everyday usage in postcolonial Zimbabwe. He, like Mpofu (2014) above also bemoans the continued hegemonic dominance of English in all official discourses in Zimbabwe, as well as the cannibalising tendencies of Shona and Ndebele over minority languages. His study demonstrates that linguistic imperialism cannot be limited to foreign languages but indigenous languages can be aggressors as well. Nhlovu analyses the use of indigenous languages in domains such as the media, the judicial system and the education sector and warns on the dangers of ‘lumping together all African languages and presenting them as equal victims of English.’ He seems to suggest that minority languages are at the mercy a double edged sword as they also have to contest the dominance of Shona and Ndebele at the same time in an ‘unfairly’ triglossic tug of war. For Nhlovu (2009), this puts minority languages in an increasingly negative trajectory as the historically marginalised languages. Nhlovu’s (2009) study is generally concerned with language policy in Zimbabwe only as far it impacts on nation building and the creation and recreation of a Zimbabwean identity. Further, the study sought to demonstrate how marginalisation of Zimbabwe’s minority languages translates into various forms of socio economic and political exclusion of their speakers (Nhlovu, 2009). His preoccupation with language marginalisation as symptomatic of political
and national exclusion is palpable in a number of his works (see also Ndhlovu, 2006; 2007; 2008). He rehashes in all these works the view that the “problem of language marginalisation is intricately encapsulated within the socio-political formation of Zimbabwe” (2009:178). He also points out, albeit without elaborating further, that a sense of language loyalty must be instilled among younger speakers of minority languages if the same are to be conserved. While not explicitly mentioning ‘family language policy,’ Ndhlovu’s (2009) recommendations resonate with the dictates of FLP. He demonstrates how language ideologies and parental impact beliefs may precipitate into the futility of attempts at cultivating language loyalty within the home. He cites as an example, a submission from one of the respondents in his research who notes that:

> language loyalty is bound to fail, especially in the face of more compelling demands that cause parents to encourage their children to learn majority languages to the point of enforcing it at home….minority language speakers may try to remain loyal to their languages by forcing their children to speak these while at home but eventually they will fail because of the prevailing realities of existence (Ndhlovu, 2009:177)

While the above submission, wrapped in pessimism and painting a picture of doom and gloom as far as cultivating language loyalty is concerned sets FLP in a negative trajectory, the present research submits that the notion of FLP provides an alternative sphere language practices can be managed effectively to the benefit of language conservation. The present study does not however lose sight of the view that the family institution as a language management sphere should not belabour in isolation of other language management spheres in intergenerational transmission of minority languages. The present study therefore makes a case for mutuality between FLP and macro level policy at the national level in minority language conservation.

Further, Ndhlovu (2009) does not go further to discuss in detail, the potential of the home domain as a language management sphere, which can be deployed to improve the speakers’ conception of themselves and their languages through parental ideological influences. He suggests that a comprehensive national language policy is the way forward to ensure minority language survival. The present study submits that the articulation of a comprehensive national language policy alone may not be enough to ensure intergenerational transmission which ultimately rests upon the speakers’ predispositions to use their languages particularly at home. This study
hence attempts to establish the points at which grassroots policies may permeate into the larger national policy domain. The present study considers the family as a very important sphere for language management which any serious study on minority language revitalisation should not ignore. In fact, there is a dearth of scholarly attention dedicated purely to the study of language use in the home by minority language speakers, to the end of making recommendations for policy. This study nevertheless profits from Ndhlovu’s (2009) in the sense that, he seems to be grounded on the linguistic hegemony paradigm, a crucial theoretical concept that can be deployed to explicate domination of one language by another in a multilingual environment. Both studies agitate for the survival and conservation of Zimbabwe’s minority languages to the end of promoting linguistic and cultural diversity, an approach most nation building initiatives have largely ignored. Ndhlovu (2009:6) explains that:

…most nation building projects in post-colonial multilingual societies are premised on the quest for linguistic and cultural uniformity based on the socio-politically powerful standard languages. This approach to nation building is often carried out and legitimised through discourses that perceive linguistic minorities as irrelevant to the national debate.

Seeing the futility of such approaches as identified in the observation above, the present study therefore seeks to understand FLP as a grassroot initiative and the extent to which it can impact minority language conservation in Zimbabwe

Ndlovu (2013) critiques implementation of mother tongue education in official minority languages of Zimbabwe as a language management policy in the macro domain of language policy. Ndlovu’s study proceeds from the realisation that since language planning involves a change of habits, namely, practices, attitudes or ideologies, education is the surest way to succeed because it directed to the youth whose attitudes are more easily manipulated (Ndlovu, ibid). He laments the exclusion of minority language speakers in the crafting and implementation of language policies that are meant to have an impact in their lives of speakers especially through the education system. He demonstrates that this exclusion is symptomatic of top-down approaches to language planning and policy that has been characteristic of Zimbabwe since independence whereby mother tongue speakers have always been relegated to reactive consumers of policies engineered at the macro level. Ndlovu (2013) also demonstrates the importance of grassroot
involvement of speakers for the success of mother tongue instruction as far as minority languages in Zimbabwe are concerned. For example, he sees the success story of Tonga in education as partly a result of strong proactive grassroots involvement and community initiatives that have influenced policy in the education sector. For Ndlovu, this has catapulted Tonga to being the first minority language to be taught and examined in post-colonial Zimbabwe. From a theoretical standpoint, the present study benefits from Ndlovu’s in the sense that language management theories are employed in both studies. The point of departure for the present study however is perhaps the fact that the present study seeks to extend principles of language management to the intimate, closely knit domains of the family while Ndlovu (2013) applies language management principles to the more formal domains of education in Zimbabwe. However, both Ndlovu (2013) and the present study have some interest on the potential interaction between the micro and the macro language policies. In the present study, FLP is regarded as a key area in bottom-up approaches.

In a similar manner to Ndlovu (2013) above, the present study views FLP, language ideologies and language beliefs as some of the overlooked aspects that are central to intergenerational transmission of minority languages. This is in consonance with the view shared by Romaine (2002) who avers that campaigns for officialisation and use of minority languages in education and other high domains may be futile if minority languages are not being transmitted in the home. This view is informed by Fishman (1997) who opines that endangered languages become such because they lack informal intergenerational transmission and informal daily life support, not because they are not being taught in schools or lack official status. As such, the preoccupation should be with encouraging, and if possible incentivising language use in the home. The thrust of this study is anchored on this school of thought.

2.5 Conclusion

The foregone chapter has provided a comprehensive review of available literature relating to the topic. It set off by acknowledging the dearth of studies that particularly focus on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in general and Zimbabwe in particular. Definitions, conceptions and the different approaches to language planning and policy were given attention with the
aim of locating the preferred approaches in the present study. In an attempt to locate the present study within the budding field of FLP, the chapter proceeded by deploying the funnel approach to review related literature. To that end, world literature was reviewed first, followed by a review of literature from Africa in general and lastly literature specific to Zimbabwe, the context in which the present research is situated. The review of literature demonstrated the lacuna regarding studies on the FLP paradigm especially within the African and the Zimbabwean stage. The review is evidently top heavy, pointing to more studies having been done at the global stage, with very little having been done on the local stage. As is apparent in the review, most studies on FLP have generally tended to focus on the intergenerational transmission of heritage languages by immigrant groups in the western world. This set off the present study from many that have been carried out as demonstrated by world literature. The literature also revealed that in Africa generally, the subject has not been nearly adequately explored as FLP is an emerging perspective in language policy especially in Africa. Within the Zimbabwean context, hardly any work reviewed here explicitly mentions family language policy as language management domain in the conservation of minority languages, save for one. However, some scholars, although not entirely focused on FLP do mention the importance of the home domain in intergenerational language transmission. As a result, it is prudent to conclude that available literature relating to FLP points to a field that is still in its nascent stages of development. As one of the ground-breaking studies on the impact of FLP on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, the present study curves a niche for itself within the emerging perspective in language policy studies. The next chapter presents the theoretical framework of the study.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented and reviewed literature related to the present study. This chapter outlines and discusses the theoretical framework that guides the present study. The study draws on Spolsky’s (2004; 2009) language management theory (LMT) as well as on Fishman’s (1991) reversing language shift (RLS) theory to understand and situate family language policy in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The study triangulates the two theories as the analytical lenses in light of their interactional tendencies as well as their emphasis on the importance of language practices and language ideologies on the articulation of family language policy and therefore on language management. As such the two are deployed to furnish, in a complementary way, a clearer understanding regarding the impact of family language policy on intergenerational transmission of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

3.2 The Language Management Theory (LMT)

The following section discusses the language management theory and its efficacy in providing the analytical frame for this study.

3.2.1 Language planning to language management: A historiographical précis

While the present study is predicated mostly on Spolsky’s (2004; 2009) views regarding language management, it is imperative that a précis of some of the contributions by pioneers of the Language Management Theory (LMT) also referred to in other literature as the “Language Management Model (LMM) and the Language Management Framework (LMF)” (Nekvapil, 2016:14) be made. Such a précis would be able to shed insight on, and provide a window into the historical metamorphosis of the language management theory that partly delivers the analytical lenses for the present study. Despite the nuanced labels, the present study deploys the most commonly used variant that is the Language Management Theory (LMT) (Nekvapil, 2016). It is also obligatory at the very onset of this theoretical exposition to acknowledge that although Spolsky (2004; 2009) provides the theoretical basis for the present study through his views on language management, he is certainly not the
first scholar to use the term ‘language management’ (Nekvapil, 2012:8) since scholars like Cooper (1989) had already proffered it among terminological possibilities (Nekvapil, 2012). It seems prudent at this juncture as well to note that although the term ‘language management’ is now widely used (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015; Nekvapil, 2012; 2016), the identity of the language management theory can assume shifting shades of meaning. While “the theory is based on the set of its theoretical claims rather than on the heading “language management” (Nekvapil, 2012:9), some of the core features of the theory have been discussed under different labels such as “the theory of language correction” (Nekvapil, 2012:9), while “some authors employ the term language management without referring to the theoretical propositions of Neustupny, Jernudd and their colleagues” (Nekvapil, 2012:9), opting to deploy the term synonymously with language planning (Nekvapil, 2012).


The term language management was introduced into sociolinguistics literature programmatically by Jernudd and Neustupny (1987) in their contribution at a conference in Québec, Canada...they associate language planning with a particular period of deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour, and they introduce a new heading for a broader field of study.

More recently, scholars such as Webb (2002), Mwaniki (2004; 2010; 2011), Spolsky (2004; 2009) and Shohamy (2006) also contributed to the development of language management theory. This approach brought a number of innovations to the theory of language planning and continues to inspire new insights into language planning and policy scholarship (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015). LMT has enthused such methodological innovations in language planning and policy as “the detailed analysis of concrete interactions or emphasis on the differing interests of various actors in language planning” (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015:3) as well as aroused interest in ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis (Nekvapil, 2012). It should be noted that prior to these innovations, language management theories have been
widely deployed in the critique and assessment of language education policies and rarely by researchers working within the family language policy paradigm.

Language management derives from the language correction theory propounded by Neustupny and Jernudd in the 1970s and 1980s (Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003; Nekvapil and Nekula, 2006; 2012; 2016). “It is a theory that is based on discriminating between two processes which characterise language use :(1) the production and reception of discourse, (2) the activities at the production and reception of discourse, i.e. metalinguistic activities" (Nekvapil, 2012:10). Put differently, language management theory is “grounded in the premise that in using language we can distinguish two main processes:(a) the generating of utterances (communicative acts) and (b) utterance management (management of communicative acts)...” (Nekvapil, 2016:14). Packaged in this way, language management can therefore be understood as an activity that is directed to language itself or at communication or certain aspects of language or communication (Nekvapil, 2016).

Jernudd (1993) asserts that language management grew as an extension and adjustment of the language planning theory. It has been argued by Jernudd that language management represents a linear development from language planning, policy, theory and practice rather than a replacement of the later by the former. Essentially, the evolution of the language management theory has in part been informed by the realisation of the inadequacies of the language planning theory of the 1960s and 70s (Nekvapil, 2012). Language management, as an extension and adjustment of the language planning theory grew from the realisation that in language planning theories of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, language problems were mainly problems of language in the narrow sense of the word (Jernudd, 1993; Jernudd and Neustupny, 1991; Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003). Elaborating on this, Mwaniki (2011:246) avers that:

Language management has evolved in a peculiar context since the 1980s: that of an increasing realisation of the limitations of the paradigm of language policy and language planning. This holds especially when applied to multilingual settings. It also holds for an increasing appreciation of the intractable and pervasive nature of language related challenges and how these challenges impact on a wide range of societal endeavours, be they political, economic, social, cultural, organisational, or technological, to name a few; and it holds for the impulse to resolve these challenges. Effectively, language management has developed on the back of the need from within the
academy and to some extent within policy circles to respond to practical concerns.

Distilling from the above, it can be argued that language management and language planning theory are somewhat complementary; although (Nekvapil, 2012) feels that the term ‘language planning’ should be reserved for the theory and activities of the 1960s and 70s. Also seen through Mwaniki’s lenses, language management is therefore a congregation of theoretical precepts, pivoting on language planning theories, such as the decision-making theory, sociolinguistic theory, modernisation theory, systems theory, critical theory, phenomenology, human development theory and management theory, particularly advanced by the new public management paradigm (Mwaniki, 2011). Adding his own perspective, Webb (2002) affirms that notion of language management draws from the generic concept of ‘management’ which refers to the set of activities undertaken to ensure that the goals and strategies of an organisation are achieved in an effective and efficient way. Within the confines of the language management theory, management refers to nuanced interventions to a myriad of language problems that are deployed by language managers to ensure that a language policy, whether overt and comprehensively articulated, or covert and implicitly derived are implemented to the benefit of preferred language use patterns and practices in particular domains (Webb, 2002).

As noted earlier, the concept of language planning theories of the 1960s and 70s sought to understand language problems in the narrow sense of the word (Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003). Contemporary approaches in language management have however tended to differ slightly in scope from the traditional tendencies. Not only do they seek to include language problems as defined in the traditional narrow sense, but they also include among them a plethora of additional problems that implicate discourse and communication in intercultural contact situations and problems that arise in proof reading, speech therapy or literary criticism (Jernudd, 1993; Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003). Consequently, many existing theories, such as language acquisition theories, language therapy theories, literary criticism and critical discourse theories appear to operate in a space similar to the theory of language management (Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003). These do not however, operate in a contradictory currency but language management
furnishes a wider framework that seek to focus on an expanded range of acts related to language problems (Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003).

Ndlovu (2013) affirms that the current language management theory focuses on discourse processes. It bridges the gap between the language planner and the language user while predicting success if language planners offer solutions to language inadequacies that language users have evaluated as in need of adjustment (Ndlovu, 2013). The language management theory is especially deployed in the present study as it makes important contributions that speak beyond the agency of the state in language planning. As such, it can potentially offer insight into the functioning of non-state and grassroot agencies in the quest to proffer solutions to language problems. Within the confines of classical approaches to language planning, “typically, it was the state, or institutions authorised by the state and experts acting on behalf of the whole society, that acted as the agents of language planning at the time” (Nekvapil, 2012:15). The concept of language management has necessitated the understanding of language planning and language policy from a devolved perspective. As such, “the representatives of LMT have stressed it that the theory is constructed in such a way as to be capable of encompassing both the dimension of macro-planning and micro-planning” (Nekvapil, 2012:15), the former used in reference to language planning which takes place at the level of the state while the latter term is reserved for language planning that is influenced by less complex social systems (Nekvapil, 2012). The macro and the micro distinctions in the LMT is in a way a submission by contemporary scholarship that it is “also imaginable and in fact, not unusual, that even ordinary speakers in everyday interactions contribute to these changes in language(s) and their use” (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015:1).

Macro and micro language planning can also be understood within the notions of organised and simple management, with macro language planning roughly corresponding with organised management while micro planning corresponds to simple management (Nekvapil, 2012; 2016). For Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003) simple management is seen as the intervention to problems as they appear in individual communication acts while organised language management involves more than one person in the management process and therefore implying an agentive interdependence of actors and participants in the management process. The
language management theory stresses the mutual relationship between simple and organised management. The profitability of deploying the LMT in this study also stems from its emphasis on the dialectical and reflexive relationship between macro and micro planning (Nekvapil, 2016) which makes the concept of language management to be extendable to the domain of family language policy. Language management theory therefore focuses on a number of levels that range from individuals, associations, social organisations, media, economic bodies, educational institutions, local government to central government or international organisations (Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003; Nekvapil and Nekula, 2006; Nekvapil, 2012; 2016). The shift in language management practice to examine language use at grassroot levels embodies the ideals of an integrated approach to language planning (Ndlovu, 2013). In short language management theory values the interplay of various actors, domains and participants, inclusive of individuals, governmental and non-governmental organisations, at the home, community or national level in the management process.

3.2.2 Language management: The Spolskian perspective

As noted in the preceding section, although not being the first to use the term language management (Nekvapil, 2012), Spolsky’s (2004; 2009) contributions to the development of language management theory lend important insights into the evolution and application the theory. Like some before him (for example Jernudd, 1993; Jernudd and Neustupny, 1987; 1991; Neustupny and Nekvapil, 2003; Mwaniki, 2004), he is also agreeable to the fact that language management theory is a logical progression from language planning and therefore adopts a processual approach to language management (Ndlovu, 2013). Spolsky (2004; 2009) avers that language policy is all about choices from a wide range of linguistic resources in a multilingual or multi dialect situation also referred to as “speech resources” (Blommaert, 2008). The goal of language planning theory should therefore be set against accounting for the choices made by individuals on the basis of rule governed patterns consensually conventionalised by the community. Some of these choices are a result of management, reflecting conscious and explicit efforts by language managers to control and influence the choices made (Spolsky, 2009).
As Spolsky writes, language management can be practised at various echelons of society starting from simple management at the level of the individual to organised language management at the macro national level. This resonates well with Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003); Nekvapil (2012; 2016) views as well. Language management therefore transcends various domains where language choices have to be made unlike classical language planning which was conceived as a state activity (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015; Nekvapil, 2012; 2016). According to Fishman (1972) a domain is named for a social space, such as home or family, school, neighbourhood, church (or synagogue or mosque or other religious institution), workplace, public media, or governmental level (city, state, nation). There are rules that govern language choice and language use in these domains. As such language choice in multilingual situations is not haphazard but is patterned in some way (Fishman, 1972). Essentially Fishman argues that the regular language choices made by an individual are determined by his or her understanding of what is appropriate to the domain. What is appropriate in the domain can be determined by those who have authority over the participants in particular domains. Domains therefore entail participant-location-topic interaction. Evidently therefore, the concept of domain is central in Spolsky’s construction of the theory of language management (Mwaniki, 2011).

For the present study, the family domain is therefore considered as a micro-management sphere while the school system for instance can be considered as a macro domain representing organised management (Nekvapil, 2012), itself being a meeting domain for various language managers (Spolsky, 2009). Other domains of language management may include government, the church and supranational organisations. Each of these domains are consistent with particular language management principles and policies, some explicitly articulated through policy statements, while some may not be formally codified, with some features managed internally and others under the influence of forces external to the domain (Spolsky, 2009). For instance, language management in the family can partly be under the control of family members, especially the parents, but its goals are regularly influenced by the outside community (Spolsky, 2009). On his conceptualisation of language policy; Spolsky (2004:5) submits that:
...a useful first step is to distinguish between the three components of language policy of a speech community: its language practices - the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire; its language beliefs or ideology-the beliefs about language and language use; and any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning or management.

From the above, Spolsky (2009) posits that language policy as social phenomenon pivots around the beliefs or ideologies, as well as consensual behaviours of members of a speech community. As such, the formulation of a satisfactory framework to account for it is problematic as it cuts across other social sciences (Spolsky, 2009). Watt (2007 cited in Spolsky, 2009) traces this generic problem to the challenge of social phenomena. He suggests that this challenge and complexity can be best captured with the use of network analysis, although noting the huge challenge with the analysis of social networks, which in their nature are dynamic, diverse and exists in a larger framework. Similarly, “language management takes place within social networks of various types. It does not occur only in various state organisations, with a scope of activities comprising the whole society…but also in individual companies, schools, media associations, families as well as individual speakers in particular interactions” (Nekvapil, 2012:11). Spolsky (2004:6) further submits that:

Language and language policy both exist in (and language management must contend with) highly complex, interacting, and dynamic contexts, the modification of any part of which may have correlated effects (and causes) on any other part. A host of non-linguistic factors (political, demographic, social, religious, cultural, psychological, bureaucratic, and so on) regularly account for any attempt by persons or groups to intervene in the language practices and the beliefs of other persons or groups and for the subsequent changes that do or do not occur.

As intimated earlier, for Spolsky, any theory of language policy should consider the three components, namely practices, beliefs or ideologies and management. These however do not operate in isolation as they interact with each other and the wider environment. Consequently, caution must be taken against being “misled and intellectually impoverished by studies that examine only a small handful of variables whereas the circumstances of the real world actually involve very complex interrelationships between much larger numbers of variables” (Fishman, Solano and McConnell, 1991:28 cited in Spolsky, 2004:6).
3.2.2.1 Language practices

According to Spolsky (2004; 2009) language practice is the first component to language policy. Language practices are the regular and predictable behaviours relating to language choice in a speech community (Ren and Hu, 2013) or “the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire” (Spolsky, 2004:5). Practice therefore relates to the overt linguistic behaviour of the speakers in a speech community. It is therefore critical within language management to note that intergenerational transmission of a language depends to a larger extent on the language practices that younger speakers are exposed to. Practice therefore is a starting point for any intervention or language management strategy that aims at the conservation of a language. Spolsky (2004:9) explains that by language practices, he means more than just “the sum of the sound, word and grammatical choices that an individual speaker makes, sometimes consciously and sometimes less consciously, that makes up the conventional unmarked pattern of a variety of a language” but extends the notion of language practice to multilingual situations to also include rules for the appropriacy of each named language in a particular domain (Spolsky, 2004).

Since the present study investigates the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, language practice is taken to mean what minority language speakers “actually do” with their languages rather than what they “think should be done” (Spolsky, 2004:14) in the context of multilingualism. An analysis of language practices by minority language speakers in the home domain is likely to shed light on the prospects of intergenerational transmission of the minority languages concerned.

3.2.2.2 Language beliefs or ideologies

The second component of a language policy is made up of beliefs, sometimes referred to as language ideologies (Spolsky, 2004; 2009). Language ideologies have potential to shape language policy in the sense that:

The members of a speech community share also a general set of beliefs about appropriate language practices, sometimes forming a consensual ideology, assigning values and prestige to various aspects of the language varieties used in it. These beliefs both derive from and influence practices.
They can be a basis for language management or a management policy can be intended to confirm or modify them (Spolsky, 2004:14).

Beliefs about a language are salient in that they may affect and be affected by a linguistic community’s view of their language. Ideologies are therefore “what people think should be done” (Spolsky, 2004:14). Subjective reactions to the statutes subsumed of the languages and language use thereof derive from variables such as how many people use it, the importance of the language to the users and the socio-economic benefits a speaker can expect by using it (Spolsky, 2009). However, beliefs are not practice, although they may influence or be influenced by practice in the sense that they “designate a speech community’s consensus on what value to apply to each of the language variables or named language varieties that make up its repertoire” (Spolsky, 2004:14).

3.2.2.3 Management

Spolsky (2004; 2009) identifies language management as a third component of language policy. Language management is understood broadly, as any sort of activity aimed at language as a communication tool or as a system as well as at language use (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015). Impliedly, language management relates to the explicit and overt efforts by someone or some group that has, or claims, authority over the participants in particular domains to modify or conform to their language practice and ideology (Spolsky, 2009). These include direct efforts to manipulate the language situation (Spolsky, 2004; 2009). The main aim of language management is to account for the language choice and to impose, modify or confirm language practices and ideologies in the lower domain. Spolsky (2004; 2009) initially viewed language planning and language management as synonyms and then the latter as the replacement of the former. He prefers the term ‘management’ in the place of ‘planning’ because he is convinced that it:

... more precisely captures the nature and phenomenon. Planning was the term used in the 1950s and 1960s in the post-war enthusiasm for correcting social problems; the subsequent failures of social and economic planning have discouraged its continued use (Spolsky, 2009:6).

Language planning theorists have, however unanimously agreeable with the view that language management should be seen as logical development from, and not a

Summarily, for Spolsky (2004:14) “language management refers to the formulation and proclamation of an explicit plan or policy, usually but not necessarily written in a formal document, about language use”. The language manager can be a legislative assembly writing a national constitution, or a national legislature making a law determining which language should be official, or it could be a state, provincial, cantonal or other local government body determining the language of signs (Spolsky, 2004). What comes to the fore as far as Spolsky’s language management component is concerned is that each and every domain has its own particular language management practices and language choices as informed by language ideologies consistent with the domains. Spolsky (2004:14) further elaborates that although beliefs may influence management, “language management efforts may go beyond or contradict the set of beliefs and values that underlie a community’s use of language and the actual practice of language use”. The present study is therefore anchored in this line of thinking. The language management component in Spolsky’s theory sheds light on how the family domain can be manipulated to influence minority language revitalisation, the main preoccupation of this study. Spolsky’s notion of language management is relevant for the present study as the study also seeks to establish the dialectics of language ideologies and management in the context of family language policy in the home domain. Spolsky notes that language policy exists even where it has not been officially proclaimed or explicitly established by the authority and as such the nature of the language policy must be derived from a study of their language practice or beliefs (Spolsky, 2004; 2009). Still, the existence of an official, explicitly articulated and formal language policy does not guarantee that it will have any effect on language practices.

3.2.3 A critique of Spolsky’s approach

The theory of language management is an emergent perspective in language policy studies whose tradition is in its nascent stages. Ozolins cited in Nekvapil and Sherman (2015:4) notes that the beginning of the 21st century has been marked by an observable shift away from the use of the term “language planning” and towards the use of the term “language management”. Nekvapil and Sherman (2015) contend
that this is symptomatic of a progression of a paradigm shift in language planning and policy presently characterised and dominated by three traditions, namely the Israeli/American tradition, the European/Asia-Pacific tradition and lastly the African tradition (Mwaniki, 2011).

While the Israeli/American tradition, for which Spolsky is its main representative (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015; Mwaniki, 2011), and the European/Asia-Pacific traditions have been explored significantly in language planning and policy studies (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015), the African tradition of language management has up to now been punctuated by profound intellectual lethargy. In other words, not many language policy researchers have invested enough intellectual effort into elaborating on it (Mwaniki, 2011). In fact, Mwaniki (2011) opines that this has been characteristic of the paradigm of language management in general. The explanation for this lacuna within the African tradition could be that there are probably a limited number of experts and scholars working within the language management tradition within the African context (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2014). Mwaniki (2011) thus agitates for the need to develop an African language management tradition that takes into consideration the specific character of the language situations in Africa, rather than mechanically transferring theories of language management from other contexts and traditions developed on the basis of data alien to the African experiences (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015). Mwaniki (2011:255) retorts that the African tradition should reject any attempts of “foisting a language management theory on African data and circumstance, when such a theory is not generated from African data and circumstance.”

Although Spolsky’s approach to language policy and language management illuminates this study, it has been criticised over motley of issues. Nekvapil and Sherman (2015) censure Spolsky for his over emphasis on the notion of domain in a generic sense, as well as his deployment of this notion at the forefront instead of the concept of community. While Spolsky initially ignores language management theory in the tradition of Neustupný and Jernudd, in his latter publication, he attempts an extensive integration of this theory (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015). This integration, however, tends to be “selective and testifies to the eclecticism of Spolsky’s approach, congregating the incongruous” (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015: 5).
However, for the present study, Spolsky’s concept of, and his emphasis on domains is rewarding as it allows for the extendibility of the tenets of language management theory to the informal and closely knit sphere of the family institution. It can also shed light on how language practices and beliefs may inform and be informed by family language policy in the family domain. Spolsky’s emphasis on the centrality of language practices and beliefs in language management is also illuminating for family language policy and therefore for the present study. This is because some of the research questions and objectives of the present study revolve around the influence of language practices and beliefs on the articulation of family language policy within the context of minority language conservation in Zimbabwe. To the benefit of the present study, Spolsky’s notion of language policy enables the study to consider domain specific locations, such as the family as language management spheres (Sloboda, 2010). The present study focuses on family language practices and preferences as constitutive of implicit policies, and how they impact on minority conservation in Zimbabwe. Despite Spolsky being representative of the Israeli/American tradition of language management (Thomas, 2006; Mwaniki, 2011; Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015), his ideas are extendable and adaptable to the context of the present research. The criticisms levelled against Spolsky (2004; 2009) do not attenuate the relevance of his approach as a theoretical frame for the present study nevertheless.

Spolsky’s approach in language policy is critical for the present study since it allows for the researcher to consider language policy beyond the traditional agency of the state (Nekvapil, 2012) and beyond the official legislation and regulation. This enables the researcher to ascertain the extent to which the ideology upon which the official national language policy is based can be reproduced in the language practices in the various microcosms of the nation-state. The mediating effect of language ideologies and language practices on management, and hence on family language policy can be understood within the Spolskian approach. Ideologies relevant to a given language will differ depending on the speech community where it is being used. This is resultant of Spolsky’s argument that language policy must be understood as functioning within a complex ecological relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic factors such as access to resources (Spolsky, 2004; 2009) and as such,
language policy often serves as a surrogate political issue for other ideological agendas (Thomas, 2006).

As far as family language policy and its impact on minority language conservation in Zimbabwe is concerned, Spolsky’s views potentially shed light on how the conservation process can manipulate the interaction between the top down and bottom up planning in terms of agency, procedure and influence. The language practices in the micro domains such as the family can potentially impact on intergenerational transmission of the minority languages resulting in their conservation. Language practices by minority language communities in various domains may in turn put pressure on the planning authorities in the macro domain and conversely lead to a positive ripple effect in the micro domain. One of the merits of language management theory is its continuous interest in the interplay of simple and organised management (Nekvapil and Sherman, 2015). As such; this research opted for this approach from nuanced motley of approaches in language planning and policy.

3.3 Reversing Language Shift theory (RLS)

As intimated in the introduction section of this chapter, this study is predicated on an eclectic theoretical toolkit that brings together the language management theory, in the tradition of Spolsky (2004; 2009) and the reversing language shift theory (Fishman, 1991). The preceding section has conversed with the language management theory. This section therefore is an exposition of the reversing language shift theory, situating it, as it does within the broader concerns of the study. Fishman’s reversing language shift theory (RLS) has informed a lot of scholarly works on minority language conservation and revitalization (Darquennes, 2007; O’hlfearnain, 2013). He is thus viewed as “an early proponent of proactive language research” (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). Subsequent to the publication of his book focusing on endangered language revitalisation in (1991), the attention on the revitalisation of endangered minority languages has increased tremendously, as compared to the pre-1991 period where language revitalisation only featured marginally as a topic in socio- and contact linguistics (Darquennes, 2007). For Fishman, the RLS theory is designed to offer linguists and language revivalists a rational and a systematic approach to what “has often hitherto been a primarily
emotion laden, ‘let’s try everything we possibly can and hope something will work’
type of dedication” (Fishman, 1991:1).

The RLS framework is an attempt on the part of the authorities that are recognised
by speakers and supporters of threatened languages to coalesce around efforts
deliberately calculated to negate the cumulative process of language attrition
(Fishman, 1991). The process of language attrition would inevitably lead to further
weakening of weak language while conversely further strengthening stronger
languages, a state of affairs regarded as undesirable. RLS therefore implies a social
policy that deliberately interferes with and seeks to disconfirm the predictable course
of events which are collectively and consensually viewed as undesirable (Fishman,
1991). In his theory of reversing language shift, Fishman continues to argue that:

…the core element on which successful language maintenance depends is
intergenerational transmission of the language from parents to their children in
the home, to the extent that remains or becomes the everyday language of
informal communication (O’Hlfearnain, 2013:348).

It should be noted that in his monograph, Fishman does not present his theory in a
schematic manner (Darquennes, 2007). However, it seems possible to identify the
various phases which can be placed into a provisional scheme, with a number of
clearly identifiable steps (Darquennes, 2007). These steps are meant to guide and
offer a path toward minority language maintenance and conservation. These are
identified and discussed below.

3.3.1 Summary of steps in the RLS process

Darquennes (2007 citing Fishman, 1991) submits that the first step on the path to
language revitalisation is the acknowledgement that all agents involved in the
process should initially go through a phase of ideological clarification. This is a prior
value consensus that should be established among RLS advocates. Fishman (1991)
writes that without the establishment of such a consensus, RLS efforts and policy
may become contested even among its advocates. The ideological clarification
phase should involve the establishment of four value positions as outlined below.

(1) Much of RLS can be implemented without compulsion.
While there is undoubtedly an element of compulsion to any government activities and policies, RLS efforts can be implemented without such compulsion as they do not necessarily have to be undertaken under any imperative or the aegis of central government. RLS is therefore not necessarily a government policy at all (Fishman, 1991). RLS efforts can be undertaken on a small scale, organised and driven by the volition of individuals who are unanimously and wholeheartedly in agreement with specific RLS objectives, and wilfully devote their resources and means to them, even without the general society’s assistance (Fishman, 1991). This value position is largely informed by the observation that governmental action and interventions are rarely effective, moreso in the absence of grassroots community and neighbourhood involvement, support and buy in. Without the support of the minority language speakers, nothing done from the RLS perspective will subsequently be enduring, and governmental efforts may either be “pro-forma” or even calculated to ‘turn-off’ more people than they ‘turn-on’ (Fishman, 1991). Grassroots buy-in therefore has a positive effect of injecting momentum and adding an impetus to the RLS efforts as it is usually taken to testify popular sentiment and support for RLS initiatives.

(2) Minority rights need not interfere with majority rights

Advocates and agents in the RLS process have to be aware that threatened languages are frequently surrounded not so much by hostile outsiders or Ymen (members of a language majority), as by unsympathetic insiders or Xmen via Yish (members of the minority language community who do not speak the minority language but speak the majority language) (Fishman, 1991). Because the latter have already begun acculturation into the majority and into the new identity, spurred on by the seemingly rewarding association with the majority language, they may feel uncomfortable with associating with RLS efforts (Fishman, 1991). In light of that, their commitment may be questioned by their kinsman and if they become pro RLS, they may be questioned by their new linguistic benefactors. As a result, Xmen via Yish are caught in a dilemma between pro-RLS Xmen (members of the language minority) and anti-RLS Ymen and they may be compelled to bend over backwards to identify with the frustrations suspicions and insecurities of Ymen (Fishman, 1991). To that caution, RLS advocates need to strive to stress that the RLS programme is not designed to infringe on anyone’s rights and dignity, no matter what their affiliations are. This should not merely be a public relations position but a deep seated
conviction (Fishman, 1991). Since RLS efforts are pursued under the aegis of linguistic and cultural democracy, RLS advocates need to pursue a social order that does not advocate for cultural imperialism after the reversal of the old order. The envisaged new status of the language achieved through RLS efforts should not precipitate into hegemony over its newly dominated networks, as according to Fishman (1991), slaves who become cruel masters do themselves great damage to the cause of abolition of slavery through the creation or perpetuation of a vicious cycle.

(3) The actors need to recognise that bilingualism is a benefit to all

According to Fishman (1991) most people are afraid of bilingualism. However, RLS agents need to dispel the myth that bilingualism is a source of chaos, but rather, the positive effects of bilingualism as a resource should be stressed. Fishman argues that there is a tendency by some pro RLS actors to accept bilingualism as a temporal strategy as they seek a completely monolingual Xish (minority language) society at the end of the rainbow. X-men via Yish have an affinity to oppose bilingualism because to them, it is a vivid reminder that that they too could have retained Xish or could even regain it rather than opt for Yish (majority language) alone. To some Y-men, bilingualism raises questions about their undisputed mastery in their home (Fishman, 1991) because they have been wrongly socialised to associate with the disadvantages of bilingualism as a source of civil and political strife. Fishman notes that bilingualism should neither be taken as temporal strategy nor an implicit threat, but should be seen as an enriching phenomenon to the multicultural currencies of the modern world (Fishman, 1991). The mutually beneficial nature of bilingualism across polities and linguistic boundaries should be stressed as an investment rather than associating it with “the curse of Babel” (Bamgbose, 1991:2). As such, RLS efforts should not aim at subtractive bilingualism. Additive bilingualism should be encouraged as it adds perspective, variety and nuancing to the lives of the speakers. Monolingualism is neither practically possible nor philosophically desirable and any RLS efforts aimed at a return to Xish Monolingualism will quickly exhaust the political, economic, physical and emotional resources and concurrently elicit early antagonism (Fishman, 1991) and lethargy.
Lastly, (4) agents of language revitalisation need to acknowledge that RLS measures should not be treated in a one size fits all approach, but there is need for measures to be localised in concordance with varying problems and opportunities encountered (Fishman, 1991). The ideological clarification phase is paramount in the sense that it creates consensus and prior value for those who advocate, implement and evaluate RLS (Fishman, 1991). Point (4) of the ideological clarification phase emphasises the contextual variation of RLS measures and that there is no single fixed approach in reversing language shift. As such specific language shift situations are approached with context specific measures. This openness makes it possible for pro-RLS agents to develop context specific RLS measures (Darquennes, 2007). The working plan for RLS measures should detail the diagnosis of the actual minority language situation which should subsequently shed light on the feasibility of the RLS priorities and therefore be able to provide tailor made efforts to enable the implementation of language revitalisation priorities (Darquennes, 2007). Depending on the individual researcher, the working plan can in varying degrees combine empirical and desk researches on language shift but bearing in mind that the working plan and the research phase both interact with the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) (Fishman, 1991).

### 3.3.2 The Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS)

The GIDS is guided by Fishman’s lifelong experience with and his insights into the workings of linguistic minorities (Darquennes, 2007). Lewis and Simons (2010: 2) affirm that:

> Fishman's 8-level Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) has served as the seminal and best-known evaluative framework of language endangerment for nearly [two] decades. It has provided the theoretical underpinnings for most practitioners of language revitalisation.

The GIDS comprises 8 stages resembling those of the Richter scale (Darquennes, 2007) and hence the degree of intergenerational disruption that describes the extent of damage (Darquennes, 2007) to any particular language can be distilled from the level in which that language is placed on the GIDS. In other words, the higher the number representing the stage a minority language finds itself, the stronger the degree of disruption or endangerment (Fishman, 1991). This means that minority languages placed on stage 8 of the GIDS are highly endangered as stage 8 of the
GIDS represents the extreme level of intergenerational disruption while minority languages placed on stage 1 are on a healthy path to revitalisation (Darquennes, 2007). The different stages of the GIDS are schematically represented in figure 3.1 below:

**Fig. 3.1: Stages of the GIDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGES OF REVERSING LANGUAGE SHIFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEVERITY OF INTERGENERATIONAL DISLOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(read from bottom up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Education, work sphere, mass media and Governmental operations at higher nationwide levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local/regional mass media and Governmental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The local/regional (i.e non neighbourhood) work sphere both among Xmen and Ymen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(b) Public schools for Xish children offering some instruction via Xish but substantially under Yish curricular and staffing control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(a) Schools in lieu of compulsory education and substantially under Xish curricular and staffing control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II RLS to transcend diglossia subsequent to its attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Schools for literacy acquisition, for the old and for the young and not in lieu of compulsory Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The intergenerational and demographically concentrated home-family-neighbourhood: the basis for mother tongue transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cultural interaction in Xish primarily involving community based older generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reconstructing Xish and adult acquisition of XSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLS to attain diglossia. (assuming prior ideological orientation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Toward a theory of reversing language shift (Fishman in Darquennes, 2007:63)_

[Xmen = member of the language minority; Ymen = member of a language majority; Xish = minority language; Yish = majority language; XSL = Xish as a second language]

The implicational scale of GIDS as in Fig. 3.1 above demonstrates that for Fishman, minority language conservation is a step by step process which cannot be achieved meteorically. It reveals that it is impossible to reach higher degrees of linguistic vitality without tackling the different stages in neat succession.

Prominence is given to stage 6 of the GIDS which represent the intergenerational continuity of a mother tongue (Darquennes, 2007; Lewis and Simons, 2010; Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). As rehashed by Fishman in much of his work, stage 6 in the GIDS is critical as “it cannot be substituted or bypassed” (O’hlfearnain, 2013:348). To the attainment of stage 6 of the GIDS, “the most important point of intergenerational language transmission is the use of the ethnic language at home…because the family and the community are critical for the maintenance of the
home language” (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013:2). Intergenerational transmission of a mother tongue can therefore profit from the use of the language in the close knit domains of the family and the related community interactions. It is the contention of most researchers that the home domain should be reserved for the mother tongue if intergenerational language transmission to successive generations is to materialise. It therefore comes as no surprise that the GIDS gives much importance to stage 6. The importance of the home domain in minority language conservation is therefore underlined by this predisposition, since for Fishman (1991:65 cited in O’Hlfearnain, 2013:348) language maintenance is not “a global ‘total language’ task but a functionally specific process that has to be tackled on well-selected, functionally specific grounds. The intimacy and privacy associated with the family provides a natural boundary and a bulwark against outside competition and substitution (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013), making it “the most common and inescapable basis of mother tongue transmission, bonding, use and stabilisation” (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013:2).

According to Fishman (1991) stages 8 to 5 provide the ‘minimal basis’ for RLS. Family language policy therefore is expected to impact significantly on stage 6. The present study focus on the impact of FLP on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, and therefore significantly speaks to intergenerational continuity of a language as espoused in stage 6 of the GIDS. The present study profits from Fishman’s theorising in more ways than one. The theory demonstrates how particular minority languages, depending on the level of intergenerational disruption, can be subjected to different language reclamation strategies. The GIDS reveals how informed intervention strategies aimed at minority language revitalisation may be arrived at. The implicational scale of the GIDS enables the present researcher to place the different minority languages on a comparative hierarchy that will, depending on the levels of endangerment, help in tailor-making strategies for reclamation. This is informed by the premise on which the RLS theory is based. That is, language revitalisation strategies should not be conceived of as one size fits all, but different language shift situations call for particular measures which may vary both temporally and spatially. The premise on which stage 6 of the GIDS is based affirms the present study’s position that the family is an extremely important realm for
understanding language policy because of its role in forming the child’s linguistic environment (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013).

The minimal basis for RLS encoded in stage 8 to 5 shows that the success of minority language revitalisation more than anything depends on the readiness of the minority language community(s) to embrace the language revitalisation measures. The speakers of the language are disposed to decide on the domains to be reserved for the endangered minority language(s) and the domains to the occupied by the majority language in the context of societal bilingualism.

The GIDS is especially useful for the present study as it not only takes into account that intergenerational transmission is not an individual decision made by parents, but also that societal and institutional language choices are critical in shaping FLP and parental language beliefs, practices and preferences in the home domain. These extra familial factors create social spaces or domains of usage (Fishman, 1991) for particular languages. Each domain constitutes:

…a constellation of participants, location, and topic that is closely associated with a particular language. That choice of language becomes sedimented over time as a social norm, so that the use of a particular language in a particular participant-location-topic context comes to be expected (Lewis and Simons, 2010:5)

The more traditional domains like the home may be reserved for the minority language while the modern domains are reserved for the majority languages, for example, in the new media (Darquennes, 2007). This would be in consonance with the recognition of bilingualism as a resource as encapsulated in step (3) of the ideological clarification phase discussed above. The present study is carried out in essentially bilingual communities and as such, the functional allocation of domains to the different languages spoken is an appreciation of bilingualism as a benefit to all (Fishman, 1991). This theorising can shed light on how FLP can potentially impact the functional allocation of domains of usage for the minority and majority languages to ensure that these do not just co-exist but also interact. The GIDS can also add clarity on how the diminishing domains of usage of a language may lead to a diminished status and value of a language to its speakers and hence a reduction in the number of speakers. The GIDS provides a means of evaluating the status of a language on this scale and therefore the degrees of intergenerational disruption. In
turn, this will be helpful in determining context specific and tailor made interventions to revitalise the language. The role of family language policy can therefore be located within the whole matrix.

According to Fishman, the role of the school system in RLS is secondary, as shown by the lower stage number in which it is given mention (stages 4 to 1) His confidence in schools especially of the types (4b) as actors in RLS is not particularly great (Darquennes, 2007). It would seem correct to say that for Fishman, stage (4 to 1) on the GIDS represents languages that are ‘safe’. These have varying degrees of institutional support, as they are used in the domains of education, mass media, the workplace and nationwide government functions. Fishman (1991) argues that there are limitations to the schools effectiveness in RLS especially if the language is not intergenerationally embedded in the language community. However the positive contributions of the school system are particularly noted especially for language with grassroots backing in the form of intergenerational transmission among the speakers. The language policy in schools is usually a top down affair where proclamations are made at the highest levels without due consultation with the speakers at the grassroots (Ndlovu, 2013). In any case, endangered languages become such because they lack intergenerational transmission at the community grassroots, not because they are not used in education or lack official status (Romaine, 2002). In this light it is prudent to point out that the present study takes a bottom up approach that is informed by grassroots participation of the language speakers at the level of the family and the community, however informing and being informed by the larger macro policy toward the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

3.3.2.1 A critique of the GIDS

According to Hinton (2003), it is undeniable that Fishman is the first and continues to be the shining light and leading researcher in language revitalisation who gave sociolinguistics its decisive thrust. His RLS model has been, and continues to be the main reference framework for many researchers working within the language revitalisation paradigm. The GIDS has especially been taken as a basis for the development of support for minority languages (Darquennes, 2007; Lewis and Simons, 2010). However, Darquennes cautions that the rave reviews, the wide
coverage and extolment that the theory has enjoyed should not be misconstrued to mean that the RLS has always been ‘epigonically’ adopted (Darquennes, 2007:64) although the GIDS remains the foundational conceptual model for assessing the status of language vitality (Lewis and Simons, 2010).

Lewis and Simons (2010) fault the GIDS for its description of the levels of disruption “in fairly static terms”. They argue that Fishman’s descriptions of the changes taking place in a language’s vitality as ‘disruption’ does not adequately explain the directionality of language shift vis-à-vis language development, meaning that a different approach to language revitalisation will be apt for a language that is at level 6 but moving towards level 7 (language shift in progress) as compared to a language at level 6 but moving towards level 5 (language development in progress). An expansion of level 6 to accommodate these distinctions is therefore necessary (Lewis and Simons, 2010).

The GIDS does not provide an adequate description of all of the possible statuses of a language (Lewis and Simons, 2010). At the upper end of the scale are certain international languages that are stronger than Level 1 while at the lower end of the GIDS are languages “that are completely extinct and others that lie dormant as the heritage language of an active ethnic community” (Lewis and Simons, 2010:7). They therefore argue that if the GIDS is to serve as a framework for describing languages at any, and all stages of their life cycle, it is imperative that several levels be added. Edwards (2010) therefore argues that, when likened to a Richter scale of disruption, the GIDS is not fine-tuned enough neither “to provide a solid structure for analysis of a language contact situation nor to provide sound advice to language activists” (O’hlfearnain, 2013:349).

The over emphasis on the importance of the home domain in intergenerational language transmission has been criticised by numerous scholars. O’hlfearnain (2013:349) writes that:

> Despite the intuitive support for the logic of this argument in language planning discourse around the world, the crucial nature of the home in intergenerational transmission and the functional differentiation of language usage have been among most criticised aspects of Fishman’s contribution to the field and remain central to debate and research.
The weight that is allotted to level 6 of the GIDS has, in the same vein been criticised by scholars such as Darquennes (2007), Lewis and Simons (2010), Hornberger and King, (2001). Intergenerational transmission (level 6) is regarded as the single most important factor in language revitalisation. Hornberger and King (2001) contend that while the nuclear family is critical in intergenerational language transmission, the use of the language in the family domain is not the only short term mechanism for an endangered language to survive. The underestimated influence of new media and the importance of socio economic mobility as some of the critical factors that influence the life cycle of an endangered language are glaring in the RLS (Strubell, 2001; Clyne, 2001; 2003; Darquennes and Weber, 1999).

An incremental number of researchers in the language revitalisation tradition stress the importance of the economic revaluation of the minority language as a potential game changer in common situations such as when parents from linguistic minorities stop using their minority language when speaking to their children as soon as they feel that the language is no longer of economic value, although they may continue using it among themselves. The parents are usually spurred on by their desire to increase chances of upward social mobility for their children and are therefore “sometimes Schizoglosically torn between using the endangered language among themselves and the use of the endangered language with their children” (Darquennes, 2007: 65).

Lewis and Simons (2010) note that the GIDS is less elaborated at the lower end of the scale where levels of disruption are at their extreme. While this simpler set of descriptive categories may suffice for the purposes of describing language shift and loss, for the purposes of language revitalisation, a more granular set of categories may be imperative (Lewis and Simons, 2010). They argue that an elaboration of the GIDS to provide a richer set of analytical categories and a clearer indication of what societal factors need to be addressed in each case is therefore an obligation.

### 3.3.3 Elaboration of Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale

This section discusses some of the proposed modifications to Fishman’s GIDS. A number of modifications have been proposed for the improvement of the Fishman’s (1991) GIDS.
### 3.3.3.1 The UNESCO Language Endangerment Framework

According to Brenzinger, Yamamoto, Aikawa, Koundioubia, Minasyan, Dwyer, Grinevald, Krauss, Miyaoka, Sakiyama, Smeets and Zepeda (2003), UNESCO has proposed an alternative framework for the assessment of vitality and status of endangered languages. The UNESCO framework establishes six categories in a scale of language vitality. However “for the purpose of assessing the status of a language, the framework provides a set of nine factors that can be analysed to determine the category” (Lewis and Simons, 2010:8). Prominence is also given to intergenerational transmission. Table 3.1 below provides a summary list of the categories and their corresponding state of intergenerational transmission according to the UNESCO framework.

#### Table 3.1 The UNESCO framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Intergenerational Language Transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>The language is spoken by all generations; intergenerational transmission is uninterrupted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Most children speak the language but it may be restricted to certain domains (e.g. home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely endangered</td>
<td>Children no longer learn the language as mother tongue in the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely endangered</td>
<td>The language is spoken by grandparents and older generations; while the parent generation may understand it, they do not speak it to children or among themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically endangered</td>
<td>The youngest speakers are grandparents and older, and they speak the language partially and infrequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>There are no speakers left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In contrast to Fishman's GIDS, the UNESCO framework provides an elaborated set of categories at the weaker end of the scale, where language endangerment is at its extreme (Lewis and Simons, 2010). However, it does not differentiate the status of languages which are above Level 6 on the GIDS scale and lumps them all together.
under the single label of "Safe" (Lewis and Simons, 2010:9). Their degrees of “safety” are not clarified to enable specific strategies of conservation to be applied. As such it becomes difficult to rely on the UNESCOs framework alone as a guide to language revitalisation. It does not specify the degrees of safety of the safe languages for purposes of tailor-made approaches to maintain them. In spite of some significant obstacles to its ready implementation, the UNESCO Framework is beginning to be widely used and reported on a broad scale (Lewis and Simons, 2010).

3.3.3.2 The Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS)

Lewis and Simons (2010) proposed an expansion of Fishman’s GIDS, arguing that, if maximal benefit from the RLS is to be achieved, its elaboration is obligatory. As a point of departure, they note the lack of elaboration of the lower end of the scale where language endangerment is at its strongest. Their Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS) nevertheless maintains the original 8 levels as per Fishman’s original gradation and additional levels are assigned new numbers or are delineated by the addition of a letter (Lewis and Simons, 2010). What is however salient in their elaboration of the GIDS is that level 6 is maintained, albeit with the distinction between 6 (a) and 6 (b) made. 6 (a) represents the level of ongoing oral use that constitutes sustainable orality signalling that intergenerational transmission of the language is intact and widespread in the community. The language use and transmission situation is stable or gaining strength. 6(b) is the level of oral use that is characterized by a downward trajectory (Lewis and Simons, 2010). Level 6 (b) represents the loss of that stable diglossic arrangement with the oral domains being overtaken by another language or languages. 6(b) also represents the level characterised by partial parental transmission of the language to their children leading to the weakening of intergenerational transmission. As a result, with each new generation there will be fewer speakers or fewer domains of use or both (Lewis and Simons, 2010).

However, although the EGIDS has a potential to explain degrees of language disruption in fuller detail, it is to a very large extent a framework that heavily leans on, and is informed by the GIDS framework under Fishman’s RLS theory. With Fishman’s GIDS retaining its foundational and seminal role in the discourse on
language endangerment (Lewis and Simons, 2010), a detailed elaboration of the EGIDS may not really be necessary for the purposes of the present study. However, it should be noted that the nature of the present study dictates that language revitalisation be seen in the context of language management especially within the home domain, as such, Fishman’s (1991) RLS theory in its original form should suffice.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has devoted its attention to the outline and discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of the study, namely the Language Management Theory (LMT) as well as the Reversing Language Shift (RLS) theory. The theoretical eclecticism employed in this study is informed by potential interaction and mutuality that the two theories share. This chapter discussed how the language management theory, as an approach in language planning and policy, and specifically in the tradition of Spolsky (2004; 2009) is deployed in this study to understand the impact of family language policy (FLP) on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. RLS theory in the tradition of Fishman (1991) was also outlined and discussed under this chapter. The discussion centred around the potential of the RLS theory to shed light on the different levels of intergenerational disruption of different minority languages and hence its potential to inform context specific tailor made efforts in minority language revitalisation. The emphasis, by the two theories on the concept of domain is especially useful for the present study, which essentially regards the family domain as a language management sphere that can be harnessed in bottom-up language management efforts in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. In reversing language shift, family language policy is critical as it is the language practices in the home that have a potential to influence intergenerational transmission of a language. The two theories outlined and discussed in the foregone chapter both speak to the importance of the home domain in the conservation of minority languages. The following chapter is a comprehensive discussion of the methodological concerns of the study.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter focused on the theoretical framework that guides the present study. This chapter provides a comprehensive discussion of the methodological and the philosophical underpinnings of this study. Precisely, this chapter presents the methodological approaches that were utilised in collecting, analysing and presenting data. Wholesomely, it outlines the research design, which is seen as the overall research plan. In that endeavour, the research paradigm, the strategies of enquiry as well as the specific methodologies deployed in the study are outlined and expounded. The data analysis and presentation strategies are also discussed in this chapter. Ethical considerations as well as reliability and validity concerns of the study are also explicated in this chapter.

4.2 Research Design

This section outlines and explains the research design of the study. As Creswell (1998) writes, a research design refers to the overall plan of the research, which involves the intersection of philosophy, strategies of inquiry, and the specific methods. Creswell (1998) emphasises the need at the conception of a study, for the researcher to consider the philosophical worldview that is applicable to it, the strategy of inquiry that is related to this worldview, and the specific methods or procedures of research that transforms the approach into research practice. A research design is explained by De Vaus in the form of an analogy of the construction of a building thus:

When constructing a building there is no point ordering materials or setting critical dates for completion of project stages until we know what sort of building is being constructed. The first decision is whether we need a high rise office building, a factory for manufacturing machinery, a school, a residential home or an apartment block. Until this is done we cannot sketch a plan, obtain permits, work out a work schedule or order materials (De Vaus, 2001:8).

In conceptualising the research design therefore, the researcher stood guided by the avowal that the design and methods must flow conceptually and logically, thereby enabling the conceptual framework and specific design features to become more and more elegantly related (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). The research design
therefore refers to the overall strategy that the researcher opted for in the effort to integrate the different componential pieces of the study into a coherent and logical currency, to ensure efficacy in addressing the research problem (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). It constitutes the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data (De Vaus, 2001; Trochim, 2006). This resonates with the notion that the actual research practice is influenced by particular philosophical ideas (Mpofu, 2013). In conceptualising the research design therefore, the researcher found himself, and remained cautious of Marshall and Rossman’s observation that:

Developing a design that is clear, flexible and manageable is dialectic, messy and just plain hard work. As the researcher plays with concepts and theoretical frames for the study, she often entertains alternative designs assessing them for their power to address emerging questions (Marshall and Rossman, 1999:54).

In light of Marshall and Rossman’s observation, in the research design section, the researcher makes a case for the particular methods, the sample, data analysis techniques and the reporting format preferred in this study. This also assisted the researcher in building a rationale for the overall design decisions, specific data collection methods and to build a case for the selection of a qualitative approach (Marshall and Rossman, 1999).

**4.2.1 Qualitative Research**

As far as the literature on research design is concerned, incremental scholarship distinguishes between quantitative and qualitative research designs (see for example, Creswell, 2003; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Berg, 2001; Ruane, 2005). While quantitative studies are concerned with the collection and measurement of numerical data (Berg, 2001); qualitative studies are concerned with collection and description of naturalist data in explaining humanistic phenomena. This study is essentially humanistic as it seeks to understand the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. For a study with this orientation, it was imperative that a qualitative approach be deployed.

A qualitative design allows the researcher to use a “variety of empirical materials, personal experience, introspection and interview among others that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000: 5). It also allows for strategies of inquiry such as narratives, phenomenologies,
ethnographies, grounded theory studies, or case studies (Creswell, 2003), which are all consistent with an interpretive research paradigm. Qualitative research properly seeks answers to questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings. According to Berg (2001:6):

…qualitative researchers, then, are most interested in how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures, social roles, and so forth.

In this vein, a qualitative approach was deemed appropriate for this study as it is useful in the investigation of a social phenomenon (Creswell, 2008; Silverman, 2005). In investigating the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, general questions were posed to participants in this research. These were meant to elicit responses on how the minority language speakers articulated, directed and negotiated their family language policies within the context of intergenerational transmission of their home languages. The findings are presented in the form of narratives which are analysed with the intention of identifying dominant and emerging themes from recurrent views. Since the views expressed by the participants could not be easily quantifiable, the qualitative approach allowed for their comprehensive analysis nevertheless. This is corroborated by Berg (2001:7) who submits that:

Qualitative procedures provide a means of accessing unquantifiable facts about the actual people researchers observe and talk to or people represented by their personal traces (such as letters, photographs, newspaper accounts, diaries, and so on). As a result, qualitative techniques allow researchers to share in the understandings and perceptions of others and to explore how people structure and give meaning to their daily lives. Researchers using qualitative techniques examine how people learn about and make sense of themselves and others.

Silverman explains that qualitative research is appropriate for exploring the meaning of “everyday behaviour” as this type of research provides “a deeper understanding of social phenomena” (Silverman, 2005:1). This understanding of phenomena is achieved because qualitative methodology allows the researcher to gain insights into the issues under discussion from the perspective of the research participants. Qualitative researchers are narrative inquirers which ‘live the story’ with their participants, record personal and social interaction through detailed field notes, available documents, and interviews (Butler-Kisber, 2010). Therefore, in this study,
the researcher formulated questions around the issues of language practices, language choices, language ideologies and language management within the family domain. From the responses to the questions, the researcher was able identify the family language policies from reported language ideologies, language practices and preferences. The responses were used to generate further discussions relating to the contributions of reported language use patterns and practices towards the conservation of the minority languages from the point of view of the participants (Flick, Von Kardoff and Steinke, 2004). The analysis of the qualitative data allowed the researcher to discuss in detail the various social contours and processes people use to create and maintain their social realities (Berg, 2001).

As Flick et al. (2004); Creswell (2009); Berg (2001) and Ruane (2005) write, qualitative research claims to describe life worlds from inside out, that is, from the point of view of the people who participate. Qualitative research “is based on a relativistic, constructivist ontology that posits that there is no single objective reality” (Krauss, 2005:760) rather, there are multiple realities constructed by human beings who experience a phenomenon of interest. The choice of qualitative approach was necessitated by the need to step beyond the known and enter the life world of participants so as to see the world from their perspective (Berg, 2001). In doing so, the goal was to make discoveries that will contribute to the development of empirical knowledge (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). The resultant idiosyncratic and purposefully constructed knowledge systems in qualitative research are symptomatic of the efforts made by people as they try to impose order on the world to construct meaning (Lythcott and Duschl, 1990). Since according to this approach meaning lies in cognition and not in elements external to the people experiencing a phenomenon (Krauss, 2005), it was therefore compelling to engage them.

As a result of its open-endedness and its more involvedness in contrast to other research strategies, the qualitative approach was preferred (Flick et al., 2004) as it also allows for an open ended engagement (Krauss, 2005). Since research methods on human beings have a tendency to affect how they will be viewed (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975 cited in Berg, 2001:7), “deductively, if humans are studied in a symbolically reduced, statistically aggregated fashion, there is a threat that conclusions drawn from such studies, although arithmetically precise-may fail to fit reality” (Mills, 1959 cited in Berg, 2001:7). In juxtaposition, qualitative approaches
emphasise the fact that each individual is unique (Krauss, 2005). They also emphasise that the researcher is a unique individual and that all research is essentially biased by each researcher’s individual perceptions. “This is not to suggest that qualitative methods are without methodological rigor. In fact, good qualitative research can be very rigorous” (Berg, 2001:7). Although this study has a predominantly qualitative orientation, it does, albeit to a limited extent employ some quantitative descriptions to add precision to narratives, pictures, and narrative in qualitative research (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

While this study is basically qualitative in nature, it should be born in mind that the qualitative research tradition is essentially broad. As such, strategies of inquiry under qualitative research are multiple as well. It therefore becomes imperative for the researcher to clarify on the specific strategies adopted in this study. This study adopted the multiple case study approach, phenomenology as well as the historical research approaches. However, prior to explicating the strategies of inquiry and the specific methods of the research, it is imperative that the philosophical ideas which guided this study are identified and discussed. These philosophical ideas are referred to as paradigms (Lincoln and Guba, 2000) or epistemologies and ontologies (Crotty, 1998). The design should link the methods epistemologically to the focus of the study and the research questions (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). Thus, the next section explains the research paradigm assumed in this study.

4.2.1.1 Research paradigm

The hallmark of a good research undertaking characteristically sets off with the selection of the topic, problem or area of interest as well as the paradigm (Creswell, 1994; Mason, 1996 cited in Groenewald, 2004). Benefitting from this insight, this section explicates the research paradigm which informed the present study. Stanage (1987 cited in Groenewald, 2004:6) notes that the use of the term ‘paradigm’ in research can be “traced back to its Greek (paradeigma) and Latin origins (paradigma) meaning pattern, model or example.” A paradigm is also regarded as the patterning of the thinking of a person; a principal example among examples, or a model to follow according to which design actions are taken (Groenewald, 2004). It is therefore an action of submitting to a view (Stanage, 1987; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Accordingly, the choice of the research design of the study, the target
population, and the sampling techniques, the methods of gathering data, the data presentation and analysis styles for this study were ultimately informed by the research paradigm. The same goes for the ethical considerations that were observed during data collection.

Bryman (2008: 14) perceives a paradigm as representative of “a cluster of proper conduct of science”. In other words, a research paradigm is an overarching perspective concerning the appropriate research practice based on ontological and epistemological assumptions (Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor and Tindall, 1994). A researcher’s epistemology is literally the theory of knowledge which serves to decide how the social phenomena will be studied (Holloway, 1997; Mason, 1996; Creswell, 1994). The term epistemology comes from the Greek word epistêmê, which means knowledge. In simple terms, epistemology therefore is the philosophy of knowledge, the knowledge claims (Creswell, 2003; 1994) or how we come to know (Trochim, 2000). “Epistemology is intimately related to ontology and methodology; as ontology involves the philosophy of reality, epistemology is how we come to know that reality while methodology identifies the particular practices used to attain knowledge of it” (Krauss, 2005:759).

In this light, the epistemological position anchoring the present study was formulated around the belief that the data for the study are contained within the perspectives of minority language speakers, particularly the parents. As the study seeks to ascertain the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, the researcher found it compelling to engage the parents of minority language families to understand how they articulated, negotiated, enforced and maintained their family language polices in the home domain, a practice that is termed language management (Spolsky, 2009). Based on parental reported language ideologies, practices and preferences, the researcher intended make conclusions regarding their language conservation and intergenerational transmission of their languages in the context of multilingualism. The researcher also sought to engage other stakeholders knowledgeable and interested in language policy issues in general to solicit their views on how family language policy can potentially feed into, and be fed by the overall national language policy in Zimbabwe at the macro level.
The ongoing argument in this section is that it is imperative to clarify right from the onset the philosophical underpinnings which determined the sources of data and the ways in which data was gathered and analysed. Essentially, this implies that before taking a position on the research methods, the researcher took note of the ontological and epistemological considerations that made up basic assumptions about the nature of reality and what can be known about that reality (Banister et al., 1994).

As far as the research paradigms are concerned, an incremental number of scholars make a distinction between the positivist and interpretivist research dichotomy in qualitative research (Mpofu, 2013). For positivists, reality is believed to be stable and can be observed and described from an objective viewpoint (Creswell, 2003), that is, without interfering with the phenomena being studied. The positivist epistemology views science as the way to get at the truth by dissecting the world well enough so that it might be predictable and controllable (Krauss, 2005). For positivists, the world and the universe are deterministic, meaning to say that they operate by laws of cause and effect that are discernable if we apply the unique approach of the scientific method. Thus, science is largely a mechanistic or mechanical affair in positivism (Krauss, 2005). Consequently, from a positivist perspective, observation and measurement are paramount in any scientific endeavour, hence their emphasis and a religious belief in empiricism and experimentation (Krauss, 2005; Trochim, 2000). Thus for positivists, the data and its analysis are value-free and data do not change because they are being observed. That is, researchers view the world through a “one-way mirror” (Healy and Perry, 2000).

While positivists are essentially and rigidly encamped in objectivist epistemology; emphasising the belief that it is possible for an observer to exteriorize the reality studied, remaining detached from it and uninvolved with it (AlZeera, 2001), for researchers working within the interpretivist paradigm, meaning exists in their interpretations of the world, which means that knowledge is interpretation (Banister et al., 1994; Krauss, 2005). As such, for interpretivist, there is nothing like objective reality (Creswell, 2003). The study of phenomena in their naturalistic environments (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) is the hallmark of the interpretivist philosophy. In other words, interpretivists admit that there are many interpretations of reality, which are part of the scientific knowledge to be pursued. Reality is subjective and is essentially
a construction in which the researcher’s prior insights and preconceptions on the phenomenon under study are key (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988). However prior knowledge of the research context is assumed to be insufficient in developing a fixed research design due to complex, multiple and unpredictable nature of what is perceived as reality (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988).

For the present study, the interpretive research paradigm was therefore deemed appropriate. The primary goals of this study are consistent with the goals of an interpretivist epistemological grounding because the overall mandate of this study was to understand and interpret the meanings in human behaviour rather than to generalize and predict causes and effects (Neuman, 2000; Hudson and Ozanne, 1988). For an interpretivist researcher it is important to understand motives, meanings, reasons and other subjective experiences which are bound to each other in time and space (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988; Neuman, 2000). This study is humanistic in outlook since it is an enquiry that seeks to understand the contribution of family language policy to the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The meaning making strategies deployed in this study are essentially context bound in that the participants were engaged within their social spaces and the prevailing multilingual nature of their habitat. Family language policy and minority language conservation are undoubtedly social phenomena which could not be lengthily understood through the lenses of an objectivist, positivist epistemology. Rather, it required an approach which considered the importance of the researcher’s perspective and the interpretative character of social reality (Mpofu, 2013). The study took an interpretivist paradigm as a result of the nature of the human phenomena under study which could not be comprehensively fathomed on the basis of the traditional notion of the absolute truth of knowledge (Phillips and Burbules, 2000). This also feeds into the avowal that we cannot be positive about our claims of knowledge when studying the behaviour and actions of human subjects (Creswell, 2003).

Consistent with an interpretivist paradigm, in making sense of the data, the researcher immersed himself into it and conversed with it to make conclusions about the nature of family language policies and their potential impact on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Essentially, the meanings drawn from the responses to the interview questions were encoded along the researcher’s
preconceptions on the nature of reality (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988; Neuman, 2000). Within the interpretivist paradigm, researchers recognise that their own background can potentially impinge on their interpretation, and they position themselves in the research to acknowledge how their interpretation flows from their own personal, cultural and historical experiences (Creswell, 2003). The researcher’s previous experiences as a researcher within linguistic minorities had an impact on the interpretation and understanding of responses from the participants as well as on situating these within the minority language conservation efforts.

The questions posed to the research participants were broad and general to enable the participants to construct the meaning of their situation, a meaning typically forged in discussions or interactions with other persons as well (Creswell, 2003) and hence creating a nexus of subjective meanings that are negotiated socially and historically. This paradigm is also referred to as social constructivism (Creswell, 2003, 2008; Crotty, 1998). This is because “interpretive researchers insist that all social knowledge is co-produced out of the multiple encounters, conversations and arguments they have with the people they are studying” (Deacon, Pickering, Golding and Murdock, 1999: 7). This study therefore focused on family language policy in the home domain as a specific context in which minority language speakers can influence and manage the language choices and practices within their larger historical and cultural settings to the benefit of minority language conservation.

4.2.1.2 Strategies of inquiry

According to Creswell (2003) strategies of inquiry are the design procedures that provide a general direction in research. Alternatively, they are regarded as the general approaches to inquiry that contribute to the overall research approach (Creswell, 2003; 2007; 2008) or research methodologies (Mertens, 1998). Much like knowledge claims, strategies of inquiry have proliferated over the years as a result of computer technology that has pushed forward data analysis and the ability to analyse complex models, with individuals continuing to articulate new procedures for conducting research (Creswell, 2003). Since strategies provide the exact direction for procedures in the research design, they influence the choice of a qualitative approach (Creswell, 2003; 2008; 2009). The methodology chosen depends on the nature of the inquiry rather than a blinkered commitment to a particular paradigm.
Thus, the methodology employed must match the particular phenomenon of interest as different phenomena may call for the use of different methodologies. By focusing on the phenomenon under examination, rather than the methodology, researchers can select appropriate methodologies for their enquiries (Falconer and Mackay, 1999) since it is the phenomenon which dictates the method and not vice-versa (Hycner, 1999).

As explicated previously, this study is humanistic in nature since it seeks to understand the mediation of social phenomena (Mpofu, 2013). It investigates the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Family language policy is a purely human phenomenon that cannot be understood outside the context of the minority language speakers themselves. The study is also situated within the interpretive research paradigm in view of the fact that it captured reality as seen and experienced by the respondents (Creswell, 2003).

### 4.2.1.2.1 Case study research

Consistent with the nature of the phenomenon under study, the research called for the adoption of a case study approach. A case study is a type of qualitative research design in which in-depth data is generated relative to a single or number of individual(s), program(s), or event(s) to learn more about an unknown or poorly understood situation (Robson, 1993; Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2001; Yin, 2003). Echoing the same sentiment, Gilham (2000) describes a case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its context particularly when the phenomenon merges with its context so that it is almost impossible to draw precise boundaries. Data gathering in case study research is largely qualitative, but it may also include quantitative strategies. This resonates well with the present study, which while largely being qualitative, also uses quantitative metrics to present data, however to a lesser extent. Case study research gathers data through tools like surveys, interviews, documentation reviews, observation, focus group discussions and questionnaires (Cohen and Manion, 1994; Mikkelsen, 1995; Becker, 1998).

As Holliday (2010); Baxter and Jack (2008) concur, the case study design is especially important in answering the questions “how” and “why”. Some of the key research questions in this study revolve around understanding how minority language families negotiate the multilingual realities in the home domain through
family language policies as well as understanding the reasons behind particular family language policies within the context of minority language conservation. Because of its ability to offer a multipronged analysis of a phenomenon, it allows the researcher to consider multiple voices with regards to the experiencing of a phenomenon. The potential of a case study design to give a voice to the powerless and voiceless, such as children or marginalised groups (Nieuwenhuis, 2007) makes it an apt strategy of inquiry for the study. The research focuses on minority language speakers in Zimbabwe, who are considered to be marginalised groups, both socially and politically, as such the case study helps in understanding how they negotiate language choices within the family institution for the conservation of their languages. Baxter and Jack (2008) aver that a case study design is very helpful especially when the researcher cannot manipulate the behaviour of those involved in the study. It is also productive when one wants to cover contextual conditions because they are believed to be relevant to the phenomenon under study as well as when the boundaries are not clear between the phenomenon under study and the context in which it is studied.

4.2.1.2.1.1 A Multiple case study approach

A number of scholars have discussed the virtues of the case study especially for researchers whose study object is enmeshed in the context they wish to study (Siziba, 2013). Nevertheless, the case study method has been criticised for its dependence on a single case which may fail to offer a generalisable conclusion (Flyvbjerg, 2007). However, this position has been refuted by some researchers who argue that it is not always the purpose or intention of case study research to provide a generalising conclusion (Ndlovu, 2013). Yet some scholars submit that it is possible to generalise on the basis of a single case (Gobo, 2007). The centrality of a case study in serving as a foundation for generalisation can be felt especially when it has a relational currency to a theoretical framework (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2001; Leedy and Ormrod, 2005; Gobo, 2007; Flyvbjerg, 2007).

In light of the above, this study opted for a multiple case study design. Multiple case study is often used as a synonym for multi-site case study, comparative or collective case study (Bishop, 2010; Baxter and Jack, 2008). If a study contains more than a single case then a multiple-case study is required (Baxter and Jack, 2008). A
multiple case study investigates a defined, contemporary phenomenon that is common to two or more real-world or naturalistic settings (Bishop, 2010). Family language policy is a phenomenon that is ubiquitous among minority language speaking families in Zimbabwe. Minority language groups are dispersed spatially across the two provinces of Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South in Zimbabwe. As such, to get a deeper understanding of the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, it was imperative for the researcher to consider a multiple case study design as it offers a means of understanding an individual, event, policy, program, or group via multiple representations of that phenomenon (Bishop, 2010, Baxter and Jack, 2008). In other words, by illuminating the experiences, implications, or effects of a phenomenon in more than one setting, wider understandings about a phenomenon can emerge (Bishop, 2010).

The strength of conclusions from single case studies is not very high, and it is claimed that the use of multiple cases has the potential to yield more robustness to the conclusions from the study (Yin, 2003; Robson, 1993; Baxter and Jack, 2008). Therefore the choice of a multiple case study approach should not be seen as an attempt to increase the sample size as a quantitatively inclined researcher might assume (Bengtsson, 1999). However robust as it may be, the multiple case study approach can also be extremely time consuming and expensive to conduct (Baxter and Jack, 2008). Pertinently, for the present study, the option for a multiple case study was inspired by the need for both literal and theoretical replication of the findings of the study (Bengtsson, 1999) in varying degrees. This would then enable a comprehensive cross analysis of the data and provide for greater explanation of the findings in the study (Merriam, 1990). The multiple case study design enabled the researcher to explore differences within and between cases with the aim of replicating findings across cases (Baxter and Jack, 2008). The likelihood that comparisons will be drawn made it imperative that the cases are chosen carefully so that the researcher can predict across case similarities or dissimilarities based on a theory (Yin, 2003). The potential of a multiple case study approach to offer a comparative picture is especially useful for the present study in that the nature of family language policies among the different minority language groups vis-à-vis the degree of intergenerational disruption or transmission of that language may shed
light on the kind of family language management practices that are effective and therefore worth benchmarking as well as those that are less effective for minority language conservation and therefore need to be discouraged, modified or discarded.

The specific cases used in the study were the L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga language groups. In both the cases, the research design was kept the same across the sites (Bishop, 2010). This means that there was no variation in terms of the determination regarding the unit(s) of analysis and the phenomenon was studied in light of the same key research questions (Bishop, 2010). In the same vein, there was no variation with regards to data collection, analysis and reporting techniques across the sites. Multiple case studies have an advantage of allowing for individual and cross site data analysis to identify key ideas and to categorise information into key ideas that explain the phenomenon (Bishop, 2010).

4.2.1.2.2 Phenomenology

In attempting to answer questions relating to the language ideologies, language practices and management among minority language speakers in the family domain, the study also employed a phenomenological methodology. According to Groenewald (2004) this is a philosophical design whose origins can be traced back to Kant and Hegel although Vandenberg (1997:11) regards German philosopher, Edmund Husserl as “the fountainhead of phenomenology in the twentieth century”. Citing Eagleton, (1983) and Fouche (1993), Groenewald contends that the premise of a phenomenological approach is that:

To arrive at certainty, anything outside immediate experience must be ignored, and in this way the external world is reduced to the contents of personal consciousness. Realities are thus treated as pure ‘phenomena’ and the only absolute data from where to begin (Fouche, 2004:4).

The above corroborates Groenewald’s avowal that phenomenology as a research design was born of the rejection of “the belief that objects in the external world exist independently and that the information about objects is reliable” (Groenewald, 2004:4). Leedy (1997) thus submits that in a phenomenological research design, the researcher develops an understanding of a subject’s or subjects’ reality as they so perceive. Holroyd (2001) opines that a phenomenological methodology attempts to explicate the meaning structures developed through the experience of the person
being questioned and as such, it should be flexible and adaptable to suit the phenomena under investigation (Crotty, 1996; Crotty, 1998; Giorgi, 1994; Giorgi, 1997; Pollio, Henley and Thompson, 1997).

Taking a cue from Creswell (2003; 2008) in the phenomenological design, the researcher sought to identify and understand the essence of human experiences concerning the phenomenon, as described by participants in the study. Therefore understanding the “lived experiences” (Moustakas, 1994; Creswell 2003; 2008) marks phenomenology as a philosophy as well as a method in which the procedure involves studying a small number of subjects through extensive and prolonged engagement to develop patterns and relationships of meaning(Moustakas, 1994).

According to Groenewald (2004:4), Alfred Schultz (1899 – 1956), furthered the idea that “the human world comprises various provinces of meaning”, as such phenomenologists believe that meaning making and understanding takes place in the everyday world of the individual where reality consists of objects and events as they are perceived in human consciousness (Butler-Kisber, 2010). However the researcher should bracket his or her own experiences in the attempt to understand those of the participants in the study (Nieswiadomy, 1993 cited in Creswell, 2003:15). Bracketing implies that “investigators set aside their experiences, as much as possible, to take a fresh perspective toward the phenomenon under examination” (Creswell, 2003:15). Moustakas (1994:34) uses the term “transcendental phenomenology” which denotes that everything is perceived freshly, as if for the first time” although he is quick to warn that this is seldom achieved.

Phenomenology is concerned with the lived experiences of the people (Greene, 1997; Holloway, 1997; Kruger, 1999; Kvale, 1996; Maypole and Davies, 2001; Robinson and Reed, 1998) involved or who were involved in the phenomenon being studied (Groenewald, 2004) and as such, the operative word in phenomenological research is ‘describe’ (Groenewald, 2004:4). The main focus therefore is to describe as accurately as possible the phenomenon, refraining from any pre-given framework, but remaining true to the facts (Groenewald, 2004).

In this study, the researcher sought to elicit descriptions of language practices in the family domain by minority language speakers within the context of societal multilingualism. The study’s commitment to a phenomenological design is evident in
that the phenomenon was studied and understood from the point of view of the parents within minority language families, who were the main target population of the study. The researcher generated discussions formulated around issues relating to how minority language speakers experienced the phenomenon of family language policy, as inferred from the parental language ideologies, practices and management, since it is them “who have experienced the phenomenon” (Creswell, 2006:61).

As a vivid demonstration of the importance of the participants in phenomenological research (Mpofu, 2013), the researcher employed interviews to gather more information on the nature of family language policies current among linguistic minorities in Zimbabwe and how family language policies are negotiated within the home domain in the wider context of multilingualism. Since the aim of a phenomenological approach is to describe, the findings of this study are presented via detailed narratives that explore in a thematic way, the various facets of the study at the intersection of family language policy and the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe and how these may impact on future trajectories with regards to the intergenerational transmission of minority languages. The phenomenological design was deemed apt for this study as it allowed the researcher to:

...analyse[s] the data by reducing the information to significant statements or quotes and combine[s] the statements into themes. Following that, the researcher develops a textural description of the experiences of the persons (what participants experienced), a structural description of their experiences (how they experienced it in terms of the conditions, situations, or context), and a combination of the textural and structural descriptions to convey an overall essence of the experience (Creswell, 2006:60).

The choice of a phenomenological design was also influenced by its potential to offer a structured approach in analysing data (Creswell, 2006).

4.2.1.2.3 Historical research

This study also leaned to a considerable degree on historical research to complement the findings generated through the use of the case study and the phenomenological research designs. Historical research or Historiography (Berg, 2001) is a method of discovering, from records and accounts, what happened during some past period (Marshall and Rossman, 1999; O'Leary, 2010) because in the
study of any contemporary phenomenon, there is a need for a researcher to “slip the bonds of their own time” (Hamilton, 1993: 43) and descend into the past. Historical research is important in any study as it provides the critical contextual link of the past to the present (Berg, 2001) and therefore enhances the present since any contemporary issue is inextricably bound with the social and historical milieu of the past (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). Historical research involves far more than the mere retelling of facts from the past or linking together redundant pieces of information from diaries, letters, or other documents, but is also descriptive, factual, and fluid (Matejski, 1986; Notter, 1972). Berg therefore notes that historical research is not nostalgia or “the retelling of comfortable past pleasantries, events, or situations” (Berg, 2001:210) but is an attempt to systematically recapture the complex nuances, the people, meanings, events, and even ideas of the past that have influenced and impacted the present (Hamilton, 1993; Leedy, 1999).

Citing Salkind, Berg notes the importance of understanding the historical evolution of a phenomenon in research thus:

\[\text{…nonetheless, understanding the historical nature of phenomena, events, people, agencies, and even institutions is important. In many ways, it may be as important as understanding the items themselves. One cannot fully evaluate or appreciate advances made in knowledge, policy, science, or technology without some understanding of the circumstances within which these developments occurred (Berg, 2001:212).}\]

Since historical research has the potential to uncover the unknown, to answer questions and to seek implications or relationships of events from the past and their connections with the present (Berg, 2001) this study found the historical research design to be illuminating. As the research sought to investigate the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, it was important for this study to begin by understanding the historical perspective to language minoritisation in Zimbabwe, and in doing so, this then enabled the researcher to connect the dots and find the missing link in the fight against language minoritisation and language shift.

A historical journey into the understanding of family language policy as a processual evolution of the broader language planning and policy studies was also important in locating the state of the art in Zimbabwe. In the review of related literature to ascertain the nature and scope of studies related to the present one, it was
imperative to lean on the historical research design. This enabled the researcher to identify the lacuna in the area which then informed the research questions and objectives of the study so as to fill in the identified grey areas. Since family language policy is a recent vein of inquiry especially within the language revitalisation paradigm, in Africa generally and Zimbabwe in particular, a comprehensive historiography of the phenomenon could not be avoided. The study therefore relied on secondary sources for documentary evidence on the issues that had a link with the research questions and objectives as well as the data gathered from the field. The study relied on documentation such as books, journals, (online and hard copy) to understand the historical perspective of the phenomenon under study so as to locate it within its contemporary currency. This is referred to as secondary analysis (Deacon et al., 1999) since the researcher goes back to the raw materials and reanalyse them in line with the aims of a research (Mpofu, 2013).

4.3 Target population

Within the social sciences, researchers are mostly interested in learning something about larger groups of people. As a result of the sheer numbers of the people within these larger interest groups, it is next to an impossibility to involve every member in the study (Ruane, 2005). The larger aggregate group is what is termed the research population and is usually too large to study it in its entirety. This study targeted speakers of minority languages and specifically the L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents as the main research participants. Also targeted were representatives of language and culture associations. As such, to get a glimpse or a “taste” of the larger entity, sampling techniques had to be employed (Ruane, 2005). “Sampling refers to the identification and selection of participants for the study from a selected target population. It is used to select a portion of the population for study” (Ndlovu, 2013:246). Sampling therefore is a form of data gathering whereby researchers do not make a direct observation of every individual element in the study population but use a subset of individuals, a sample — and the results therefrom are used to make inferences and generalisations to the whole population (Mpofu, 2014). In the same vein, Deacon et al. (1999) further aver that sampling issues can be used in all kinds of areas, but more commonly people, social groups, events, activities institutions and texts. As such, it has continued to be a common and useful strategy for gathering information and has been firmly established a research practice in social research.
despite the considerable skepticism that has characterised and surrounded it (Ruane, 2005).

4.4 Sampling techniques

While the above demonstrates that the conceptualisation and definitions of sampling are uncontested, it should be noted that there is a plethora of sampling techniques as there are a number of considerations to be made to determine the sample size for individual studies. The idiosyncratic variations in sample size are mainly determined by issues such as the nature or type of study, time, the resources available to the researcher and the extent to which the selected sample is representative of the target population (Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Flyvbjerg, 2007). Consistent with the aforementioned, in this study, all these considerations impinged on the sampling techniques that the study opted for. Similarly, the target population of the study was also determined by the strategies of enquiry as explicated in the research design, namely the case study, the phenomenological as well as the historical research designs.

4.4.1 Purposive sampling and snowball sampling

The study mainly relied on a sampling toolkit pivoting around purposive and snowball or chain referral sampling, both in choosing the cases and in selecting the sample from the target population. The primary participants for the study were chosen through purposive sampling, also known as judgemental sampling (Marshall, 1996) or convenience sampling (Ruane, 2005). Purposive sampling is a non-probability/non random sampling technique whereby the researcher actively selects the most productive sample to answer the research question (Marshall, 1996; Groenewald, 2004). In qualitative research, purposive sampling is used because it is a method that involves handpicking supposedly typical or interesting cases (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2001). It selects participants of the study from a target population, because of some defining characteristics that make them the holders of the data needed for the study (Ndlovu, 2013). Qualitative research is normally based on non-probability and purposive sampling rather than probability or random sampling techniques (Nieuwenhuis, 2007). The sample size is kept small and is purposefully selected from individuals who have the most experience with the studied phenomenon. The assumption that “big is beautiful is challenged in qualitative
research” (Mpofu, 2013:95), hence the sample size has to be kept small so as to generate “intensive insights into complex human and social phenomena in highly specific circumstances” (Maykut and Morehouse, quoted in Mpofu, 2013:95). This allows for the solicitation of the richest possible data available.

The researcher decided on what needed to be known and therefore set out to find people who could, and were willing to provide the information for the study by virtue of their knowledge or experience (Bernard, 2002; Lewis and Sheppard, 2006 cited in Adam, 2014). In this study, the researcher chose purposive sampling to identify the primary participants. The purposive sample was based on the researcher’s judgement and the purpose of the research (Groenewald, 2004). As such, the study targeted those who had lived experiences of the phenomenon under study. To this end, the researcher used his networks with L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga speaking students from the department of languages of Lupane state University as well as some contacts from previous researches in Kalanga and Tonga speaking communities. These networks provided the researcher with names and locations of people who could potentially be included in the purposive sample as primary respondents (Groenewald, 2004). Interviews were then scheduled with the potential respondents.

In the study, the target population were the parents from Kalanga and Tonga speaking families. Since family language policy essentially involves language management at the level of the family, parents are the ones that could potentially influence family language policies and language practices in the home domain. Expectedly, they are the ones who can also modify language practices, beliefs, ideologies and language choices within the home. As such, they were considered valuable sources of information regarding the phenomenon of family language policy in the home domain.

To gain entry into the research sites, the researcher used purposive sampling to identify primary participants (Groenewald, 2004). The main characteristics of purposive sampling have been discussed earlier and there is therefore no compelling need to rehash them here. The primary respondents were chosen with the considerations on the research problem, the type of information needed as well as the expectations regarding the qualities of respondents having been made (Kruger,
1988; Ruane, 2005; Marshall, 1996). This was done in tandem with the caution that in qualitative research, it is the phenomenon that must dictate the method including the type of participants, not vice versa (Hycner, 1999). The identification of primary respondents was deliberately done to ease the researcher’s entry into the research sites since the primary respondents acted as references for successive participants.

Snowball sampling was used to further penetrate the research sites in order to trace additional participants. This is a sampling method that is used to expand the sample by asking one informant to recommend others for interviewing (Ruane, 2005; Babbie, 1995; Bailey, 1996; Holloway, 1997). According to Ruane, snowball sampling is:

…essentially a sampling strategy built around referrals. (The technique’s name invokes the image of rolling small snowballs into larger and larger snowballs.) The researcher will start the sampling process by contacting a few individuals for inclusion in the sample. These people will then be asked for names of additional people who might be willing to be part of the research project (Ruane, 2005:117).

As explained above, the primary respondents who were included in the purposive sample acted as referrals for more participants. The purposive sample interviewees were asked, at their own discretion (Groenewald, 2004), to provide the names and locations of other L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents who could potentially participate in the research. The process was repeated with successive participants until the data saturation (Ruane, 2005) was achieved for both population segments. At the end of the fieldwork, 34 L1 Kalanga parents and 28 L1 Tonga parents had participated in the study.

Greig and Taylor (1999) write that those respondents in the primary purposive sample, through whom entry into the field is gained usually act as gate keepers while those who volunteer assistance are known as key actors or key insiders. Gate keepers are thus named because they have some kind of authority and control over access to a research site (Neuman, 2000). Key insiders have a tendency to adopt the researcher (Groenewald, 2004) which is detrimental to the study as it may lead to potential isolation of the researcher from some useful informants (Bailey, 1996). Individuals who are loners or individuals who are not networked can be left out of the snowball since primary informants have the key to influence the network of respondents (Ruane, 2005). Despite these draw backs, snowballing was adjudged to
be useful for this study given the fact that the researcher was traversing and unchartered territory, as such, referrals potentially increased the confidence and trust from the informants regarding the intentions of the researcher (Ruane, 2005). The nature of the phenomenon under study dictated that snowball sampling be opted for. As the study attempts to look into the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, it was prudent to engage the minority language speakers since they are the ones experiencing the phenomenon. As such, to get into their life worlds, some degree of trust and confidence in the researcher had to be established within the research participants.

Purposive sampling was also employed in the identification of representatives from Language associations such as Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA), Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association (KLCDA) and Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO) for interviewing. 6 language and culture association representatives participated in the study. Language associations and language committees were deemed important for this study as they are the ones who are in touch with the grassroots in the bottom up approaches as well as with the government in the top down planning. They often lobby the government for the recognition, promotion and functional expansion of the minority languages to help give impetus to language conservation efforts. Above all that, they are also speakers of the minority languages in question, which means that they could also use their experiences as minority language speakers and activists at the same time to proffer useful solutions and viable collaborative and complementary solutions between the macro and micro language policy domains in the fight against minority language extinction.

**4.5 Data collection techniques**

This section outlines and discusses the data collection techniques deployed by the study.

**4.5.1 The interview method**

The interview is considered to be one of the most useful data gathering techniques in qualitative research, “a staple of many academic experiences” (Ruane, 2005:146). Berg (2001); Robson (1993); Cohen and Manion (1989) define an interview simply
as a conversation with a purpose to gather information. Ruane concurs by defining an interview as “a purposeful conversation wherein the interviewer has a set research agenda, that is, key points or questions that must be addressed” (Ruane, 2005:149). A more elaborate definition is given by Nieuwenhuis (2007) who considers an interview to be a two-way communication in which the interviewer asks the participants questions to collect data precisely to learn more about ideas, beliefs, views, opinions, practices and behaviours of the participants. “Of all the data collection techniques available in our search for information, the interview strikes many as the single best device for promoting understanding and getting at the truth” (Ruane, 2005:146).

In qualitative research the profitability of using interviews as data gathering techniques is amplified by their ability to help the researcher to obtain rich descriptive data that will help the researcher understand the participant’s construction of knowledge and social reality (Ndlovu, 2013). Interviews are useful for collecting data which would probably not be accessible using techniques such as documentary analysis, observation or questionnaires because they leave room for in-depth probing and follow ups that would otherwise be impossible with other data collecting techniques (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2001; Bell, 2009; Wagner, 2010 cited in Ndlovu, 2013). The researcher is also able to access nonverbal cues such a facial expressions, emotive expressions via supra segmentals such as tone of voice which may be more telling than what is actually expressed verbally. This is the advantage of “being there” (Ruane, 2005:155). This study opted to for the use of the interview since it deals with family language policies among minority language speakers, language itself being an emotion laden topic whose discussion can be productive under a face to face interaction. Quoting Walliman (2001) on the importance of interviews in qualitative research, Ndlovu avers that:

In face to face interviews the researcher is in a good position to be able to judge the quality of the responses of the participants, since he/she can even look at the non-verbal forms of communication that also help ascertain the participant’s inner feelings about the subject. The researcher can be able to notice if a question is properly understood and to reassure and encourage the participant through his/her body language and appreciation of the responses which are all valuable tools in promoting complete responses (Ndlovu, 2013:274).
Face to face interview is also relatively cheaper compared to telephone and online interviews, and are the only option available in areas with no telephone, cell phone network coverage and internet connections. Moreover, Legard, Keegan and Ward (2003) submit that qualitative interviews are normally conducted face to face as it would be extremely difficult to conduct really detailed in depth data over the telephone. As such the interview should be:

...an intense experience, for both parties involved, and a physical encounter is essential context for an interview which is flexible, interactive and generative and in which language is explored in depth (Legard, Keegan and Ward, 2003:142).

Essentially, this study was mainly conducted in the marginalised communities of Matabeleland North and South provinces, areas punctuated by poor telecommunications infrastructure, poor road network and a generally poor population who would not normally afford telephonic or other technologically mediated forms of interviewing. The face to face interview was therefore the prudent option.

Although there is high enough consensus with regards to what and interview is, the consensus on how to conduct it is not nearly as high (Berg, 2001). As a consequence, there are a plethora of categorisations of the “the family of qualitative interviews” (Rubin and Rubin, 1995 cited in Berg, 2001). However, in qualitative research, notwithstanding the variability of preferred labels, there are broadly three recognised types of interviews. These are namely the structured, the unstructured or in-depth interviews (Legard, Keegan and Ward, 2003) as well as the semi structured interview (Walliman, 2001; Leedy and Ormrod, 2005; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Rugg and Petre, 2007; Babbie, 1995; Denzin, 1978).

4.5.1.1 Semi structured interviews

In the attempt to gain a deeper understanding on the nature and practice of family language policy by minority language speakers in the home, the study specifically made use of the semi structured interview also referred to as semi standardised interview (Berg, 2001). Edwards and Holland (2013:29) opine that:

In a typical semi structured interview the researcher has a list of questions or series of topics they want to cover in the interview, an interview guide, but there is flexibility in how and when the questions are put and how the
interviewee can respond. The interviewer can probe answers, pursuing a line of discussion opened up by the interviewee, and a dialogue can ensue.

Echoing the same view as Edwards and Holland, Berg (2001) posits that in a semi structured interview, the researcher implements a number of predetermined questions or special topics that are posed to each interviewee. The questions are asked in a “systematic and consistent order but interviewers are allowed freedom to digress” (Berg, 2001:70) particularly in pursuit of emerging perspectives that can help the researcher to understand the phenomenon better. Cohen and Manion (1989) observe that semi-structured interviews are mainly preferred for their flexibility as adaptable ways of collecting data that offer the possibility of modifying one’s line of inquiry as one can easily make follow-ups and probe interesting items that emerge during the interviews.

In this light, the study opted for the semi structured interview to collect data from the Targeted L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents. The semi structured interview was preferred for its ability not only to allow the researcher to probe far beyond the answers as compared to the structured interview (Berg, 2001), but also for its flexibility that allowed “much more space for interviewees to answer on their own terms than structured interviews” (Edwards and Holland, 2013:29).

As the study sought to understand the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, it was imperative to interview the minority language speakers who are at the centre of the phenomenon. Minority language groups in Zimbabwe are largely domiciled within the extremely marginalised corners of the country, they are characterised by low levels of literacy. That being the case, the researcher had to opt for a semi structured interview which would help guide the participants through the research process while also giving the respondents room to talk about the phenomenon in their own terms (Berg, 2001) given their unlikely familiarity with specialised terminology used in language planning and policy studies. Considering the multi sited case study approach that the study also adopted, semi structured interviews sufficed because of their ability to provide “some structure for comparison across interviewees in a study by covering the same topics, even in some instances using the same questions” (Edwards and Holland, 2013:29). To this end, the researcher developed an interview guide that consisted of
open ended questions to allow the interviewees to talk about their experiences in an unconstrained manner.

The researcher targeted parents of minority language speaking families to elicit data on how they experienced, influenced and even directed their family language policies in the context of minority language conservation. The parents were considered to be the language managers and the main articulators of language ideologies within the larger family institution who are able to influence other members as far as language use and language choice within the family is concerned (Spolsky, 2009). As such, they formed the main target population.

4.5.1.2 Unstructured in depth interviews

The study also utilised unstructured interviews, also known as in-depth interviews (Legard, Keegan and Ward, 2003) to elicit views from purposively selected representatives of language and culture associations. These participants were drawn from the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association (KLCDA), the Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO) and the Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA). The in depth interviews were conducted face to face at the site of the interviewees’ choice. Community based minority language advocates have an intimate attachment to the grassroots and the nuclear family, as such, they act as intermediaries between the top-down and bottom-up RLS advocates. Commenting on the unstructured interview, Edwards and Holland (2013:30) submit that:

    In the unstructured interview the researcher clearly has aims for the research and a topic of study, but the importance of the method is to allow the interviewee to talk from their own perspective using their own frame of reference and ideas and meanings that are familiar to them.

The unstructured interviews were open ended and sought to elicit views from language association representatives concerning the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The use of unstructured open ended interviews was motivated by the observation by Nieuwenhuis (2007) who avers that open-ended or unstructured interviews can help the researcher to explore the participants’ views, ideas, beliefs and attitudes about certain events or phenomena. Since minority language advocates and activists are normally change oriented and change driven, seeking particularly to influence the
policy makers at the macro level of government to enact deliberate policies that empower minority languages, their views were considered to be illuminating in finding common ground between the bottom up and the top down efforts for the mutual benefit of minority language conservation. This resonates with the view that in open-ended interviews participants may propose solutions or provide insight into events or phenomenon being studied (Nieuwenhuis, 2007).

To that end, the researcher formulated broad questions pivoting on the role of community based language advocacy groups at the grassroots in encouraging intergenerational continuity of the minority languages for posterity. Other broad questions sought to stimulate discussions on the role of government and non-governmental interventions that could potentially encourage family language policies that deliberately advantage and are profitable to minority languages users and therefore to intergenerational transmission of the language, given the pivotal role of the family institution in the intergenerational transmission of a language. Considering the nature of advocacy and activism, the researcher opted for the unstructured interviews so as to gain a fuller and more comprehensive picture on the nature of the relationship top down and bottom up interventions to intergenerational disruption and therefore to enable the study to proffer mutually beneficial solutions to policy makers at the top, solutions that may also be beneficial to the grassroots and therefore increasing their affinity to be embraced.

4.5.2 Records and documentation

As part of desk review, also termed document analysis, the study utilised secondary sources to a considerable extent. These documents are any preserved recording of a person’s thoughts, actions or creations (Potter, 1996). Secondary sources are very useful in research as they have the potential to shed light on, and to complement the primary data gathered from the field (Ndlovu, 2013; Deacon et. al., 1999). Their complementarity with other primary sources of data can be seen as far as their ability to provide confirmatory or contradictory evidence to the research findings and therefore the possibility to help shape and consolidate the researcher’s arguments are concerned (Potter, 1996; Deacon et al., 1999; Ndlovu; 2013). Documentary research was used in this study to complement data that was gathered from the field
through interviews with parents drawn from the selected minority language communities as well as those drawn from language association representatives.

In this study, documentary evidence was deployed in the acquisition of theoretical perspectives on family language policy and the conservation of minority Languages. This was achieved through a thoughtful identification and discussion of related literature that also helped to construct a logical framework for the study (Marshall and Rossman, 1999) and to locate the study within the larger field of language planning and policy. The use of secondary sources was also paramount in demonstrating the researcher’s knowledgeability on issues relating to the intellectual traditions surrounding and supporting the study and therefore in the identification of knowledge gaps and the lacuna within the field in an attempt to lay bare the demonstrated need for the study (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). This involved the review of studies relating to family language policy, minority language conservation and revitalisation as well as other studies that communicated a theoretical involvedness with the issues that are of concern in the present research. All this was intended to locate the study within the existing theoretical and empirical traditions as well as to locate it within its own unique and ground-breaking sub field of family language policy.

4.6 Data analysis and presentation plan

This section explains the data analysis and presentation plan for this study. Creswell writes that:

The process of data analysis involves making sense out of text and image data. It involves preparing the data for analysis, conducting different analyses, moving deeper and deeper into understanding the data (some qualitative researchers like to think of this as peeling back the layers of an onion), representing the data, and making an interpretation of the larger meaning of the data (Creswell, 2009:183).

Since qualitative data are normally in the form of text, the act of analysis involves the deconstruction of the textual data into manageable categories, patterns and relationships (Neuman, 1997; Mouton, 2002 cited in Adam, 2014) in the systematic search for meaning (Hatch, 2002 cited in Siziba, 2013). Qualitative analytical methods are therefore diverse and nuanced (Holloway and Todres, 2003 cited in Braun and Clarke, 2006).
4.6.1 Thematic content analysis

Data gathered through the semi structured and unstructured in depth interviews were subjected to thematic content analysis, which is one of the few generic skills across qualitative research (Holloway and Todres, 2003 cited in Braun and Clarke, 2006). Despite thematic analysis being a foundational method for qualitative analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006), and having a long history and wide usage in research, the term has no clear cut definition (Mpofu, 2014). Boyatzis (1998 cited in Siziba, 2013) defines thematic analysis as a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns or themes within data through minimally organising and describing the data set in detail so that what has been learned can be communicated to others (Siziba, 2013). This is the definition that the study adopted. Data analysis therefore involved the retelling of the story through meaning making so that the data makes sense. Data analysis was informed by the type of data that the study was dealing with and the aims of the research (Bryman and Burgess, 1994; Okely, 1983 cited in Siziba, 2013). To this end, thematic content analysis as a method of data analysis in this study entailed:

- Organising and interrogating data in ways that allow researchers to see patterns, identify themes, discover relationships, develop explanations, make interpretations, mount critiques, or generate theories. It often involves synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, categorisation, hypothesising, comparison, and pattern finding. It always involves what Wolcott calls mind work...Researchers always engage their own intellectual capacities to make sense of qualitative data (Hatch, 2002 cited in Siziba, 2013:118).

This study deploys thematic content analysis, given its productivity as a qualitative analytical method. Braun and Clarke (2006) credit thematic content analysis for its flexibility and potential to be deployed across theoretical divides, thereby allowing the researcher to group and distil a list of common themes from the text in order to give expression to the communality of voices across participants (Anderson, 2007: 1 cited in Siziba, 2013).

Thematic content analysis sufficed for this study also for the reason that it speaks to the interpretive nature of reality. This study takes on a phenomenological strategy of enquiry, particularly interrogating the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Data that was gathered through interviews had to be interpreted subjectively as the researcher had to extract
meaning from the interview transcripts in light of the research questions. Berg, (2001:239) argues that an interpretive orientation “allows researcher to treat social action and human activity as text. In other words, human action can be seen as a collection of symbols expressing layers of meaning.” Of course, the interpretation of the text is also dependent on the theoretical idiosyncrasies of individual researchers. Data analysis involves interpretation, that is, a researcher's understanding of events as related by participants (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). As such, the researcher was at the centre of the interpretive process to generate meaning from the interview transcripts. As an active participant in the research, the researcher therefore adopted:

...an exploratory, non-judgemental orientation by trying to learn what [was] going on in particular situations or contexts and, through analysis and interpretation, [to] arrive at an understanding of the distinctive orientations, perspectives or beliefs of the people concerned (Biggerstaff and Thompson, 2008 cited in Adam, 2014:170).

As this is a phenomenologically oriented study, the researcher attempted to uncover or capture the ‘telos’ or essence of the participants’ accounts in conversation with the data contained in the interview transcripts. This approach provided the researcher with a means of discovering the practical understandings of meanings as encoded in the interview transcripts (Berg, 2001).

According to Berg, (2001), data analysis should not be taken as a discrete phase of the research process, but rather should be viewed a processual and ongoing aspect of the research. To this caution:

The qualitative analysis process was approached like a spiral or circular process and not as a fixed linear action. The content analysis approach implied that the various steps of analysis were regarded as procedural guidelines and not as rigid steps like that of a recipe” (Adam, 2014:170).

Acquainted with the above view, the researcher concurrently engaged in data analysis as the research progressed, identifying common themes and recurrent views that needed further probing on the basis of the research questions. This was done in line with Bryman and Burgess’ (1994: 217) emphasis on the need for continuity of analysis throughout the tenure of a qualitative study since the research design, data collection and analysis are simultaneous and continuous processes (Cited in Siziba, 2013:118). Creswell (2009: 184) concurs that data analysis is an
“ongoing process involving continual reflection about the data, asking analytic questions, and writing memos throughout the study”, gathering data, making interpretations, and writing reports. While interviews were being carried out, the researcher simultaneously analysed interview data collected earlier, writing memos that were also included as a narrative in the final report (Creswell, 2009).

In the presentation of data, what Siziba (2013:118) terms “transforming the field into text”, the study deployed qualitative data presentation strategies. Qualitative techniques allowed the researcher to analyse and illuminate findings from the study through the use of narratives (Mpofu, 2013). To this end, effort was made to employ names for themes from the actual words of participants and to group themes in a manner that directly reflected the texts as a whole (Anderson, 2007). In the write up, the generalisations made in the presentation of findings stemmed from the stories and views of the participants, and these are cemented in some instances by way of direct quotations.

While this study is largely qualitative, it does, to some extent rely on what may be considered as quantitative techniques in augmenting the qualitative presentation methods. Despite Denzin’s reservations about the quantitative techniques in qualitative analysis through “the elephant in the living room” metaphor (Denzin, 2009:140), graphs, pie charts and tables, which are considered to be quantitative metrics were deployed to add precision to words, thereby increasing the clarity and summarisability of the research findings. These quantitative data presentation techniques provide a snap shot of what the qualitative narrative details.

4.7 Validity and reliability concerns of the study

There are several precautions that researchers need to take to ensure that the findings of their researches are valid and reliable (Creswell, 2009). Validity of a study, also referred to as the study’s trustworthiness, authenticity or credibility (Creswell and Miller, 2000 cited in Creswell, 2009) is the degree to which the findings of a study can be considered to be accurate from the standpoint of the researcher, the participants or the readers of an account (Creswell and Miller, 2000 cited in Creswell, 2009). It is therefore incumbent upon the researcher to demonstrate the accuracy of findings as well as convince readers of that accuracy (Creswell, 2009).
One of the core determinants of validity and reliability in qualitative research relates to methodological rigour (Tobin and Begely, 2004; Twycross and Shields, 2005 cited in Adam, 2014). Rigour refers to the “demonstration of integrity and competence in qualitative research by adherence to detail and accuracy to assure accuracy and trustworthiness of the research process” (Adam, 2014:171). Creswell (2009) recommends the use of multiple strategies to ensure validity of the research process.

In light of the above, the study actively incorporated validation strategies into the research process to satisfy the reliability concerns of the study. Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Creswell (2009) emphasise the need for prolonged engagement in the field. Through prolonged engagement:

…the researcher develops an in depth understanding of the phenomenon under study and can convey detail about the site and the people that lends credibility to the narrative account. The more experience that a researcher has with participants in their actual setting, the more accurate or valid will be the findings (Creswell, 2009:192).

As per the above observation, the researcher invested a considerable amount of time in the field, gathering data and engaging with the participants. The prolonged stay in the field also legitimated the data gathered as it became a culmination of a process in which enough time was dedicated, and due diligence exercised.

To ensure methodological rigour, the researcher used the strategy of triangulation. According to Flick (2004) cited in Mpofu (2013:103), “triangulation is the observation of a research issue from at least two different methods, for example the application of different methodological approaches, triangulation of data, or triangulation of theories.” The concept of triangulation can imply either using different data-collection methods or different designs (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). To that end, the study triangulated different data sources and examined evidence from these sources to build a coherent justification for themes (Creswell, 2009). By relying on a multiple case study approach, the study ensured that data was gathered form a multiplicity of sources (i.e L1 Kalanga parents, L1 Tonga parents and language and culture association representatives). The researcher interviewed parents of minority language families as well as representatives of language and culture associations to get a fuller picture about the phenomenon. This was done for the reason that if themes are established based on converging sources of data or perspectives from
participants, this process could be claimed as adding to the validity of the study (Creswell, 2009).

The study also triangulated data gathering techniques by relying on the semi structured as well as the structured interviews, for reasons detailed elsewhere in the thesis. The interview’s legitimacy was ensured by a clear conceptualisation and a purposive design of the interview schedule (Adam, 2014). Methodological triangulation also increased the validity of the study. The research process was adequately described and the strategies of inquiry were explicated in accordance with the criteria for qualitative research and the research aims (Adam, 2014). Essentially, the strategies of inquiry were also triangulated as they incorporated the case study, phenomenological as well as historical research designs.

As detailed in the theoretical framework (Chapter 3), the study pivoted on an eclectic theoretical apparatus. In other words, the study is anchored on triangulated theoretical toolkit that is informed by Spolsky’s language management approach as well as Fishman’s reversing language shift theory. Theoretical triangulation is one of the strategies that ensured that the study is valid and reliable. This allowed the researcher to view issues from multiple perspectives and multiple lenses in attempting to explore the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe.

The study also triangulated data analysis and presentation strategies. While the study predominantly follows a qualitative research design, relying on qualitative approaches for data presentation, it also leaned to a considerable degree on quantitative indices such as graphs, pie charts and tables to add clarity to data presented in the form of narratives. Qualitative data presentation strategies enabled the researcher to extensively engage with data to demonstrate clear links between data and interpretation through the use of verbatim examples from participants to ensure that the process was traceable (Adam, 2014). The triangulation of data presentation techniques also added to the validity and reliability of the research findings.

Over and above, the researcher capitalised on, and profited from the support of colleagues in the department of languages at Lupane State University whom the researcher engaged as “peer debriefers” (Creswell, 2009:192). To this end, the
researcher requested peers from the department to act as his debriefers who had to review and ask questions about the qualitative study so as to ascertain how the account resonated with people other than the researcher. In this study, these were considered to be “fair-minded peers, conversant with the issues discussed in this thesis for the purpose of exploring aspects of the study which may have eluded the researcher’s mind” (Mpofu, 2013:104). This strategy potentially adds validity to the findings since it involves an interpretation beyond the researcher and vested in another person (Creswell, 2009).

4.8 Ethical considerations

In conducting research, especially where participants are human subjects, there is a compelling obligation to observe ethical practices. There are numerous ways by which threats to ethical conduct in research can be experienced. Concerns about ethical practices in research can be traced back to the end of World War II (Adam, 2014) when violation of subjects within biomedical research during the war was exposed. Consequently, codes of conduct came into being. Adam (2014:1) citing National Commission (1979) traces the genesis of the agitation for ethical conduct in research thus:

When the biomedical experiments conducted by physicians and scientists on prisoners in concentration camps were exposed, there was a startling new awareness of the vulnerability of those held captive, who were subjected to experiments they never consented to, conducted by those in power or in positions of authority. The result was the Nuremberg Code, which became the prototype of many later codes ...intended to assure that research involving human subjects would be carried out in an ethical manner.

In light of the above, in conducting this study, the researcher ensured that the research process adhered to the “epistemic imperative” (Mouton, 2001: 239, cited in Siziba, 2013:121). This engendered in the researcher, a commitment to integrity and truth in the research, characterised by unequivocal adherence to the ethical research standards. Consistent with the researcher’s institutional demands for ethical conduct, the researcher applied for, and was granted Ethical clearance by the UNISA’s Department of African Languages Ethics Review Committee under the clearance number 2015_DALRERC_014.

Since the participants in this study were human subjects, the researcher ensured that before interviewing them, he obtained their informed consent to participate. To
that end, the researcher took a number of precautions to ensure that the rights of research participants extended “to their being given a fair option to either participate in the research or not” (Siziba, 2013:121) as well as the option to withdraw from the study if they felt the compulsion to.

Procedurally, for all the interviews the researcher set off by introducing himself as well as articulating the study’s intentions. The study took a cue from Erikson (1967) in Burgess (1984) who warns that it is unethical for a researcher to deliberately misrepresent his identity for the purpose of entering a private domain to which he is not eligible. “In any case gaining access to research participants as well as gaining informed consent are ongoing and negotiated processes that continued throughout this study” (Butler-Kisber, 2010 cited in Mpofu, 2013:105). The researcher also clearly spelt out to the participants that no direct benefit, monetary and otherwise were expected to accrue from their participation in the study. However, potential benefits with respect to the conservation of the minority languages were explained.

Participants were assured that there was no harm that could reasonably be anticipated as a result of their participation in the research. As noted by Celia and Anushko (2008: 96 cited in Mpofu, 2013), it is the researcher’s obligation to maximise research benefits and minimise harm to the participants by taking the responsibility to ensure that research participation is informed and voluntary. In the study’s attempt to unearth the nature of family language polices, the practices, beliefs and ideologies about language among the Kalanga and Tonga minority language groups, it was effectively delving into their intimate life worlds and as such, their protection had to be guaranteed. In order to give a voice to the research participants without exposing them to any risk or harm, the researcher requested to use codes in the write up, while retaining place names, a request to which all participants consented. In the quest to obtain in-depth data, the researcher remained cautious not to be over ambitious to the extent of overstepping the boundary of ethical research norms (Blaxter, Hughes, and Tight 2001).

Similarly, during the write up of the thesis, the same ethical practices were observed as they were in the data collection stage. This was done in line with De Laine’s (2000:2) avowal that, “the author must accord the subject the same respect in print
as would be conveyed in the face to face situation; one must not say in print what would not be said to someone's face" (De Laine cited in Siziba, 2013:121).

4.9 Conclusion

In this chapter, the researcher has grappled with the outline of the methodological issues guiding the study. The chapter has discussed in detail, the adopted research design, research paradigm, the target population and the sampling techniques for the study. Processually, the chapter also concerned itself with the precise mechanics of the data collecting procedures as well as the data presentation and analysis plan deployed in the study. The steps that were taken to ensure the protection of research participants from any harm, as well as steps taken to ensure voluntary participation by the respondents were discussed at length under the ethical considerations section. Essentially, the chapter has articulated the practical mechanics of conducting fieldwork as well as its interface with human subjects (Siziba, 2013). Since the study is situated within the interpretive research paradigm, focusing on how the participants experienced the phenomenon of family language policy, in the context of minority language conservation, a qualitative approach was adopted. The qualitative approach allowed the researcher to study the subjects within their naturalistic environment, emphasising the importance of the participants’ views in understanding the phenomenon. As such, the study employed strategies of enquiry that are consistent with the study of humanistic phenomena. To that end, the study deployed a triangulated tool kit for strategies of enquiry that revolved on the case study, the phenomenological as well as the historical research designs. These strategies of enquiry allowed the researcher to capture the participants' opinions, views and experiences at the intersection of family language policy and the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. As revealed in the chapter, the study relied on purposive and snowball sampling to identify the participants for the study. The study deployed thematic content analysis in analysing the data collected from the interviews. The productivity of relying on content analysis was also discussed in this chapter. The reliability and validity concerns of the study were addressed via a plethora of strategies chief among which included the strategy of triangulation, prolonged engagement, and peer debriefing as well as theoretical eclecticism. The next chapter presents and analyses the findings of the study.
CHAPTER 5
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the research focused on the methodology used in the study. To that end, the chapter spelt out the research design for this study. Besides explicating the research design, strategies of enquiry and specific methods that the study employed, the preceding chapter also outlined and discussed the target population, the sampling techniques, the precise mechanics of data collection methods as well as the data presentation and analysis plan. With regards to the research design, the researcher explained the option of a qualitative approach, which in essence was determined by the nature of the phenomenon under investigation. As explicated in the preceding chapter, the nature of the phenomenon under investigation also influenced the research paradigm. The previous chapter explained that the present study is situated within the interpretivist paradigm. The interpretivist paradigm was appropriate for this study in light of the fact that the present study considers the views of the speakers of minority languages to be key in understanding the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The specific data gathering techniques were therefore informed by the need to get into the life worlds of the participants, to understand the phenomenon from their point of view, since it is them who are at the centre of experience. The choice of the interview as the main method of gathering primary data was explained to as having been primarily informed by the need to capture these experiences. The preceding chapter also dealt with the validity and reliability concerns of the study as well as the ethical considerations that were observed in data collection to ensure that participants' rights were not impeded on.

The present chapter focuses on the presentation and analysis of research findings. It presents and analyses data gathered through interviews. In that endeavour, the presentation of data takes on a thematic approach as detailed in the preceding chapter. Essentially, data is presented under two broad sections and subsections as annotated. The first broad section, and its related subsections presents and analyses data gathered through semi structured interviews with parents from Kalanga speaking families, hereafter (L1 Kalanga parents/ participants/ respondents) and parents from Tonga speaking families, hereafter (L1 Tonga parents/ participants/
The second broad section presents and analyses data gathered from unstructured interviews with representatives of language and culture associations, namely, the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association (KLCDA), Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO) and Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA). As was intimated in the previous chapter, qualitative strategies are used in the presentation of findings in this chapter. The precise motivations for the option of such strategies were explained at length in chapter 4. Findings are presented in a narrative format. However, quantitative metrics such as bar graphs, pie charts and tables are also used to complement qualitative strategies by adding precision to the narrative account. Data is presented under themes. These themes were formulated from the questions that guided the interviews as well as from the responses by the participants as they relate to the research questions.

5.2 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS FROM SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS WITH L1 KALANGA AND L1 TONGA PARENTS

This broad section presents and analyses findings from the semi structured interviews conducted with L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents (hereafter also referred to as participants, respondents or interviewees). As intimated earlier, for the purposes of this study, a total of sixty two minority language speaking parents were interviewed (N=62). This section starts by presenting and analysing participants’ biographical data as well as participants’ family linguistic profiles before delving into the analysis of findings that relate directly and speak to the specific research questions that the study sought answers to.

5.2.1 The participants’ profiles

This subsection presents the profiles of the participants who took part in the study. The necessity for the profiling arises out of the need to demonstrate the appropriateness of the sample used in the study, from the point of view of qualification and competency to provide valid data for the study. In the presentation of findings, the symbol (N) is used to indicate the total number of respondents in each specified category. The sample used in this study comprised of thirty four L1 Kalanga parents (N=34), twenty eight Tonga parents (N=28) and six language and culture associations representatives (N=6). The reasons for the sample were
discussed in detail in the preceding chapter and therefore need not be rehashed here. The grand total of the participants that took part in the study is sixty eight (N=68). Table 5.1 below is a summary of the target population, the number of participants per specified population segment, the data collection method used for each population segment as well as the grand total number of the participants in the study.

Table 5.1: Target population, Number of participants and method per population segment (N=68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method per target population</th>
<th>Number of L1 Kalanga parents</th>
<th>Number of L1 Tonga parents</th>
<th>Language association Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi structured interviews</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured interviews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 5.1 above, the majority of the participants in the study consisted of minority language speaking parents drawn from the Kalanga and the Tonga language groups. Since the study focuses on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, the researcher found it imperative to engage the minority language speakers themselves so as to ascertain their language ideologies, practices, preferences and management within the home or the family institution that could possibly impact on the intergenerational transmission of the minority languages. The parents constituted the main target population because they are considered by this study to be the articulators of family language policies in the home. They are also central in the articulation of family language ideologies which puts them at the focal point of family language policies. As such they constituted the majority of the participants (N= 62). As shown in table 5.1 above, semi structured interviews were conducted with 34 L1 Kalanga speaking
parents as well as 28 L1 Tonga speaking parents. The choice of the semi structured interview was explained in detail in chapter 4. As presented in table 5.1 above, it is evident that in the study, 6 language association representatives were also interviewed. The language and culture associations’ representatives were also considered to be important in this research as they are the ones who are responsible for lobbying both the bottom up and the top down planners in attempt to influence formulation and direction of language policy at the national level that would likely affect the articulation and direction of family language policy. A summary of the number of respondents per population segment, the data collection method used per population segment as well as the total number of participants is graphically illustrated in Figure 5.1 below.

**Fig.5.1: Number of participants per population segment, data collection method and total number of participants**

(N=68)

As illustrated in Fig.5.1 above, participants for the study totalled sixty eight in number, the bulk of them drawn from L1 Kalanga speaking parents (N=34) and L1 Tonga speaking parents (N=28). The remainder of the participants were drawn from representatives of language and culture associations (N=6).
5.2.1.1 Participants' gender profiles

This section presents and analyses the gender distribution of the research participants. It is important to capture the gender distribution of the participants as the gender variable has a potential to influence language ideologies and beliefs about language as well as language practices. As such, a clearer picture of the gender composition of the participants is imperative. It is therefore paramount for this section to deal with the gender distribution of the research participants. In pursuit of that objective, this section captures the gender dynamics within the target population as a whole and within the respective population segments.

The research participants comprised of both male and female sexes. Out of a total of sixty two participants, twenty two participants were female (N=22) while forty participants were male (N=40). These figures represent participants from both the L1 Kalanga parents and L1 Tonga parents. Precise figures from within each population segment reveal that from the L1 Kalanga parents, twelve were female (N=12) while twenty two were male (N=22). From the L1 Tonga parents, findings reveal that ten were female (N=10) while eighteen were male (N=18). In terms of percentages, female participants contributed 35.5% of the total number of participants while male participants contributed 64.5% of the grand total. This distribution is illustrated in figure 5.2 below.

Fig.5.2: The distribution of L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga participants by gender in percentage (N=62)
Fig. 5.2 above demonstrates that from the total number of participants, 35.5% were female while the majority 64.5% were males. The distribution of female participants within the L1 Kalanga population segment was 35.3% while males contributed 64.7%. Within the L1 Tonga population segment, females contributed 35.7% while male participants made up for the remaining 64.3%. Table 5.2 below summarises the gender distribution of L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga research participants within the respective population segments as well as showing the grand total.

**Table 5.2: Gender distribution of the target population, number of participants per population segment and the grand total of the target population (N=62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population segment</th>
<th>Number of males</th>
<th>Number of females</th>
<th>Total per population segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Kalanga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Tonga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 above reveals that the research participants were predominantly males (N=40), while female respondents constituted a minority (N=22) of the grand total. Within the population segments, males still contributed the majority of the participants (N=22) for L1 Kalanga parents and (N=18) for L1 Tonga parents. Females contributed a minority in both population segments (N=12) and (N=10) for L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents respectively. In short, the data presented in table 5.2 above confirms that most family heads who were interviewed were male while a minority of the respondents were female. The gender distribution of the participants in percentage form is captured in table 5.3 below.
Table 5.3: Gender distribution of participants per population segment in percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population segment</th>
<th>%males</th>
<th>%females</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Kalanga parents</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Tonga parents</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evident in table 5.3 above, the majority of the respondents in both population segments were male, making up 64.7% of the participants in the L1 Kalanga population segment and 64.3% in the L1 Tonga population segment. Female participants constituted a minority in population segments, 35.3% in the L1 Kalanga population segment and 35.7% in the L1 Tonga population segment.

5.2.1.2 Age distribution of participants

This section presents and analyses the age distribution of the research participants. The ages of the participants are considered important in this study since they may be useful in understanding language ideologies, language practices and preferences by minority language speaking parents. Knowledge of participants’ ages may also help explain certain linguistic practices and by extension family language policy. Since language conservation scholars put emphasis on the intergenerational transmission of languages especially through consistent use in the home domain, a clearer picture of the ages of speakers can help shed light on the degrees of intergenerational disruption or continuity of the language in question. A clarification regarding the ages of the participants can certainly assist in answering questions related to validity and reliability of the data presented in this chapter. It was also important to capture the ages of the participants as they speak to the degrees of exposure and experience as a parent and therefore to family language policy.

Data gathered through semi structured interviews that were conducted with L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents reveal that the ages of the participants ranged from
thirty five (35) to eighty six (86) years. The age distribution of the participants per population segment is captured in tables 5.4 below.

**Table 5.4: Age distribution of participants**  
N=62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range(years)</th>
<th>L1 Kalanga parents (N=34)</th>
<th>L1 Tonga parents (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 above reveals that the majority of the participants within the L1 Kalanga population segment who were interviewed in this study were within the 61-65 years
age range. The participants within the 61-65 year age range contributed 29.4% of the participants in the L1 Kalanga population segment followed by the 35-40 year age range which contributed 20.6% of the participants. On the lower end, the 86-90 age range contributed 2.9% of the participants in the L1 Kalanga population segment. Table 5.4 also shows that the participants in the L1 Tonga population segment (N=28) exhibited variability in terms of their age ranges. As demonstrated in table 5.4 above, the majority of the participants within the L1 Tonga population segment were drawn from the 35-40 year age group (46.4%). This means that the population segment was dominated by middle aged parents. This demonstrates that, unlike the L1 Kalanga population segment, younger speakers of Tonga were readily available for interviewing as shown by their dominance in the sample. The L1 Kalanga sample was dominated by the elderly within the 61-65 year age group (29.4%). The age distribution of L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents is also illustrated graphically in figure 5.3 below.

**Fig.5.3: Age distribution of participants (N=62)**

As illustrated by the bar graph in fig 5.3 above, most of the participants in the L1 Kalanga population segment were within the 61-65 year age group (N=10), followed by the middle aged parents in the 35-40 year age group (N=7). The 86-90 year age
group contributed the lowest number of participants (N=1). The bar chart above also demonstrates that the majority of the L1 Tonga parents who were interviewed in this study were drawn from the 35-40 years age group. This can be interpreted to mean that there were younger speakers of Tonga who were readily available and willing to participate in the study as compared to the L1 Kalanga population segment which was dominated by the elderly.

5.2.1.3 Participants’ levels of educational attainment

Question 1(c) sought to establish the highest levels of educational qualifications attained by the participants. There was a nuanced variation with regards to levels of educational attainment by both the L1 Kalanga and the L1 Tonga population segments. It was considered very necessary to ascertain the levels of education of the participants so as to assist the researcher to determine the levels of understanding of the participants in relation to the issues discussed in the interviews. Levels of education usually have a direct and strong correlation to consciousness especially on issues relating to marginalisation. Upon establishing the levels of education, the researcher would then proceed from an informed perspective, following a line of questioning and inquiry that was likely to be comprehensible to the participants. Table 5.5 below provides a précis of the respondents’ highest educational attainments.

Table 5.5: L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga participants’ highest levels of educational attainment
N=62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest educational qualification range</th>
<th>Number of L1 Kalanga participants (N=34)</th>
<th>Number of L1 Tonga participants (N=28)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub A-B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1-7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in table 5.5 above, respondents had varied levels of educational attainment, ranging from Sub A, up to tertiary level. The distribution of respondents according to the specific grading categories of the Zimbabwean education system is clearly depicted in the table 5.5 (note that Sub A and B are no longer tenable in the current grading system). As demonstrated in table 5.5 above, for both the L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga population segments, the grade 1 to grade 7 category had the highest preponderance. 11 participants from the L1 Kalanga population segment revealed that they had been educated to levels between grades 1 to 7 while 12 respondents from the L1 Tonga population segment indicated that they had also been educated to similar education range. Those respondents educated to the levels of between forms 1 to 4 constituted the second largest group (N=9) and (N=11) for L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga respectively. The information presented in table 5.5 is also presented graphically in figure 5.4 below for further clarity. 2 participants indicated that they had been educated up to ‘A’ level in either population segment while another 2 had been educated to tertiary level within the L1 Kalanga population segment and 1 within the L1 Tonga segment also indicated having a tertiary level qualification. For the L1 Tonga population segment, 2 participants indicated that they had not attained any kind of formal educational qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1 Kalanga</th>
<th>L1 Tonga</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form 1-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 5-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5.4: The distribution of respondents’ highest levels of educational attainment (N=62)

The bar chart above clearly shows that most of the respondents fell within the grade one to grade seven education range (N=23). The form one to form four range had the second largest number of respondents (N=20). The data presented on figure 5.5 above points to a largely semi-literate group of respondents who had only gone completed primary education. Levels of literacy and levels of educational attainment are generally low in Matabeleland North and Matabeleland south provinces in Zimbabwe. These are the two provinces that have suffered years of marginalisation on many levels including access to education and other social amenities. It is therefore not surprising that the research sample in this study also mirrored this enduring state of affairs and therefore augured well with that narrative. A negligible number of respondents (N=3) indicated that they had been educated to tertiary level. This meant that for most of the interviews, the researcher had to remain cautious as far as the questioning techniques were concerned. The researcher had to try and create an anxiety free interview encounter by constantly reviewing his line and technique of questioning so as to remain comprehensible to the respondents but at the same time retaining relevance to the purpose of the interviews.
5.2.1.4 Respondents’ status in the family

As part of the profiling process to assess the suitability of respondents and their potential to contribute meaningfully in answering the research questions, question 1(d) sought to establish the positions held by the participants in their respective families or homes. Since this study sought to understand the potential impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, it considered language management within the family and home domain to be pivotal in intergenerational transmission of the minority languages for posterity. As such, for this study, parents were regarded to be the important players as far as language management strategies in the home are concerned. Parents’ language ideologies and beliefs are likely to inform language practice in the home as parents are considered authorities who articulate, direct and enforce certain language practices in the home. Proceeding from this thinking, the study targeted those language speakers who were parents or heads in their family setups. It was therefore important for the researcher to establish the position or status of the respondents in their families. To that effect, participants had to be parents (fathers or mothers) within their respective families. Table 5.6 below shows the participants’ statuses within their homes.

Table 5.6: The number of ‘fathers’ and ‘mothers’ per population segment and the percentage of the total (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status/position in the family</th>
<th>L1 Kalanga population segment</th>
<th>L1 Tonga population segment</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 5.6 above, from the total sample of the respondents, 64.5% of the respondents were fathers while 53.5% were mothers within their respective families.
This means that from the 62 families represented, 40 were represented by the fathers, while 22 were represented by the mothers. This means that the researcher only interviewed one parent per family, even if both the father and mother were available for interviewing. The total percentages of respondents according to their statuses within their respective families for the whole target population are shown in figure 5.5 below.

**Fig.5.5: The distribution of respondents by status/position in the family (N=62)**

![Pie chart showing 64.5% fathers and 35.5% mothers.]

Figure 5.5 above clarifies that the majority of the respondents constituted of fathers who accounted for 64.5% of the total population while mothers accounted for 35.5% of the total population of respondents.

**5.3 Participants’ full linguistic profiles**

This section presents the participants’ full linguistic profiles. It has already been established in the preceding sections that respondents that were targeted for this study had to be mother tongue speakers of either Kalanga or Tonga for them to be included in the sample. Out of a total of 62 respondents, 34 were L1 Kalanga speakers while 28 were L1 Tonga speakers. However, it was deemed important for this study to establish the full complement of languages spoken by the participants in addition to their mother tongues or first languages. As alluded to in chapter four, the target population for the study is largely domiciled in Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South provinces of Zimbabwe. These provinces are known for housing the majority of Zimbabwe’s indigenous languages, especially the minority languages.
This is also inclusive of Ndebele, one of the major languages spoken in Zimbabwe. As such, in the said provinces, societal and individual bilingualism and multilingualism are the norm rather than the exception (Bamgbose, 1991). The need to establish the full complement of languages within the repertoire of the respondents in addition to their mother tongue was necessary in the sense that family language policy is deemed to be understandable within the context of choices that are available to the respondents. Language ideologies, language beliefs and language practices shape and are shaped by the available alternatives. With this in mind, the researcher felt the compulsion to establish the full linguistic profiles of the participants as presented in Table 5.7 below. The additional language(s) spoken by L1 Kalanga respondents are indicated by a tick against the respective respondent who is assigned a code instead of the respondents’ real names to protect their identities. This is part of the attempts to ensure confidentiality as was outlined under the study’s ethical considerations in chapter 4.

Table 5.7: Additional languages spoken by L1 Kalanga participants (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>participant code</th>
<th>Nde</th>
<th>Sho</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Nam</th>
<th>Ven</th>
<th>Sot</th>
<th>Che</th>
<th>Tswa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAL 001</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 002</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 003</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 004</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 005</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 010</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 011</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 012</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 013</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings presented in table 5.7 above demonstrate that bilingualism and multilingualism are the norm among L1 Kalanga speakers. As shown in the table, all respondents (N=34) indicated that they speak Ndebele as an additional language. Ndebele is therefore one of the major languages spoken by L1 Kalanga participants.
in addition to their mother tongue. Shona is also one of the additional languages reportedly spoken by L1 Kalanga participants but its preponderance was negligible compared to Ndebele. English is also spoken by certain sections of the research population but it is not as widespread as Ndebele as well. This therefore points to a widespread Kalanga –Ndebele bilingualism amongst the majority of participants as shown in table 5.7. Other languages such as Nambya, Venda, Sotho, Chewa and Tswana were also reported to be spoken, albeit by a very small number of the respondents. L1 Kalanga respondents were drawn from Bulilima and Mangwe districts in Matabeleland South. The proximity of these areas to Gwanda and Beitbridge explains why some L1 Kalanga speakers also speak Sotho and Venda as additional languages. Sotho is predominantly spoken in and around Gwanda while Venda is spoken in areas bordering Gwanda and Beitbridge districts (Ndhlovu, 2009). Plumtree is a border town that is a gateway to Botswana. As such, it is understandable that some participants indicated that they also spoke Tswana as one of their additional languages.

The L1 Tonga population segment also exhibited varying degrees of bilingualism and multilingualism. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, 28 L1 Tonga speakers were interviewed in this study. Table 5.8 below captures the L1 Tonga respondents’ linguistic profiles. In a manner similar to table 5.7 above, table 5.8 also presents the linguistic profiles of L1 Tonga respondents. The additional languages spoken are indicated by a tick against the respondents who are assigned codes.

**Table 5.8: Additional languages spoken by L1 Tonga participants (N=28)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Additional languages spoken by L1 Tonga participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 001</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 003</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 004</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 006</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in table 5.8 above, all L1 Tonga respondents (N=28) also indicated that they were bilinguals of varying kinds. In essence, bilingualism was also discovered to
be widespread among the Tonga respondents. As shown in table 5.8, most L1 Tonga respondents also speak Ndebele as an additional language. A significant number also speak Shona and Nambya, while a negligible number indicated that they spoke Chewa as one of their additional languages. English was also reported to be spoken by a section of the population. L1 Tonga respondents were drawn from Binga district in Matabeleland North province of Zimbabwe where Tonga is predominantly spoken. Ndlovu (2009) however notes that despite Binga district being the epicentre of the Tonga speaking community, the language is also spoken in some parts of Gokwe, in the Midlands, parts of Mount Darwin and Chirundu in Mashonaland East as well as in Kariba districts in Mashonaland West. The proximity of Binga to other linguistic communities such as Nambya in the Hwange district (Ndlovu, 2009) in addition to Ndebele has also resulted in the same languages being spoken by the L1 Tonga participants. Binga also shares borders with Gokwe districts where Shona and Ndebele are spoken. This geographical proximity has also resulted in a variety of languages being spoken by the Tonga. As shown in table 5.8, the preponderance of Ndebele, Shona and Nambya as the additional languages spoken by L1 Tonga participants was roughly the same. Chewa was also found to be spoken by a section of the respondents as evident in table 5.8. However, Chewa as an additional language was not as widespread as Ndebele, Shona and Nambya within the linguistic repertoire of the L1 Tonga participants.

5.4 Participants’ other family members’ linguistic repertoires

To fully comprehend the nature of language practices and preferences in the home domain by minority language speakers, the researcher found it imperative to establish the complement of languages within the repertoire of the respondents’ family members. Since family language policy pivots on the language choice, language practice and language preferences in the home domain, a meticulous discussion of this dictates that the available choices be known beforehand. As such, it was important to be aware of the languages that are available as alternatives to the mother tongue, also within the speakers’ repertoire. The researcher was therefore implored to establish, from the respondents; the list of languages within their families’ linguistic ecosystem. Table 5.9 below summarises the findings to question 2(c) which sought to establish the languages spoken by the respondents’ family members.
Table 5.9: A repertoire of languages spoken by L1 Kalanga participants’ family members (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Kal</th>
<th>Nde</th>
<th>Sho</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Nam</th>
<th>Ven</th>
<th>Sot</th>
<th>Che</th>
<th>Tswa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAL 001</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 002</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 003</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 004</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 005</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 010</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 011</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 012</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 013</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 014</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 015</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 016</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 017</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 019</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 020</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 021</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 022</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 023</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 024</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 025</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL 026</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings presented in table 5.9 above relate to L1 Kalanga respondents’ indications on the broader linguistic repertoire of their family members. The respondents were asked to indicate the languages spoken by other members of their family as in question 2(c) in the interview schedule (see appendix A). Table 5.9 therefore presents the responses to that question. As shown in table 5.9 above, Ndebele is the only language that is present in the linguistic repertoire of all participants’ families. All respondents revealed that Ndebele was largely spoken by their family members. The preponderance of Kalanga within the range of languages spoken by respondents’ family members was not nearly as high as Ndebele. This means that some family members of the L1 Kalanga respondents do not speak Kalanga at all, despite the parents being L1 Kalanga speaking. Shona and English are also present within the linguistic repertoire of a negligible number of respondents’ families. 4 participants also indicated Venda to be part of the languages spoken by their family members while only 2 participants indicated that Sotho is also spoken by their family members. 4 respondents attested that Tswana is spoken by some members of their families.
Data collected from L1 Tonga respondents also revealed that participants’ family members were predominantly multilingual. The responses indicate that in most families, more than one language is spoken. Data also from L1 Tonga participants showed that Tonga is spoken in all of the participants’ families by other family members. This contrasts with most L1 Kalanga participants’ families where Kalanga does not feature in their linguistic repertoire as shown in table 5.9. Table 5.10 below captures the L1 Tonga participants’ families’ linguistic repertoire.

**Table 5.10: A repertoire of languages spoken by L1 Tonga participants’ family members (N=28)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Ton</th>
<th>Nde</th>
<th>Sho</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Nam</th>
<th>Ven</th>
<th>Sot</th>
<th>Che</th>
<th>Tswa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TONG 001</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 002</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 003</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 004</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 005</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 010</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 011</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 012</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 013</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 014</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 015</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 016</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 017</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONG 019</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As evident in table 5.10 above, responses from L1 Tonga participants regarding their family members’ linguistic repertoire revealed that Tonga is spoken in every respondent’s families by other family members. This also paints a picture of widespread use of Tonga. Ndebele, Shona and Nambya are also part of the linguistic repertoire of a considerable number of families. The distribution of Chewa and English is negligible in that a few respondents indicated their use by other family members.

5.5 Respondents’ awareness of the ‘minority’ status of their home language.

The awareness of the threat of extinction stalking minority languages has in many cases been the catalyst to language practices and management intended to negate the course of the threat. As such, awareness regarding this threat can spring minority language speakers into readiness to defend their language and promote its acquisition by younger speakers. The first step to an ideologically informed family
language policy requires that minority language speakers be conscious of the status of their language so as to be emboldened to take corrective steps at redressing the predicament of the language. In most cases, parents whose language ideologies are influenced by their awareness of language endangerment have a tendency to appreciate their language, which can apparently encourage them to maintain it and promote its acquisition and use by their children (Schwartz, 2008). Question (2) in the interview guide therefore sought to establish the levels of awareness among the respondents’ regarding the minority status of their languages. Responses to question (2) are presented below.

Table 5.11 Do you consider yourself to be a speaker of a minority language? N=62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>L1 Kalanga</th>
<th>L1 Tonga</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 5.11 above, most participants indicated that they considered their home languages to be minority languages. The majority of L1 Kalanga respondents (N=24) and the majority of L1 Tonga respondents (N=19) all answered in the affirmative, meaning that they were aware that their respective home languages were threatened languages. Only a minority of the respondents (N=10) for L1 Kalanga and (N=9) for L1 Tonga respondents indicated that they did not consider Kalanga and Tonga respectively to be minority languages. Those who answered in the affirmative contributed 69.4% of the total number of respondents while those who answered in the negative contributed 30.6% of the respondents as shown in table 5.11.

5.6 Participants’ views regarding the importance of home language conservation

Language ideologies at the intersection of home language conservation and family language policy are usually influenced by the importance or value that the speakers attach to a language. This observation resonates with Ravindranath’s (2009:9)
argument that “It is generally agreed that among all of the factors that promote or prevent language shift, by far the most important is the value assigned to the language by the speakers themselves.” As a commitment to understand the nexus between the importance assigned to a language by its speakers and their concomitant family language policies, the study found it imperative to establish the participants’ levels of awareness regarding the importance of their home languages. In that regard, question (4) explicitly solicited for these views. The participants’ views concerning the importance of their home languages are presented and analysed below. Table 5.12 below presents the generic views as well as the actual responses from the interviewees regarding the importance of home language conservation.

Table 5.12: Generic views and actual responses regarding the importance of home language conservation by L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga participants (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic View 1</th>
<th>It is very important to conserve our home language</th>
<th>(N=55) 88.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td>• Language is a carrier of culture and it is therefore important to conserve our home languages as they embody our culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The home language is an important medium of communication that helps us to communicate effectively amongst ourselves and our children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our home languages are the mainstay of our cultural heritage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our home languages are the media that we use to communicate even with our ancestors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We understand better when addressed in our own languages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our children need to learn to speak and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

understand our languages.
- The home language should be conserved for future generations.
- People should not shy away from their mother tongues.
- Our languages make us who we are as a people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 2</th>
<th>It is becoming less important to agitate for the conservation of home languages</th>
<th>(N=7) 11.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td>• Globalisation demands the knowledge of world languages such as English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our home languages are not taught in schools and therefore they have no much use beyond the home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other languages have more value and they create employment opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Our children are not interested in learning the home language and therefore there is no need to continue forcing them to speak them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Languages have no real use in government and in the media.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Languages are looked down upon and speakers are denigrated and stigmatised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No real incentives for being fluent in the language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 5.12 shows, there were broadly speaking two generic views from participants regarding the importance of conserving the home language. One set of
respondents maintained that there was a compelling need for them to conserve their home languages. As shown in table 5.12, the majority of participants were of the view that their home language must be conserved given the importance of language in the transmission of culture, the efficacy of home languages in enabling effective communication as well as the function of language as a symbol of a people’s identity. Similar views have been expressed by Barbour (2000:9) quoted in Ndhlovu, (2009:7) who avers that:

The cultural coherence of an ethnic group is often partly expressed by language [in the sense that] a distinctive language may help to demarcate the ethnic group from other groups, and a common language may facilitate communication and hence coherence within an ethnic group.

The interviewees who felt the need to conserve their home languages accounted for 88.7% of the total respondents while 11.3% of the interviewees felt that it was increasingly becoming less important to agitate for the conservation of the home language given the increasing demands of globalisation for competencies in global languages. Negative evaluations by the speakers of the language and their affinity to be associated with languages of opportunity seem to be the major catalysts which fuel this broad view. Nyota (2015) also found a correlation between a people’s perception of their languages and their tendency to shift to other languages with real economic opportunity. However, for the present study, it is noteworthy that the majority of interviewees were found to be aware of the importance of home languages and therefore the need for their conservation.

5.7 Participants’ awareness of their roles as language managers in home language conservation

Interview question (5) sought to establish the participants’ awareness regarding their roles as language managers within the family institution. Within the family, parents are the ones with the capacity to direct family language policies given their authoritative positions within the family. Very often parents decide what language(s) to use, not only for themselves but also for their children although parental preferences may run counter to children’s preferences often as a result of the fact that parental preference may not necessarily coincide with children’s literacy levels, particularly in the parents’ mother tongue (Kasatkina, 2011). However, it was
considered important for this study to ascertain the respondents’ awareness regarding their roles as language managers in articulating, enforcing and directing family language policy to the benefit of minority language conservation in the home. The articulation and direction of family language policy is likely to be impacted by the extent to which parents are conscious of their roles. Table 5.13 below presents the participants’ views regarding their awareness of their roles as language managers in the family.

**Table 5.13: Generic views and actual responses regarding participants’ awareness of their roles as language managers in the family**

(N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 1</th>
<th>Yes, it is important as a parent to be at the forefront of language conservation efforts in the family</th>
<th>N=47 75.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td>• Parents and elders are the ones who are most aware of the implications of language extinction and language death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If languages are to be conserved and saved from extinction, parents should lead by example.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As the head of the family, I should be the one directing and influencing language use and practice in the family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I am the one with the authority to compel my children to speak their heritage language as their elder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I am the one who knows what is good for the children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As a parent I am the custodian of the language and it is my duty to lead the efforts aimed at transmitting the language to the next generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children do not know what it means to have a language you can call your own; parents are the ones who know and therefore should transmit that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in table 5.13, L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents (N=62) were asked for their views regarding their roles in leading home language conservation efforts. As revealed in table 5.13 above, the majority of respondents held the general view that knowledge to the younger generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 2</th>
<th>Not really necessary to enforce a language that is not desired by children and other family members.</th>
<th>N=6 9.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | • Nowadays people are free to choose a language that they want to use.  
                      • Family members have a right to speak a language that they prefer.  
                      • I cannot dictate the language to be used. |        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 3</th>
<th>It has to be a collective effort</th>
<th>N=5 8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | • Language conservation efforts will succeed if every member of the family takes interest and initiative.  
                     • It is not exclusively the duty of the parents alone to enforce language management strategies to conserve minority languages.  
                     • Parents are not always around in some cases to enforce their preferred language practices. |        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 4</th>
<th>Children have their own preferences</th>
<th>N=4 6.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | • Parents sometimes give in to their children’s preferred language choices.  
                      • The school system has a huge influence on children’s choices. |        |
parents had a pivotal role to play in articulating and directing family language policies that would impact positively on home language conservation. They argued that as conscious adults, it was them who could possibly understand the impact of language extinction more than the children. As such, they had to act as torch bearers leading by example. In addition, respondents pointed out that as parents, they are the custodians of the language who have an obligation to transmit the language and the knowledge contained therein to the next generation, as such, it is the parents’ duty to lead the conservation efforts in the home front.

Yet, some respondents felt that it was no longer fashionable or necessary for parents to dictate language choices to their children. As shown in table 5.13, actual responses under generic view 2 indicate that 9.7% of the participants do not think that as parents they should be the ones dictating the family language policy. They felt that family members should be left to decide what language they preferred even in the home domain as it is within their rights to do so. Some respondents argued that that the parents should not exclusively enact and direct family language policies without the input and consent of other family members such as the children. As shown under generic view 3.8% of respondents held the view that home language conservation should be a collective process, whereby every member takes interest and initiative. In other words, these participants felt that family language policy has to be negotiated among family members. As such, the buy in from the rest of the family was deemed to be important in the conservation of home languages among minority language families.

Some respondents, (6.5%) felt that it was difficult for them as parents to force children to adopt their preferred positions regarding language use in the home. They indicated that children normally have their own preferences that are sometimes influenced by language practices in other domains such as the school system or the wider community. They argued that as parents, they therefore tended to capitulate to the children’s preferences, sometimes to the detriment of home language conservation.

5.8 Parental language preferences in the home domain

The home domain has been cited as the single most important sphere for intergenerational transmission of a mother tongue. Fasold (1987) argues that if a
people’s mother tongue ceases to be used in the home domain that would be a sure sign that language shift is in progress for that particular group of people. Language use and language practices within the home can therefore provide useful pointers regarding the degree of commitment to language maintenance. Parental language preferences are therefore likely to influence the general familial language ideologies and specific family language policies. Question (6) in the interview guide, (Appendix A) therefore attempted to establish the participants’ preferences regarding language choice in the home domain. The parental preferences are most likely to influence family language policy and therefore the degree of commitment to home language conservation. Tables 5.14 and table 5.15 below presents the participants’ views regarding their language use preferences in the home domain and the reasons for their preferences.

Table 5.14: L1 Kalanga participants’ language preferences in the home and the reasons for their preferences (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred language(s)</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalanga only</td>
<td>• Kalanga is my mother tongue and my home language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=16) 47.1%</td>
<td>• Kalanga represents my identity and I do not want to lose it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is the language I want my children to learn and speak as well so I lead by example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I don’t want my language to die so I make sure that in my household Kalanga is the ‘official’ language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I cannot allow another person’s language to dominate in my household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalanga and Ndebele</td>
<td>• I prefer both Kalanga and Ndebele since some of my family members are not fluent in Kalanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=17) 50%</td>
<td>• My children speak Ndebele so I prefer both languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I sometimes speak in Kalanga with my wife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because she understands but my children only understand Ndebele so I use it to communicate with them mostly.

- My husband speaks Ndebele as a first language so I have to accommodate him.
- Both languages are important to me. Kalanga is my mother tongue but Ndebele is like an adopted language that has become equally important.
- My children learn Ndebele at school so in most cases I speak with them in Ndebele so that they can practice using it for school. In helping them with their Ndebele homework I also use Ndebele. I use Kalanga with them at times so that they do not forget their heritage.
- I want my children to grow up knowing both languages. Both languages will be useful in their lives so I prefer both languages to be spoken at home.
- I sometimes use both Kalanga and Ndebele in the same utterance (codeswitching).
- I prefer the one parent one language strategy (OPOL). I speak Kalanga with them and allow their mother to communicate with them in Ndebele so that they become exposed to both languages.
- I allow my children to respond to me in a language of their choice, but I always use Kalanga when speaking to them.
- It is the arrangement that works these days.

| Kalanga and Shona (N=1) | • I am married to a Shona speaker and therefore I also speak Shona for the sake of my spouse. |
Table 5.14 above demonstrates that parental language use preferences in the home by L1 Kalanga participants are influenced by a plethora of reasons. Since parental language use preferences are usually thought to be dictated by language ideologies, they, by extension have the potential to influence the nature of family language policy. About half of the L1 Kalanga participants (50%) indicated that they preferred both Kalanga and Ndebele to be used within the home domain because it is an arrangement that works as it is pragmatic. These participants seemed to actively promote bilingualism within their homes as shown by their preference for the equitable use of Kalanga and Ndebele. Some of the reasons as shown in table 5.14 had to do with the influence of the education system that resulted in parents capitulating to their children’s language preferences, intermarriages between the Kalanga and the Ndebele and the general tendency by the Kalanga to adopt the majority language in the wider economic context. Some participants indicated that that they preferred the “one parent one language (OPOL) strategy” (King, Fogle and Logan-Terry, 2008:914; Smith-Christmas, 2014:512), also referred to as the one person one language strategy (King, 2016:726) whereby they communicated with the children using the minority home language while allowing their spouses to use another language such as Ndebele when communicating with the children. Evidently, this initiated the promotion of active bilingualism. While parental language preferences usually guide family language policy, the influence of other language management spheres outside the family context is evident in these findings. These findings are in consonance with Schwartz’s (2008:402) observation that the direction of family language policy can make visible the relationships between private domains and public spheres that reveal the conflicts that family members must negotiate at the intersection of the realities of social pressure, political impositions, and public education demands on the one hand, and the desire for cultural loyalty and linguistic continuity on the other.

On the other hand, 47.1% of the L1 Kalanga participants indicated that they preferred the exclusive use of Kalanga in their homes. These particular participants seemed to be overly conscious of the importance of the home domain in the
intergenerational transmission of their mother tongue. They tended therefore to jealously guard the home domain and reserve it solely for the use of Kalanga. They were also aware of the role of their language as a marker of their identity as well as the importance of language as a carrier of culture. Such a strong sense of ownership of the language alone is an important precursor to a family language policy that impacts positively on intergenerational transmission. One participant indicated that she preferred both Kalanga and Shona so as to accommodate her Shona speaking spouse.

While the findings presented on table 5.14 above show that L1 Kalanga participants show a nuanced commitment to ensuring intergenerational transmission of Kalanga, especially with 50% of the respondents preferring a bilingual family language policy, L1 Tonga participants demonstrated a stronger sense of commitment in reserving the home domain for the intergenerational transmission of Tonga despite the extra-familial pressures dictating the opposite. Table 5.15 below presents the L1 Tonga participants’ language use preferences in the home domain.

Table 5.15: L1 Tonga participants’ language use preferences in the home and the reasons for their preferences (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred language</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tonga only (N=20) 71.4% | • It is the language that I primarily use in everyday conversation with my family members.  
• It is a marker of my identity and therefore using it at home helps preserves that identity.  
• It is my mother tongue and home language.  
• My family members can speak and understand it hence there is no need to bring in another language into the home.  
• I am proud of whom I am and my language and I would like my children to be proud of it so I make sure that the language is used in the home.  
• Tonga is now taught in schools and therefore I want my... |
children to speak it fluently. The home is the best place for them to gain that proficiency so that they perform well in the subject at school.

- I have control regarding the choice of language to be used in the home and I use that power to enforce Tonga among my children and family members.
- It is my duty to preserve our heritage and language is part of that heritage that must be passed on to the next generations. The home presents an opportunity for the speakers to transmit and teach the language to the children so that they can also pass it on to their children as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Combination</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Tonga and Ndebele** (N=4) 14.3% | • Some of the children learn Ndebele at school so, for the purposes of school work I sometimes the one parent one language strategy (OPOL) to cultivate the use of both languages by children.  
  • I sometimes use both languages within the same utterance (codeswitching).  
  • My spouse speaks Ndebele as such I sometimes use Ndebele when addressing her.  
  • This is the arrangement that works in my family.  
  • There are incentives for learning Ndebele as much as there are incentives for learning Tonga. |
| **Tonga and Shona** (N=1) 3.6% | • Spouse speaks Shona |
| **Tonga and Nambya** (N=3) 10.7% | • Spouse speaks Nambya |
As demonstrated by the responses captured in table 5.15 above, L1 Tonga participants indicated a widespread preference for the use of Tonga in the home. An outright majority (71.4%) prefer to reserve the home domain for an exclusively Tonga centred family language policy. As such, the majority of L1 Tonga participants’ reified a strong preference for a pro minority family language policy which put Tonga at the centre of the whole scheme of things. The L1 Tonga participants were more assertive regarding their language use preferences in the home domain. Since “children usually reflect the value system of their parents, which may vary from strong personal allegiance, attachment to intolerance towards their languages” (Ndlovu, 2013:429), a strong preference of Tonga at home by the parents is likely to influence children’s preferences as well. Children are impressionable by nature and are likely to capitulate to their parents’ language practices. As compared to the L1 Kalanga participants, it can be argued, based on the findings that the Tonga participants exuded stronger allegiance and loyalty to their language. Some respondents also gave the impression that Tonga had the advantage of being taught in some schools, and as such, this also added an impetus to a Tonga centred family language policy to complement the school efforts. Children could also find continuity within the home-school transition. Yet, some participants promoted the use of the minority home language alongside another language by deploying the OPOL strategy.

Comparing findings presented in table 5.14 with the findings presented in table 5.15 reveals that Tonga participants have a high enough regard for their language such that they almost unanimously reserved the home domain for its exclusive use while the majority of L1 Kalanga participants exhibited some degrees of indifference regarding the exclusive use of Kalanga in their homes. A negligible number of L1 Tonga participants (N=4) preferred to use both Tonga and Ndebele in the home. Tonga and Nambya were preferred albeit by a negligible number of respondents. The same applies to the use of Tonga and Shona. The preference for a somewhat bilingual family language policy by this negligible number of participants was mainly informed by the need for spousal linguistic accommodation. Participants indicated that their spouses were from the other language groups (such as Ndebele, Nambya and Shona). To accommodate them, they had to sometimes use their spouses’ languages. The influence of the school system was also cited as the other reason.
The long and short of it however remains that L1 Tonga participants demonstrated a stronger affinity for pro minority family language policies while L1 Kalanga participants demonstrated and reified pro bilingual family language policies considering their language use preferences in the home. These preferences could possibly be linked to the general attitudes that the participants have towards their languages. As reiterated by Nahir (1984; 1988; 1998); Paulston (1988; 1998); Adegbija (1994; 2001); Webb (2002; 2009; 2010); Batibo (2005) cited in Ndlovu (2013), studies have shown a positive correlation between a people’s positive attitude towards their language and the pride they take in their language, and therefore the likelihood that they take proactive steps to revitalise and maintain it.

5.9 Participants’ observations regarding their children’s language preferences and practices in the home

The intergenerational transmission of a language is to a larger extent dependent on how well or otherwise the younger generation receives and is willing to learn it. If a language has more active younger speakers, the prognosis for its survival is always positive. Conversely, if a language has more aging speakers than it has younger speakers, then its survival likewise takes on a negative trajectory. Children’s language use preferences in the home can be taken as indicative of just how well they replicate or otherwise contradict their parental language preferences and ideologies. As such, the study had to establish from the participants, their children’s language use preferences in the home. In that quest, question (7) (as in the interview guide) required participants to comment on their observed language practices and preferences by children in the home domain. Related to, and proceeding from question (7), question (8) required participants to state the probable reasons for their children’s language practices and preferences as per their responses to question (7). Tables 5.16 and 5.17 present the findings to questions (7) and (8) by L1 Kalanga participants and L1 Tonga participants respectively.
Table 5.16: L1 Kalanga participants’ observations regarding their children’s language preferences in the home domain and the probable reasons (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s) preferred by participants’ children at home</th>
<th>Probable reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kalanga only (N=4)                                      | • As an L1 speaker of Kalanga, I make sure that everyone in the family speaks Kalanga especially at home.  
• My children are proud to be Kalanga and I have taught them to value their language, so they speak the language on their own volition in the home. |
| Kalanga and Ndebele (N=10)                              | • They can speak and understand both languages well.  
• They learn Ndebele at school so they sometimes use it in the home.  
• In the community Ndebele and Kalanga are spoken widely so children tend to use both languages at home.  
• As parents we are not very strict on the language to be spoken at home so children can choose which language they want to use. Sometimes they even code switch between the two languages.  
• As parents we encourage the use of the two languages because they are all important in the children’s lives.  
• It is a pragmatic choice that works. |
| Ndebele only (N=19)                                     | • The children cannot speak Kalanga, but they are fluent in Ndebele so they  |
speak Ndebele even at home.
- They prefer Ndebele only because they regard Kalanga as a 'language of the elderly.'
- They view Kalanga as inferior and they see prestige in Ndebele since it is the language taught in schools.
- They say Kalanga is difficult to learn and therefore they prefer Ndebele which they consider to be ‘easy.’
- The children usually say Kalanga is a ‘funny’ language, they even laugh at me when I speak in Kalanga, hence they prefer Ndebele.

Kalanga and Shona (N=1)
2.9%
- Their father speaks Shona so they sometimes prefer Shona especially when speaking to him and they use Kalanga when speaking to me

Table 5.16 above presented the findings that relate to interview questions (7) and (8). It specifically presented data that relates to the participants’ own observations regarding their children’s language use and practices in the home. While it is generally expected for parental language use preferences to influence the children’s preferences and practices, table 5.16 reveals that there is a mismatch between L1 Kalanga parental language use preferences presented in table 5.14 and the preferences and language practices of their children. Interestingly, table 5.16 shows that children of most L1 Kalanga participants prefer to use Ndebele in the home. This is despite the fact that a significant number of L1 Kalanga parents (47.1%) prefer a Kalanga centred home language policy as demonstrated by the findings in table 5.14. Table 5.16 also demonstrates that 29.4% of the L1 Kalanga participants observed that their children prefer to use both Kalanga and Ndebele in the home,
thereby capitulating to a pro bilingual preference. This is despite the fact that 50% of
the parents preferred a pro Kalanga-Ndebele bilingual family language policy. In this
instance, there is less conformity to parental language use preferences by the
children. The majority of participants (55.9%) as demonstrated in table 5.16 indicated
that their children preferred to speak Ndebele only at home, which is also in stark
antagonism to the preferences of most parents as presented in table 5.14. Only one
participant indicated that her children use Kalanga and Shona in the home.

The findings to question (7) and (8) are testament to the fact that parental
awareness, their language ideologies and beliefs, parental preferences regarding
language use, although pivotal in intergenerational transmission, do not always
translate to a positive correlation with children’s language practices and preferences.
As Spolsky also notes, beliefs are not practice, although they have the potential to
influence practice. As demonstrated by the data presented above, children may have
their own preferences which in most cases are informed by wider social, economic,
educational and oftentimes sociolinguistic variables. As shown in the findings above,
language practices in other domains such as the school, the wider community and
various levels of the social strata have a far reaching influence on the preferences of
the children. Prestige variables, and various other emotive aspects related to the
status of language permeate easily into the perceptual radar of the children and may
impinge on how they conform to parental linguistic and ideological frame of
preference. The language practices and preferences among the children of L1
Kalanga participants “reflect prestige related effects on language choice as a result
of a sociologically determined hierarchical structure of languages, which has its roots
in socio-historical, political and economic experiences (Ndlovu, 2013:430). These
have endured through the pre-colonial, the colonial and postcolonial epochs.
Kalanga language has always subordinated to Ndebele dating back to the early days
of linguistic contact. The colonial epoch did more harm than good to Kalanga in that
it entrenched and cultivated the unequal status of Ndebele and Kalanga especially in
education and various other high ranking domains, especially following Doke’s
(1931) recommendations. This has resonance with Ndlovu’s (2013:430) observation
that:

These painful historical legacies that these groups suffered left a lasting
impact on their attitudes towards their languages and their ethnolinguistic
vitality and awareness, social and cultural character and ethnic and linguistic nationalism. These legacies have been further compounded by the colonial and postcolonial subtractive bilingual policies. Their socio-historical experiences of being dominated culminated in language accommodation, language shift, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness.

As shown by the findings presented above, children of L1 Kalanga participants seem to conform to language preferences and practices that are quite anathemic to their parents’ preferences. All this points to the fact that a desired family language policy is difficult to achieve especially under situations of subtractive bilingualism, especially if reproduced in sectors such as the education system. Ndlovu (2013) argues that generally, Kalanga speakers have suffered linguistic subjugation especially with respect to Ndebele, from historical times right through to the present. He opines that these phases of domination have left a permanent legacy and a syndrome of inferiority that:

…has stuck to their minds to the extent that it has become institutionised and canonised. Consequently, these speakers have developed low emotional, functional, intellectual and loyalty stake of their languages and shifted to dominant languages. They often lack self-esteem and readily abandon their language, culture and self-identity in favour of the more widely used languages. Their languages are a stigma and these speakers have a low estimation of their languages and culture. Their past offers only demobilising symbols which force them to forget or hide their linguistic identity (Ndlovu, 2013:431).

L1 Tonga participants revealed a somewhat different picture regarding their children’s language use preferences in the home compared to the L1 Kalanga participants. Table 5.17 presents L1 Tonga participants’ observations regarding their children’s language use practices and preferences in the home, together with probable reasons for the observed language practices.
Table 5.17: L1 Tonga participants’ observations regarding their children’s language preferences in the home domain and the probable reasons (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s) preferred by participants’ children at home</th>
<th>Probable Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Tonga only (N=18) 64.3%**                             | • They understand the importance of the language in their lives.  
• They are proud of their language.  
• I enforce the language at home so my children are now used to the policy that Tonga is the only language spoken within the walls of my home.  
• They all know the language and speak it well so they find no compelling need to use another language.  
• Most family members are fluent in Tonga hence Tonga is the language they understand better.  
• The language is also taught in schools and children are therefore more confident when using it.  
• I encourage them to speak only in Tonga when they are home and they seem to be responding positively. |
| **Tonga and Ndebele (N=4) 14.3%**                        | • Some of the children learn Ndebele at school so for the purposes of school work I allow them to sometimes use Ndebele.  
• Their mother speaks Ndebele so they speak Ndebele with her.  
• It is a pragmatic choice; Ndebele is also one of the major languages spoken in the |
As the findings presented in table 5.17 demonstrate, there is high affinity for the preference of Tonga in the home. The majority of L1 Tonga participants (64.3%) indicated that their children use Tonga only when they are at home. This can be taken to construe that there is a higher propensity by L1 Tonga children to capitulate to their parents’ preferred language practices in the home. A cursory look at table 5.15 which presented the L1 Tonga parental language preference at home will reveal that 71.4% of L1 Tonga participants preferred a Tonga only policy at home. Table 5.17 shows that there is 64.3% conformity by children to parental preference. There is evidently a smaller degree of variance between parental preference regarding family language policy and the actual practice as observed from their children. Language awareness, language loyalty and pride, parental enforcement, higher levels of language spread and proficiency among family members, the need to complement language use and practice in other extra familial institutions such as the school were cited as the probable reasons for the preponderance of Tonga among the children in the home. Ndlovu (2013) also explains that Tonga children are more likely to speak their language unlike the Kalanga who in most cases prefer Ndebele as shown in table 5.16 because they have not suffered similar linguistic and cultural disenfranchisement compared to the Kalanga. He adds that:

In the history of the Tonga, the legacy of historical domination by the Ndebele do not compare to the experiences of the other groups. Because of the unfavourable climatic conditions for agriculture in Binga, Mzilikazi did not extend much of his influence to the Tonga speakers. Tonga speakers are proud of their resistance to and avoidance of Ndebele raiding in the mid-19th century and the term ‘Tonga’ means independent or grumblers, a term which the Tonga used to refer to themselves in opposition to the groups… (Ndlovu, 2013:432).
On the other hand, for Ndlovu, the low preference for an exclusively Kalanga centred language use by L1 Kalanga children can be traced to the sociohistorical experiences of the Kalanga under the Ndebele, and later under “more than double linguistic imperialism” (Ndlovu, 2013:430). He therefore sees Tonga linguistic continuity and loyalty as a product of historical continuity in addition to sustained community centred language revitalisation and revalorisation efforts.

Further, 14.3% of the participants indicated that their children preferred to use Tonga and Ndebele alternately in the home. The influence of extra familial domains such as the wider community’s linguistic ecology as well as, the education system was cited as the probable reasons for this preference. The use of Tonga and Shona as well as the preference for Tonga and Nambya were also observed albeit by a negligible 10.7% of participants in both cases. The preference was mainly mediated by the bilingual nature of respective families whereby one of the parents was from a different language group. However, it is paramount to take note of the degree of variation between the Tonga only and the Tonga- Ndebele bilingual policy among the children in the home. The fact that an outright majority seem to prefer a Tonga only arrangement confirms the higher levels of commitment to maintaining the home as a sacred institution for mother tongue usage, which in itself is a healthily ripe environment to brood intergenerational transmission.

5.10 Participants’ views regarding parental strategies of encouraging the use of the mother tongue at home

As shown by the presentation of findings in section 5.9, both L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga participants’ observations regarding the language practices and preferences of their children in the home domain demonstrated that the desired conformity to parental family language policies was yet to be achieved. In other words, participants’ responses indicated that children do not always capitulate to the preferences of their parents. This notwithstanding, parents as language managers who articulate, give direction to, and sometimes explicitly enforce family language policy do not always yield to their children’s resistance as well. Proceeding from the findings in 5.9, question (9) in the interview guide sought to establish the participants’ strategies for recourse that they employ to try and increase conformity to their preferred family language policies in the home by the children. This is what Spolsky
(2009) terms language management. Spolsky further writes that language management involves the explicit and observable efforts by some authorities in particular domains to ensure conformity to preferred language practice and ideology.

It was considered salient to establish the kinds of mechanisms or language management strategies parents deployed to help cultivate linguistic competence and to ensure the use of home languages within the family. These strategies constitute important aspects of family language policy. The strategies employed by the L1 Kalanga and the L1 Tonga participants were generally found to be similar. For that reason, as well as for the avoidance of tautological tedium, they are presented simultaneously in table 5.18 below.

Table 5.18 Parental intervention strategies of encouraging mother tongue usage at home by children (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention strategy 1</th>
<th>Promoting a reading culture in the language</th>
<th>88.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td>• I have a collection of books written in my language that I make sure children read every day after school and on weekends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I sometimes write short stories in the language that I then give my children to read and explain what they understand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If I come across any book that is written in my language, I make an effort to take it home with me so my children can read it as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I encourage children to ask for reading material that can be available from the school library then I help them to read after school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention strategy 2</th>
<th>Encouraging and participating in conversation with the children in the</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I make sure that I regularly use the language when speaking to the children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I demand that children reply me in the mother tongue when I address them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I do not respond if my children address me in another language at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sometimes I play a naming game with the children. I ask them to give me the names of certain animals, household items, certain processes in the mother tongue. That increases interaction in, and knowledge of the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I sometimes give incentives to my children for speaking in the mother tongue at home. For instance I give them sweets for, biscuits or chips for consistently using the home language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I sometimes rebuke the children if they use a language other than the mother tongue at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I have banned the use of any other language in the home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I react angrily when addressed in any language other than the home language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I use the simplest form of the language when addressing my children and I encourage them to do the same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I encourage children to speak in their mother tongue even among themselves when playing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention strategy 3</th>
<th>Narrating folktales in the language</th>
<th>30.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I retell folk stories in the mother tongue regularly in the evenings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I also encourage them to retell folk tales that they remember through the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the findings presented in table 5.18 show, there is a mosaic of intervention strategies that parents of minority language families employ to encourage acquisition
and widespread use of the mother tongue especially within the home domain. The language management interventions reveal that parental preferred language practices in the home have a complex nested relationship with other extra familial structures. In attempting to encourage the use of the minority home languages, parents seem to recognise the relevance and interaction between the private home domain, the public institutional structures and the socio-political context. As revealed in the findings in table 5.18 above, participants were in unanimous agreement that encouraging and participating in conversation via the minority language with their children is the most common strategy they use especially in the home. All the participants (100%) indicated that they employed specific strategies that encouraged conversation in the minority language. Some participants indicated regular use of the home language when speaking to their children and demanding that the children in turn reply using the home language. Incentivising consistent use of the home language by children was also found to be constitutive of specific strategies that are used by parents to encourage use of the mother tongue in the home. Some participants indicated that they often rebuked their children for using a language other than the mother tongue in the home, while others went to the extent of banning the use of any language other than the mother tongue in the home.

Promoting and encouraging a reading culture in the minority home language was cited as another generic strategy employed by participants to encourage widespread use of the home language by children. 88.7% of the respondents indicated that promoting literacy in the minority language through providing for and supervising reading in the home language was one of the strategies they employed to promote competency and encourage usage of the minority language in the home. Some respondents indicated that they had a collection of books written in the minority home language which they availed to the children to read while some participants indicated that they encourage their children to utilise whatever resources they could at school to access literature in their home language. This strategy highlights the importance that parents attach to language literacy as a language management measure in minority language conservation. However, as is evident in the findings presented in table 5.18, the active participation of parents in encouraging literacy is impacted by the fact that some of the parents themselves have low levels of literacy, even in the mother tongue. As such, only 88.7% indicated the importance they
attached to literacy and specified the proactive steps they take to encourage and promote literacy in the minority language.

A further 30.6% of the participants indicated that they partook in story telling with their children in the mother tongue. The retelling of ‘inganekwana’ (folk stories) is a favourite pastime especially for the rural population who do not have access to modern means of passing time such as television sets and radios. However, retelling of folktales has also dramatically decreased as modern technologies continue to permeate and diffuse through the country. This notwithstanding, exclusive use of the minority home language in retelling of folk stories is still being used as strategy to encourage and promote acquisition of minority languages at home. The 30.6% of the participants reflect that it is not a very widespread strategy nevertheless.

The only way to ensure intergenerational transmission of a minority language is by ensuring that the speakers of the language, especially the children are provided with enough opportunity for interaction in the language. To ensure that there is increased opportunity for interaction in the minority language, 46.8% of the respondents indicated that they arrange for regular contact between their children and other members from their extended families who are fluent in the home language. That way, their children also experience increased opportunity for the use of the home language. To that end, some participants regularly send their children to the rural areas during school holidays where the opportunity for interaction is increased through contact with their grandparents and the general rural community which in most cases speaks and uses the minority language regularly and fluently. This is some sort of immersion strategy intended to expose the children to a communicative environment to enhance effective acquisition. Schwartz and Moin (2011) also observe that some parents, especially among immigrant families may even opt to send their children to their country of origin where their mother tongue is spoken to improve L1 knowledge. Some may send their children to an L1 speaking summer camp. The latter of course is an elitist intervention strategy that the ordinary third world rural folk cannot dream of.

Some participants indicated that they regularly invited other fluent members of their extended family to visit and spend weekends. During these visits, they exclusively use the home language as a way of cultivating confidence in their children to also
use the language. As shown in table 5.18, a further 56.5% regularly encourages and engages in listenership to programmes that are broadcast using their respective minority languages on National F.M radio and Getjenge community radio. They said that they encourage this with the hope that when their children hear their home language on national radio, they may gain confidence in speaking the language as well. Figure 5.6 below also shows the number of participants and the intervention strategies they employ to encourage the usage of minority languages in the home domain.

**Fig 5.6: Participants’ intervention strategies employed to encourage use of the minority language in the home (N=62)**

As shown in figure 5.6 above, all the participants (N=62) indicated that they encouraged their children to use the minority language in everyday discourse
especially in the home. This figure also demonstrates that the majority of parents are aware of the fact that for intergenerational transmission to take place, children should actively participate through using the language. It also demonstrates that parents are aware that language use is the key to language maintenance. A large number of parents (N=55) also indicated that they encourage literacy in the minority language through helping their children with literature written in their home language. The importance of literacy in the mother tongue in language conservation cannot be overemphasised. As shown in figure 5.6, some parents (N=19) narrate folktales to their children via the home language so as to cultivate competency. Storytelling as an example of effective child centred communicative discourse and its impact on language learning has also been discussed in other studies (cf Smith-Christmas, 2014). Yet a significant number of respondents (N=29) revealed that regular contact with members of their extended family, especially those fluent in the minority language was encouraged and actively taken up. This increases exposure in the language and therefore increases chances of acquisition. Endeavouring to increase exposure to the language as a strategy has also been rehashed in various other studies. Schwartz and Moin (2011) for example cites the example of South African immigrant children in Australia whose parents were dissatisfied with their L1 knowledge in Afrikaans and had to search for an external supporting sociolinguistic environment. “They strove to provide the children with maximum exposure to L1, and often chose residential suburbs with a high concentration of South African immigrants” Schwartz and Moin, 2011:2). Further, some participants encourage their children to listen to programmes broadcast in their minority language on radio as a way of cultivating competency and confidence in the children’s use of the language.

5.11 Participants’ views regarding obstacles encountered towards achieving preferred language practices in the home

As mentioned elsewhere, achieving preferred language practices that are in concordance with parental language ideologies and preferences especially with respect to children is a debilitating task. Children may inhabit preferences that run counter to parental inclinations. These also contribute significantly to the articulation, direction and reproduction of family language policy. As such, to understand the nature of resistance that parents face in achieving their preferred language management styles, question (10) in the interview guide required participants to
comment on the obstacles they faced, if any, in achieving preferred language practices in the home.

A majority of participants indicated that children often have their own preferences that influenced how positively or otherwise they conformed to the parental preferences. Prescriptive family language policies by parents are evidently challenged or antagonised, though rarely overtly, by children. Findings to question (10) generally revealed that neither parental prescriptive family language policies, nor their demonstrated desire for linguistic continuity and intergenerational transmission always coincided with equally motivated children to accept the language. In some cases, children’s language choices and preferences were influenced by extra familial language practices such as in the school. In cases where children learn an indigenous language that is not their original home language, such children tended to have a positive evaluation of the school language and it is this value laden lenses through which they tend to hierarchically order the indigenous languages to reproduce negative attitudes towards those languages not taught in schools. For the children, the same languages are viewed as inferior and therefore not deserving of serious attention. In short, participants cited negative attitudes, children’s rudimentary competency in the home language, and lack of institutional support as well as the influence of extra familial language practices encroaching into the home domain as mainly constitutive of the obstacles that militate against the achievement of parental preference as far as family language policy is concerned. The findings to question (10) are presented in the bar in figure 5.7.
As indicated in figure 5.7 above, the majority of parents (N=55) cited children’s attitudes towards the minority home language to be a major obstacle towards achieving the desired language practice in the home. A considerable number of participants (N=50) cited lack of competency in the minority language to be a major impediment in achieving the desired language practice in the home. The same number (N=50) felt that language practices within the extra familial institutions such as the school contributed significantly to non-conformity to preferred family language policy. They argued that children would most likely extend their school language practice into the home, a practice that is hard to discourage, given the prestige accorded to school language practice on the part of the children. Some participants (N=34) felt that other institutions outside the home domain did not do much to complement parental efforts in the home. At worst, they felt that language practice in government and other public institutions betrayed the general lack of commitment to aid intergenerational transmission of minority languages. Essentially, negative attitudes towards speaking minority languages exhibited by children are in fact, a reproduction in the home, of the general negative evaluations of minority languages.
at the level of the nation. In this sense, the family becomes a microcosm of the state as far as children’s preferred language practices are concerned.

5.12 Participants’ assessment of their children’s proficiency in the home language

The extent of intergenerational transmission of a minority language can be inferred from how proficient the younger generation is in the minority language. To that end, question (11) required the participants to provide a general assessment regarding the proficiency levels of their children in the mother tongue. The compulsion to establish parents’ own assessment of their children’s proficiencies in this study was not only mediated by the need to make inferences to the extent of impact of specific family language policies and language management initiatives in the intergenerational transmission of the home language, but also by the observation that “parents’ assessment of their children’s language development is a significant component of parent to child communication, and an integral part of family language policy” (Schwartz and Moin, 2011:1). Parents’ assessment of their children’s proficiencies in the mother tongue can also potentially shed light on the degree of disruption or displacement of the language. However as Schwartz and Moin (2011) caution, it is difficult to come up with, and to implement an objective scale of assessment of proficiency or competence, moreso for this study. Further, even though they may be present, such quantitative inventories may not fit into the scope of the present study. This is said in light of the fact that part of the data for present study was collected from the rural areas where the general population may not be able to utilise such scales, let alone be conscious of their existence. To this justification, Schwartz and Moin (2011:1) opine that:

Clearly, parents do not use special scientific methods, such as the Communicative Development Inventories, to assess their children’s language development. As lay people, they tend to apply more general subjective assessments in their daily parent-child communication such as ‘good-bad’ or ‘better-worse’ to estimate their children’s language knowledge. These general assessments serve as genuine instruments in their FLP.

Benefitting from, and cautious of Schwartz and Moin’s insights, participants were allowed to use subjective descriptions to assess their children’s proficiencies in the mother tongue. Borrowing from the ideas of Schwartz and Moin (2011), participants
were asked to comment using phrases like “they all speak it well, or some speak it well, or most speak it well none speaks the language”. L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents’ own assessments of their children’s proficiencies in the minority home language are presented in figure 5.8 below.

**Fig 5.8: Participants’ own assessments of their children’s proficiencies in the home language**
*(N=62)*
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Figure 5.8 above demonstrates that most L1 Kalanga participants’ assessments of their children’s proficiencies indicated a diminishing knowledge of the Kalanga language among the children. The majority of the participants (N=13) indicated that some of their children ‘speak it a bit’, while a significant number of participants (N=11) indicated that ‘none (of their children) speak it’ at all. As far as the findings in figure 5.8 are concerned, a red flag situation is obtaining with regards to intergenerational transmission of Kalanga. Only a minority of participants (N=6) indicated that ‘all (their children) speak (Kalanga) it well’. Some participants (N=4) indicated that ‘most (of their children) speak it (Kalanga) well.’ This a worrisome state of affairs requiring immediate redress if Kalanga is to be conserved for posterity. Read together, figure 5.8 significantly speaks, and is spoken to by the data presented in table 5.9 which demonstrated that Kalanga is not as common within L1 Kalanga participants’ family linguistic repertoires as would be expected of a home language. That same distribution is reproduced in the low proficiency levels of the
children as assessed by the parents. As it is in table 5.9, there are a considerable number of participants who did not indicate Kalanga to be part of their family members’ linguistic repertoire. As such, findings presented here resonate with those in table 5.9.

As also evident in figure 5.8 above, L1 Tonga participants’ own assessment of their children’s proficiencies in the home language shows that most parents’ (N=20) indications were that ‘all (their children) speak it (Tonga) well’. As evident in figure 5.8 above, the majority of participants were of the view that Tonga is spoken proficiently in the home by all their children. A negligible number of participants (N=5) indicated that ‘most (of their children) speak it well.’ A minority of participants (N=3) indicated that ‘some (of the children) speak it a bit.’ Contrasted to the L1 Kalanga participants’ assessments, it is clear that most L1 Tonga children are active users or speakers of their mother tongue unlike their L1 Kalanga counterparts. Notably, degrees of intergenerational transmission are likely to be higher among the Tonga than they are expected to be among the Kalanga. Again, marrying data presented in figure 5.8 to the data presented in table 5.10 reveals some degrees of intimacy between the two data sets. L1 Tonga participants indicated as in table 5.10 that Tonga is a common language within the linguistic repertoire of their family members. It is therefore not surprising that the majority of L1 Tonga children can speak the language well, of course basing on the participants’ own assessments of their children’s proficiencies.

5.13 Participants' views on the impact of family language policy on children's proficiency levels in the mother tongue

Following parents’ own assessments of their children’s competencies in the minority home language, the study proceeded to solicit from the participants, their views regarding whether or not they thought their children’s proficiency levels in the home language mirrored preferred parental family language policy. To that end, question (12) required participants to comment on whether or not they thought their family language policies contributed to their children’s proficiency levels as per their own assessments in 5.12. The need to establish the interaction between family language policies and children’s proficiency levels was necessitated by the desire to infer the extent of the influence of parental language ideologies on children’s language
practices. A mismatch between parental language ideologies and actual practices would otherwise be taken to signal some kind of resistance to family language policy while a positive correlation between ideology and practice would indicate that the family language policy is embraced. A situation such as the former might be taken to reflect intergenerational disruption while the latter may be favourable for intergenerational transmission. Sanna-Kaisa (2012) opines that while parents often make the initial, more or less explicit and conscious decisions on the family language practices based on their own language ideology, these ideologies are rarely stable. The language practices may also be equally dynamic. Changes in practices may then modify the ideology upon which the language policy is grounded (Spolsky, 2004 cited in Sanna-Kaisa, 2012:8). Tables 5.19 and 5.20 below present the findings to question (12).

Table 5.19: L1 Kalanga participants’ generic views and actual responses to question (12)
Do you think your family language policy contributes to your children’s proficiency levels reported above?
(N=34)

| Generic view 1       | Yes, I think it does                      | (N=7)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The children’s levels of proficiency reflect the success of parents’ efforts to teach the language to the children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategies that I employ to encourage children to speak the language seem to be working.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Children now appreciate the importance of their language as a result of our efforts as parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Children seem to embrace their mother tongue as equally important as other languages hence the improvement in competence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 2</th>
<th>No, I think it does not</th>
<th>(N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children seem to do as they please.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most of the times children prefer to speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele at the expense of their home language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children resist the parents’ preferences and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer the majority language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While I prefer equal use of Ndebele and Kalanga,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children seem to opt for Ndebele more often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What parents prefer at home is outshined by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what children learn at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They hold dear the language they learn at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 3</th>
<th>To some extent it does.</th>
<th>(N=3) 8.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children adhere to parents’ preferences only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when parents are around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They use the minority home language sparingly,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and this contributes to inadequate acquisition of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the home language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Had it not been for my strict enforcement of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalanga, children would have totally abandoned it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They also learn it at school although the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaches the language very sporadically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am rarely at home to enforce the use of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language at all times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19 above demonstrates that most L1 Kalanga participants felt that their children’s proficiency levels in the mother tongue were not reflective of parental language preferences and family language policies. In other words, family language policies do not result in the ideal levels of proficiency in the mother tongue. As
indicated in the table, 70.6% of the L1 Kalanga respondents felt that there was a mismatch between the participants’ language ideologies and actual practice by children. The mismatch resulted in low proficiency levels in Kalanga by the children (see figure 5.8). This shows that L1 Kalanga children do not wholly embrace their parents’ language ideologies and preferences (as presented in table 5.14). The majority of L1 Kalanga participants indicated that they did not think that their children’s proficiencies matched the parental family language policies. This implies that there is a mismatch between the children’s proficiencies and parental expectations; at least as far as parental language ideologies and family language policy are concerned. On the other hand, 20.6% of the L1 Kalanga participants felt that the children’s proficiencies in their home language matched parental expectations as far as ideologies and family language policies were concerned. This shows that family language policy, when enacted and negotiated between the parents and their children can impact positively on proficiencies in the home language, and by extension on intergenerational transmission of the language. Essentially, Curdt-Christiansen (2013) notes that a co-constructed family language policy between parents and children can influence positive or negative indexicalities of linguistic practices leading to enriched or impoverished linguistic repertoires among the children. Children’s practices on the other hand can also entice parents to evaluate existing family language policy for adequacy and efficiency. The findings presented in table 5.19 above reveal that children’s practices may shape the trajectory of family language policy (Sanna-Kaisa, 2012:8).

Further, a negligible 8.8% of the participants felt that their family language policies did to some extent contribute to their children’s proficiency levels in the home language. They argued that while children rarely conform to parental family language policies at all times, they tend to do so especially when parents are present. This means therefore that, for the participants, the degrees of proficiencies in the minority home language would have been higher among the children had the family language policy been adopted and religiously implemented by the children regardless of the presence or absence of parents at particular times. These findings indicate that parental language ideologies and language management do not always correlate positively with children’s language practices, although they evidently influence it. Notably, these findings demonstrate that the big gap or a large degree of mismatch
between parental commitment to Kalanga language maintenance (as inferred from parental language ideologies and preferences, see table 5.14) and the degrees of proficiency in Kalanga by the children projects a negative prognosis for the intergenerational transmission of the Kalanga language (as read from the parents own assessments of their children’s proficiency levels in figure 5.8).

As far as L1 Tonga participants’ views on the impact of family language policies on their children’s proficiencies in the home language, a different picture emerged. Unlike the L1 Kalanga respondents, the L1 Tonga participants seemed to generally view their children’s proficiencies as a direct reflection of parental family language policy. In other words, indications were that L1 Tonga participants seemed to agree that family language policy impacted positively on the children’s proficiency levels in the home language. The responses relating to question (12) by L1 Tonga participants are presented in table 5.20 below.

Table 5.20: L1 Tonga participants’ generic views and actual responses to question (12)
Do you think your family language policy contributes to your children’s proficiency levels reported above? (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 1</th>
<th>Yes, I think it does</th>
<th>(N=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td>• Children’s proficiency levels reflect parents’ efforts that encourage the use of the language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proficiency levels are reflective of the amount of initiatives we employ to increase the use of the language at home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children are highly aware of the importance of their home language through parental teachings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The encouragement to freely speak the language in the home give the children confidence in the language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The home is exclusively reserved for the</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
language, as such; children learn it fast and are not scared or ashamed to speak it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 2</th>
<th>No, it does not</th>
<th>(N=3) 10.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Actual responses** | - Children have their preferences.  
- Whatever language they want, they speak.  
- I feel that from the amount of initiatives and encouragement, they should be speaking the language with better fluency than they do presently. | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 3</th>
<th>To some extent it does.</th>
<th>(N=) 21.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Actual responses** | - I sometimes enforce the language at home, but in some instances I am hardly at home, I think in a way the occasions I have tried to enforce the language have been effective.  
- Sometimes I will be tired to fuss about the children’s language use.  
- The school also plays a role since Tonga is also widely taught there. | |

As demonstrated in table 5.20 above, the majority of L1 Tonga respondents (67.9%) felt that the high levels of proficiency in Tonga of their children as per the parents’ assessment of children’s proficiency levels (see figure 5.8) were a result of parental family language policy. This could also be a result of consistent use of Tonga by the parents as inferred from the predominant preferences of Tonga participants for a Tonga only family language policy (see table 5.15). In his study of L1 Japanese preschool children, Kasuya (1998) also found a strong correlation between parental consistency in L1 use and the levels of proficiency in the L1 by the children. The majority of L1 Tonga participants as evident in table 5.20 above felt that the
language management efforts they deployed to encourage the realisation of family language policy played a greater part in the children’s competency levels in Tonga. These strategies are to a considerable extent also linked to parental language ideologies. On the other hand, 10.7% of the L1 Tonga participants felt that the reported children’s proficiency levels did not match the parental preferences and ideologies. However, this figure is very negligible compared to the degree of mismatch as reported by the L1 Kalanga participants. Further, 21.4% of the respondents felt that the proficiency levels of their children in Tonga were to some extent (not exclusively) influenced by the family language policy. They acknowledged the role of other extra familial domains, particularly the school as also contributing to the proficiency levels of their children. They indicated that Tonga is widely taught in school; hence their children were also exposed to it through formal learning. Overall, what is of note is that the relatively small degree of mismatch between parental commitment to Tonga maintenance (as articulated in parental language ideologies and preferences, see table 5.15) and the children’s proficiency levels in the home language demonstrates the positive influence of family language policy in the intergenerational transmission of Tonga (as inferred from parents’ own assessments of their children’s proficiency levels in figure 5.8).

5.14 Participant’s views regarding their awareness of community initiatives aimed at minority language conservation

Participants’ views regarding their awareness of other community initiatives that aim at the conservation of minority languages demonstrated a mosaic of extra familial community initiatives that could potentially impact on family language policy. Community initiatives identified by participants were intended to increase the use of the minority language by impacting on language attitudes, confidence in using the language, and intergenerational transmission of the minority language in the community at large. In fact, Schwartz and Verschik (2013:8) have demonstrated how the family can be considered an “intermediate level between the individual and the community” which can present differences and even tensions between individuals, families and the larger community in the context of language policy (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). In the context of societal bilingualism and multilingualism, parental approaches in the negotiation and articulation of family language policy may be futile if the larger community presents a conflicting paradigm in terms of language
ideologies, practices and evaluative stances towards the language. To ascertain the extent of community involvement and buy in regarding minority language conservation, question (13) sought to establish the nature of community initiatives that L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga participants were aware of and/or are involved in to the benefit of intergenerational transmission of the respective minority languages in the context of family language policy since the family level is “a place where community and the individual meet” (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013:8). This and the subsequent subsections present and analyse participants' responses to question (13).

5.14.1 L1 Kalanga participants’ awareness of community initiatives

Beyond the family, but still within the micro domain of the community, there are a plethora of initiatives that L1 Kalanga participants demonstrated awareness of that they viewed to be among visible efforts aimed at conserving the Kalanga language. The main community initiatives identified by L1 Kalanga participants are presented below.

5.14.1.1 Kalanga language and culture festivals

Most participants seemed to be aware of initiatives that are aimed at promoting Kalanga language cultural awareness among the people of Bulilima and Mangwe districts through festivals. Although the frequency of these Kalanga cultural festivals could not be ascertained, participants underscored the usefulness of the festivals towards the conservation of Kalanga language. Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association, (KLCDA) was cited as the major organisation that seemed to be at the forefront of community initiatives aimed at conserving Kalanga language and culture. A lot has been written concerning the relationship between language and culture, and for the purposes of this study, it should suffice to note that language and culture are inseparably intertwined. Cultural conservation implies language conservation. Participants indicated that during these festivals, the language of communication is exclusively Kalanga. Participants indicated that this exclusive use of Kalanga during the festivals is meant to cultivate a sense of pride among the speakers as well as a sense of ownership of the language by the speakers. Expectedly, this is meant to cultivate usage of the language among the younger speakers of the language for intergenerational transmission.
Tjinyunyi Babili Trust (TBT) and Plumtree Development Trust (PDT) were also cited by participants as other community based initiatives which, although mostly focused on developmental work, occasionally facilitated Kalanga cultural festivals in Bulilima and Mangwe districts as part of their endeavour to increase community capacity towards sustainable economic development. As Bamgbose (1991; 2011) notes, development conceived outside the use of indigenous languages is futile because languages alien to the local population may in fact confuse the population rather than inform them. An awareness regarding the existence of these community based initiatives by participants means that the participants know where to go to for support as far as the conservation of Kalanga is concerned.

5.14.1.2 Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association (KLCDA)

Some participants indicated awareness of the existence of a language and culture association that agitates for the development and promotion of the Kalanga language and culture in Zimbabwe. Participants indicated knowledge of, and having participated in community initiatives headed by KLCDA in promoting Kalanga language. Some participants indicated having participated in the writing of poetry, short stories and novels in Kalanga as part of KLCDA headed community initiatives. These books, novels and anthologies were said to be part of the KLCDA initiatives to revive Kalanga language and culture.

5.14.1.3 Getjenge community radio initiative

As part of efforts to cultivate the use of Kalanga language, participants indicated awareness of the existence of an almost exclusively Kalanga community radio station. Some of the participants indicated that they have occasionally contributed content for broadcasting. The Getjenge community radio, although yet to be licenced for legal broadcast, operates mainly on pre-recorded content that is distributed to the public. A cursory look at the profile of the community radio station reveals that Getjenge community radio initiative is a brainchild of Plumtree Development Trust which is intended to serve the interests of the predominantly Kalanga districts of Bulilima and Mangwe. Participants felt that having a radio station broadcast in Kalanga does not only give prestige to the language but also offers platform for children to learn the language and a voice for the Kalanga people who are otherwise excluded from mainstream media in Zimbabwe. A number of scholars have written
on the extent of usage of minority languages in mainstream media. They have concluded that the sporadic use in the media of minority language such as Kalanga not only impacts negatively on information dissemination to the particular language population but also on the status of the language concerned (see for example Ndhlovu, 2009; Maseko and Ndlovu, 2013). The diminished status of the language cultivates negative attitudes towards the same. Negative evaluations of a language are likely to impact negatively on intergenerational transmission. It is in this light that participants felt that the launch of a community radio station broadcasting predominantly in Kalanga has been helpful in demystifying the unpleasant associations of the language with backwardness and low prestige. In any case, the prestige of a language is not in its intrinsic character but in its utility value in particular spaces. Consequently, usage of Kalanga on radio should cultivate confidence in the speakers of Kalanga within the community at large. Moreover, participants felt that the launch of Getjenge community radio will likely result in the promotion of Kalanga music. Music can also be a source of language input that children can benefit from in language learning and acquisition.

5.14.1.4 Church initiatives

Some participants mentioned the existence of initiatives at various church organisations aimed at the translation of the bible into Kalanga. In essence, a number of participants revealed that certain churches such as the Seventh Day Adventist (SDA) already have a Kalanga bible and a Kalanga hymn book.

5.14.1.5 Community Drama groups and film in Kalanga

It was also established that there is an existence of community drama groups that staged plays at various community gatherings using the Kalanga language. In most of the plays, Kalanga cultural heritage is portrayed and showcased. One participant indicated involvement with the community drama initiative and the same participant intimated that he was in the process of producing a short film in Kalanga. Drama can be very useful language learning and acquisition tool as it can potentially provide language input for the speakers. Film as an important source of language input can be effective especially if subtitles are provided in the widely used language. The participant indicated his intention to use English subtitles in the same manner that soapies, dramas, and telenovelas on South African television do. The participant
cited the example of how some Zimbabweans have learnt certain aspect of languages such as Venda on the South African soapies such as Muvhango, Sotho, Zulu and Tswana and Xhosa from Generations through the use of English subtitles. He felt the same could be applied to Kalanga language, effectively underscoring the importance of bilingualism.

5.14.2 L1 Tonga participants’ awareness of community initiatives

Just like the Kalanga participants, L1 Tonga participants also seemed to be aware of visible community initiatives that they felt somehow impacted on the use and continuity of the Tonga language.

5.14.2.1 The Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO)

Some L1 Tonga participants mentioned knowledge of the existence of the Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO). They mentioned having participated in cultural festivals partly organised by TOLACCO and other community based organisations. These festivals were said to be mostly a celebration of Tonga culture, including language. As a community based language and cultural advocacy group, TOLACCO’s activities were said to be impacting positively on the Tonga people’s attitudes towards their language and culture.

5.14.2.2 Community based development agencies

Some participants mentioned the existence of Basilwizi Trust, a community development organisation, founded by the local people of the Zambezi valley. Although it being a development oriented organisation, participants mentioned that Basilwizi Trust also played an important role in the conservation of Tonga language and culture through the provision of technical support to Tonga writers and in the translation of various national documents into the Tonga language. Together with other organisations such as Silveira House, and the Catholic commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP), Basilwizi was mentioned to be at the forefront of the development of literature in the Tonga language. The organisations mentioned here have played a central role in the production of Tonga literature for use in schools, especially with Tonga being the first of the minority languages in Zimbabwe to make significant inroads in the education sector. Some participants indicated that Basilwizi Trust also promotes the use of Tonga in its community meetings and workshops with
the local population. Participants noted the importance of the use of Tonga in community meetings as positively impacting on the use of Tonga in the community at large.

5.15 Participants’ views regarding expected governmental support in minority language conservation

The extent of success of particular language management interventions in the family are in most cases dependent upon the degree of complementarity and intimacy between the top-down government and the bottom-up community initiatives. As explained elsewhere in the thesis, government’s top-down policies may fail to impact positively on intergenerational transmission of minority languages if the policies cannot interact with the preferences of the speakers at the grassroots level. Proceeding from this observation, it was found compelling for the study to solicit the views of the study participants regarding what they considered to the obligation of the government in complementing familial and community efforts in conserving minority languages. To that end, the framing of question (14) in the interview guide was intended to establish the participants’ views regarding the role they felt government should play in minority language conservation in the context of family language policy. The views from L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga participants are presented in tables 5.21 and 5.22 respectively.

Table 5.21: L1 Kalanga participants’ views regarding government’s obligations in conserving minority languages in the context of family language policy (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 1</th>
<th>Government must promote the teaching of Kalanga in all schools in the districts (N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual responses</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kalanga should be taught in all schools from grade one up to form six where possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kalanga should be taught on an equal time allocation as other languages like English and Ndebele.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kalanga must be used as a medium of instruction especially from grade one to three.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enact laws to compel schools to enforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compulsory teaching of Kalanga in Bulilima and Mangwe districts.

- Ensure that schools adhere to the implementation imperatives of the education act.
- Employ teachers who are mother tongue speakers of Kalanga to teach Kalanga.
- Government must engage parents when making decisions regarding language policy in the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 2</th>
<th>Government must promote the use of Kalanga in the media</th>
<th>(N=34)</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | - Increase the usage of Kalanga on national radio.  
- Increase the usage of Kalanga on national newspapers.  
- Introduce Kalanga programmes on National television.  
- Free the airwaves to give space for community radio stations broadcasting in Kalanga. |        |      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 3</th>
<th>Government must fund and support the production of Kalanga literature</th>
<th>(N=34)</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | - Government should provide funding to individuals and organisations intending to produce books in Kalanga.  
- Government must support institutions of higher learning such as colleges and universities to research and publish in, or on Kalanga.  
- Support literacy activities aimed at bolstering Kalanga. |        |      |

| Generic view 4 | Government must promote the use of Kalanga in all formal institutions | (N=34) | 100% |
**Actual responses**

- Allow Kalanga to be used in parliament.
- Allow Kalanga in courts of law.
- Allow Kalanga in government offices.
- Ensure that government institutions in predominantly Kalanga areas are manned by Kalanga speakers.

The findings presented above indicate that from the point of view of the L1 Kalanga participants, there is a miscellany of obligations expected of the government to complement the familial efforts in minority language conservation. These include the need on part of government to promote the teaching of Kalanga in all schools in Bulilima and Mangwe districts where Kalanga is predominantly spoken. All the respondents (N=34) felt that the government must take decisive steps to promote Kalanga in education. They felt Kalanga should be taught at all levels from primary school up to tertiary level. As evident from actual responses under generic view 1 in table 5.21, some respondents indicated that the time allocated for the teaching of Kalanga should be same as that allocated for the teaching of other major languages such as English and Ndebele. L1 Kalanga parents noted that Kalanga as a language is given secondary treatment in most schools. In the few schools where Kalanga is taught, it is restricted to between grades one to three and never beyond. One respondent noted that:

_Esikolo okufunda khona abantwana bami, isiKalanga bayasifundiswa. Okubuhluntu nje yikuthi isiKalanga asithathwa serious njenge zinye indimi ezifana lesekihiwa (isiNgisi) lesiNdebele. Sifundwa from grade one to grade three only, njalo kasibhalwe ku grade 7. Ngabe uhulumende uyanceda ekuthini isiKalanga laso sibhalwe ku grade 7 ukwenzela ukuthi abantwana labo basithathe serious._

At the school that is attended by my children, Kalanga is taught. However, what pains me is that Kalanga is not given serious attention compared to other languages such as English and Ndebele. Kalanga is only taught from grade one up to grade three and it is not examined at grade seven. If only government could help by ensuring that Kalanga is also made an examinable subject at grade seven level, this would make the children to take the language seriously.
The verbatim response above shows that in some schools, Kalanga is not given much attention owing to the fact that it is not examined in grade seven. As such, this generates negative attitudes towards, and negative evaluations of the language. Consequently, it is viewed as inferior, especially by children. Further, some participants felt that the language should be used as a medium of instruction in schools, especially at lower levels as dictated by the Education Act. The 2006 amended Education Act provides for the teaching of, and the use of minority languages as media of instruction in subsection (2) and (4) respectively of section 62 part X11 of the act. Subsection (2) of the section alluded to specifies that:

In areas where indigenous languages other than those mentioned in subsection (1) above are (Shona, Ndebele, English) spoken, the minister may authorize the teaching of such languages in schools in addition to those specified in subsection (Government of Zimbabwe, 2006).

Subsection (2) of the section 62 of the Act empowers the minister to authorise the teaching of indigenous languages other than the major ones (Shona, Ndebele, English) that are specified in subsection (1). The participants felt that the government, through the responsible minister should heed to the demands of the act by activating and enforcing the teaching of Kalanga in all schools in Bulilima and Mangwe districts, themselves being predominantly Kalanga enclaves. Further, the use of Kalanga (and other indigenous languages) as a medium of instruction is legislatively supported by sub section (4) of the same section which states the following:

Prior to form one, any one of the languages referred to in subsection (1) and (2) may be used as medium of instruction, depending upon which language is commonly spoken and better understood by the pupils (Government of Zimbabwe, 2006).

The above also makes it possible for minority languages such as Kalanga (among other indigenous languages) to be used as medium of instruction at primary level (prior to form one) if it is understood by children. Participants therefore indicated that government should create a follow up instrument to monitor the implementation of these provisions in schools. Some participants suggested that the deployment of teachers to Kalanga speaking areas should also take into account the linguistic profiles of the teachers as this has implications on the implementation of mother tongue instruction provided for by the Education Act. The same concerns are raised
argue that mother tongue instruction cannot be fully realised in the Zimbabwean education system if the precise mechanics of teacher deployment are not in a mutually intelligible conversation with the dictates of the linguistic provisions in the Education Act. To underscore this viewpoint, one respondent had this to say:

_Sifuna abantwana bethu bafunde ngesi Kalanga, njalo bafundiswe ngabantu abalwaziyo ulimi lwesi Kalanaga. Uhulumende kumele abone ukuthi labo abafundisa isi Kalanga ngabasazi kahle._

We want our children to be taught in Kalanga, by teachers who know the language. Government must therefore ensure that those teachers who teach Kalanga know the language very well.

The above response speaks to issues concerning mother tongue instruction. From the point of view of this particular respondent, the teaching of the language will not suffice if its agency is vested in non-native speakers of the language. Moreover, participants demanded that government must consult them and seek their input as the speakers of the language whenever decisions about their language were to be made. Essentially, this speaks to the need by top level management to interact with bottom up planners at the community level if language policy is to be successful.

Also apparent in generic view 2 in table 5.21 above, all the participants (N=34) pointed out the need for the government to promote the use of Kalanga in the media. While conceding that Kalanga is used on National F.M (former radio 4), participants felt that the airtime allocated for Kalanga on radio was a far cry compared to what other languages such as English, Shona and Ndebele enjoy. As such, they felt that Government should deliberately promote more use of the language on national radio. Scholars such as Maseko and Ndlovu (2013), Ndhlouv (2009) and Ndlovu (2014) raise similar concerns regarding the deficient use in the media, of minority languages when compared to the major languages such as English, Shona and Ndebele. Participants therefore felt it was the government’s obligation to provide an enabling environment for the expansion of usage of minority languages such as Kalanga in the media. The participants mentioned the need to expand the use of Kalanga into the territories of television broadcasting and newspapers. They argued that the use of Kalanga on national television will go a long way in cultivating confidence in the use of the language as well as in rebutting negative stereotyping of that the language as inferior. This in turn would encourage acquisition of the
language by the younger generation. Beyond this, the visibility of the language in the media can potentially catalyse and reinvigorate its use even among adult speakers who may have been capitulating to the pressures associated with language shift. To this, one participant retorted:

*Kungani kungela ngitsho lolulodwa uhlelo olwenziwa ngesiKalanga ku TV?Kufanele uhulumende avumeze ukusethenziwa kesiklanga ku TV. Lokho kuzenza abantwana abalathande ulimi lWabo ngoba beluzwa kuTV.nxa kungenzakala lokho, bazabona ukuthi ulimi lwabo lalo lulesisindo njengazo nje zonke indimi.Lokho kuzayenza bafune ukulufunda.*

Why is it that there is not even a single Kalanga programme on national television? Government should allow the use of Kalanga on national television. That will cultivate a liking of the language in the children if they hear their language on television. When this happens, the children will realise that their language also has value just like all other languages. That will then compel them to learn it.

All participants (N=34) indicated that government was obliged to fund and support the production of literature in Kalanga. They argued that literature would go a long way in supporting acquisition activities both in the home and at school. They therefore implored the government to support any individual or organisation that was seized with producing Kalanga literature. They also pointed out that institutions of higher learning must be supported in their quest for research into minority languages such as Kalanga.

Respondents also felt that the use of Kalanga in other formal domains was met with resistance as such; they felt that Kalanga should be empowered as one of the languages recognised by the new constitution to be used across all domains such as the parliament of Zimbabwe, the courts of law and in general government business. As one participant observed:


Kalanga should be spoken everywhere and in every little place. We want to hear it in parliament; we want to hear it in government offices. In fact Kalanga speakers should be able to speak their language freely, anywhere.
Government offices in areas dominated by Kalanga speakers must be manned by Kalanga speakers so that Kalanga language can also be used there. If that happens, you will see that all these problems will disappear and children would learn it when they realise that their language is useful after all. Besides, isn’t Kalanga one of the 16 languages in the (new) constitution?

As the responses show, there is a lot that L1 Kalanga participants felt was the government’s mandate as far as aiding minority language conservation is concerned. This legitimate expectation by the speakers also speaks to the fact that language conservation and reversing language shift can only be possible if there is a meaningful conversation between the bottom-up and the top-down language management spheres. In the context of family language policy, formal institutional support rendered to minority languages potentially results in increased confidence in the use of the language, which also impacts positively on intergenerational transmission, and therefore on family language policy.

As a consequence of the different historical circumstance between the Kalanga and Tonga speakers, the two languages, while seemingly are traversing the same path, and their predicaments appearing a lot more similar, the findings of the study show that Tonga language seems safer than Kalanga as far as intergenerational transmission is concerned. The bulk of the explanations for this state of affairs are predicated on the amount of institutional and community support that Tonga has enjoyed over a long time. Resultantly, government support to Tonga has come much earlier as compared to Kalanga. Ndlovu (2013; 2014) writes about the success story of Tonga language revitalisation efforts mainly being a consequence of institutional and community support, the Tonga historical continuity as well as the much earlier propagation of advocacy activities among the Tonga compared to Kalanga. As such, L1 Tonga participants’ views subtly betrayed the fact that Tonga has considerably profited from governmental support when equated to Kalanga as far as support for language issues are concerned. Table 5.22 below captures the L1 Tonga participants’ views regarding what they thought the government ought to do to assist in the conservation of Tonga.
Table 5.22: L1 Tonga participants’ views regarding government’s obligation in conserving minority languages in the context of family language policy (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 1</th>
<th>Government must help consolidate the teaching of Tonga in schools</th>
<th>(N=28) 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | • Continue to provide support for the teaching of Tonga in areas where it is mostly spoken.  
• Ban the teaching of other languages such as shona and Ndebele in Tonga speaking areas.  
• Employ Tonga speaking teachers to areas inhabited by Tonga speakers.  
• Make Tonga the language of instruction at primary level.  
• Allow the community leaders to oversee the teaching of Tonga. | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 2</th>
<th>Government must provide support for the introduction of degree programmes in Tonga at state Universities and colleges.</th>
<th>(N=26) 92.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | • Government must move in to support the teaching of Tonga in all state Universities.  
• Lupane state University should also be used as a focal institution in the teaching of Tonga since it is situated very close to the Tonga speaking communities.  
• Introduce Tonga in teacher training colleges. | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic view 3</th>
<th>Government must promote the use of Tonga in the media</th>
<th>(N=28) 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Actual responses | • Increase the use of Tonga on radio.  
• Introduce Tonga programmes on national television. | |
As validated in table 5.22 above, L1 Tonga participants also had a montage of expectations as far as the envisaged role of the government in the conservation of minority home languages is concerned. Chief among these was the expectation that government must consolidate the teaching of Tonga in schools. All the respondents (N=28) felt that it is imperative for the government to continue supporting the teaching of Tonga in schools in more ways than one. Acknowledging that Tonga was already part of the curriculum in most schools especially in the Binga district, participants signposted their wish for government to continue supporting the teaching of Tonga and the introduction of the subject in the remaining areas. One participant indicated thus:

We are happy that Tonga is now taught in most schools in the district and we wish for the government to continue with the support as well as introduce Tonga to other areas where it is yet to be taught.

The above is a subtly concession by the participant that Tonga, unlike most of the minority languages has benefited from government support hence its widespread teaching across the Binga district. Unlike Kalanga, Tonga seems have profited much from government. As such, the contemporary narrative among the Tonga presently borders on emphasis for the need for consolidation of that support. Some
participants went to the extent of proposing that government must ban the teaching of other indigenous languages such as Ndebele and Shona in those areas which are predominantly Tonga speaking. These seemingly radical language management proposals also resonate with the evidently Tonga centred language ideologies that seem to be the driving force regarding language preference and practice among L1 Tonga participants. As a vivid demonstration to such a commitment, some participants also pointed out the need for the government to consider deploy only Tonga speaking teachers in the Binga district. One participant noted that:

*Siyafisa ukuthi uhulumende abhane ukufundiswa kwezinye indimi ezinjenge siNdebele lesiShona kuzigaba zethu. Udaba lolu sesake salusa lasezinduneni ukuthi ziluse phambili kwezinye izikolo ngizwa kuthiwa sokwake kwaphosa kwakhali nduku ngendaba yonaleyi*

We really wish that government bans the teaching of other languages such as Ndebele and shona in our (Tonga speaking) areas. We once engaged our chiefs on this matter so they could take it forward (to government). In some schools I hear people almost fought because of this matter.

The above response testifies to the importance that the particular participant holds of Tonga language. The response is also symbolic of the amplified resistance the Tonga have towards linguistic acculturation and assimilation. All this speaks to the language ideologies and beliefs that are held by the Tonga. Just as some of the L1kalanga participants indicated, the issue of non-Tonga speaking teachers was also raised as an ailment requiring an antidote. To this, government was cited as holding the key to the panacea. To that end, participants indicated that government must, as provided for by the Education Act, activate the use of Tonga as the medium of instruction especially for primary education in and around Binga where it is predominantly spoken. Towards this goal, participants indicated that the speakers themselves must be consulted and be allowed to take centre stage.

Probably feeling that Tonga language has gained some ground in education, especially considering its wide spread teaching in most schools, some respondents (N=26) felt that it was time the government provided support for the introduction of degree programmes in Tonga at state Universities and colleges. They argued that, to consolidate the ground that has been covered and the achievements so far, it was now the time to incrementally introduce Tonga in Universities and colleges. As one participant saw it:
It is important that government supports the introduction of Tonga at universities and colleges to consolidate the gains that the language has made at lower levels of education. We now have Lupane state university close by. The government must provide support for the introduction of a degree in Tonga, using Lupane as a focal institution. I hear U.Z already teaches Tonga. It would be beneficial for the community if the programme is also introduced at Lupane University which is located a stone throw from the heart of Tonga speaking communities.

The above verbatim response, while also doubling up as an admission that Tonga has made significant strides especially in primary education, is also testament that Tonga speakers are already aiming high as far as the teaching of their language is concerned. All these efforts are aimed at increasing the vitality of the language. When the language is taught at levels such as university or college, the prestige ranking of the language increases, so does the desire for acquisition. In totality, that impacts positively on intergenerational transmission of the minority language.

As demonstrated in the findings presented on table 5.22, all L1 Tonga participants (N=28) indicated that they expected government to promote the use of Tonga in the media. As attested to by the actual responses under generic view 3 in table 5.22 above, participants felt that the government must facilitate an increased visibility of Tonga on national radio and national television. Moreover, some participants underscored their desire to see coming to fruition, the introduction of a licenced Tonga community radio station, broadcasting exclusively in Tonga. They argued that the use Tonga on radio was likely to accord the language prestige so that children can aspire to speak it and therefore seek the language input. They argued that the station itself would also provide language input to the language learners as well as re-ignite its usage among adults who might have otherwise ceased using it or yielding to the temptation to. Participants also implored government to support the introduction of an exclusively Tonga newspaper, in the same fashion as Kwayedza and Umthunywa for the Shona and Ndebele speakers respectively. One respondent retorted that:

Why is it that we do not have our own Tonga newspaper? Is it not a fact that the Ndebele speakers have their Umthunywa while the Shona speakers have their own Kwayedza? Why don’t we have ours? Government must address that issue as a matter of urgency. That (introduction of a Tonga newspaper) will make Tonga speakers to be proud of their language as well as encourage children to learn the language.

A majority of participants (N=25) felt that government must allow the use of Tonga in all high ranking domains. They indicated that the use of the language in such high domains as the parliament was bound to increase the prestige with which the language is viewed as well as debunk the various stereotypes and myths that Tonga is a language spoken by backward, primitive “two toed people”. One particular response which vividly captured this is as follows:

*Uhulumende kufanele avumeze ukukhulunywa kwesiTonga endaweni eziphakemeyo leziqakathikileyo njenge phalamende. Phela nxa isiTonga sesikhulunywa kulezo ndawo, abanye abantu yikho ukuthi babone ukuthi lalo lulimi lwabantu abanormal, hayi lokho okukufanisela ukuthi amaTonga ngabantu abasalele emuva, engani ngabantu abangela zitho ezikwanileyo njengabanye abantu.*

Government must allow Tonga to be spoken in high ranking domains such as the parliament. It is only then that other people will see that our language is not a language of the abnormal people and stop imagining that Tonga people are primitive species who not fully evolved as normal beings.

The use of minority languages in (H) domains in Ferguson’s (1959) terminology can help not only in demystifying stereotypes but also in increasing confidence in its use and therefore resulting in increased desire by people to learn it.

### 5.16 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS FROM UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE ASSOCIATIONS

This broad section presents and analyses data gathered through unstructured interviews with representatives of language and culture associations. As explicated in chapter 4 (Methodology), language and culture association representatives were targeted for this study for a number of reasons. Language and culture associations are by their nature community based grassroots organisations that embody advocacy for the recognition, promotion and consolidation of their languages (especially those threatened with extinction). Language advocacy work in more ways than one constantly demands that the agents consistently interact with the speakers at grassroots level, as well as with policy makers at the government level. As such,
at any given time, language and culture associations are likely to be in touch with, and appraised of the goings on at the national level regarding minority language conservation efforts as well as with the preferences of the speakers of the language at the community and family level. Having said that, it is important at this juncture, to conjure the point that since the present study is an investigation into the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe, the question of how macro government planning impact on micro level planning becomes central. Some of the objectives of the study therefore characteristically intersect on the need to establish the potential interaction and conversation between top down planning and bottom up approaches in the search for a benchmark that would feed into the overall national policy in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Clearly, the importance of minority language advocates as the bridge between the micro grassroots levels and the macro government level cannot be overemphasised.

As depicted under the precise mechanics of data collection in chapter 4, a total of six (6) language and culture association representatives were interviewed. Two (2) were drawn from the Kalanga Language and Cultural Development Association (KLCDA). The other two (2) were drawn from the Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO) while the remaining two (2) were drawn from the Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA), itself being the umbrella body under which all the marginalised languages of Zimbabwe are represented, of course inclusive of Kalanga and Tonga. It is however not the intention of the researcher in this section, to unnecessarily rehash the precise details of the methodology, but merely to put the data presentation and analysis in this section into proper perspective. Because of the tendency of the responses to be similar, the findings from different respondents are presented and analysed at the same time to avoid unnecessary repetition of detail. In any case, the similarities as far as participants’ responses are concerned were anticipated because of one main reason. Advocacy groups are by their character, an assemblage of likeminded lobbyists, who normally share a common vision and views regarding their preferred direction of change. Language and culture associations are usually groupings of individuals who are unanimously and wholeheartedly in agreement with specific RLS objectives and sometimes wilfully devote their resources to that end (Fishman,
1991). However, this notwithstanding, where different views were expressed, especially across different associations, the data presentation and analysis strategies in this section respond accordingly.

5.16.1 Language and culture association representatives’ views regarding the importance of preserving minority languages in a multilingual community

The researcher could not, despite the overwhelming temptation to, yield to taking it for granted that the participants, by virtue of being advocates for minority language rights, were aware of the importance of conserving minority languages. Consequently, in all cases, the interview set of by the researcher asking the participants their views regarding the importance of conserving minority languages in a multilingual context (see question (1) in the interview guide, Appendix B). Participants expressed a number of views. However, chief among them was the view that preserving minority languages was important because language is a vehicle of culture, through which all aspects of a people’s intangible heritage are transmitted from one generation to the next. One participant noted that:

Preserving languages is respect of humanity (sic) among people whose language has been allowed and promoted to survive (sic). Preserving minority languages also means allowing the continuity of minority cultures and that enriches humanity in general.

Evident from the response above, preserving minority languages implies preserving humanity. In fact, maintaining all languages is enrichment to humanity and allows free participation of different language speakers in everyday social intercourse. One respondent opined that preserving languages where everyone is happy reduces social frictions.

Further, participants indicated that a person’s language, regardless of its perceived status, is a marker of that individual’s identity, a carrier of culture and a symbol of being. This is captured in the view expressed by one participant below:

A language is the identity of any person. Without language you lose your sense of belonging. When you lose language you lose the momentum of belonging even nationally.

The representatives of the three language and cultural associations that were interviewed unanimously chorused the views presented above. Observably, their
views resonated well with those of the Kalanga and Tonga parents presented and analysed in the preceding broad section.

**5.16.2 Language and culture association representatives’ views regarding the role of minority language speakers in the conservation of minority languages**

Question (2) in the interview guide (Appendix B) sought to establish the levels of awareness among the language and culture association representatives regarding the role of language speakers in conserving minority languages. All the participants indicated that at the community level, speakers of minority languages had an obligation to continuously speak their language even in the face of adversity and despite whatever lure to abandon them. They noted that the role of the speakers at the family and community level was to pass on the language to the next generation. One participant opined that:

> The speakers should proudly speak their language without fear or any feeling of suppression. That obviously takes confidence. It comes with a whole lot of packages to speak a language.

The sentiments expressed above indicate that while the role of the speakers of the language is to pass it on, through consistently and fearlessly using it, the task is a lot more cumbersome if the speakers are especially disenfranchised and stripped of their confidence in the language. Another participant noted that:

> If you think you will be perceived to be somebody, people use it(sic), but if people perceive you to be inferior, that your language is of no value, then people shy away from the language.

In the same vein, one participant representing TOLACCO drew the researcher’s attention to a Tonga proverb that says “Kuvuna kali kumulomo” (in your mouth is a weapon and your survival). The participant noted that this Tonga saying captured the spirit around which the fight against marginalisation of Tonga was emboldened. The respondent equated this saying to the Ndebele expression that goes “umtwana ongakhaliyo ufela embelekweni” (a child that that does not cry to express discomfort while on its mothers back will eventually die on its mothers back). Essentially, this means that speakers of the language should not just end with speaking the language but also express their dismay if they feel their language is suppressed. Formation of language associations, producing literature and educational materials in the minority
languages, conducting cultural festivals and engaging policy makers were cited as some of the roles that speakers have to play in minority language conservation.

5.16.3 Language and culture association representatives’ views regarding the role of the family institution in intergenerational transmission of minority languages

Question (3) as in the interview guide (Appendix B) solicited the views of language and culture association representatives on what they considered to have been the role of the family institution or the home domain in the intergenerational transmission of languages fronted by their respective associations. Again the Reponses were generally similar in a unanimous fashion. The home was considered to be playing an important part in that, for the participants, it has consistently been the only domain where the use of the minority languages has been considerably enforced, albeit with varying degrees of success. Participants argued that, it is also in the home where parents have been able to deploy language management strategies that could potentially benefit minority language conservation. In other words, the home was seen as the last line of defence against language shift or language extinction. As one KLDCA representative saw it, with respect to intergenerational transmission, the home has been the major domain where Kalanga has remained strong. This respondent opined that:

"Kalanga has been strong at home, but the moment you walk through the school gate, you are told ‘not beyond here’. You then begin to ask yourself, is it worth it to speak this language? You begin to feel inferior and you regress. Despite the school system being the major challenge, the use of the language in the home is what has kept the language alive but it has slowly been losing that momentum because of the school. Children also tend to bring home with them, the language practices and behaviour and attitudes they experience at school.

Despite playing a vital role in ensuring intergenerational transmission, the home has been under constant antagonism from the school language policy especially for Kalanga."
5.16.4 Language and culture association representatives’ views regarding the role of the associations in inspiring mother tongue use at the family level

To ascertain the impact of language advocacy activities on family language policy, and therefore on intergenerational transmission, language association representatives were asked for their views on the role they play in inspiring families to cherish and use their home languages. Participants indicated that while it is difficult to directly influence language practices in each individual household, they had a number of strategies that they employed to concientise speakers at community level on the importance of using their mother tongue at home. One ZILPA representative cited the roll out of awareness and concientisation programmes within respective linguistic communities geared towards educating speakers on the importance of home language transmission. Cultural festivals and road shows were also cited as some of the tools that are used by language and culture associations to inspire families to use their languages. Participants also indicated that they encouraged parents to give their children names in their respective home languages as a means of cultivating confidence and raising intrigue about the language within the children themselves. Children are inquisitive in their nature, and as such, naming them using their mother tongue is likely to arouse within the children an inquisitive stance regarding the origin and meaning of their names. Some participants also indicated that they encouraged parents to teach praise totems and poetry to their children in respective minority languages as a means to try and cultivate the use of the languages within families.

5.16.5 Language and cultural association initiatives

There are a variety of initiatives that were found to be implemented by language and culture associations towards the conservation of their respective minority languages they represent.

5.16.5.1 Engaging government and other stakeholders on policy issues

Participants indicated that as language and culture associations, much of their activities revolved around advocacy for the elevation, promotion and development of the marginalised languages. This inevitably requires constant lobbying of government and policy makers on issues to do with the teaching, use, status and
recognition of the languages. One respondent noted that as language and culture associations, their goal is to:

...lobby and advocate for an all stakeholder inclusion in the development of policy, or any decision that would affect the concerned linguistic groups. We also lobby responsible ministries of education to enforce the use of mother tongue especially in primary schools.

Further, participants also noted their role as language and culture associations as the link between the local communities and the government. Because of their influence, they source funding for the production of teaching and learning materials for schools, funding for language and cultural festivals as well as monitoring the implementation of language related policies especially in education. Vividly emphasising the above point, one participant indicated that:

As language and culture associations, our role is also to engage government, through relevant line ministries on policy setting, educational institutions for purposeful inclusion into their systems, the teaching of minority languages. We also inspire communities to participate in the development of their languages, as well as encouraging the younger generation to pursue the learning and prioritisation of their home languages.

Much of the activities of the advocacy groups pivot around the promotion of respective languages especially in education. Beyond that, language and culture association representatives indicated that they also did not end in lobbying for the teaching of the minority languages but also for the consolidation of the positive interaction between the demands of the school and that of the home as far as language issues are concerned.

5.16.5.2 Engaging traditional leaders at the grassroots

Language and culture association representatives also mentioned that they constantly engaged chiefs and other traditional leaders in the community on issues relating to the conservation of minority languages and culture. One participant particularly noted that:

As the traditional leaders in the community, chiefs are the custodians of these languages and cultures. Leaving them out of any decisions regarding language and culture are bound to be futile. People at the community level are only likely to embrace any language policy decisions that are endorsed by their traditional leaders. As such, language associations play a mediating role
between the speakers and the leadership at large, both at the grassroots as well as the national level.

The language and culture association representatives unanimously indicated that all grassroots efforts aimed at conserving minority languages demanded a buy-in from the community. This is in consonance with Fishman (1991) who warns that governmental interventions are rarely effective without the grassroots community and neighbourhood involvement, support and buy-in. The most effective way to win the hearts of the community was therefore to win the support and consent of the traditional leaders. Language and culture associations therefore saw themselves as the link between the traditional leadership and policy makers at the government level.

5.16.5.3 Language and cultural festivals

From the interviews, it became clear that language and culture associations played a central role in organising cultural festivals for their respective language groups. For the KLCDA, festivals to celebrate the Kalanga language and culture are a permanent feature in their calendar. The festivals are also used as a platform to market and showcase not only the Kalanga language and culture, but also the various Kalanga artefacts. Similarly, TOLACCO, in association with other community based initiatives and technical partners such as Basilwizi Trust and Silveira House also partake in festivals to celebrate Tonga language and culture. Such activities are important in the revitalisation and conservation of minority languages as they go a long way in reinvigorating the use of the languages.

5.16.6 Participants assessments on the impact of language and culture associations’ initiatives on minority language conservation

To establish the extent of influence of the language and culture association on minority language conservation, the study solicited for tangible developments that could be credited to the initiatives of associations as far as language conservation is concerned. All the language association representatives who were interviewed felt that although the journey is still long, their initiatives have however impacted positively on language conservation efforts.
5.16.6.1 KLCDA representatives’ views regarding the impact of KLCDA initiatives on the conservation of Kalanga

Interviewees noted that the initiatives of the association have to date impacted positively on the conservation of Kalanga. One of the interviewees argued that as a result of the KLCDA initiatives, speakers were beginning to appreciate the language. He argued that before the birth of the association, a lot of Kalanga speakers had started to write off the language, while a whole lot more were actively working against the language by resisting its teaching at schools. The particular interviewee pointed out that with the KLCDA’s conscientisation efforts, the association has triggered language conservation activities at family level, clan level and village levels. The interviewee noted that as a result of their initiatives, annual family gatherings have become common where members of extended families meet to celebrate their language, their heritage as well as dig more into their Kalanga history. A substantial number of middle aged parents have started to use the language with their children as well as enforcing it within their homes. Consequently, the number of children who are proficient in Kalanga has also been rising. Moreover, other speakers have taken up writing and publishing in Kalanga. Participants also cited the emergence of online Kalanga radio stations run by individuals as having been directly motivated by KLCDA initiatives.

Beyond the micro level, KLCDA representatives who were interviewed for this study pointed out the inclusion of Kalanga as one of the 16 languages in the new constitution as a direct result of their advocacy activities. The KLCDA representatives however expressed some misgivings on the status label given to the language in the constitution. They noted that their preferred position was for Kalanga to be given the status of ‘formerly marginalised’ language. They argued that this recognition would have enabled the language to receive affirmative action and preferential treatment so as to cover some ground that has been lost.

Moreover, they identified the introduction of Kalanga in schools, where it has since been examined in some schools in Bulilima and Mangwe districts at grade seven for the first time in 2015 as resultant from their agitation. However, one respondent was quick to point out that the number of schools that facilitated the examining of Kalanga at grade seven was negligible. As such, the participant indicated the need
to continuously push for the spread of Kalanga into predominantly Kalanga territories. The above were cited by the KLCDA representatives to be among some of the tangible outcomes of the association’s advocacy activities.

5.16.6.2 TOLACCO representatives’ views regarding impact of TOLACCO initiatives on the conservation of Tonga

Just like their KLCDA counterparts, representatives of TOLACCO who were interviewed spoke glowingly of the achievements made by their association as far as the conservation of Tonga is concerned. However, throwing caution to the wind, they also felt that a lot still needed to be done to reach a state of equilibrium as far as the Tonga language and other major languages were concerned. The interviewees emphasised community participation as being key to the milestones that the Tonga languages has passed, including the successes recorded in the teaching of the language at various levels of the education. Interestingly, for the Tonga, having the language spoken in the home is no longer a major concern. This could be so because the language is spoken quite proficiently by the younger generation. As such, their worry now seems to be its use in high ranking domains. The interviewees indicated that Tonga was the first of the minority languages of Zimbabwe to be examined at Ordinary level (form 4). As one of the interviewees noted:

The road to get to where we are has been very bumpy, meandering, slippery and sometimes frustrating. However, grassroots initiatives are finally paying off. For Tonga, after thirty years of struggle to go beyond grade three learning it (sic), we eventually had our first historic grade seven examination written in 2011, and our first Ordinary level (form 4) Tonga examination in 2015.

As far as the interviewees were concerned, the success story of Tonga cannot be attributed to TOLACCO’s initiatives alone, but to the wider community’s participation. The inclusion of Tonga as one of the sixteen languages recognised by the new constitution of Zimbabwe was also cited as the one milestones for which TOLACCO could partially claim glory. Other notable milestones that TOLACCO representatives felt the association could be credited for includes the growing literary tradition in Tonga. Participants noted the increasing output of Tonga literature, including primary and secondary school textbooks as having been supported by the association through the Tonga writers association. As a result, the participants noted that the Tonga speaking communities were now more determined to see their language develop even further.
5.16.7 Language and culture associations’ representatives’ views on the role of government in the preservation of minority family languages including those threatened with extinction

The study found it imperative to establish, from the point of view of language and culture association representatives, the role that they envisaged government should play in the conservation of minority home languages. KLCDA, TOLACCO and ZILPA representatives shared common views regarding the obligation of government in minority language conservation. Chief among these views was the need for government to provide an enabling environment as well as effective legal instruments for the monitoring of language in education policy as enshrined in the Education Act. As one interviewee summarised it:

It is the duty of the government of the day to continue smoothening policies that create and sustain an enabling environment for the development of the marginalised languages. The languages must also be taught at all colleges and universities and government must make it an enforceable rule that public communication be in the languages of the recipient communities. Government should also provide funding for the development of the said languages, and for the translation of public information on health, education, parliamentary proceedings into the minority languages.

In brief, language and culture associations echoed the same views as the parents who also felt government must actively take up the promotion of minority languages through providing funding and support. Impliedly, language and culture association representatives were aware of the fact that for minority language conservation to be successful there has to be an all stakeholder involvement and buy in.

5.17 Conclusion

This chapter has presented and analysed the findings of the study. The first broad section of the chapter presented and analysed findings from semi structured interviews with the L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents who were targeted for the study. The second broad section presented and analysed findings from unstructured interviews with representatives of language and culture associations. In the first broad section, findings were presented in a narrative format while tables, bar charts as well as pie charts were also used to add clarity and precision to words in the narrative presentation. In the second broad section, findings were presented in a narrative form. The L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents constituted the main target
group for the study, while language and culture association representatives were targeted as a complementary group to corroborate or to refute the findings from the main target group. As such, the bulk of the findings presented in this chapter were from the interviews with L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents who constituted the main target group. The following chapter is the discussion of findings.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

6.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter (chapter 5) presented and analysed the research findings. The first broad section of chapter 5 presented and analysed findings from semi-structured interviews with L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents who were targeted for the study. The second broad section presented and analysed findings from unstructured interviews with representatives of language and culture associations. The precise mechanics relating to how the sample was arrived at have been discussed in elsewhere in the thesis. In conversation with the research questions and the objectives of the study, the findings presented in chapter 5 were presented under sections as they related with the research questions. Qualitative data presentation and analysis strategies were used to present and analyse data. Data was presented and analysed in a narrative format. However, as evident in chapter 5, some quantitative metrics such as tables, bar charts and pie charts were also deployed to add precision to the narrative form.

This chapter is the discussion of the research findings. It is the penultimate chapter of the study and it discusses the research findings in concordance with the theoretical approaches upon which the study is grounded. Without losing sight of the main focus of the study, the findings are also discussed in relation to the existing literature in the subject of family language policy and minority language conservation. As this discussion proceeds however, it is important to bear in mind, the central focus of the research. The study focuses on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. As such, the central question revolved around how parents within minority language families articulated, directed and managed family language policy in the home, in the context of minority language conservation. The study also sought to establish the parental language management strategies for the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The discussion of findings is illuminated by a reliance on themes as they emerged in the data presented in chapter 5. To that end, some of the themes in the discussion are based on participants’ verbatim responses, while others stem from recurrent views and arguments as distilled from findings presented in chapter 5.
6.2 The nature of family language policy

As far as the terminology used to describe different kinds of FLPs are concerned, literature on family language policy has provided researchers with a mosaic of nuanced albeit related labels. Altman et al. (2014) opine that family language policy types are generally defined on the basis of parents’ ideological orientations with regards to attitudes and beliefs towards the maintenance and development of L1 and L2. For example, in her study on the impact of extended family members on family language policy in the context of Gaelic-English bilingualism on the island of Skyle in Scotland, Smith-Christmas (2014) distinguished between a Gaelic-centred FLP and bilingual FLP. In the same vein in their study of family language policy and reported language use and proficiency among Russian-Hebrew bilingual children in Israel, Altman et al. (2014:219) distinguished between “strongly pro-Russian, mildly pro-Russian and pro-bilingual FLPs.” For Altman et al. (2014), the first two classifications were used synonymously with strict pro-Russian and mild pro-Russian descriptions. Similarly, in this present study, the classifications of family language policies are inferred from parental language ideologies, beliefs and language preferences in the home. Language ideology and preference usually influence practice and management and therefore FLP. In a way, the parental dispositions towards minority language maintenance are the basis through which the nature of FLP is identified and described in this study. While leaning on the insights afforded by Smith-Christmas (2014) and Altman et al. (2014) alluded to above, the present study also attempts an integration of Fishman’s (1991) reversing language shift theory and Spolsky’s (2004; 2009) language management theory (see chapter 3) in describing the type and nature of FLPs inferred from the research findings presented in chapter 5.

As a consequence, this present study found it compelling to lean on the terminology afforded by the theoretical lens upon which the present study is predicated. In this study, parental language ideologies instantiated the division of families into two policy groups based on parental responses (Altman et al., 2014). To that end, the two types of FLP types are identifiable from the recurring views in the findings presented in chapter 5. From the parental language ideologies (see section 5.7 in chapter 5) and parental language use preferences in the home (see section 5.9 in chapter 5) it was possible to identify the recurrence of pro-minority home language
FLP or pro-Xish (Fishman, 1991) and the pro-Bilingual FLPs. “The decision to use ‘ideology’ as the focal point in the categorisation of FLP types was motivated by its ability to disambiguate similar practices from different beliefs” (Altman et al., 2014:221).

Deploying Fishman’s terminology as used in his reversing language shift theory (see annotation of GIDS in Fishman’s reversing language shift theory in Chapter 4), Fishman (1991) uses the suffix –Xish as a synonym/code for minority home language. However, in this study, the preference is for the use of other synonyms such as pro-minority home language, pro-Kalanga or pro-Tonga FLP. A pro-Xish FLP means that parental language ideologies and preferences showed a disposition or high affinity towards the maintenance of the minority home language while a pro-bilingual FLP means that parental language ideologies and preferences indicated a predisposition for the use of the minority home language alongside another language in the home. Parents with a pro-minority home language ideology “would take certain language management actions to eliminate the undesired practice of speaking L2 in their L1-only home” (Altman et al., 2014:221), while parents with a pro-bilingual ideology would encourage, or not mind the use of another language along with their L1 in the home. These ideology and parental preference based classifications enable the researcher to capture family linguistic dynamics which may, otherwise, be overlooked if the distinction between the FLP types was to be based exclusively on practice (Altman et al., 2014). Table 6.1 below shows the FLP types and the criteria used to classify families under the respective FLP types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLP type</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-minority home language FLP</td>
<td>• Parents think the minority home language should be conserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents prefer only the minority home language to be spoken at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents will employ strategies to ‘reverse language shift’ if they feel the minority home language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is threatened in the home (e.g. sanctions for the use of any language other than the minority home language, not responding when addressed in any language other than the minority home language, incentivising the consistent use of the minority home language especially by children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-bilingual FLP</th>
<th>Parents think that the use of the minority home language and another language(s) is beneficial.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents expose the children to both languages (e.g. one parent one language strategy (OPOL).)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents may code switch and/or allow children to code switch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Altman et al. (2014:222)

Table 6.1 above shows the types of FLPs as extrapolated from the findings presented in chapter 5. It shows the criteria used by the study to arrive at the two types of FLPs identified in conversation with the data. The identified FLP types are expected to make the discussion of the data more succinct, yet easy to make sense of. However, it should be born in mind that the FLPs identified from the data are a summation of the recurrent tendencies rather than a reflection of individual family language use idiosyncrasies.

6.2.1 Language awareness and language ideologies: The key ingredients in articulating a pro-minority home language FLP

Levels of awareness and consciousness regarding the importance of family languages were discovered to be the key determiners of family language policy.
Findings presented in chapter 5 demonstrate that there is a correlation between parental consciousness regarding language issues and their commitment to a pro-home language FLP. Impliedly, parents who exhibit low levels of consciousness are usually predisposed to negotiate their FLPs or even leave it inexplicitly articulated. Findings presented in table 5.11 in chapter 5 show that the majority of the participants from both the population segments were aware of the minoritisation of their home languages and the long term implications of language loss. There is a relationship between awareness of language minoritisation and the tendency by parents to take visible steps to defend the language from threats of extinction. As such, the majority of respondents saw the importance of conserving their home languages. This, coupled with parents’ awareness regarding their roles as language managers impacted on the parents’ overall ideologies and beliefs regarding language, and therefore on FLP. Previous researchers such as Curdt-Christiansen (2013) and King et al. (2008) have underscored the notion that “language ideology is often the underlying force in family language planning and decisions on what language to practice and what measures to employ to influence or control family members’ language behaviours” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013:2). The generally high degree of language awareness therefore inevitably speaks to the disposition by the majority of participants to favour or prefer a pro-minority home language FLP.

Since language ideologies are based on perceived value, power and utility of a language, they are crucial in shaping language practices in ways that are sometimes unexpected (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). A strong belief in the value of the minority home languages as a carrier of culture, an important part of intangible cultural heritage, the single most important medium of communication among the speakers and the medium through which traditions are transmitted through generations(see table 5.12) is the precursor to a pro-minority home language FLP. Strong beliefs regarding the utility of the home language is demonstrated in the following excerpt from an interview with one L1 Kalanga participant:


Our home language is very important beyond measure. It is our mainstay and the medium through which we communicate with our ancestors. If one
abandons their mother tongue what will he or she possible do when the need to communicate with the ancestors arises? It is for this reason that the Kalanga language must be conserved.

The interview excerpt above shows a profound belief in the value of Kalanga to the participant. The participant’s belief in the language is likely to arouse an attachment to the language that will spring him into readiness to defend the language should he feel any threat to it. The interview excerpt above reverberates with another view expressed by one L1 Tonga respondent who pointed out that:

_Ulimi lwethu lwangekhaya luqakathekile kakhualu. Singabantu besiTongeni nje ngenxa yolimi. Sizwanana kangcono nxa sikhulumisana ngalo ulimi lulu. Kungakho nje kuqakathekile ukuthi siludlulisele phambili kuzizukulwana ezilandelayo_

Our mother tongue is very important. We are who we are (Tonga people) because of the Tonga language. We also understand each other better when we communicate amongst ourselves using our mother tongue. It is therefore important that we also pass on this language to the next generations.

The findings presented in chapter 5 vividly demonstrate that the catalyst to a pro-minority home language FLP is language awareness and language ideologies especially among the parents. If the parents are motivated enough, they are likely to enact a pro-minority home language FLP. Findings presented in 5.6 to 5.9 in chapter 5 show that parental ideologies influence language management in the home. As Schwartz (2008) observes, parents whose language ideologies are influenced by their awareness of language endangerment have tendency to appreciate their language, which can apparently encourage them to maintain it and promote its acquisition and use by their children.

6.2.1.1 “My language is a symbol of my proud identity”: A predominantly pro-minority home language FLP among Tonga families

The overwhelming preference for a Tonga-only home language use practice by L1 Tonga parents (see chapter 5, table 5.15) means that a pro-minority home language FLP is the predominant choice among the Tonga. Awareness of language endangerment and the general positive attitudes by the Tonga towards their home language could be the reason L1Tonga participants reified a pro-minority home language FLP. The predominant use of Tonga in the home also profits from language management practices in extra familial spheres such as the school system.
The Tonga language has had the fortune of being the first of the minority languages to be taught in most schools in the Binga district from grade one up to grade seven. It has also been significantly introduced at secondary schools where it has been examined at ordinary level (O’ Level). As such, parental preferences for the sole use of Tonga in the home are complemented by the fact that children generally have a positive attitude towards the language. In his study on the use of minority languages in education in Zimbabwean schools, Ndlovu (2013) also found a widespread usage of Tonga in the school system in Binga district, both as a school subject and as medium of instruction. He also found out that positive evaluations of the language exists among school children and concluded that it could possibly the validation of Tonga in the curriculum that contributes to these positive attitudes.

A pro-minority home language FLP among Tonga families is likely to be successful because of the pillars supporting the family language choices in the form of the education sector. The positive attitudes are “possibly an expression of the Tonga speakers' clear and strong loyalty towards their language, especially given that in most cases the pupils' language attitudes are a reflection of the parents' language ideologies and practices” (Ndlovu, 2013:420). The extent of intergenerational disruption is likely to be lower for Tonga as compared to other minority languages like Kalanga whose use and visibility in the education system is not nearly as widespread. A pro-minority home language FLP will thrive if complemented by a supporting sociolinguistic environment such as the school, especially given the clear consensus about the critical role of early education in the maintenance and intergenerational transmission of the minority language (Schwartz, 2010).

6.2.1.2 Pro-minority home language FLP among the Tonga: A case of minority rights interfering with majority rights?

As proposed in the ideological clarification phase of Fishman’s (1991) RLS theory, one of the important value positions in establishing consensus among RLS advocates is that in all efforts aimed at minority language conservation, minority language rights need not interfere with majority language rights. Findings presented in chapter 5 demonstrated that L1 Tonga participants have a very strong sense of ownership and loyalty to their language. Their strong ideological beliefs in their language are responsible for the largely pro-minority home language FLP that most
participants seemed to prefer. This notwithstanding, the pro-minority home language FLP thrives mostly because of the support from extra familial domains such as the school. However, in the quest to maintain a stranglehold on the home domain, while making further inroads into higher domains, L1 Tonga participants seemed to be willing to cross the line as drawn by the RLS theory in the ideological clarification phase. The proposal to ban the teaching of indigenous languages other than Tonga in the Binga district tithers on the brink of minority rights interfering with majority rights. The banning of speaking any language other than Tonga in the home, while ideologically driven, also goes against the dictates of Fishman’s value consensus as enunciated in the RLS theory. In the articulation of FLP and other advocacy programmes aimed at conserving minority languages, Fishman (1991) advises that RLS activities should be packaged in a way that does not infringe on anyone’s rights and dignity, whatever their affiliations. As such, banning of the speaking of Ndebele, and its teaching alongside Shona in schools in Binga district does not auger well with, and runs counter to Fishman’s cautions in the ideological clarification phase of the RLS theory. Since RLS efforts are carried under the banner of linguistic democracy, they should not in any way attempt to pursue a social order that advocates for cultural imperialism, and therefore should not attempt to use the envisaged status of the language to hegemonically dominate its new networks so as to avoid creating a vicious cycle (Fishman,1991).

6.2.2 Extra familial language practices: A catalyst to a pro-bilingual FLP

Findings presented in chapter 5 demonstrated that more often than not, extra familial language practices such as the language policy in schools impact on FLP. In the context of home language conservation, depending on the sociolinguistic and to an extent the socio-political environment surrounding the particular minority languages, such extra familial spheres may impact negatively on the realisation of FLP. When a minority language has limited usage beyond the family sphere, maintaining a pro-minority home language FLP may prove to be a task of colossal proportions. As such, parental language preference may exhibit some degrees of capitulation to the socio-political reality surrounding the minority language.
6.2.2.1 Bilingualism in schools in Matabeleland

Bilingualism within the school system tends to impact on the language socialisation of children. The languages that are taught as subjects in schools tend to be accorded prestige to an extent that parents are sometimes compelled to allow the school languages to be spoken in the home, regardless of whether they are the families’ mother tongues or not. The following section discusses the influence of the school system on FLP.

6.2.2.1.1“My children learn Ndebele at school and speak Kalanga at home so both languages are important”: Negotiating the private-public linguistic demands in the context of FLP

The findings presented on table 5.14 in chapter 5 indicate that a majority of L1 Kalanga parents demonstrated an affinity for a pro-bilingual FLP. The preference for a Kalanga-Ndebele bilingual FLP seems to be chiefly mediated by the extra familial linguistic demands such as the school. One could argue that the pro-bilingual FLP among the Kalanga reflects a negotiated settlement pitting the desire for linguistic continuity on one hand and the socio-political factors on the other (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). While the school demands presented a fertile ground for a thriving pro-minority home language FLP among the Tonga, the demands of the school is evidently the Achilles heel for the realisation of pro-minority home language FLP among the Kalanga. Lewis and Simons (2009) opine that in any case, intergenerational transmission of a language does not lie in parental control alone, but also on societal and institutional language choices as well. Although the school can be of influence in the intergenerational transmission of a language, Fishman (1991) notes that there are limits to its effectiveness in RLS especially for languages that are not intergenerationally embedded in the community. In any case, “endangered languages become such because they lack informal intergenerational transmission and informal daily life support, not because they are not being taught in schools or lack official status” (Fishman, 1997 cited in Romaine, 2002:2). This underscores the view that schools are not the single most important domains to concentrate on in the intergenerational transmission of minority languages.

Within Bulilima and Mangwe districts where data relating to L1 Kalanga FLP was collected, Ndebele language is predominantly taught as a subject in schools, and
also used as a language of instruction, albeit sparingly (Ndlovu, 2013). This state of affairs has thrived since the colonial times when, as per the advice of Doke (1931) Ndebele was imposed as the only indigenous African language to be taught in those areas. In fact, Ndlovu (2013) and Msindo (2005) trace the genesis of Kalanga domination by Ndebele to the pre-colonial times of King Mzilikazi. They are of the feeling that Kalanga incorporation into the Ndebele state marked the genesis of the decline of the Kalanga language under the more superior Ndebele language which was the ‘official’ language of the Ndebele state, also spoken by the ruling elite in the mould of the Khumalo clan.

The preference for a pro-bilingual FLP pitting Kalanga and Ndebele is a subtle indication of the capitulation of the Kalanga to the socio-political reality (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). Ndebele is not only widespread in schools, but also in the community as the major endoglossic (Batibo, 2005) official language spoken in Bulilima and Mangwe districts. Bilingualism is thus the norm rather than the exception. In their daily lives therefore, minority Kalanga speakers are compelled to make a lot of choices regarding language use. These choices are not only limited to the family sphere, but to the wider society. Because much of these choices they make can potentially determine the quality of their experiences in particular domains (Kasatkina, 2011), they are often compelled to be more pragmatic rather than ideological in their choices. In most cases, parents are spurred on by the desire to increase chances of upward social mobility for their children such that they capitulate to bilingual realities of society (Darquennes, 2007; Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). “Since minority languages normally have limited domains of usage, this choice normally put into the matrix a plethora of options, dominated by majority languages” (Kasatkina 2011:36). The choice of which language dominates in everyday usage does not only “elucidate the hierarchical order of the languages related to different market values, but they also provide insights into the processes of language development, language shift and language change” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2016). In any case, the choice to use or not to use a particular language does not lie in the general uselessness of one’s linguistic product but lies moreso in the functional relevance of the language in the domain that it is being used (Siziba, 2013).
6.2.2.1.2 Bilingualism as a benefit for all: Relating bilingual realities to pro-bilingual FLP among the Kalanga

The findings from interviews presented in chapter 5 demonstrated that the majority of L1 Kalanga parents pursued a pro-bilingual FLP. Findings also validated that bilingualism is a widespread phenomenon in most families. The benefits of bilingualism are multiple. For example, Bamgbose (1991) details the advantages of bilingualism, both at individual and societal levels as enriching for human endeavour. Fishman (1991) therefore adds that while it is important to conserve minority languages, this should not be to the detriment of the prevailing social order, since different languages have different roles to play in a multilingual society and are useful to the speakers in more ways than one. Fishman’s RLS theory, in the ideological clarification phase acknowledges the benefits of bilingualism. He argues that RLS advocates need to understand that bilingualism is a benefit to all. To that caution, RLS advocates should embrace it, not only as a temporally strategy or an implicit threat but as an enriching phenomenon to the multicultural realities of Modern society (Fishman, 1991).

L1 Kalanga participants who were interviewed indicated a predominant preference for a pro-bilingual FLP. This is also concretised by the following excerpt from one L1 Kalanga participant regarding her preferred language choice in the home:

I prefer to use both Kalanga and Ndebele when I am at home. Both these languages are important in our everyday lives as they are both useful in varying ways especially to the children. Kalanga is my mother tongue that I was born into while Ndebele is like a second language adopted from ‘next door’. Children also learn Ndebele at school hence it is important for them to be knowledgeable in Ndebele, yet they are not supposed forget their Kalanga mother tongue as well.

The response above vividly captures the pro-bilingual ideology exhibited by the participants. What features sonorously in the above excerpt is the effect that
language use in the school has in the articulation of the pro-bilingual FLP among the Kalanga. Fishman (1991) also notes that embracing bilingualism means that the speakers of the languages are themselves disposed to decide on the domains to be reserved for the minority language and the domains to be occupied by the majority language. Curdt-Christiansen (2014) also reiterates that FLPs constantly interact with and are often shaped by the national language policy especially the language in education policy. In her study of Chinese-English bilinguals in Singapore, Curdt-Christiansen (2014) concluded that socio-political and educational realities in Singapore often influenced FLP.

All this corroborates the point being made in the present study that a pro-bilingual FLP among the Kalanga is a culmination of the interaction between top down approaches in the macro domain of the state and bottom up approaches in the micro level of the family. However, in the case of Kalanga, the influence of the top down planning on FLP seem to conflict with an effective pro-bilingual preference because of the weaker “funds of knowledge” in the top down regarding FLP. The term “funds of knowledge” is used by Moll et al. (1992:133) cited in Schwartz and Verschik (2013:9) to mean the “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being.” In the context of a pro-bilingual FLP among the Kalanga, the language managers in the school system as a top-down language management sphere lack the requisite “funds of knowledge” to support a pro-bilingual FLP. Ndlovu (2013) found out that most schools in Bulilima and Mangwe districts where Kalanga is predominantly spoken are manned by non Kalanga speaking teachers. As far as the learning of Kalanga is concerned, this state of affairs sets the school in a collision course with FLP. The school system seems to be promoting subtractive bilingualism by placing Ndebele in the fore, to the detriment of Kalanga. Fishman (1991), in his RLS theory advises that all actors in the RLS process need to embrace efforts that seek to foster additive bilingualism because it adds perspective, variety and nuancing to the lives of the speakers. In a way, L1 Kalanga parents viewed the promotion of bilingualism amongst their children as intended for the benefit of children themselves, as well as for the benefit of maintaining their cultural background at the same time promoting economic opportunities (King and Fogle 2006 cited in Kheirkhah, 2016).
6.3 Parental language preferences versus children’s language practices at home: A mismatch between ideology and practice

Lack of, or inadequate formal institutional support for the minority languages was identified in the study as partly to blame for the mismatch between parental language ideologies and language practices among the children. The net effect of the mismatch is that it validates Spolsky’s (2009) argument that it should not be taken for granted that parental beliefs about their language alone can have a positive impact on children’s language practice since language policy should be understood as functioning within complex nested ecological relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic factors.

Findings presented in chapter 5 demonstrate that parental language ideologies do not always coincide with children language practices in the home. “Children can reject parents’ efforts and the family can become a site for conflictual understandings of what constitutes family members’ appropriate language choices” (Spolsky, 2008:18 cited in Kheirkhah, 2016:21). Findings presented in tables 5.14 and 5.15 in chapter 5 indicated that there is a considerable gap between the parents’ role as language teachers and managers who are expected to insist on minority language use, and actual usage of the language by children (Schwartz, 2010). The majority of L1 Kalanga parents were for a pro-bilingual FLP, while the majority of L1 Tonga participants preferred a pro-minority home language FLP.

However, parental reports regarding their children’s language practices presented in tables 5.16 and 5.17 in chapter 5 for L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga respectively showed that there were varying degrees of mismatch between parental ideology and children’s practices. While the majority of L1 Kalanga participants preferred a pro-bilingual FLP, the majority observed that their children had a monolingual preference for the use of Ndebele only which is the majority community language (in terms of official status and use). Only a minority of L1 Kalanga children seemed to prefer a pro-bilingual arrangement, contrary to the desires of the majority L1 Kalanga parents, thereby validating the view that “although parents may encourage and demand the use of a certain language(s), families’ language use patterns may not be what parents’ explicit policies aim for” (Kheirkhah, 2016:21).
For the L1 Tonga population segment, the majority of parents preferred a monolingual pro-Tonga FLP. Parental reports of their children's language practices at home also indicated that most children also adhered to a monolingual pro-Tonga arrangement at home. However, there is a degree of mismatch in terms of the figures. Although a majority of L1 Tonga parents reported higher degrees of conformity to a pro-minority home language FLP by their children, some reported degrees of mismatch between parental ideologies and children's language practices in the home. In Spolsky's (2009) view, the articulation of a language policy revolves around the beliefs or ideologies as well as the consensual behaviours of members in a domain. However, for him, these beliefs are not practice, although they may influence practices. Parental ideologies and beliefs do not always translate into practice. This is usually a result of the fact that language ideologies are often power inflected and tend to become the source of tensions shaping family language practices (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). The study established that mismatch between beliefs and practice can be understood at various levels. All this corroborates King and Fogle's (2006) view that while parental language ideologies play a significant role in language maintenance, minority language maintenance is itself not an easy enterprise. Although parents may be willing and motivated to maintain their languages (King and Fogle, 2006) language use in educational settings, peer influences and community practices may motivate children to use and feel more closely to the majority languages (Caldas, 2006).

Spolsky (2009) notes that subjective reactions towards language derive from such variables as the importance attached to the language and the socio-economic benefits a speaker can expect by using it. Low levels of conformity to parental language ideologies by L1 Kalanga children partly stem from the diminished status of Kalanga, at school and other extra familial community domains where Ndebele is favoured and preferred. A low level of usage of Kalanga also leads to low proficiency levels in the language. This is partly a result of negative language attitudes cited by parents as one of the probable reasons. Kalanga language is not widely taught in schools, and therefore, in the eyes of the children, it cannot be ‘a useful’ language. As Ndlovu (2013) observes, while proficiency requirements in Ndebele and Shona at the end of primary and secondary school education promotes active bilingualism among minority language speakers in Zimbabwe, it in turn fosters language shift.
Kheirkhah (2016) concurs with this view. He avers that children especially in educational settings tend to articulate various orientations towards different languages, and as such, the school system for them is a site for negotiations and exploitations of languages in a variety of ways (Kheirkhah, 2016) which may impact on FLP.

The status of Ndebele as one of the national languages is in itself a form of pressure imposed on minority language speakers to shift. Ndebele language is therefore viewed as a prestigious language amongst the younger generation. In most cases, the Kalanga youth have developed low emotional, functional, intellectual and loyalty stake of Kalanga language and shifted to Ndebele language (Ndlovu, 2013). As a result, they often lack self-esteem and readily abandon their language, culture and self-identity in favour of the Ndebele language (Ndlovu, 2013). Their language is a stigma and these speakers have a low estimation of their languages and culture. One L1 Kalanga respondent in fact noted that her children did not see the language’s usefulness beyond its comic value, thus:

Abantwana bayahleka okumangalisayo nxa bengezwa ngikhuluma isiKalanaga. Bayangibuza ukuthi kanti yindaba ngikhuluma ulimi lwezalukazi.

My children laugh their lungs out when they hear me speaking in Kalanga. They even ask why I speak in the language of old hags.

Such negative evaluations of the language by children lead to the abandonment of Kalanga in the home. It may also mediate the resistance to speak the minority home language by the children. “By resisting the use of parents’ languages, (e.g., by using the majority language and/or refusing and criticising the heritage/minority (or parental) language use), children can implicitly negotiate and reshape the family members’ language choices” (Kheirkhah, 2016:22 citing Fogle and King, 2013:2). In such a situation, parents may begin to capitulate to the preferences of their children, thereby effectively participating in language shift themselves.

For the Kalanga, the massive emigration of the young generation out of Bulilimamangwe district and the country was said to be leading to cases where these emigrants acquire new languages and eventually lose their Kalanga language (Dube, 2015). Moreover, the Ndebele themselves have promulgated stereotypes of Kalanga culture as backward people stuck in old, exploitative traditions (Dube, ibid).
Negative attitudes towards minority languages therefore lead to lack of desire by the children to seek input, and thereby impacting on children’s proficiency levels.

In total, all these factors may also influence “positive and negative indexicality of linguistic practices leading to enriched or impoverished linguistic repertoires.” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013:3). As such, extra familial language factors have an effect on the realisation of FLP and therefore on intergenerational transmission of minority languages. The discussion of findings of the study has so far demonstrated that parental explicit and implicit language ideologies and preferred language practices are seldom ever realised in FLP. In other words, children do not always conform to parental preferences. While there may be a myriad of reasons for the non-conformity, the findings of the study presented in chapter 5 have shown that parents rarely give in to children’s lack of conformity.

6.4 Children’s proficiency levels in the home language: Success or failure of FLP?

As discussed in the previous sections, the desire by parents to transmit the heritage or family language to their children does not always translate to success. As alluded to earlier, the mismatch between ideology and practice provides validation to that effect. The low degrees of proficiencies in the mother tongue also provide proof that the success of FLP is not always as high as the parental desire to transmit the language. There is miscellany of reasons why parental language preferences, ideologies as well as family language policy, though well meaning, may fail to fit or achieve desired goals. Since “the proof is always in the pudding” (Romaine, 2002), overt and observable language practices and proficiency levels, especially among children can be taken to represent degrees of success or failure of FLP. The efficacy of FLP on intergenerational transmission of minority languages in this study can be inferred from the language practices and concomitant proficiency levels in the mother tongue by the children.

Fundamental questions concerning how to best describe or define successful FLP have been asked (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). Some scholars have suggested a framework that defines success of FLP by considering degrees of balanced bilingualism among the children, yet others have opted for a flexible approach that focuses on describing the actual interactional processes through which the family
realises, negotiates and modifies its FLP in face to face interaction (Fishman, 1991 cited in Schwartz and Verschik, 2013).

As demonstrated by the research findings presented in chapter 5, success of FLP in this study is understood within context of the parental ideologies and preferences vis-à-vis reported children’s practices and concomitant proficiency levels in the minority home language. Understood in this sense, the pro-minority home language FLP pursued by L1 Tonga parents was reproduced and reified in children’s language practices and resultant levels of proficiency, albeit with degrees of mismatch as discussed in the preceding sections. The pro-bilingual FLP articulated by L1 Kalanga parents was not fully mirrored in the language practices and proficiency levels among the children, thereby exhibiting larger degrees of mismatch. Families face a plethora of challenges in the realisation of FLP. Among these are the identity conflicts, time pressure constraints in negotiating conflicting language demands and the negative net effects of macro-level social processes such as state language policy (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). Despite this, the research findings demonstrated that even under these difficult and conflicting circumstances, some families do succeed in holding on to their home languages and pass it on to their children for posterity.

A significant number of L1 Tonga parents reported a positive correlation between parental ideologies and children’s language practices and proficiencies. In other words, the majority of Tonga participants observed that their children preferred using Tonga only in the home (see table 5.17 in chapter 5). This could also be explained within the confines of the “strong impact beliefs” (De Houwer, 1999) among the Tonga parents that they could effectively control or manage language use among their children (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). Parental impact beliefs are understood to mean the amount of self-belief by parents “that their language practices have the power to alter the language acquisition process of their children” (Perez Baez, 2013:38). Strong impact beliefs among the L1 Tonga participants resulted in them reifying a strongly pro-minority home language FLP, which was reproduced in the children’s language practices, albeit with certain degrees of mismatch. Strong impact beliefs could also be responsible for the forceful parental intervention strategies such as the ‘banning’ of speaking of any language other than Tonga in the home. On the other hand, weak impact beliefs, or lack of impact beliefs (Perez Baez, 2013:39)
could be responsible for the higher degrees of mismatch between L1 Kalanga parents’ language ideologies and their children’s practices. According to Perez Baez (2013) lack of impact belief weakens parents’ ability to implement language intervention strategies or management and is the precursor to language shift (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). Of course, as the study has shown thus far, FLP is to a larger extent impacted by extra familial language practices at the macro level of society. As such, parental impact beliefs are to an extent also influenced by language practices beyond the family sphere.

6.5 ‘Parental capitals’ as language management tools deployed in the realisation of FLP

The findings of the study have shown that especially where parents possess strong impact beliefs regarding their potential to control their children’s language behaviour in the home (De Houwer, 2009), or positive beliefs regarding their language, parents would deploy language management strategies in an attempt to influence practice to the end of realising parental articulated FLP. The study has shown that faced with a situation whereby children’s language practices conflict with parental ideologies, parents have at their disposal, a variety of language management strategies or “parental capital” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013:2) that they deploy to achieve desired language practices. “These practices can be managed and controlled implicitly and explicitly through a range of actions” (Kheirkhah, 2016:11). In the context of FLP, such parental capital and management strategies are nuanced (see table 5.18 in chapter 5). Different studies have shown that parental intervention strategies, while having the same goal, differ spatially and temporally. Similarly, this study established that parents would normally deploy context appropriate strategies to realise FLP.

6.5.1 Family literacy activities as meditation tools in the realisation of FLP

Different forms of literacy activities were found to be pursued by both the L1 Kalanga and L1 Tonga parents as mediating tools in encouraging minority home language usage by the children in the home. A number of studies have emphasised the importance of family literacy activities in child language competency development (see for example Schwartz; 2010; Schwartz and Verschik, 2013; Curdt-Christiansen, 2009). “Regardless of which language(s) and how many languages they are learning, young children need regular and frequent input to learn a particular
language” (De Houwer and Bornstein, 2016:681). This underscores the importance of home literacy activities in child language development, especially in the context of minority languages whose presence in the school system is marginal. Table 5.18 in chapter 5 reveal that the majority of parents interviewed in this study encouraged and promoted a reading culture in the minority home languages. Children were encouraged to read parents’ collections of literature and short stories written in the minority home language. To that end, parents took up the role of educators in the home in trying to cultivate proficiency in the minority home language among their children. In other instances, parents would read books written in Ndebele for their children in the minority home language, in what Smith-Christmas (2014:516) refers to as “child-centred contexts” which emphasised the minority home language as “the child centred code” (Smith-Christmas, 2014:518).

6.5.2 Utilising cultural artefacts in realising FLP

The findings presented in table 5.18 in chapter 5 demonstrate that minority language parents also utilised particular cultural artefacts in attempting to encourage and cultivate proficiency in the home language amongst the children. Perez Baez (2013) and Seloni and Sarfati (2013) have also demonstrated that in language management in context of FLP, cultural artefacts and literacy activities play a central role in providing continuity for intergenerational transmission and resistance to language shift (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). In this study, it was established that African cultural activities like the retelling of folktales in the minority home language were utilised as language management strategies to try and encourage home language transmission to the children. Folktales are by their nature not only entertaining to children, by they also provoke interest within the children to dig deeper and relate to the characters in the folktales. The use of the minority home language “in child centred contexts” (Smith-Christmas, 2014:516) such as storytelling cultivates in the children, an intimate connection with the language and the culture as depicted in the folktales and stories. All these family level activities are intended, ultimately to encourage the use of the minority home language especially among the children.

Ren and Hu (2013) have also demonstrated the importance of storytelling in child language development. In their study of two Chinese-English bilingual families in Singapore, they found out that in trying to cultivate the grandchildren’s proficiency in
their heritage Chinese language, the grandmother frequently read them Chinese fairy tales, only in the Chinese language. Similarly, the retelling of folktales using the minority home language can therefore help in cultivating the knowledge of the language by the children and therefore impact on intergenerational transmission. All this is testament to the fact that FLP is not a matter of parents authoritatively enforcing particular language practices on children and other family members, but rather, parents have to creatively use their parental capitals as well as linguistic and cultural resources to achieve FLP. As such, FLP is to a larger extent negotiated and co-constructed by parents and children (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013).

6.5.3 Utilising extended family structure

The study established that amongst a host of strategies at the parents’ disposal in the realisation of FLP, parents also utilised the extended family structure to cultivate language proficiency among the children. There are various ways through which this was achieved. Participants indicated that regular contact with the extended family members was encouraged and facilitated for the children through by allowing children to visit relatives during weekends or during school holidays, and by also inviting members of the extended family structure to visit the family. For the children, regular contact with members of the extended family structure who are fluent in the minority home language provides language input and opportunities for immersion learning of the language. It also cultivates interest and confidence in the language for the children, especially when they hear other members of the family speak it. Some participants indicated that they regularly sent their children to spend the school holidays with their grandparents who are fluent in the minority language and who speak it regularly. This was intended to expose the children to more language input and a communicative environment to use the language. In any case, Kasatkina (2011:51) has shown that “the more generations who live under the same roof, the greater that probability that the mother tongue will be maintained in the home…the presence of aunts and grandparents reduce the odds that the child will be monolingual, especially when grandparents or aunts and uncles who speak a mother tongue live in the home, the frequency of conversation in the mother tongue increases.” Spolsky (2009) also concurs that within a larger sociocultural context, children’s language socialisation typically involves more people than just the children’s parents. It involves such actors as extended family members, friends and
others in the children’s social networks. This allows for their participation in a “repertoires of language/literacy practices and adopt a variety of participation formats for different situations” (Rogoff, 2003 cited in Ren and Hu, 2013:65).

The utilisation of the traditional family structure as a language intervention measure constitute a creative strategy of blending heritage and new practices (Ren and Hu, 2013), otherwise known as syncretism (Gregory, 2008; Gregory et al., 2004 cited in Ren and Hu, 2013). Syncretic practices involving children and their older siblings, their parents, their grandparents and other supporters in their lives have proven to be important and effective in children’s language development. Essentially, grandmothers have been proven to play pivotal roles not only as caretakers and agents of language socialisation for the children, but also in FLP (Ren and Hu, 2013). To that end, through her everyday interaction with her grandchildren, her language practices become important “funds of knowledge” (Moll, et al., 1992:133) that can facilitate language and literacy development in the children (Ren and Hu, 2013).

6.5.4 Maintaining ‘dual-lingualism’ and ‘happy-lingualism.’: Flexible Pro-bilingual strategies in the realisation of FLP

The study has also shown that some participants, particularly most L1 Kalanga parents, probably cognisant of the overwhelming intrusion of the majority Ndebele language into the family domain (as depicted by the preference of Ndebele only by most of the participants’ children in the home, see table 5.16 in chapter 5), have resigned to a pro-bilingual (Kalanga-Ndebele) FLP as evident in table 5.14 in chapter 5. The virtues of a pro-bilingual arrangement have been discussed earlier, with reference to Fishman’s ideological clarification phase of the RLS theory, which cautions that RLS advocates must embrace bilingualism as a resource, and not see it as a precursor to a conflict ridden society. Cited in Smith-Christmas (2014:515), Garafanga (2011) has argued that most minority language speaking parents “talk language shift into being” by relenting to their children’s preference for the use of the majority language. The findings presented in chapter 5 (see table 5.14) show that the majority of L1 Kalanga parents who were interviewed actively resist this practice of adopting the majority language (Smith-Christmas, 2014) by allowing a bilingual FLP, where the use of both Kalanga and Ndebele is allowed in the home domain.
Parents allowed such bilingual practices as codeswitching between Kalanga and Ndebele, as well as “dual-lingualism” (Smith-Christmas, 2014:515), that is interactions in which the interlocutors possessed mutual understanding of each other's languages (in the speech event), but one partner consistently uses a specific language while the other partner sticks to another (Smith-Christmas, 2014). In this case, parents allowed their children to address them in Ndebele, while they exclusively stuck to Kalanga when responding to the children. In some instances, parents allowed codeswitching as a way of ensuring that the pro-bilingual FLP was realised. These pro-bilingual strategies have been proven to reduce anxiety levels among children, thereby providing an enabling affective environment for the learning of the two languages. Low anxiety lowers or weakens the functioning of the affective filter that acts to block language input in the language learning process (Krashen, 1987). All these strategies were identified as principal among pro-bilingual parents.

These strategies are informed by the need for parental flexibility as an underpinning of successful FLP (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). It is believed that in developing truly bilingual children, there must be an emphasis on child centred approaches, invariably characterised by a consideration of pragmatic flexibility in terms of language choice as well as the consideration of sociolinguistic, situational and interpersonal factors (Palvin and Boyd, 2013 cited in Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). Kopeliovich coined the term “happy lingual” (Kopeliovich, 2013:250), a term that:

…reflects the positive emotional colouring of the complex processes related to the heritage language transmission, a special emphasis on the linguistic aspects of childrearing, unbiased attitude to diverse languages that enter the household and respect to the language preferences of the children.

As demonstrated in the findings presented in chapter 5, pro-bilingual parents stated their desire to witness bilingual development in their children as far as language use in the home was concerned. As such, they stressed importance of a pro-bilingual FLP as a ‘pragmatic choice that works’ nowadays. Consistent with the parental views, the happy lingual approach means that while FLP can be articulated as a means of conserving the minority home language, parents have to avoid “fights against natural sociolinguistic forces” (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013:15) that may result in the children gravitating towards the dominant language. The happy lingual approach is thus packaged as one that stresses bilingualism as an asset and not as
a flaw (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013); hence it should be understood within the confines of:

…an ultimately optimistic family language policy striving to make a full use of the existing linguistic resources of heritage language speakers, no matter how limited they may seem. It stands for an ecological approach taking the sociolinguistic reality as it is: without unrealistic expectations and without criticism (Kopeliovich, 2013:273)

The efficacy of the happy lingual approach as a pro-bilingual language management strategy is in its emphasis on the need to find “a delicate balance between our efforts to protect and cultivate the vulnerable language, on the one hand and, and avoiding futile fights against natural sociolinguistic factors that drive children towards the stronger language, on the other hand” (Kopeliovich, 2013:273).

6.5.5 The One-Parent-One-Language strategy (OPOL)

Closely related to the dual-lingualism strategy (Smith-Christmas, 2014) discussed above, is the One-Parent-One–Language strategy (OPOL) (Rojant, 1913 cited in Schwartz and Verschik, 2013:5). Pro-bilingual L1 Kalanga parents’ views expressed in table 5.14 in chapter 5 revealed widespread adherences to the OPOL strategy in their quest for the realisation of a pro-bilingual FLP. The OPOL strategy is described as a “situation in which one parent strictly enforced the speaking of the minority language with the child, while the second parent might speak the minority language with the child in addition to the majority one…” (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013:5). In this case, the realisation of the OPOL principle among the L1 Kalanga parents was made possible through participants’ use of either the minority Kalanga language with the children while the other parent used Kalanga with the children in addition to the majority Ndebele. The OPOL strategy has been found by many studies to be one of the very effective and stimulating minority language acquisition strategies (Schwartz and Verschik, 2013). It is also one the flexible parental approaches in the realisation of FLP.

6.6 Children’s agency in enacting and directing FLP

The findings of the study presented in chapter 5 have shown that despite the popular view that strongly foregrounds parents as language management authorities who control and shape children’s language activities and language practices (Kheirkhah, 2016), children can also play an agentive role in the articulation and direction of FLP,
and may sometimes “have greater influence on parental language choices than the reverse” (Perez Baez, 2013:42). The findings of the study have shown that the desire by parents to see their children perform well at school in the majority language results in parents yielding to the use of the majority language in the home with the children, despite their explicitly stated parental desires for the use of the minority language in the home. The L1 Kalanga parents in the study noted how they sometimes allowed their children to use the majority Ndebele language in the home, not only because it was what children preferred, but also because Ndebele is taught as a school subject in most areas of Bulilima and Mangwe districts where Kalanga is spoken. The desire for upward social mobility leads parents to capitulate to their children’s practices. A section of the L1 Tonga parents, despite their strong beliefs about their language also showed some degrees of yielding to their children’s language practices, also in response to extra familial practice in the school. This shows that children have a huge impact on the direction of FLP, since they can influence parental approaches to language choices in the home especially where parents are “motivated by their linguistic aspirations for their children” (Luykx, 2005:1409). Perez Baez (2013) study on FLP of the diaspora community of San Lucas Quiavini of Oaxaca, Mexico also revealed that children can play an agentive role in the articulation of FLP, especially where parents have weak impact beliefs on the level of control they can exercise over their children’s language choices. Similarly, he also cites family external language practices such as the school and peers as impacting greatly on the parent’s capitulation to children’s preferences. Luykx (2005) also writes about children as socialising agents in the articulation of family language policy in the sense that they may indirectly exert influence over parents’ linguistic development in situations where “parents adapt their own language use in order to promote desired linguistic competencies in their children” (Luykx, 2005:1409).

6.7 Conclusion

The foregone chapter has discussed the findings of the study in conversation with the theoretical underpinnings of the study. By identifying themes as they emerged in the data presented in chapter 5, the chapter discussed the nature of family language policy pursued by minority language families as well as the implication of language practices on intergenerational transmission of the minority languages. The
discussion revealed that the nature of family language policy and language practices in the home is not exclusively a matter of the parents to decide, although parental ideologies are normally the ones that drive FLP. The discussion noted how extra familial language practices such as language use at school impacted on children’s language preferences in the home and therefore on the articulation of FLP. In the absence of desired conformity to parental preferred language practices by children, the chapter discussed the various strategies that parents deployed in the attempt to realise desired language practices in the home. The chapter also established that while parental language ideologies are influential in the direction of FLP, the mismatch between parental ideologies and children’s language practices and proficiencies in the mother tongue means that achieving a desirable language practice, and by extension intergenerational transmission in the family is dependent upon the interaction of a number of factors. As such, the negotiation and renegotiation of family language policy is an essential component of home language conservation. FLP is therefore essentially a negotiated enterprise between parents and children as well as between the macro and the micro language management spheres. This therefore means that the synergy between the bottom up and the top down planning domains are paramount especially in early literacy practices within the children’s linguistic development. Intergenerational transmission of minority languages is likely to be achieved if these synergies are realised and consolidated. The following chapter is the conclusion of the study.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The previous chapter (chapter 6) focused on the discussion of research findings. It discussed the research findings in concordance with the theoretical approaches upon which the present study is anchored as well as in consonance with related literature intersecting on family language policy and the conservation of minority languages. To that end, findings were discussed under themes as they emerged from the data presented in chapter 5. Some of the themes were formulated in conversation with the research questions and research aims. The present chapter is the conclusion of the study. It affords a conclusive discussion of the study especially by focusing on the pertinent issues raised throughout the research. In particular, the chapter explains the contributions of the present study to the broader concerns of minority language conservation in the context of multilingualism. To that end, the chapter rehashes the major points raised in the study regarding the impact of family language policy in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe as per the study’s findings and arguments. This chapter also attempts to make recommendations for future practice as well as for future research, based on the findings of the study and on the experiences of the researcher throughout the tenure of this research. The first section is the conclusion in relation to the research findings followed by the study’s recommendations.

7.2 Research findings

The thesis investigated the impact of family language policy on the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. To that end, the study deployed an eclectic theoretical toolkit that was informed by the language management theory as well as the reversing language shift theory. The study sought to understand, through the analysis of the mechanisations of family language policy among minority language speakers, the influence of language ideologies and language practices on the intergenerational transmission of minority languages in the home. It also detailed the concomitant language management strategies that parents deployed in the home domain to realise desired language practices in the context of family language policy. Specifically, the study focused on the Kalanga and the Tonga language L1 speakers.
In particular, the research targeted parents from minority language families and solicited for their views regarding their family language policy and language practices and how these policies and practices impacted on the intergenerational transmission of the respective minority languages. Beyond that, the study sought to establish the various ways by which family language policy, as a micro level approach to language policy interacts with the macro level language practices on the national front. This was done so as to understand influence of other extra familial language practices on language choice in the home and therefore on intergenerational transmission of minority languages from parents to children.

The research established that different minority language groups tend to articulate different kinds of family language policies mainly as a result of the different circumstances that surround particular minority languages. In other words, the study found out that parents from minority language families reproduced and reified family language policies consistent with their language beliefs and ideologies, as well as in response to other extra familial factors. To be specific, the study established that the majority of L1 Kalanga parents reified and articulated a pro-bilingual family language ideology that promoted the use of Kalanga as a minority home language alongside Ndebele language which is one of the major endoglossic languages spoken in and around the Bulilima and Mangwe districts where the L1 Kalanga participants were drawn from. On the other hand, the study established that the majority of L1 Tonga parents articulated a monolingual pro-Tonga ideology that seeks to promote the use of Tonga only in the home. The pro-bilingual family language policy among the Kalanga is chiefly instantiated by the fact that Kalanga language has limited domains of usage as compared to the Ndebele language in Bulilima and Mangwe districts and indeed in Zimbabwe in general. Ndebele is the language that is taught in schools in Bulilima and Mangwe, as such, children from Kalanga families are exposed to the language at school, while Kalanga is not taught in most schools. The desire by L1 Kalanga parents to witness upward social mobility by their children therefore lead parents to prefer a pro-bilingual family language policy. The monolingual pro-Tonga family language policy preferred and reproduced by the L1 Tonga parents is symptomatic of their unwavering commitment to ensure the survival of Tonga. Fortunately for the Tonga speakers, Tonga language is now widespread in most primary schools in Binga districts. This therefore means that enforcing a pro-Tonga
family language policy within Tonga speaking families is supported by the school system.

The study revealed that, unlike the Tonga, whose language is taught in schools, enforcing a pro-bilingual family language policy among the Kalanga has not been an easy task. Because L1 Kalanga children are taught Ndebele in most schools, they have tended to develop negative attitudes to speaking Kalanga even at home. This study has shown that despite most L1 Kalanga parents preferring a pro-bilingual family language policy, most children from the L1 Kalanga households seem to prefer speaking Ndebele only at home. They have positive evaluations of Ndebele as compared to Kalanga. On the other hand, the Tonga children have positive evaluations of the Tonga language and they therefore conform to the pro-Tonga family language policy articulated by their parents. However, the study has shown that this is not without certain degrees of non-conformity.

The study has demonstrated that achieving parental preferred family language practices and language policy is not an easy enterprise. It has also shown that forcing children to speak a particular language in the home may not be the best solution to achieve intergenerational transmission and conservation of minority languages. The degrees of mismatch between parental articulated ideologies and children’s language practices and preferences as demonstrated in this study attests to this fact. Parental language ideologies of the L1 Kalanga do not coincide with children’s language practices. This shows that children’s language socialisation is by no longer a matter of what is preferred by the parents alone. Extra familial language practices such as language use in the school have a huge impact on children’s language socialisation and therefore on family language policy. Parental views expressed in this study have demonstrated that family language policy among minority language families can therefore be best described as negotiated between parents and children, within the broader context of the socio-political reality. The socio-political realities surrounding the minority languages may therefore compel parents to renegotiate their preferred family language polices with their children. The L1 Kalanga participants in this study have aptly demonstrated this point. The findings of the study have also demonstrated that because of the parents’ desire to see their children scale the ladder of success; they capitulate to the language practices and
preferences of their children, thereby giving in to child's resistant agency. In other words, broader societal factors interact with family language policy, and general macro language practices are prone to reproduction, contestation or negotiation within the family domain, thereby impacting on intergenerational transmission of minority languages.

The L1 Tonga parents in the study have demonstrated that it is possible to achieve desired a monolingual pro-minority home language family language policy that is paramount for intergenerational transmission if supported by an enabling macro sociolinguistic environment such as when the language is taught in schools. On the other hand, L1 Kalanga parents interviewed in this study have also demonstrated how difficult it is to achieve a desired pro-minority home language or even a pro-bilingual family language policy if the minority home language has no other use beyond the home domain. This is because children tend to associate languages that are taught in schools with prestige while those that are not taught tend to be stigmatised. The task of achieving intergenerational transmission is harder for the later than it is for the former.

As evident in the findings presented in the thesis, when parents have strong impact beliefs and are motivated, they normally take active steps to ensure the realisation of their preferred family language practices and family language policy. The study has shown that among the strategies that parents employ is the promotion of home literacy practices among the children such as reading short stories in the minority home language as well as the retelling of folktales to children in the minority home language. These parental strategies constitute what is referred to as language management. The study has shown the extent of importance of these language management strategies in the realisation of family language policy. However, the impact of the language management strategies in cultivating proficiency in the children is also dependent on other factors. The family external environment also impacts the efficacy of language management in the sense that if management practices are not supported beyond the home, the minority home language, through which the stories are retold, risk being to being a language only capable of nothing else beyond storytelling. This may further stigmatise the minority home language. The study has also shown the efficacy of providing children with literature in the
minority home language, encouraging listenership to radio programmes broadcast in the home language as well as facilitating children’s contact with members of the extended family structure in cultivating proficiency in the home language among the children. As shown by the study, family language policy and explicit language management efforts do not always necessarily result in the increased use of, or proficiency in the minority home language by the children. Thus, in extreme cases as found out by the study, parents have gone to the extent of banning the use of languages such as Ndebele in the home by the children. However, the study has cautioned against such a practice, as it goes counter to the very dictates of the attainment of linguistic rights, a notion upon which minority language conservation is premised.

In net total, the study has demonstrated the importance of family language policy in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. The research has shown that while achieving intergenerational transmission of minority languages is a huge task, especially in the context of societal bilingualism, the family, because it intimate nature can be a new frontier that if given enough scholarly attention, can provide a fresh angle in the fight against minority language endangerment. The study has demonstrated the dialectical relationship between micro family language policy and the macro national language policy in the sense that family language policy is not impervious to the mechanics of national language policy and the two potentially feed into each other. It suffices to say therefore that any effort to conserve minority languages in Zimbabwe must take into account the top-down and bottom-up interaction in language policy.

7.3 Recommendations for further research

As has been emphasised in other sections of this study, interest regarding the role of family language policy in the conservation of minority languages is only gathering momentum. Therefore, within the Zimbabwean context in particular, there are so many research directions that the present study has to proffer for future researchers. As a result of the specific approach and design issues relating to the present study, its results may not be generalisable to other contexts and situations whose uniqueness were not factored into the mechanics of the present study. This is a pioneering study in the intersection of family language policy and minority language
conservation in Zimbabwe. As such, the present study is a springboard from which further research can be launched. In that regard, the following is a list recommendation for future research that could build from insights afforded by the present study.

1. The present study focused on parents’ perspectives regarding how they articulated and reified specific kinds of family language policies in the context of minority language conservation. One of the limitations of the scope of the present study therefore is that the voices of the children are muted. Future studies can focus on both parental and children’s own perspectives regarding language choice and family language policy in Zimbabwe. Further, other researches could focus on children’s preferences regarding language use in the home and how that impacts on minority language conservation.

2. Future studies could also seek richer ethnographic data on family language policy by conducting focused studies with a limited number of families, and investigating how individual language use and choice in specific interactions speak to family language policy.

3. Future research can also deploy other approaches such as conversation analysis to examine family members’ language choices in specific concrete situations to understand how particular family language policies are negotiated or even contested among family members in the context of minority language conservation.

4. This study was carried out with a predominantly rural based population. The limitation of this study therefore is that the influence of English language on family language policy does not feature in a prominent way. One might therefore want to do similar study focusing on the urban population.

5. This study focused on the impact of family language policy on the conservation of indigenous minority languages in Zimbabwe. The concept of this study could also be extendable to the study of family language policy among immigrant families in Zimbabwe or in any other country to reveal how
migrant families negotiate and maintain their heritage languages in a foreign country.

6. Future research can also focus on the intermarried bilingual family language policy and how intermarried couples negotiate their family language policy.

7. The study mainly deployed snowball sampling to identify the main participants. This may have limited the network of respondents for the research. Future studies could therefore rely on a different sampling technique.

7.4 Recommendations for future practice

The findings of this study have demonstrated the importance of family language policy in the conservation of minority languages in Zimbabwe. Because language conservation ultimately depends on intergenerational transmission of the minority language in the home domain, the study has shown that family language policy interacts with, and is impacted by other macro language practices in the extra familial domains. As such, for minority language maintenance to benefit from family language policy there has to some kind of paradigm shift in the manner that minority language speakers, advocates of minority language rights, stakeholder institutions and the government approach the subject. Stemming from the research findings and arguments, the following bulleted list constitutes the study’s recommendations for future practice.

1. Focus on minority language conservation should not be limited to macro issues whereby the obsession has been with the officialisation of minority languages. The micro domain such as the family can also be an important sphere in which language practices by family members can influence impact on language conservation. Since intergenerational transmission depends on language use in ordinary conversation, efforts at language conservation should also be directed at encouraging use of the language in the home.

2. Extra familial factors such as language practices in the school or community have an influence on language practices among the younger generation.
Efforts at increasing intergenerational transmission of minority languages should therefore transcend the home and filter into the extra familial domains. The home must not be treated as an isolated domain regarding children’s language socialisation and intergenerational transmission.

3. Government should incentivise the use of minority languages so as to cultivate a sense of the language’s worth among minority language speakers and thereby increasing the use of the languages in the home and beyond.

4. Since some explicit language intervention strategies may not always be successful, parents must find innovative ways of transmitting the home language to children such as enacting and participating in child centred FLPs rather than parent centred FLPs.

5. Parents should also allow for a negotiated FLP among themselves and the children so as to create an anxiety free language socialisation environment.

6. Rather than striving for a monolingual FLP, parents must embrace bilingualism as resource and an enriching phenomenon, and should therefore strive to foster additive bilingualism into the family language ideology, so as to create a ‘happy-lingual’ environment.
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INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARENTS OF MINORITY LANGUAGE FAMILIES

TO: THE PARTICIPANT

My name is Busani Maseko. I am pursuing a PhD in Languages, Linguistics and Literature at the University of South Africa. In fulfilment of the requirements of this degree, I am carrying out a study titled *The Impact of family Language Policy (FLP) on the Conservation of Minority Languages in Zimbabwe*. The study seeks to establish the nature of family language policies that are pursued by minority language speakers in the context of societal multilingualism. The research also seeks to make conclusions on how the reported language practices, language choices and language ideologies among minority language groups are likely to impact on the conservation of the minority languages in Zimbabwe. This study therefore emphasises the importance of the speakers of the languages in achieving these objectives. I request that you assist by responding to the questions I am going to pose to you. Your opinions, views and experiences are of paramount importance to this study. Your responses shall be treated with confidence and will only be used for the purposes of this research. Your identity will be kept anonymous even in the presentation of the findings of the study.

1. Biographical Data

   (a) Gender
   
   (b) Age
   
   (c) Highest educational qualification
   
   (d) Position in the family e.g. Parent (Father, Mother)

2. Family linguistic profile

   (a) What is your mother tongue?
   
   (b) Which other languages do you speak?
   
   (c) Which languages are spoken by other members of your family?

3. Do you consider your home language to be a minority language?

4. What are your views regarding the importance of conserving your home language?
5. As a parent/family head, do you consider it necessary to be at the forefront of your home language conservation efforts in the family?

6. Given the importance of the home domain in the intergenerational transmission of a language, what are your preferences regarding language use within your home?

7. What are your observations regarding your children’s language use preferences in the home domain?

8. What do you think are the reasons behind the observed language practices and preferences by your children reported in the preceding question?

9. Do you encounter any resistance or obstacles in achieving your preferred language practices in the home domain?

10. What language intervention strategies have you put in place to encourage your children to speak the mother tongue in the home?

11. Comment on your children’s proficiency levels in their home language.

12. Do you think your family language policy contributes to your children’s proficiency levels reported above?

13. Are there other community initiatives that you know of or that you are involved in that are likely to result in the increased use of your language especially by the younger generation?

14. What kind of support do you think is needed from the government to complement your efforts at the family and community level to ensure the conservation of your home language?

End of the Interview
Appendix B

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR LANGUAGE AND CULTURE ASSOCIATIONS’ REPRESENTATIVES

TO: THE INFORMANT

My name is Busani Maseko. I am pursuing a PhD in Languages, Linguistics and Literature at the University of South Africa. In fulfilment of the requirements of this degree, I am carrying out a study titled *The Impact of family Language Policy (FLP) on the Conservation of Minority Languages in Zimbabwe*. The main thrust of the study is to establish the nature of family language policies that are pursued by minority language speakers in the context of societal multilingualism. The research also seeks to make conclusions on how the reported language practices, language choices and language ideologies among minority language groups are likely to impact on the conservation of the minority languages in Zimbabwe. As part of the objectives, the research also seeks to make recommendations for policy at the national level in the fight against minority language marginalisation and language shift. To that end, your experiences as a minority language advocate will be invaluable to this research. Since you are a grassroots based minority language advocate, who is also in touch with the goings on at the national level regarding minority language conservation efforts, your input is important as you provide the link between speakers at the grassroots community level and the governmental level. I request that you assist by responding to the questions I will pose to you. Your opinions, views and experiences are thus of paramount importance to this study. Your responses shall be treated with confidence and will only be used for the purposes of this research. Your identity will be kept anonymous even in the presentation of the findings of the study.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is the importance of preserving minority languages in a multilingual society with focus on the family?

2. What would you consider to be the role of speakers at the grassroots level in minority language conservation efforts?

3. What do you consider to be the role of the family institution or home domain in the intergenerational transmission of minority or family languages?
4. Given the importance of the home domain in the intergenerational transmission a language from one generation to the next, how do you inspire families to cherish and use their home languages?

5. As a fecund association, what role do you play in preserving minority language rights and what initiatives have you taken to preserve minority languages?

6. Comment on the impact of your initiatives and grassroots oriented efforts in conserving minority and family language policies.

7. What role do you envisage the government should play in the preservation of minority languages or family languages including those threatened with extinction?

8. Do you think minority and family language conservation efforts have been successful to date?

9. Is the minority language that you are representing showing signs of revalorisation and reverence in terms of allocation of functional space?

End of the Interview