CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH CONTEXT

1.1 The concept of family language policy

The term ‘language policy/planning’ has been defined in various ways (Reagan 2002: 420). The notion of ‘language policy’ is, however, generally used at the level of government or province which decides on the languages to be used by the people it administers. This policy is enshrined in a nation’s constitution; it has institutional backing, and is imposed on particular structures, groups of people, with rules and regulations. In other words, a government can enforce or implement a language policy. Spolsky (2004) insists that the processes that operate in macrolevel planning also operate in microlevel planning. In his view, language policy involves practices, beliefs or ideology about language and language use, and efforts to influence practices (p. 14). Beliefs or ideologies encompass the values attributed to a language that govern language choice (Spolsky 2004: 14). The choices in turn affect practices. For Spolsky,

*the domain of language policy may be any defined or definable social or political or religious group or community, ranging from a family through a sports team, or a neighbourhood or a village, or a workplace or organisation, or city or nation state or regional alliance. (Spolsky 2004: 40)*

Spolsky (2004) maintains that ‘language policy operates within a speech community of whatever size’ (p. 40).

This thesis investigates the concept of language policy in relation to the microlevel: the family, in particular immigrant DRC families in South Africa. Since schools, companies, and public institutions have language policies, the meanings of language policy mentioned above can well be extended to family language policy (FLP).

The notion of FLP (from now on FLP) requires taking cognizance of four key notions. The first fundamental notion of ‘family language policy’ in this thesis is that families make choices about which languages to use at home. This policy may be explicit or implicit (Spolsky 2004: 8), monolingual or multilingual, the same or different for adults
and children, highly regulated or ‘laissez-faire’. In this thesis, ‘family language policy’ is used to refer to a unilateral decision taken by parents about language use in the home. While some theorists would call it ‘language choice’ or ‘language preference’, I have chosen language policy in order to understand the relation between choice, power, identity and external forces.

Second, the choice of which language/s the family has to use may be made democratically or negotiated between parents, and/or imposed by more powerful members of the family. It is important to understand the extent to which power relations in the family affect these language choices. For example, in African families that are patriarchal, the father has more power than the mother in making rules. Where policies are imposed, members of the family have to decide whether or not to comply and in what circumstances.

Third, language is fundamentally tied to identity. ‘We learn who we are and what we are through the language(s) and local discourses in which we are raised’ (Ricento 2002: 1). The choice of language, for Hall (1974), is profoundly related to the choice of and construction of particular identities. Peirce’s (1995) work on identity and investment is crucial to understanding how a FLP is tied to a family’s values in relation to articulating distinct identities in SA which are informed by their aspirations. Their identity investments affect how they position themselves in relation to both the diasporic community and local communities.

The final point is the impact of external forces on the formation and implementation of the FLP at the microlevel. For example, xenophobia directed at immigrants might lead to limited opportunities to interact with the local community and result in the choice of homeland languages in the family. The language of schooling may also influence a family’s decisions.

In this research project I use the term ‘language choice’ to include all the languages used in face-to-face interactions. I also use the term ‘immigrant’ to mean ‘refugees and
asylum seekers’ as well as ‘émigrés or voluntary exiles’, and the term ‘practices’ to mean what people regularly do with language and how they do it. Further, the terms ‘language’ and ‘code’, on the one hand and the concepts ‘immigrant learners’ and ‘immigrant children’ on the other hand, are used interchangeably in this thesis. I also use the term ‘indigenous languages’ to refer to ‘all African or Bantu languages’. Similarly, the notion of ‘home languages’ is used to mean ‘all languages, African and non-African’, spoken in the homes of immigrant families.

1.2 Situating the research project

For Gramsci (1985), every time the question of language surfaces, it means that a series of other problems are coming to the fore. Language is not a mere medium of communication but also a carrier of a set of societal values, the norms and beliefs of a given community. As a function of culture, language and its practices then become social manifestations of people’s daily struggles. To this end, language as social action (Norton 2000; van Dijk 1996) embodies relations of power embedded in people’s interactions and mobility. The use of languages in immigrant families in a host country is likely to affect their linguistic or cultural identities. This study is concerned with the situated use of spoken language as a means of communication. It explores the in-family language socialization practices in four immigrant families from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), using a multiple case study.

The study is located in different areas of Johannesburg. It seeks to understand the assumptions that underpin family language policies, the children’s attitudes towards DRC indigenous languages, the nature of parent-child interaction, and the impact of the policy on relationships outside the home. It also investigates the research participants’ diasporic identities and their positioning in South Africa. Bosher (1997: 593) argues that the degree of ethnic identity maintenance is seen as a crucial factor for children’s self-esteem, psychological well-being, successful adjustment to their new society. It also increases the chances of succeeding academically.
Through their language practices parents convey ‘language, behavior, values, and beliefs to give shape to their children’s experience or primary identity’ (Gee 1990: 151). The way we are perceived by ‘Others’ may also have an impact upon the way we actually perceive ourselves and in turn construct the ‘Other’. Local languages and discourses shape our ‘ways of being people-like-us, i.e. ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking’ (Gee 1996: viii). This establishes a link between language, culture and identity, as discussed further in Chapter 2.

In a multicultural society like South Africa, multiple sets of discourses associated with varied ethnic and linguistic groups operate within complex multilingual settings. As a medium of cultural processes, language raises questions about the link between language and ‘authentic’ ethnic identity, particularly in the context of immigration. In this regard, Ricento (2002) asks how we can conceptualize the identities of people using multiple languages in multiple settings, specifically in the context of immigration.

1.3 Identifying the research problem

In the context of immigration, homeland languages are often prohibited in family interactions because they are thought to impede the children’s spoken competence and literacy development in the dominant language of the host society. But this exclusion, Amati-Mehler et al (1994) argue, may engender in children a painful experience of exile from the affective world of their parents. On the other hand, homeland languages, particularly in the diaspora, may be perceived and encouraged as a core element of culture and ethnicity. Research has found that multilingualism (specifically, in the diaspora) allows mental flexibility and social mobility in multiple settings and circumstances, and that in a multilingual environment a child can learn to speak two or more languages (e.g. Cummins 1996, 1984, 1981a; Heugh 1995) simultaneously or sequentially. The question is: how do immigrant children maintain their linguistic and cultural heritage, along with the development of fluid identities that transcend the narrowly essentialist conceptions of ethnicity?
My interest in this research stems from my experiences and ethnic identity as a DRC immigrant teacher (and father) in South Africa. During my encounters with other DRC families (most of whom are both economic and political refugees), I noticed that some parents had restricted their children to the use of English at home, whereas they used two or more DRC indigenous languages in addition to French and sometimes interacted with children in these languages at home. Their children then responded in English. My immediate impulse as a father, a teacher, a researcher and a Congolese, with strong a sense of ethnic identity, was to understand the assumptions behind such language choices. The choice of any language in a family is often attributed to language valuation or assessment and linked to an array of cultural, moral and/or socio-economic strategies (Dhir & Savage 2002; Eiss & Pedersen 2002; Lankshear 2002; Grin 1996; Cooksey 1996; Coulmas 1992, 1991). In this study, I wanted to investigate how these language choices affect the research families, the status of DRC languages in the diaspora and the immigrants' sense of cultural belonging. Language is not only the medium by which 'a community communicates its culture to its members within the society in which it operates; it also facilitates a creation of value through the exchange of ideas within the context of culture' (Dhir & Savage 2002: 2). Dhir and Savage (2002) add that 'like money, language is an asset', what Bourdieu (1991) calls cultural capital.

Gee (1996), drawing on Bourdieu, argues that each speech community has its own ways of thinking, behaving, saying, speaking, believing, acting, and valuing. It is these specific ways that define how people represent themselves in the world (Bourdieu 1991), when they enact their multiple ‘selves’ or ‘identities’. By identity, I mean 'a sense of self in relation to others' (Weis 1990: 1), or a mark of distinctiveness, i.e. self-definition or differentiation in relation to 'otherness'. In speaking, people attempt to organize a sense of themselves in relation to the social milieu. When immigrants arrive in South Africa, they are confronted with local cultures and language practices which may influence them and their children. They find themselves in a specific ‘configuration of meanings which gives them access to and locates them within a [South African] culture’ (Clarke et al 1981: 54). Culture, as Shor (1993) argues, is constituted of the ‘actions and results of humans in society, the way they interact in their communities,
and the addition immigrants make to the world they find’ (p.30). In other words, immigrants and members of the host society influence one another through their interactions.

These interactions may change the immigrants’ behaviours or attitudes and enable them to perceive things differently. But in order to interact with members of the host society and to access local social networks, immigrants have to acquire local languages in formal and informal settings. If they speak only English, the dominant language embodying social prestige and rewards, this undermines not only DRC indigenous languages and culture, but also local African languages. The present research also seeks to understand whether one’s ties to a particular ethnic culture can be transmitted in another language, such as English.

Families are seen as a key channel through which values, beliefs, norms, and knowledge are transmitted to younger generations or a place where primary linguistic and cultural identity is constructed (Gee 1996: ix). Since school is viewed as a place where children have to acquire academic competence in the dominant societal language (here, English), I believe that the responsibility to learn (to speak) and to maintain African indigenous languages rests with families. This is why I have chosen to conduct this in-depth study in families, rather than in the DRC community more broadly. The use of indigenous languages by family members can act as a vehicle of self-definition and create a sense of common belongingness in South Africa. As a social instrument (van Dijk 1997: 2-3), language is embedded within culture. It is known that language and culture, language and identity, and language and gender are interconnected (e.g. see McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas 2001; Norton 2000; Archer 1999; Bhabha 1994; Ngugi 1986).

1.4 Research aims and questions

There are three general aims that underpin this study. First, this research project seeks to investigate language practices in DRC immigrant families, using a case study method
to understand the assumptions that govern or influence the choice of language policies and practices in DRC immigrant families in South Africa. Second, it attempts to explore children’s attitudes towards their DRC and South African languages. Practically, the study aims to explore the extent to which families’ attitudes towards their own indigenous languages are likely to contribute to the maintenance or extinction of those languages in the diaspora as well as the implications for family and peer relationships. Third, this study also attempts to understand the extent to which DRC immigrant families can keep their ethnic identity and at the same time live in South Africa.

The central question of the research project is: What are the current language policies and practices of selected DRC immigrant families, and their implications for children’s schooling and for relations within the family and the DRC immigrant community, and for relations outside of these? Related to this main question are the following specific questions:

(i) What are the DRC parents’ underlying assumptions that underpin the language policies in their homes in the South African context?

(ii) What are the children’s attitudes towards their parents’ home languages and or language policies for the home?

(iii) What languages are used for which interactions, and what are the implications of this?

Answering these questions involves describing, analyzing, and interpreting the data gathered from diverse sources: immigrants’ life accounts, family observations and field notes, interviews and informal conversations with selected family members and the children’s teachers and principals.

1.5 Rationale

Three factors have motivated this study. Firstly, there is a significant amount of research on immigrants’ language choice, ethnic identities and on inter-ethnic interactions in many parts of the world, particularly in North America, Australia and
Europe. But few studies in South Africa have focused on immigrant families’ language practices and/or their identities in the diaspora. To date, very few theorists of English language and literacy education in South Africa have attempted to research the linguistic background of South African Africans’ identity construction. Much of their work has focused on national language education policy (e.g. de Klerk 2002; Heugh 1995), identity construction in relation to African languages (e.g. Makoni 1996), academic literacy at secondary and tertiary levels (e.g. Starfield 1999; Kapp 1998), schooled literacy practices and the formation of social identity in rural areas (e.g. Malan 1996a & b). Mesthrie (1995), in particular, explored the survival and decline of Indian languages in South Africa. But there has been little or no interest in investigating language socialization practices of immigrant families or their children in terms of their indigenous home languages in contact with South African languages, including English. This lack of information on language use in the context of language/culture contact in South African immigration suggests the need for a study such as this.

Secondly, focusing on the situated use of oral languages(s) of selected DRC immigrant families, the study also seeks to understand the reasons for their coming to South Africa, and their expectations. It explores how immigrant families communicated within the family in their homeland (i.e. their family language policy in the homeland), how they currently use language to interact in the host land, how they are perceived by members of the host society, and how they perceive themselves. Immigrants’ language communication difficulties have been researched elsewhere by many scholars like Smolicz (2001), Norton (2000), Grosjean (1996, 1982), Bamgbose (1994), Ng (1981).

Finally, in raising an awareness of language policies in the family and seeking to understand the role of homeland languages in the creation of ethnic identity in the diaspora, this case study offers insights to language theorists (and other interested parties) who are involved in studies on immigrant families’ language behaviours in South Africa.
1.6 The context of the research

This section describes briefly the immigrants’ movement to South Africa (SA), their knowledge of local languages, social status on arrival in the host country. It also depicts aspects of post/colonial language policies in DRC education, and the immigrants’ settlement and organization in SA.

1.6.1 Brief historical background to immigration to South Africa

Migrations are part of a long history on human mobility. Given that there are always factors that drive people out of their native lands, such as wars, natural calamities (drought, famine, disease), socioeconomic instability, and persecution of varied kinds, a relevant question is: When and why did DRC citizens migrate to South Africa?

A vast country in the center of Africa, the Democratic Republic of Congo, formerly Zaire, became politically independent from Belgium on 30 June 1960 (www.congo2000.fr/asp). Since then, the country has been torn by sociopolitical tensions ranging from secessions and rebellions through dictatorship to wars. The West – East cleavages of the Cold War between the USSR and allies, and the USA and European Community had a strong impact upon the politics of Central Africa, making ex-Zaire the nexus of their struggle for power in Central Africa (Chomé 1967: 49). As Ake (1991) confirms, the Cold War forced western countries to be ‘indifferent to issues of human rights and democracy in Africa in order to preserve their economic and geopolitical interests and to facilitate their obsessive search for allies against communism’ (pp. 33 – 34).

Thus, sustained by the West, through the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) (Chomé 1967: 49), Mobutu came to power on 24 November 1965 through a military coup d’Etat. His despotic rule over Zaire (now DR Congo) lasted until 17 May 1997 when he was overthrown by Laurent Kabila’s rebellion. Kabila also received little support from the population because he followed Mobutu. The lack of democracy and the regime of political terror are reflected in economic mismanagement, corruption, plundering of
natural resources, arbitrary arrests, executions, embezzlement, massive oppression (Kadima & Kalombo 1995; Ake 1991; Chomé 1967). As a result, DRC regimes have been characterized by their ‘indifference to the consequence of the economic malfunctioning for the welfare of the ordinary citizen’ (Roth 1979: 3). While these circumstances together with recent wars in the DRC led to migration, the question is why have many DRC migrants migrated to South Africa (a non-French-speaking nation), instead of other African countries?

1.6.2 Border-crossing to South Africa

Although the patterns of immigration to South Africa are multifaceted, they derive from the DRC’s internal politics and ‘the socioeconomic or sociopolitical transformations’ of the host country (e.g. McDonald et al 2000; Taylor & Barlow 2000; Bekker & Carlton 1996; Crush 1996). Tollefson (1991) names such conditions ‘push and pull’ factors, in that the push factors force immigrants to leave their country of origin while the pull factors attract them to a foreign land. In their small-scale research project on DRC immigrants in Johannesburg, Kadima and Kalombo (1995) found three main causes of emigration from the DRC to South Africa: the socioeconomic crisis, the political instability of Mobutu’s regime, and personal reasons (e.g. business, studies). To these factors, I add a fourth: the recent wars of Kabila’s regime.

However, immigrating to a given country is often a matter of personal choice and decision. The decision to move to South Africa is partially influenced by those who are already in the country. Taylor and Barlow (2000: 135), for example, argue that ‘having family and friends’ in South Africa contributes in two fundamental ways. It offers immigrants (i) immediate support in the form of housing, community, local information, and interpersonal and emotional comfort, and (ii) an opportunity to be initiated into the worldview, including language, of the host country.

Cross-border migration into South Africa also has a long history rooted in the development of the gold mines and agriculture during the apartheid era, which drew workers principally from Lesotho, Swaziland, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe. These
categories of workers are viewed as less educated, compared to recent African immigrants ‘who have at least a secondary education level’ (McDonald et al 2000: 77). Migrations from the DRC to South Africa started in the early 1990s but were sporadic in the past for three reasons. Firstly, as McDonald et al (2000) argue, ‘distance and apartheid legislation have no doubt been key factors in the regional differences in migration histories’ (p. 76). Secondly, English proficiency constituted a barrier to socioeconomic integration, thus enhancing DRC nationals’ preference for emigrating to Europe (France, Belgium and Switzerland). Finally, the lack of sufficient information about the educational and industrial development of the country produced less interest in coming to South Africa.

This situation has changed since 1994 because post-apartheid South Africa offers a different socioeconomic profile. Some immigrants overtly link their arrival in South Africa to Nelson Mandela, as this extract confirms:

‘We came for Mandela. We rejoiced in the victory of the people against the apartheid government and Mandela is also an African symbol of freedom. South Africa would be a garden of Eden, a respite from the madness back home’ (Adams 2001: 40).

The release of Nelson Mandela from prison (Section 6.1.2) and the first democratic election in 1994, coupled with the country’s relative economic and industrial development (McDonald et al 2000; Adegoke 1999; Crush 1996), and DRC’s membership of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), acted as pull factors that prompted (and still prompt) migrations from the DRC into South Africa. The question is Who are the DRC immigrants in South Africa?

1.6.3 Immigrants’ social status in South Africa

In a summary of their recent book (www.hsrcpress.ac.za/full_title), Cross et al (2006) state their views on migration in Sub-Saharan Africa. They report that the world’s poor are voting with their feet to escape poverty and make their bid for new lives in new places. As the world’s poorest continent, Africa is seeing an increasing number of its citizens migrate from its rural areas to its cities and new overseas destinations. As a result,
South Africa, as a new democracy with a relatively stable economy, receives many foreign citizens, especially Africans, including the families in this research, in search of better living conditions. Scholars of South African immigration (e.g. Cross et al 2006; Mattes et al 2000) show that there are many negative popular stereotypes of mainly black foreigners, accompanied by xenophobia, intolerance, and discrimination. Mattes et al’s (2000) studies indicate that SA’s non-citizens (both whites and black) are well qualified, with 93% holding a post-secondary qualification and 15% a postgraduate degree (p. 3). This means that foreign Africans, including refugees are making a valuable contribution to the country’s economic growth and development, and they bring in linguistic and cultural diversity.

As far as DRC immigrants to SA are concerned, most of them are forced immigrants (political or economic), and skilled people (e.g. medical practitioners, engineers, nurses, university/college lecturers, accountants, lawyers) (Kadima & Kalombo 1995). That is, as middle-class people in the DRC, who could afford to emigrate in the 1990s and early 2000s. Others have been educated only to secondary level. Despite their contribution to the socioeconomic growth of South Africa, their standard of living is poor. The research families, in particular, gave up their status (e.g. social position, houses, jobs) and came to SA. Refugees or immigrants in South Africa are called names (Adegoke 1999) translated, for example, as invaders, job grabbers, beggars, drug dealers, strangers (see Section 1.6.4). In SA some of the elite families that constitute my sample (see Chapters 4 –7) have lost their social standing, dignity and honour because of xenophobic behaviour (see Section 1.6.4).

1.6.4 Language competence and stereotyping on arrival

Although South Africa is a multilingual country like the DRC, there is no single language of interaction common to both nations. While French is the immigrants’ home lingua franca, English is the dominant medium of interaction in most domains of use in the
host land, such as education, media, government, and the corporate world. It should also be noted that all the immigrant families in my sample are from the DRC élites.

In the history of immigration, the first encounter between ‘strangers’ and the local populations often produces mixed feelings, especially when immigrants attempt to access local social networks (Schultz 1971). Most research on South African immigrants (e.g. McDonald et al 2000; Mattes et 2000, 1999) acknowledges that some South Africans hold very negative views of immigrants and immigration. They believe that the newcomer will deprive them of economic opportunities and life resources. This feeling engenders what some scholars like Bloom (1998) have called fraternal rivalry. This animosity is commonly called xenophobia, the fear of the stranger. African immigrants (including DRC citizens) find themselves discriminated against in a number of spheres.

In reality, their lack of knowledge of local languages and their different varieties of English (see Chapters 2, 4 – 7) undoubtedly mark the boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’, ‘the insiders’ and ‘the outsiders’: the ‘Other’ (Keane 1997; Kearney 1995). The discrimination may partially be a legacy of the apartheid regime (perpetuated by political speeches of the recent past) which offered black South Africans few opportunities to interact with fellow Africans, thus building a psychological ‘Berlin Wall’, or communication barrier. This is tied to the construction of foreign Africans as ‘Makwere-kwere’, ‘strangers’ (e.g. McDonald et al 2000; Adegoke 1999). The term makwere-kwere can be defined as (i) ‘people speaking unintelligible languages’, or (ii) using non-South African accents of English and African languages and (iii) not understanding and speaking (all) South African languages’. These differences are constructed as negative and ‘other’.

‘Kwere-kwerisation’ constrains some individuals’ social readjustment (see Cox 2000; Rex & Drury 1994; Compani 1994). This positioning particularly makes Heller (1987: 181) see ethnicity as a product of opposition. In other words, barriers mounted by a host ethnic group against a particular ethnic group may have positive consequences for
the internal cohesion of that host ethnic group by forcing the members to forge a national group identity (Cambridge 1992; Eade 1992). Language here acts as an important element of a group's internal cohesion in an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1983).

1.6.5 Historical background to language policy in the DRC

Like South Africa, the Democratic Republic of Congo is a multilingual and multicultural country. Of the 1,000 languages spoken in Africa (Gollinck & Chinn 1989: 141), over 250 are used in the DRC. However, only four indigenous languages, namely Kikongo, Lingala, Tshiluba and Swahili are officially recognised. To understand language and literacy policies in DRC institutions such as family, church, the judiciary, and public administration, it is important to look briefly at the sociocultural and historical background of the DRC because language policy and education are inevitably linked to it.

The language policy of the country which was (and still is) predominantly French-speaking is reflected in education and it has been shaped by colonization and evangelism. In the early years of colonial occupation (the Free State of Congo), literacy education was the work of Christian missions. From 1892, the colonial administration sponsored education in local or ethnic languages (www.congo2000.com/fpage.asp). The teachings of the gospel were given in indigenous languages, such as Kipende, Tshiluba, Kimbala, LoMongo, Songe, Kikongo, Kiyaka, and Aruund, mainly for the practical purposes of spreading Christianity. This also enabled the Christian missionaries to integrate and to know more about indigenous communities. The missions opened general education schools and in return received plots of land. But the state exercised political control at the level of teaching programmes and their management (www.congo2000.com/fpage).
1.6.6 Aspects of post/colonial language policy in DRC education

The missionaries are seen as the pioneers in the establishment of schools in the DRC. Official education, using indigenous languages and French, was established in 1908 when the Free State of Congo came under full Belgian control. It was designed to train public servants (see also Pennycook 1994; Said 1995, 1978 on Anglicism) or clerks. The linguistic diversity of the DRC was then an obstacle to inter-ethnic communication and political governance. The colonial language policy-makers deliberately selected four local African languages: Kikongo, Lingala, Tshiluba, and Swahili (a Tanzanian dialect introduced into the DRC by European missionaries via the eastern borders). These languages are distributed as follows: (i) in the west and north-west: Kikongo and Lingala (the language of the colonial army and of Kinshasa, the capital city) and (ii) in the east: Tshiluba and Swahili. The four indigenous languages and French were adopted as the national languages for over two decades before independence in 1960. While French was thought of as the medium of national communication and public administration, the other four languages were used for communicative and religious purposes among ethnic groups within determined geographic territories.

During the colonial period, the avenue to the best primary and secondary schools was through French. It is claimed that Europeans received instruction in French and natives in their mother languages (www.congo2000.com/fpage.asp). This is the dual language policy in education which was also designed for and implemented in Asian colonized countries (see Said 1995: 3). Very few indigenous children were given places in institutions for European children. The following statement from ‘La Politique Coloniale Belge’ (Belgian colonial politics), as read by van der Kerken in 1943, claims that

some indigenous children, designed to become clerks, were being taught in one of the Belgian languages: French and Dutch (www. congo2000.com/fpage.asp).

These colonial policies placed most people at a disadvantage as they were denied access to the French language and therefore could not participate in the social and economic networks likely to produce the symbolic and material resources they aimed at (Norton 2000; Bourdieu 1991, 1977). In other words, knowledge of the French language
acted (and still acts) as a gateway to those resources. The dual language policy in education (indigenous languages and in French) began the marginalisation of indigenous languages in the DRC, in that these languages do not provide opportunities for socio-economic advancement. The creation of the indigenous élites symbolized by the ‘Carte de Mérite Civique’ (Civic Merit Card) (Brausch 1961) finally led to the division of the society into the ‘westernized’ élites, called the 'évolués' (civilized as opposed to 'primitive/uncivilized') by the colonizers, and the 'less literate or illiterate'. The emergence of this African middle-class called ‘Évolués’ includes building and transport contractors, tradesmen, craftsmen, small manufacturers, teachers (Brausch 1961: 4). They all received the Carte de Mérite Civile’, indicating that they have assimilated European civilization or ‘ways of thinking, behaving, believing, doing, being, speaking, belonging’ (Gee 1996: ix). They became, as Brausch (1961) reports, ‘Africans behaving like nouveaux riches’ (new rich people, italics in original text) after they had obtained their registration in the category of civilized persons granted to an African by a court ruling, preceded by an enquiry proving that the applicant was living according to European standards’ (p. 24).

In postcolonial DRC, these ‘évolués’ are labeled by the less educated as the ‘Je-le-connais’ (I know it/everything) as those who are highly educated, i.e. those who always like speaking French, those who have reached the hilltop of Western knowledge in French. Those who do not know French, i.e. those who are not well educated, define themselves as people who arrived only at the foot of the mountain, or at the cross-road. The reason for this is that Kinshasa University is situated on the Amba Mount. This symbolizes in the eyes of the less educated people the peak of Western knowledge offered in French.

Pennycook (2002) views colonial language policies in terms of ‘governmentality’ (a concept borrowed from Foucault, relating to the management of populations) and ‘protectionism’ (Pennycook 2002). He claims that the historical use of language policy in the colonised nations (i.e. use of mother languages and masters’ language) acted as an arm of colonial governance and thus was linked to the production of discursive forms
of subjectivity (Pennycook 2000 1998). While the term governmentality is seen as ‘an array of technologies of governance’ (Rose 1996: 42), the term protectionism is viewed as ‘the ways in which mother language language policy has been intertwined with particular ways of constructing the Other’ (Pennycook 2002: 13). The choice of the colonial/indigenous language as medium of instruction was ‘frequently linked to an array of cultural, moral, and educational strategies of governmentality realized through school curricula’ (Pennycook 20002: 16). Fundamentally, there was the need for education to produce a new generation of colonial élites likely to take part in colonial capital and to become intermediaries between the mass population and the colonial master (see Brausch 1961). Referring to the education context in Papua New Guinea, Smith (1987) concludes that education was a means of political, economic and social control in the colonial state.

During the postcolonial period, especially Mobutu’s long era, the language situation became more politicised as a result of Mobutu’s philosophy of ‘Authenticité’ (Authenticity), i.e. recourse to the ancestral values and thus languages. Language was seen as the instrument of control and dominance. While claiming to promote African languages, particularly the four national languages: Kikongo, Lingala, Tshiluba and Swahili, Mobutu privileged Lingala to the detriment of the others, by creating a divide between these national languages, with Lingala serving his political interests. However, French continues to keep its élite and neutral position.

There are two reasons for the prevalence of Lingala over other languages. First, it has the highest number of speakers and listeners because it is the language of DRC modern music (commonly called ‘Kwasa-kwasa’) and it was the political instrument of oppression during Mobutu’s reign. It became the official language of the armed forces and police service, and thus the national ‘indigenous lingua franca’ (Adegbija 1994). Secondly, Lingala is associated with prestige or high social status. It is the language of the Capital City, Kinshasa at the nexus of the DRC politics of centralisation (and of ex-Zaire’s one-party system). Kinshasa dwellers called ‘Kinois’ appear to have more prestige and power with a wider worldview than their fellow countrymen called, among
others, 'Movilla', 'Mbokatiers': villagers (Movilla: from village; mbokatier: a Frenchised term from the Lingala word mboka: village, or rural area). The Kinois view 'mbokatiers' as backwards and uncivilised. Within the context of this study, speaking Lingala or learning to speak it in South Africa hides one’s original DRC status and thus allows the individual to acquire the prestigious identity of a civilized person, a social ‘évolué’, one who is open-minded.

1.6.7 Patterns of language practices in postcolonial DRC

The history of language practices in postcolonial DRC families is rooted in colonial language policy and levels of education or literacy in the DRC. People educated to secondary level will often use some French, along with their mother languages. Similarly, those with university or higher degrees, or who are from the so-called 'évoluées' families will utilise French as their primary means of interaction. In such families, indigenous languages are marginalized. In contrast, 'less educated' people, deprived of European education, speak indigenous languages and show a strong interest in their indigenous culture. In-between, a third category emerges, constituted of elements from both groups. In this case, both DRC indigenous languages and French serve as a means of interaction among family members and the community. The patterns of language use mentioned above tend to reflect the practices in families situated in urban areas and they differ from families in remote rural areas of the DRC. In South Africa, as immigrants take on the DRC languages of the diasporic group, former social markers and the divides they create begin to disappear.

1.7 DRC immigrants’ settlement and organization in South Africa

1.7.1 Location of immigrants

The geographic concentrations of DRC immigrants in Johannesburg are diverse, in that they are categorised in terms of their individuals’ socio-economic, educational and professional status, religious beliefs and or other business interests, as well as the motives for and time of immigration. Sandton, Berea, Yeoville, peripheral Bellevue, Alberton, Rosettenville and Troyeville in Johannesburg are the most common
residential areas for DRC immigrants. These areas are illustrative of the history of DRC nationals' immigration in South Africa and the social structures of and unequal power relations within this ethnic community. For example, Sandton, one of the wealthiest Johannesburg suburbs is home for the wealthiest DRC citizens: business men and former politicians commonly called ‘les mouvanciers’, i.e. ‘the bourgeois’, who together with Mobutu ruled the country for over three decades. This group of DRC immigrants came to South Africa long before the collapse of the Mobutu regime, but settled only when Mobutu’s regime began to sink in the early 1990s and after Kabila took over from Mobutu in 1997.

The most popular destination for DRC immigrants in Johannesburg is Yeoville because of its dense concentration of DRC nationals and DRC-related sociocultural, economic or political activities. It recreates an ‘imagined nation’ (Anderson 1983), in that it has a growing number of churches, pubs, restaurants, schools, businesses (agents and others often dealing in DRC foods, cosmetics, clothing, and export of SA foods, commodities and other items to the DRC and Angola) and other ethnic social networks. It is seen as the nexus of almost all meetings and the locomotive of all initiative for DRC immigrants. Berea is second to Yeoville. It is evident that dense concentrations in areas like Yeoville and Berea are likely to offer safety, security, and psychological comfort to the DRC community against acts of xenophobia and to facilitate communication with relatives and friends left behind. Other areas such as Rosettenville, Alberton and Troyeville receive DRC nationals who prefer living far from the ethnic areas. Alberton, in particular, is home to medical practitioners. Researchers such as Taylor and Barlow (2000) claim that having fellow countrymen (friends and/or family) who are already in South Africa offers some advantages to new DRC immigrants like housing, initiation to language and new way of life.

In all DRC immigrants’ residential locations, homeland languages seem to build members’ interpersonal relationships (see details in Section 1.8.2). These languages are the foundation of multiple social organizations set up by the DRC community in Johannesburg. Research undertaken in Australia by, for example Burnett (1998), on
issues surrounding immigrants’ settlement indicates that language plays an important role in settlement success. However, despite its links with ethnic identity in the diaspora, language is not the only factor of ethnic geographical concentration in specific areas. Other factors such as profession or social status, and personal reasons are likely to influence the immigrants’ settlement in Johannesburg. The point of interest is the implications of the geographic location for family language policies and/or practices. It is claimed that the geographic concentration of immigrants is ‘an important part of the integration process which allows immigrants to maintain some cultural ties to their country of origin’ (Funkhouser 2000: 489) while living in the host country. Language similarly plays a crucial role in the process of assimilation. For example, a study by Hunter (2000: 466.) in the USA reveals that Hispanics and Asians who speak English fluently and have high economic status live in places nearly equivalent to those of the whites. As Hunter (2000) reports, ethnic segregation tends to decline with the length of time or stay in a host country. Consequently, space and spatiality are learned behaviours and become an integral part of an individual's and/or a group's daily social struggles inside and outside of their community.

1.7.2 Social organization: language at core

Language is viewed as the appropriate means of social organisation within any discourse community, and is often the instrument used for establishing ethnic boundaries between insiders and outsiders. I am concerned with the way the DRC community is organized in Johannesburg and the implications of homeland languages for social structuration.

Within the DRC community, national and ethnic languages serve not only the communicational needs of immigrants but also drive the establishment of diverse ethnic and professional associations that govern the immigrants' lives in South Africa. In a multilingual/multicultural nation such as the DRC, sociolinguistic differences and political divergences are likely to engender multifaceted groupings. DRC immigrants are united in terms of professional interest, region of origin in their homeland, religious beliefs and cities or towns of origin. As Akhtar (1999: 16) argues, ‘the psychological
outcome of immigration depends upon the nature of the country or region left behind’, and that of the host country. It is evident that immigrants face more difficulty and loneliness in the early stages of immigration in their search for material or socio-political safety. In terms of professional interest, there are such organizations as the Association of Congolese Medical Practitioners in South Africa, Wits Student Congolese Association (recently established), and Wits Technikon Student Congolese Association.

Apart from these institutions, DRC immigrants have established socialisation centres in the form of restaurants and pubs where ethnic food and other services are offered. The most popular destinations appear to be pubs such as ‘Kin-Malebo’ and ‘La Reference’ in Yeoville, ‘Chez Ntemba’ in Hillbrow and Bruma, and ethnic churches. Some DRC immigrants also send their newly arrived children to ‘Sheik Anta Diop’ School/Yeoville. This school offers French from primary level up to matriculation level and is regarded as ethnic because it was established by a DRC-born South African citizen. All these institutions provide a way of maintaining national languages in the diaspora. In the varied institutions cited above, DRC immigrants interact with many people of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.

DRC churches are the most visited places by immigrants and (among) the first established foreign African congregations in Johannesburg. The reason behind this is that the Democratic Republic of Congo has about 70% of its population being Christians (www.congo2000.com/fpage.asp). It is recognised that in a situation of displacement, uprooting and fragmentation, churches provide psychological comfort, spiritual regeneration and hope for the future (www.episcopalchurch.com). DRC churches thus help newcomers to settle and integrate into the local society. In all these DRC institutions, homeland languages act as the bridge for DRC immigrants. The dominant language in most domains is French, which serves as the lingua franca among DRC nationals who use different vernaculars such as Kikongo, Lingala, Tshiluba and Swahili.
1.8 Immigrants in South Africa

All the selected families are classified as voluntary and involuntary or forced migrants, in that they left their native land for another country for various reasons. Among the forced immigrants, there are refugees (i.e. those who have been granted refugee status), asylum seekers (i.e. those who applied for asylum permits) (Akhtar 1999), and ‘accidental’ refugees’ (Elovitz & Kahn 1997, cited in Akhtar 1999: 167). Elovitz and Kahn (1997) describe an accidental refugee as someone who arrives in a country for business or a visit, but because of the changed circumstances in the country of origin, can no longer return there. In this research, the selected families are voluntary migrants (English-only family), accidental refugees (French-only and French-Tshiluba households) and refugees (Multilanguage family). In each family, parents and their children (at school-going age) born in the DRC are defined in this study as first-generation immigrants (G1) and children born in South Africa as second generation immigrants (G2). A third group, named transitional generation (TG), comprises children born in the DRC who had no schooling there and left the country when they were too young to have accurate memories of it.

Members of each group may perceive things differently, and this is likely to lead to differences in the attitudes of the different generations to their home or indigenous languages. In SA, immigrants come across other cultures and languages that may impact on them and their children; this may impede the development of DRC indigenous languages. In SA, multilingualism has statutory recognition (South African Constitution, Section 6, 1996). The revised ‘South African Language Bill’ (17 May 2000) recognises the language rights of all South Africans but offers no space for immigrants' linguistic needs. DRC immigrants who decide to learn or speak South African indigenous languages also need to learn English. English embodies prestige and rewards; it is likely to provide immigrants with material resources. The overall research project in the selected DRC immigrant families comprises eight chapters, as outlined in the following section.
1.9 Thesis overview

Chapter One has described the language policy in the DRC during and after the colonial period. It also provides the necessary context to enable us to understand this research and the difficulties that immigrant families face in using language in South Africa, within and outside the home.

Chapter Two discusses the literature in relation to language, culture, and ethnic identity in the context of immigration. A number of perspectives that inform the data description and analysis are also discussed.

Chapter Three presents the methodological frame that guided the selection of sites and participants and governed the data gathering and organization, data analysis, and interpretation.

Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven are devoted to the data analysis. They describe the research families’ language policies and practices. Each chapter focuses on one family, their geographic location and its effects on the family language policy (FLP); how members define themselves and are in turn defined; how they behave in relation to the languages they know and other languages they want to learn; and how other people behave towards them and their languages.

Chapter Eight is a conclusion which summarizes the findings in relation to the research questions, focusing on the patterns and differences that emerge in the four case studies. It also discusses the implications of the FLPs in South Africa and suggests directions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter raises certain questions that the study attempts to answer. Language, as one of the indispensable and universal features of the cultural system of all societies (Herbert 1992: 1), is diversified or multiple. It is linked not only to culture but also to identity, ethnicity (especially in the diaspora), a quest for belonging, relations of power in families and in interactions between people. Language creates a boundary between ‘people like us’: the insiders and ‘the outsiders or strangers’, the ‘Others’. The implications of these parameters for social relations are of interest in the discussions related to the social and linguistic life of immigrant families in South Africa. The link between language and culture, particularly in the context of immigration, is discussed in the next section.

2.2 Language and culture

Research undertaken in the context of immigration (e.g. Armour 2001; McEntee-Atalianis & Pouloukas 2001) indicates that people link (ethnic) language use to culture. Since language is viewed as a structural prerequisite for human interaction, there are certainly connections between language and culture. Language practices in immigrant families are embedded in the everyday interactional life of the wider society. Understanding language in society requires a social theory (Mesthrie et al 2000; Bhabha 1994; Ngugi 1993; Fantini 1991). Any human group has basic needs to fulfill for its survival. Language is one of the markers of the way of life called culture.

The term ‘culture’ has been defined in a number of ways. For most anthropologists and sociologists, it is the way of life of members of a social group, constitutive of and constituted by ideas and repeated practices/habits learnt, shared, and conveyed to younger generations. It is ‘the active process of generating and circulating meanings,
i.e. the way of life’ (Fiske 1989a: 23), or ‘the design of living which determines appropriate or acceptable ways or forms of behaviours’ (Mesthrie et al 2000: 29). These acceptable forms embody ‘values and norms’. While values are general guidelines for behaviour, norms are specific guides to action for behaviour deemed acceptable within the community. This worldview is acquired through a process of socialization, using language. Any form of values and norms, i.e. our ‘we do this’ and ‘we do not do that’ (see Thompson et al 1993) that stand against those acquired in the ethnic group are likely to produce culture shock.

Within the scope of this project, the culture of an immigrant family is embedded in everyday activities, relationships and social processes expressed mainly through language, and other concrete and visible artifacts. Language, in particular, as a carrier of culture embodies ‘patterns, moves, rhythms, habits, attitudes and knowledge’ (Ngugi 1986: 14). These create a person’s sense of self, distinct from that of others. As both a medium of communication and the vehicle of a culture, language directly impacts on our lives and the way we construct our vision of the world. Some researchers such as Hughes (1993) argue that through language immigrant parents seek to convey their history, specific ethnic values, patterns of interpersonal behaviours, practices, and patterns of communication. In connecting language to culture, Bhabha (1990: 304) understands and locates language within the social imaginary - nation, culture and community - in which a person’s identity is situated.

From this perspective, it can be seen that through interactions with the parents or other family members and the wider society, children acquire specific ways of saying, thinking, behaving, acting, speaking, and believing of their group embedded in language which Gee (1996: viii) calls ‘Discourses’. But in Gee’s view, people have multiple selves in multiple settings and thus acquire more than one Discourse. It should be noted, however, that immigrants’ children, particularly the transitional and second-generation ones, may not see language as a marker of cultural identity or ethnic identification but simply as a means of identification with the family. The reason is that they are not emotionally attached to the language of a country of which they have no
mental image. Some children may lack oral fluency in homeland languages but may still define themselves as DRC descendants. This research will also investigate the immigrant children’s link to their ethnic languages.

At this point, it is worth noting that Shor (1993) conceives of culture as ‘the actions and results of humans in society, the way people interact in their communities, and the addition people make to the world they find’ (p. 30). Obviously, beside language, there are ‘ideas and practices, values, beliefs, rules, social institutions and patterned (i.e. organized and ordered) social relations as well as symbols and signs, rituals and customs’ (Lankshear 1998: 14). Discursive practices may also translate into and embody other specific behaviours and artifacts such as clothing or bodily expressions, acts and attitudes, and eating habits. In a situation of displacement, these discursive practices cannot remain static. Culture is constantly redefined, in that new situations followed by new interpretations make people modify their earlier practices. People may switch to English with a view to succeeding in their host land. In the South African context, for instance, most Indians or Asians have lost their homeland languages but still carry on and live their culture in English. The present study seeks to find out what constitutes each family’s ethnic or cultural identity. The following section highlights the relationship between language and identity.

2.3 Language and identity

2.3.1 Meanings and relationship

In an attempt to find a link between language and identity, I draw on Tajfel (1974) who first conceptualized the notion of ‘social identity’. Tajfel presents the development, maintenance, and transformation of identity in terms of social psychological processes: social categorization, awareness, social comparison and a search for psychological distinctiveness (for details, see Section 2.5). For him, identity is derived from group membership and involves an individual's self-concept and the emotions tied to that group membership (Tajfel 1974: 69). This group membership appears to be mediated through language at an early stage of children’s life. In discussing the identity formation
In children at an early age, Akhtar (1999) posits that parents’ expectations of children, specific family myths, and inter-generational transmission of ethnic worldview or experience play an important role in the children’s future identity formation (p. 50). In fact, immigrant parents’ adjustment to a new life can have a significant impact upon their children’s self-representation.

In conceptualising the relationship between language and identity, Norton (2000: 5) in turn says that 'language is not conceived of as a neutral medium of communication but has to be understood in relation to its social meaning'. Considering the conditions under which individuals use language, Norton (1997a: 410) believes that 'every time people use oral language to address interlocutors, they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world'. By doing so, they are engaged in identity construction and negotiation. It is claimed that in and through language the individual is constituted as a subject (Alexander 1986: 63), and ‘the world is marked by language, not engulfed by it: in language we inhabit, construct and extend realities’ (Chambers 1994: 133). In this regard, Ngugi (1993) recalls that different people have their own irreducibly distinct cultural invariants that shape their historical paths (p. xvii). Values are the basis of a group’s identity, their sense of particularity as members of the community (Ngugi 1986: 15). In this sense, identity becomes the foundation of people’s self-differentiation as it defines their social worldview or culture. This research seeks to establish whether immigrants can still consider themselves members of their community after losing their homeland languages.

Further, questions of language and identity, as Edwards (1985: 2) argues, are extremely complex because identity is subjective. Norton (1997a) has defined the term ‘identity’ in terms of how people understand their relationship to the world. People learning a dominant language aim to access the cultural and material resources of the dominant group. From this perspective, Bourdieu (1977: 652) refers to the relationship between identity and symbolic power. The term 'symbolic' [power] is tied to people’s attitudes and valuations. In this respect, Bourdieu (1977) shows the importance of
language in constructing the relationship between the individual and the social. He adds that a person's speech can only be understood in relation to the person who speaks and the larger networks of social relationships. In addition, many of these may embody unequal power relations. In this sense, an individual's identity may change in accordance with changing social and economic relationships, in that these will influence the way individuals understand the world and their possibilities for their future (see Norton 2000).

Language becomes 'the place where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested, i.e. a place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity is constructed' (Weedon 1997: 21). In the context of immigration, relations of power usually emerge when immigrants attempt to access the host society’s social networks. Relations of power may also emerge within family interactions (see Section 2.9.2 for details). English, as the dominant language in most domains in South Africa, is viewed as the language of social mobility and better opportunities.

In exploring the relationship between language and identity, Morgan (1997) found that accent engages the speaker's sense of self, i.e. it also indicates who a person is. In South Africa, English accent may identify someone as belonging to a specific South African ethnic group as, for example, English first language speakers, Asians, Afrikaans native speakers, black South Africans or foreign Africans. The South African society in the apartheid era was divided into four main racial groups: whites, blacks, Indians and coloureds. The English accents of these groups draw much upon their primary languages. But this fact is changing as a function of where children go to school as well as how they self-identify. Research carried out in other countries has also noted this link between language and identity. For example, Goldstein (1997) investigated bilingual life and the language choice of Portuguese immigrant women in a Toronto multilingual/multicultural factory and found that Portuguese was a symbol of solidarity and group membership. Recently, Norton (2000) explored the interaction between immigrant women in Canada and the target language community and showed that
language was the site of identity negotiation between immigrant women and members of the host society. In South Africa, Gaganakis (1992) researched language and ethnic group relations in non-racial/private schools and found that fluency in English served as a particular identity marker of black learners in Soweto. English was (and still is) perceived by members of their community as a language of upward mobility embodying prestige and power, compared to African languages (Mutasa 2000; Motala 1997).

It is known that identity is a repertoire of possible selves and it is not static but dynamic over time and space. Because immigrant families are living in SA, they will acquire new meanings, new values, new practices which are continually (re-)created (Hall 1990: 235). Immigrants will develop distinct patterns of life and thus give expressive form to their daily social life-experience.

However, language is not always the salient feature of ethnicity or identity for all ethnic groups. For Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985: 5), people very largely may have given up their languages except for ritual purposes, for example, Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, Tamil and Hindu (Mesthrie 1995). This means that ethnic identity can survive a total loss of language. Research in this area also highlights the subjective and changing character of ethnicity or ethnic identity. Considering intergenerational differences, ethnicity may not mean the same thing to all family members. This study tries to find out whether or not a DRC language is a sine-qua-non condition for DRC group membership in South Africa and the range of other cultural elements that continue to link research participants to their homeland.

2.3.2 Symbolic identity: language and other cultural elements

In the context of (South African) immigration ‘a nation can be re-created in various ways and from a variety of circumstances’ (Smith 1981: 18). It is recognised that language is not the only way of maintaining cultural links with one’s homeland, and that there are other symbols that may fulfill this function. However, it may carry a certain value for the individual and the group in the diaspora. For example, its value may be derived from the role played by the language for the social group.
Symbols or images (concrete or abstract) represent a human group’s beliefs, values and thus have a social significance. Culture may be seen as ‘a vast integrated semiotic in which language is a subsemiotic’ (Lamb 1964: 96). It may be extrapolated that people’s social organisation (e.g. restaurant, club, church, pub) and other characteristics, such as body language, clothing, facial expression, walking style, and hand gestures may also constitute signs of and define a particular ethnic group. They may thus establish a boundary between ‘Us’ and ‘the Other’. Practically speaking, in a society where power relations emerge as result of routinised interaction, those conceptual, perceptual and motor systems, and other stimuli may constitute together with language the sociocultural landscape of an ethnic group (Lamb 1984), making it distinct from others. Carrasquillo (1991) views culture as including such aspects as dress, diet, music, and food.

It is apparent that identity can be expressed in a number of ways and characterised by ‘a nostalgic allegiance to the culture of the immigrants' old country, or a love for and pride in a tradition felt but not incorporated in everyday behaviour’ (Gans 1991: 76). There are no established rules for people to express their identity; but they can find ways to do it. Gans (1991: 75) adds that any mode of expressing ethnic identity is valid as long as it enhances the feeling of being ethnic. The present research seeks to understand how the research participants express their ethnic identity in South Africa. In the context of this thesis, in response to local life experience of everyday interaction, a range of discursive practices may emerge. From this viewpoint, it becomes obvious that language alone cannot be indicative of identity or ethnicity (see Jongenberger & Aarsen 2001) for DRC immigrants. As I said in the previous section, discursive practices, means and outcomes of cultural process or conventions are used to maintain some ties, between immigrant adults and their children, to their country of origin. However, considering the generational differences, immigrants’ children may not perceive those to DRC cultural elements and languages in the same way as their parents.
Research conducted in the area of symbolic identity (e.g. Stokes 1994; Çaglar 1993; Clarke et al 1981; Douglas & Isherwood 1979) shows some connections between cultural artifacts and identity formation. Clarke et al (1981: 53) add that ‘humans draw on resources made available to them by the specific ways of their speech community to engage in meaning-making’. Douglas and Isherwood (1979: 12) also state that goods have a communicative value due to their symbolic and expressive functions. Consumer goods, especially foods, play a fundamental role in the life and identity of immigrant families. Grinberg and Grinberg (1989: 79) add that food takes on special relevance because it symbolizes the earliest structural link with one’s country. Preparing and eating homeland-like meals creates a sense of nostalgia, of resurrecting that ‘imagined nation’ (Anderson 1983) in the foreign land, i.e. a sense of remaining ‘people like us’ (Gee 1996: ix). I understand the word ‘nostalgia’ as ‘homesickness, or that excessively sentimental yearning for times and places left behind’ (also Akhtar 1999: 176).

However, in a globalised world where cultures interpenetrate, the eating habits of an ethnic group are likely to be hybrid; the eating patterns of immigrants are likely to be mixed, rather than a monotonous ethnic diet (see also Çaglar 1993). I understand ‘ethnic diet’ as the kind of food characterised by a menu of limited variety, constituting an integral part of the group’s way of life. Another cultural element linked to the life of an ethnic group in the diaspora may be homeland music. DRC music may not confer the same identity as alien types of music such as reggae, hip-hop. Stokes (1994: 5) says that music is socially meaningful not entirely but largely because it provides a means by which people recognise identities and places and the boundaries which separate them from the ‘Other’.

It can be concluded that the loss of a language may not deprive an individual of his/her ethnic/cultural identity as a person may take his/her identity and carry it through other means. A DRC immigrant child in South Africa who does not speak DRC languages may wear DRC clothes, dance to DRC music and treat his/her parents with respect, while speaking English or any local language of the host country (Chapter 4). S/he thus has a hybrid identity.
2.4 Gender relations

The constitution of gender identity is based upon the awareness of being male or female. Gender roles (Green 1975, cited in Akhtar 1999: 66) are one's overt behaviour in relation to other people with respect to one’s gender. Speaking particularly of African tradition, Elliott (1996) argues that gendered structures embody different gendered sets of cultural patterns. To illustrate, women learn nurturing values and show concern for individuals while men learn to view their social behaviours in the family in terms of authority or power (see Akhtar 1999; Hwang et al 1996; Mesthrie et al 2000).

With regard to language, gender is a dynamic sociocultural construct that is historically, culturally, situationally and interactionally constituted and negotiated (Winter & Pawels 2000; Norton 2000; Woolard 1997). Language policies (and thus practices) in research immigrant families depend upon who has the power to make decisions. Immigrant women and men experience the external world differently and thus may have different attitudes (see also Norton 2000). The differences may come from their educational level, the frequency of social interaction with the host society, and how accessible this society is to immigrant women and immigrant men. This may influence their attitudes to ethnic languages.

Norton (2000), for example, found that immigrant women in Canada were disadvantaged by their status as mothers or female workers and other related factors. Other studies conducted in Australia and New Zealand (Pauwels 1997; Tsokalidou 1994) revealed that immigrant overseas-born men initiated language shift in most ethnic and linguistic communities whereas immigrant overseas-born women played a greater role in maintaining the ethnic languages.

The present study aims to establish whether or not the connections between language, identity and gender found in the literature hold.
2.5 Ethnicity in immigration

2.5.1 Ethnic identity formation

Discussing the development and transformation of (social) identity, Tajfel (1974) suggests four principal stages in an inter-group contact, namely: (i) social categorization, (ii) the formation of awareness of social identity, (iii) social comparison, and (iv) a search for psychological distinctiveness. I use and adapt these constructs to the situation of immigration in South Africa.

In the early stage of their settlement, in a given context through verbal interaction with the host society, immigrants may be discriminated against or marginalized and thus allocate others and themselves category membership. This process of self- and ‘otherisation’ due to negative social attitudes to African immigrants turns into social comparison that emerges from that valuation, thereby leading to the awareness of relative social status or identities applied to both local populations (as in-group) and immigrants (as out-group). It is during this double social comparison-awareness process that a sense of socio-psychological self-differentiation is increased by establishing some visible features (Tajfel 1974). It is significant to note that identity as a sense of self in relation to others (Weis 1990: 1) is created by and creative of responses to, social forces (see Heller 1982).

While identity is a sense of self in relation to others, the term ‘ethnicity’ is used to identify members of a social group as different from others. For Gillborn (1990: 7), ethnicity refers to the ‘sense of expression of ethnic difference and it involves judgements made upon other people’s identity markers’. Gillborn (1990) adds that ‘members of an ethnic group see themselves as culturally different from other social groups and are seen by others to be so’ (p. 4). Ethnic groups differ from one another in terms of values, childrearing practices, sense of history, modes of expression, patterns of interpersonal behaviour (Akhtar 1999; Hughes 1993), ancestry, and the language of its members. It is noted that ethnicity is ‘transmitted to the children by exposure to the family’s cultural mores and the ethnic language within the family’ (Akhtar 1999: 67).
Alba (1990) reports that immigrant parents who desire some ethnic identity for their children can attach some importance to its acquisition by means of language. Language is thus used for the purpose of understanding the dynamics of ethnicity (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba 1991). It is claimed that ‘by identifying with others within the ethnic group, the child identifies with their investment in, for instance: religion, language, and shares in the differentiation of those persons unlike the group and inimical to it’ (Volkan 1988: 49). I may draw on Thompson et al’s (1993) view to argue that such identity is both positive (we do this) and negative (they do that).

The varied groups, through the process of interaction with others, identify themselves as sharing the same values and lifestyle. Paulston (1994: 31) claims that these socio-cultural values held in common are unconsciously learned behaviours. Linguistic and cultural features mark the boundaries between the insiders and outsiders, and form the basis of ethnic identity. There is recognition that ethnicity is enacted and recreated for immigrants when contact is made with members of the host society. Discussing the formation of ethnic identity, Heller (1987: 181) maintains that ‘the first principle of ethnic identity formation is participation in ethnic social networks and, therefore, in activities controlled by ethnic group members’. She adds that (ethnic) language is important here as a means by which access to networks is regulated. It is evident that language may ‘represent a group identity and become emblem of that identity when there is contact with other groups whose ways of being are different’ (Heller 1982: 3).

In the context of immigration, ethnicity may be ‘symbolic’ and ‘instrumental’ (Oommen 1997: 21). The question of hybrid identity becomes more complex. In South Africa, DRC immigrants ‘live in the [mental] nation of others, on the edge of foreign cultures and languages’ (Bhabha 1990: 291). However, immigrants will differ in terms of educational level and the structure of opportunities open to them in the new land. This research project thus attempts to find answers to questions such as: What DRC identities do immigrants have, especially their children? And how are their identities affected in SA? It is believed that the host society’s negative attitudes to the immigrants may shape their sense of themselves as DRC nationals rather than as members of an ethnic
subgroup.

2.5.2 Language and ethnic mobilization

In South Africa, the marginalisation of foreign Africans, which I deliberately name ‘kwere-kwerisation’ (i.e. the calling of immigrants ‘makwere-kwere’ or strangers), can encourage an individual to adjust socially as well as lend meaning to the local. In other words, barriers mounted against a given immigrant group may have positive consequences for the internal cohesion of that group by forcing its members to rely upon each other and their community. In this situation, the discriminated and uprooted individuals may have recourse to their homeland values and beliefs and languages, recreating their imagined entities, a home away from home (see Jankowski 1995; Young 1995). Chambers (1994) supports the view that immigrants are always in transit: the promise of homecoming becomes an impossibility. The social non-integration may also force them into a common geographical location, a sense of common fate and identity among them, and thus develop DRC networks. In this situation, Schipper (1999) and Clarke (1992:) refer to ‘the quest for belonging’. This concurs with Hall’s (2000: 14) view that ‘identity is the ground of action’.

Having escaped Mobutu’s dictatorship and fled Kabila’s wars and the attendant socioeconomic hardships, DRC immigrants come to South Africa with the intent of finding peace and improving their material conditions. However, they face discrimination and have to embrace their status as an ethnically marginal group. A common past nationality engenders national consciousness or homesickness. The immigrants have the opportunity to assist one another financially, socially, psychologically, and spiritually: In this context Anderson (1983) speaks of ‘imagined community’. The marginalisation of immigrants may lead to what Rex and Drury (1994) name ‘ethnic mobilization’. I understand this as ‘a process in which members of an ethnic group, in specific and relevant situations, develop heightened levels of group consciousness vis-à-vis other groups’ (Rex 1994: 15). Ethnic mobilization emerges from a situation of conflict between the host society and immigrants as an ideological response to a set of discriminatory practices and prejudices. Indeed, for Verma et al (1994), conflicts
emerge when social opportunities have to be competed for. This idea is in tandem with Heller’s (1987) conception of ethnicity when she claims that ethnicity is a product of opposition (p. 181). Belonging to a particular ethnic network offers a sense of extended kinship and organised activation of some kind of solidarity relation vis-à-vis a collective fate.

Language undoubtedly acts as a bridge in interpersonal relations. However, it is beyond the interest of this research to explore whether belonging to a particular ethnic network is a response to the immigrants’ marginalisation. Nevertheless, the study seeks to understand how those institutions and other parameters like ethnic geographical locations are likely to impact upon family language policies and practices in South Africa.

2.6 Language policy and the ideology of language absorption

A number of scholars have highlighted the absorption of indigenous or colonized languages by colonial and postcolonial language policies and the modern process of globalization. They name these linguistic absorption processes 'linguistic imperialism', or 'linguicism' (Phillipson 1992; Ngugi 1993, 1986; Skutnabb-Kangas 1988). I understand linguistic imperialism as a hegemonic way of attributing or imposing colonial languages as (i) the lingua franca among the colonised and (ii) the official language in the main domains of language use such as education, the media, government, science and technology, and commerce. Linguicism refers to the ‘ideologies, structures and practices which legitimate and reproduce asymmetries (or unequal division) of power and physical and non-material resources between groups that are defined in terms of language’ (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988: 13). Phillipson (1992) overtly mentions the colonialist ideology reflected in ‘the creation of an idealistic European image, the devaluation of the dominated languages, the suppression and stagnation of their cultures, institutions, life-style and ideas’ (p. 38). That is, the domination over indigenous languages and cultures. I use the term 'ideology' to mean 'the values or forms of the dominant social group that serve their interests to the disadvantage of the
dominated’ (Eagleton 1991: 29-30). As well, Fairclough (1995: 12) regards ‘ideology’ as ‘ways of representing the world, particular constructions of social identities and particular constructions of social relations’.

Fanon (1967a) insists that a man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language. Similarly, Mwaura (1980) says that ‘language influences the ways in which we perceive reality, evaluate it and consider it’ (p. 27). It is argued that language, and other symbolic forms, can act as a powerful means of maintaining and reproducing unequal relations of power (Janks 2000). Drawing on the ideas put forward above, I understand linguistic domination in relation to immigrants’ languages as the hegemonic impact of English upon the immigrants’ languages. It should be noted that DRC indigenous languages are already suppressed or marginalized by the dominant national language, French. In South Africa, DRC immigrants use English alongside French; this is likely to be supplanted by English as the new language of the immigrants, particularly of the immigrants’ children.

Presently the marginalization of South African indigenous languages, minority languages (languages of smaller groups) or minoritized languages, including African languages, is seen as the result of the spread of English as the language of the world. By minoritized languages, I mean the languages of the great majority of the population that have been culturally subjugated or silenced by economically powerful groups. English is widely used in science, technology, education, the media and business. In South Africa it is the dominant language in most domains of use such as education and administration, and thus a gatekeeper to job opportunities. Boyle (1997: 169) argues that English, under the innocuous guise of a helpful language for business and travel, has become a potential weapon for cultural and economic domination. Ngugi (1986) highlights the destructive role that the colonial languages, English and other European languages, have played (and still play) in subverting indigenous languages. The South African situation is complex and, in my view, the consequence of the language policy of the apartheid era. This gave African people less access to English as the language of power or social mobility than French in the DRC.
However, the adoption of English as the dominant national language in most domains of use in some countries has been the key to their socioeconomic success. For example, in Singapore English language policy made the country economically successful (Pennycook 1994). In investigating the role of English in Hong Kong, Boyle (1997, 1995) points out that English has been instrumental in the prosperity of the country and is presently a passport to better employment in Hong Kong. It offers entry into 'lucrative' careers in an increasingly competitive job market. In the context of this study and considering the importance of English in education and the job market in South Africa, immigrants, particularly their children, need access to this language. In a society which values and recognises the importance of English, refusing to give children access to dominant forms [in English] perpetuates their marginalisation in the society. Similarly, drawing on Janks (1995), providing the children with dominant forms will contribute to maintaining dominance of the linguistic form. This situation may impact on some extent the choice of language in the family, as discussed in the next section.

2.7 Family language policy

2.7.1 Family language policy: children’s socialisation

Language, for most African ethnic groups, acts as a central value of their culture and a tool for the socialisation of children at an early stage of their life (Ngugi 1986: 15). In the diaspora ethnic language is also thought of as a means of maintaining a common bond, thus preventing the possible disintegration of family life. Smolicz (2001) also recalls similar views when she reports Australian Greek parents’ fear of seeing ‘family relationships and ties [with the homeland] break down with the loss of home language [and thus of other values] and their children not being able to communicate with members of their ethnic community’ (p. 159). In this case, language serves as an important sign of self-identification, i.e. a symbol of ethnic identity. I agree with Clyne’s (1991: 93) concern ‘to view cultural values according to the terms in which they are meaningful to the group concerned’. But the question that emerges for the present research is: To what extent can home language be maintained and transmitted to younger generations, especially in the context of immigration?
It is important to know how best language ability or proficiency in parents’ home languages can be developed and supported in the diaspora. It is recognized that children use the language to build up and maintain relationships, to think and exchange information, and to socialise and communicate. The chosen languages in the family are usually those that parents want to raise their children in, either from birth or to shift to at a certain point of their lives in specific sociocultural situations. The parents’ decision is complex since it results from diverse (sometimes conflicting) parameters. These may embody inequitable power relations in the family decision-making as to how to ensure its effective implementation or practicability. The language that the children hear in the family produces receptive competence, in that they can hear but cannot speak it (see also Baker 2000). It also raises a number of questions regarding the language practices proper. The research attempts to find answers to the following questions: What are the reasons for choosing a given language for use in the family? What are the immigrant parents’ attitudes towards their own indigenous/homeland languages?

As Gilroy (1996: 249) notes, families observe the world around them and adjust their behaviours. Ager (2001) contends that language policy in immigrant families is the language behaviour of the more powerful parent, usually the father. The problem becomes more complex when family language decision-makers have different ethnic and/or linguistic backgrounds and where each of them would like children to learn to speak their preferred language. Drawing on Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1991), home socialisation shapes the child’s view of the social and cultural environment. In other words, the images of childhood, expressed in myths, proverbs and beliefs, patterns of childrearing and education are powerful bases of primary identity that become norms and values for a child’s future (Lamb & Hwang 1996: 1). These norms and values make children feel emotionally attached to the childrearing language. But it should be noted that in the conditions of immigration, primary identities become fragmented, fractured or dismantled (Brah 1996; Bhabha 1990), thereby influencing the language policy in immigrant families.
For Peshkin (1991), a FLP is usually designed when opportunities for true social integration sought through access to local networks are denied; they become restricted to a few symbolic images like language, fashion, or eating habits. This may happen in a family adopting the dominant host language. However, the language policy (based on homeland languages) may not be accepted by all family members, particularly the children who are being educated in English, ‘the gatekeeper to full participation in the social life and thus the channel through which access to local social networks is gained’ (VandernHeinvel & Wooden 1996).

Similarly, the use of English in an immigrant family, for instance, can bring about communication gaps between members who are not fully fluent in it and still define themselves ethnically within SA. Fanon (1967a) treats such use of a colonial language as one of the most powerful forms of alienation. The consequence of such a policy may result in the ignoring of the stated policy by the continued use of homeland language/s. Saunders (1982) found that immigrant families who shifted to using English only, did not succeed in passing on ethnic languages to their children (p. 2). He adds that using a language in which parents feel confident improves the children’s esteem for their parents (Saunders 1988: 36).

2.7.2 The value of the language in the family

The term language policy/planning has been defined in various ways. In practice it aims to ‘solve language problems, preferably on a long-term basis’ (Reagan 2002: 420). I use the term ‘language policy’, following Ager (2001), to mean actions taken about language use in the family by those who hold power. The process itself involves decision-making about language, its use and implementation. It confers socioeconomic, educational as well as political meaning upon the individual and the society. By family language policy (FLP) I mean the unilateral, non-negotiable decision that parents make in the choice of (a) given language(s) as the medium/media of interaction within the family, and for their children’s futures. The policy exists in practice and is in the mind of the family ‘policy-makers’ and family members. Factors such as ideology, (elitist) image projection (or a generation of a possible external opinion on what and who people
actually are), social integration, intimacy or closeness (in the family), can be some of the reasons given for establishing a FLP. Hall (1974) looks at language choice in relation to identity construction, attitudes and goals. I draw on these ideas in my attempt to analyse and interpret the reasons for the FLP in the selected immigrant families. Ager (2001: 175) insists that language policy is the language behaviour of those individuals who hold power in the family, and indicates their own ideologies, preferences, and likings.

The choice of a given language may also answer such questions as: What is the real status or value of the language in the society at the time of the choice? What can immigrants gain by using it? What does it represent or signify to them? In an attempt to understand the choice parents make for family interaction, I rely upon the philosophical construct of ‘value’ and the socio-historical factors governing the language policy in each research family in the present study.

If we regard language practices as ‘a series of acts of use and exchange’ (Eiss & Pedersen 2002: 284), it can be seen that these acts thus influence, govern or affect our ‘identity or sense of self’ (Weis 1990: 1). Therefore, according to researchers such as Dhir and Savage (2002), Pedersen (2002) and Cooksey (1996), value is described in a number of ways: ‘economic, linguistic, aesthetic and ideological dimensions of human life’ (Eiss & Pedersen 2002: 283). I use the notion of value to trace aspects of family language valuation in the language choice across socio-historical and geographical contexts. Language policy in the family may be informed by a number of factors.

Coulmas (1991) recognises that every language has a utilitarian value. By this is meant all kinds of tasks that the language may perform, the philosophy embedded in language choice, and the opportunities for using the language at a given time and place. This value varies from context to context and from family to family. Therefore, the valuation of a language is subjective. In South Africa, each immigrant family chooses languages likely to be used in the family in terms of what the language means to them. The valuation of a language is situated within the social context (Dhir & Savage 2002;
Graeber 2001). In fact, Coulmas (1992: 88) states that ‘the value of a language is determined by a number of factors, all of which contribute to make language a medium of communication’.

Each immigrant family may find in the concept of ‘value’ a way of articulating distinct identities, or of responding to power relations within the framework of their particular struggle for integration in the local social networks. Immigrant families may also use language value analysis to move across ethnically temporal boundaries, unveiling their life histories and thus their present life and children’s futures. Eiss and Pedersen (2002) argue that the ‘significance of value does not reside solely in its theoretical ‘worth’ in a market place but rather in its capacity to interpret, and perhaps to change, the world in which it circulates’ (p. 287). Value relates to the meaning of particular places and moments to the sociohostorical realities within which these operate.

Obviously, language valuation or choice may arise from the social, linguistic, and economic needs of the family (members) whether present or future. In SA, the rewards and prestige that English offers to its speakers may also have an impact on language policy in some families which adopt, for example, an English only policy. The need to maintain homeland identity may also influence a family. Regardless of the reasons for adopting a family language policy, parents will have to take into account the family values that may govern or represent the communication needs of the family members. Baudrillard (1972) discusses the term ‘value’, providing some categories such as use value, exchange value and symbolic value, which I adopt in my discussion of language policies in the families.

The notion of ‘symbolic value’ (Bourdieu 1991, 1977; Marchand 1982; Baudrillard 1972) refers to the use of language in society. Through a given language, a family may define its social position which may distinguish it from all others. Language then acts as a source of power and differentiation (Ng & Bradac 1993; Ngugi 1993; Bourdieu 1991). For example, French may signify educatedness to the DRC community or simply the use of a colonized language by the colonized people as well as a symbol of DRC
citizenship. Similarly, speaking good English in South Africa is seen by many African families as a gateway to better job opportunities and upward mobility. All the language values described above may impact upon family language policies.

However, a language perceived to be of low utilitarian value may well serve a particular ‘symbolic’ significance. This research project aims to answer the following questions about family language policy: What are family language needs and the language politics of the community or wider society? How can the family’s needs be satisfied in daily interactions? What can be obtained from a given language policy? How do family members adapt to an evolving pattern of communication, and to changing family conditions and milieux? Answers to these questions are expected from participants’ responses to the interview questions (see Appendix G for the interview questions).

2.8 Language choice, maintenance and shift in immigrant families

An essential characteristic of immigrants with strong sense of ethnic identity is their capacity to maintain personal continuity amid change and with the passing of time (see Akhtar 1999: 64, citing Lichtenstein 1963). Related to this feature is the term ‘self-history’ which is used to mean a sense of enduring and of a continuation with one’s own past (Stern 1985, in Akhtar 1999: 64). From this perspective, individuals, especially immigrants ‘comfortably locate themselves in their current realities and can envision their future’ (Akhtar 1999: 64). To maintain contact with their social and linguistic past, immigrants keep their homeland languages and other cultural elements reflecting their past life experiences.

Regarding immigration, the effects of languages in contact may take different forms: language maintenance, shift or assimilation, or language death. There are conditions under which immigrants either maintain their home languages or shift to the dominant language of the host country. While language maintenance means the continuing use of homeland indigenous languages in the face of the socially more powerful languages of South Africa, language shift refers to the replacement of those indigenous languages by
another as the primary medium of communication and socialization among immigrants (Mesthrie et al 2000: 253). Language shift in immigrant families results from the possible transformations or different kinds of assimilation (e.g. marital, cultural) that the immigrant families may go through. In the present study, 'marital assimilation' does not apply as all the research families were already married before leaving the DRC. But this assimilation may happen when the immigrant children marry outside of their ethnic community. There may also be language shifts as transitional generation (TG) members become more integrated in the South African society.

Language shift or maintenance in immigration may also result from economic changes, demography, institutional support (i.e. the use of immigrants' languages in education, religion, media or administration) and immigrants' self-esteem (Mukherjee 1996; Jones 1990). People choose to maintain or shift to other languages as their social relationships change (Milroy & Milroy 1985b). Language maintenance in this project may be associated with the family language policies and its links to the ethnic community. For example, in the last case, immigrants may be tied to each other in only one way, that is, relative or friend, or to more than one way, e.g. friend, relative, co-employee, neighbour, and member of the same congregation or club. Language maintenance also depends upon the levels of competence or proficiency. Family members may be fluent or have insufficient exposure to the homeland language and continue to use it in an imperfect way. Similarly, they may have full understanding of the language but be unable to use it productively. Homeland languages may be maintained when members hope to return to their native land. This idea echoes Said (1990) who posits that ‘in a secular world contingent, homes are always provisional and that borders and barriers that enclose them within the safety of familiar territory can also become prisons’ (p. 365). However, if immigrant families decide to reside in SA, their attitudes to homeland languages may change.

Other parameters may also lead parents to encourage the use of a language or certain languages to the detriment of others. For example, in South Africa, the value attached to English by mainstream society may affect the language choice in immigrant families.
Some immigrant parents may encourage their children to speak English, the prestige language, rather than other South African indigenous languages, given the belief that knowledge of English leads to increased access to economic networks. Another reason might be the attitudes of inferiority concerning African languages inherited from the colonial past and perpetuated in the education system of the new élites.

Language acts as the medium of transmission of ethnic knowledge, traditions, values and beliefs to younger generations. The family language policy and language practices in the form of interactions among immigrant family members affect their ‘selves’ and interpersonal relationships within the family, the DRC community, and the wider South African society. In the interaction process, the child acquires language/s orally and also internalises sets of pre-defined behaviours, interrelated strategies to be used productively later. Besides, a common language for socialization and intimacy in the family is likely to facilitate communication among family members.

2.9 Language practices in a multilingual setting

2.9.1 Language interaction of multilinguals

Research on how people in multilingual communities interact has received considerable attention from (applied) linguists and social researchers. In this section I draw on theorists such as Mesthrie et al (2000) and Jessner (1999) to understand how the research participants use multiple languages in their families and why they use them.

Milroy and Muysken (1995) and Eastman (1992) claim that multilinguals mix their languages in their everyday speech. They add that in a multilingual/multicultural milieu where people from different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds interact, mixing many languages is the norm, and that ‘people living in multilingual communities often speak two or three additional languages’ (Myers-Scotton 1993: 33). It is evident that in everyday conversations, bi-/multilingual speakers mix the varied languages by either borrowing words or phrases or by shifting from one language to the other in the course of the interaction. Myers-Scotton (1993) and Eastman (1992) speak of a Matrix
Language (ML) and an Embedded Language (EL). These respectively refer to a language in which the majority of words occurs and the language from which the material enters a matrix language (Eastman 1992; Myers-Scotton 1992).

Beside, Jessner (1999) attempts to define codemixing as ‘a complete change from one language system to the other’ and borrowing as the process of using ‘individual elements of the Embedded Language (EL) in the Matrix Language (ML)’ (p. 23). Nevertheless, researchers such as Pandharipande (1990) claim that it is hard to draw a clear line between borrowing and code-switching. Elaborating on this idea, Myers-Scotton (1992) posits that there is little reason to distinguish between borrowing and code-switching. In this regard, it is considered that all code-switches structurally represent material embedded into a Matrix Language (ML). She concludes that borrowing and code-switching should not be seen as distinct processes but as part of a single continuum, ranging from abrupt loans to core borrowings. Gysels (1992) seems to agree with Myers-Scotton (1992) when she contends that ‘EL material may look as much a borrowing as a code-switch’ (p. 42). She thus argues that no structural elements can account for the fact that elements from an EL can at once be established as borrowings (loans) and thus used as code-switches. In this regard, the language of authority may be the socially perceived language of power (i.e. the dominant language in society or ethnic community). It may also subjectively perceived as such by the individual speaker. Confronted with the varied meanings of code-switching, codemixing and borrowing put forward above, I will regard code-switching or mixing as a shift from one language to another inter- or intra-sententially, and borrowing as any borrowed word from another language.

The question that emerges is: how do people actually code-switch? Some researchers have attempted to answer this question. Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that people living in urban areas or multilingual communities often speak two or three additional languages. In her research carried out in some areas of Africa, she observed that ‘the most common pattern of bilingualism in Africa is to use the speakers’ own mother language, plus an indigenous lingua franca, or an alien official language such as
English or French’ (p. 36). Referring to the language practices in Kenya, she reports that the most common trilingual pattern was the speaker’s mother language, Swahili, and English (p. 36). This pattern emerges from a specific situation and environment and cannot, however, be taken for granted. In their research carried out in Bukavu, eastern DRC, Goyvaerts and Zembele (1992) found that people mixed Swahili, Shi (a local indigenous language) and Lingala inter- and intra-sententially. Of these three DRC indigenous languages, two, Swahili and Lingala, are official and are used for different goals. In South Africa, language practices among DRC speakers who have more than one indigenous lingua franca may differ to some extent, revealing other linguistic patterns.

As a conventional and normal process in the routine use of language, code-switching is viewed by researchers like Heller (1992) as a range of linguistic practices people create and deploy to accomplish social goals. Heller (1992) thus claims that code-switching ‘represents a range of linguistic resources upon which people can draw to define the value of the other resources they control and to regulate access to them’ (p. 124). In this regard, I refer to Myers-Scotton’s model of the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) which places power in the speaker who, in speaking, reveals multiple identities. Blommaert (1992) and Myers-Scotton (1993, 1983) also noticed this phenomenon in their studies conducted in Kenya and Bukavu (eastern DRC) respectively. In another study undertaken by Goyvaerts and Zembele (1992) in Bukavu, code-switching was seen as a marked choice to encode power and solidarity.

Clearly, code-switching acts as a means of calling into play specific forms of a speakers’ linguistic and cultural knowledge. This is not equally distributed among members of the same family, the ethnic group or any speech community. This unequal distribution gives way to the reproduction of unequal relations of power (Gumperz 1982). In the present research, family members who have sufficient knowledge of prestigious languages (and thus culture) of the host society are likely to have more power than those without such knowledge. This power may well manifest among family members in conversations (for a full discussion, see next section). Code-switching may,
therefore, be a way to maintain, control or exert relations of power within the family.

2.9.2 Language and distribution of power

Bourdieu (1991, 1977) believes that every language interaction bears traces of the social structure that it both expresses and helps to re-produce. It goes without saying that language proficiency includes the right to speak, make oneself heard, be believed or obeyed (Mesthrie et al 2000). Bourdieu (1977: 652) claims that those individuals who have knowledge of and proficiency in the language of power (here English) are likely to have more social networks, prestige and rewards than others. They will thus have power and authority in the economic and cultural power relations of the family or society. Power and authority are interconnected and in interaction they can be expressed in a number of ways: voice quality, pitch of voice or rate of speaking, and code-switching. With a view to being obeyed, speakers may raise their voices or shift to a language of power.

I agree with Bourdieu (1977: 651) that language is ‘a symbolic asset which can receive different values depending upon the social context in which it is used’. Language practices, embodying inequitable power relations, occur in a specific ‘context of situation and context of culture’ (Halliday & Hasan 1985; Clark & Ivanic 1997). In Halliday and Hasan’s (1985) view, the context of situation also includes the participants and the relationships between them, the physical setting, the time and the milieu in which the interaction takes place. The selected family members will function in the context of South African culture.

I use Scollon and Scollon’s (2003: p.x) concepts of ‘discourses in places’ or ‘geosemiotics’ to mean how we use language in physical, concrete instances, and in relation to certain events, or ‘platform events’ (e.g. watching TV together, eating, playing). This theory interprets language meaning by considering the public and physical or lived world that surrounds the interaction. In other words, the social action depends on where and when and how the interaction happens in time and space. The
Scollons’ theory helps me to interpret power relations arising from the interaction, i.e. how people respond to certain situations to exert power over other people.

2.10 Multilingualism and social mobility in South Africa

Multilingualism, as the ability of an individual to speak more than two languages, is a natural phenomenon among people in contact. Language, as a medium of communication builds relationships and allows access to other people's social networks. It is recognized that different languages can perform different functions in multilingual societies and are associated with the maintenance of multiple identities. In education, for example, multilingualism enables learners to make and share meaning successfully. In immigrant families it allows members to negotiate their multiple identities within family and peer relationships, DRC communities and the wider South African society and to access their social networks. As Baker (2000) and Mesthrie (2000) affirm, multilinguals are flexible in their language practices.

In South Africa, multilingualism has statutory recognition (Section 6, South African Constitution 1996), supported by the South African Languages Bill (17 May 2000) and the 'Language Policy and Plan for South Africa' document (6 November 2000). The languages bill aims to promote all eleven South African official languages and to encourage respect for equal treatment in all sectors. However, it is argued that all languages do not enjoy equal status, despite the bill’s strategies for effective implementation of the languages (Mesthrie et al 2000; Mutasa 2000). Webb and Kembo-Sure (2000) add that ‘less than 10% of South Africans use English as L1 and less than 25% black South Africans know it well enough to function fully in public’ (p. 38). In addition, lack of provision for a language policy for immigrants influences immigrant families' language choice that may inhibit the maintenance of DRC indigenous languages and their learning of local indigenous languages. This is the legacy of colonial language policies.
The point of interest in the analysis above is that the sociocultural legacy of past language policies and the effects of globalisation may (still) have an impact on how research participants perceive things in the new land, particularly on their attitudes to home languages. Mother languages are often prohibited in family interaction because they are thought to impede the oral communicative and literacy development of children in the dominant language of the host society. For Amati-Mehler et al (1994), this exclusion may engender in children a painful feeling of exile from the affective world of parents.

2.11 Identifying African immigrants

A nation is a protected historico-cultural and bounded political space sensitive to any invasion. This sense of belonging is attached to the locale in which people originate, live or find themselves, and thus produces organisations of emotional forces. Any crossing of bounded national territory by ‘strange’ biographical and cultural differences leads to collision with locally pre-established historical and cultural facts.

At this point, it is important to understand what constitutes ‘Southafricanness’. At the national level, Klaaren (1999) says that the Republic of South Africa Constitution (South African Constitution 1996) defines its varied boundaries, and the national identity and citizenship of its people in terms of ‘citizenship by descent, naturalization and jus soli’ (wwwserver.law.wits.ac.za/school/klaaren.html). Refugees’ children may inherit the social status of their parents. Castle and Davidson (2000) define such countries as Canada, USA, Australia and France as nations of immigrants. However, in these nations immigrants have to give up their ethnic languages for the local dominant language. Refugees and asylum seekers are reformed to ‘become a new people in a melting pot, bound not by a common ancestry but by a common destiny to build a new nation based upon freedom, equality and opportunity (Gitlin 1995: 56).

Language (intonation, or accent, lack of fluency) may be another dimension used to identify the newcomers in a country and consequently to set boundaries between ‘us’
and ‘them’. Mpe (2001: 20) confirms that ‘on account of a sound that their unintelligible foreign languages are supposed to make’, they are called ‘makwere-kwere’. Language can be powerfully used to position the ‘Other’ (Ng & Bradac 1993: 9), thus becoming a means of signifying the ‘Other’. Most DRC immigrants come to South Africa with little or no knowledge of English or other South African languages. On arrival, they face communication problems and are easily identified as aliens. Akhtar (1999) acknowledges that ‘there is a prominent difference between the bodily characteristics of the newly arriving immigrants and that of the natives of his country of adoption’ (p. 27). Physical differences may impede immigrants’ integration into the host society and thus impact on their assimilation and identity reorganisation. Some constructions as ‘the expression of public opinions’ (McDonald 1993: 221) are attached to all foreign African ethnic groups in South Africa because of their group membership and skin pigmentation. Foreign Africans are constructed as job/house grabbers, crooks, money launderers (e.g. Adegoke 1999: 15), and drug dealers. This negative representation of African immigrants may be as a result of ethnocentric prejudice, rather than as a result of contact with the immigrants.

It is no secret though that some African immigrants’ illegal conduct perpetuates such negative attitudes towards immigrants and legitimates the use of the term ‘makwere-kwere’. But homogeneity distorts social facts by attempting to represent all immigrants’ identities as static, fixed. The use of (verbal) attributes to define foreigners indicates differential power relations that assign individuals to specific structural positions within the (ethnically defined) social system (see Baron 1984). Ethnic representation is always mediated and constructed by politics and culture.

2.12 The politics of social space: language and ethnic group

In their attempt to access the social networks of South Africa, African immigrants meet resistance. They are also marginalized and subjected to discrimination. The foreignness of their languages, accent, and citizenship is likely to become an obstacle to socioeconomic integration. Thinking more clearly about ‘context of situation and context
of culture’ in which languages are used, Pratt (1991: 34) uses the concept of ‘contact zones’. These are social spaces where cultures and thus their languages meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power. In the everyday sociolinguistic practices of individuals and their construction of ‘selves’, human beings struggle to create or find social space for themselves.

2.13 Hybridity of immigrants’ identities

The term ‘hybridity’ is today at the core of the multifaceted debates in the fields of social anthropology, human geography, cultural studies and theories of migrations or people’s displacement. The idea of (socio)linguistic hybridity is rooted in Bakhtin’s (1984) work. Bakhtin uses the term ‘hybridisation’ to refer to an encounter between two different linguistic systems or the mixture of two languages. This mixture is seen as the feature of the historical evolution of all languages. The idea of language hybridity can be applied to culture and ethnic groups, particularly in the context of immigration. It is ‘endemic to all migrations of people’ (Ahmad 1995: 18) and creates the cross-fertilisation of cultures and languages. For their survival, the selected families have to incorporate some cultural aspects of the new land, which, as Carrasquillo (1991) argues, lead to new blended cultural patterns.

Luke and Luke (1998: 21) define identity in terms of the locus, or the place where immigrants share their living space with the host community. Immigrant families have to live in the languages and culture of the host nation, thus leading to the culturally ‘hybrid’ or ‘diasporic’ identity. In SA the new way of life can impact on the children’s homeland values and parenting immigrant families may be caught between the strict discipline of their homeland culture and the childrearing practices of their host country. South Africa has a powerful infrastructure led by English-speaking media: newspapers, radio and television dominated by the American way of life. With exposure to English-speaking media and education in English, immigrant children often become unwilling to speak homeland languages (Carliner 2000).
2.14 Language learning

Researchers such as Baker (2000) assume that parameters such as age at the time of immigration, academic level, gender, motivation and investment are important factors in second language acquisition. Language acquisition involves affective issues such as motivation and (Norton 2000; Krashen 1982). In the context of the family, motivation and confidence are rooted in the need and desire of individuals to communicate within their families and in the world around them. Norton (2000), drawing on Spolsky (1989), gives three factors that facilitate the acquisition of second language by immigrants in the natural environment.

Firstly, she argues that the more a person is exposed to and practises a language, the more he/she will become fluent in it. Secondly, the fluent speakers of the target language have to offer him/her access to their social networks and opportunities to practise the language. Thirdly, the host society must be open and stimulating and provide a range of contextual cues for understanding language use. I agree with Norton (2000) that to acquire a second language in an informal milieu, immigrants need both instrumental and integrative motivation. They also need ‘investment’ (Peirce 1995: 9), i.e. socially and historically constructed relations of immigrants to the host society's language and their desire to learn to speak it. It helps to acquire a range of symbolic and material resources, to increase their cultural capital (i.e. knowledge and skills) and to access unattainable resources (see Norton 2000).

In a setting, people may acquire language/s in a number of ways. Children, in particular, may be 'compound bi-multilinguals', i.e. people who acquire two or more languages from birth and are able to use them interchangeably in a given situation (Ervin-Tripp 1975) or separately in particular circumstances. They may also be coordinate bi-/multilinguals, i.e. speak one language (first language) and later acquire (an)other language/s. Heugh (1995), for example, calls this learning ‘additive’ multilingualism. In contrast, a policy connected with feelings of inferiority and or undervaluation and situations in which indigenous languages are being replaced by the dominant language
is referred to as ‘subtractive or transitional’ bilingualism (Heugh 1995; Ngugi wa Thiong’o 1986; Lambert 1983). However, a multilingual need not be able to speak all languages with equal proficiency because of the lack of the provision of equal opportunities to each language.

2.15 Relationships and children’s identity negotiation in school

Peer relations are essential to immigrant children’s adjusting to the new learning milieu. Peshkin (1991) posits that children of immigrants face stereotyping in school, and that the process of identity negotiation involves the compromise of primary selves and feelings. Displaying sameness and having a common language may be important elements for identity negotiation among schoolchildren. In contrast, any feature ‘making a child different from the other is used for bullying’ (La Fontaine 1991: 13). Kent (2002) contends that ethnic groups need to have an ‘Other’ from whom they can contrast. The relationships between the immigrant learners and their local peers may take the form of what Cummins (1996: 15) calls ‘coercive relations of power’ or ‘collaborative relations of power’. In speaking of ‘coercive relations of power’, Cummins refers to the exercise of power by the dominant group to the detriment of a subordinated group. Such behaviour is reflected in and shaped through the use of a particular form of discourse legitimating the inferior status accorded to the immigrant families and their children, which Ryan (1972) calls ‘blaming the victim’.

In the wider South African society coercive relations of power operate to maintain the division of material resources and status. In contrast, ‘collaborative relations of power’ operate on the assumption that power is generated in interpersonal and/or intergroup relations. In this case the power relationship develops confidence and motivation in the immigrant learner to succeed and thus participate completely by developing a secure sense of self. Jones (1995) has found that stereotyping is the source of conflict in schools. It is claimed that rejected students may acquire deficits in self-esteem as a result of negative perceptions and low expectations of them by teachers (Spindler & Spindler 1989: 14). Trueba (1989: 41) adds that cultural change can also adversely
place self-esteem in jeopardy. But for De Avila (1986), intelligence and access to opportunity can also influence the academic performance of multilingual immigrant children.

Peshkin (1991) and Jones (1995) believe that friendships within the schools emerging as a result of any school organization tend to break ethnic barriers among learners. Similarly, Hartup (1992) adds that ‘friendships are unique contexts for transmitting information about self, others and the society’ (p. 187) in which one lives. Friendship acts as the immigrant learner's social support network in that it offers emotional and cognitive resources for his/her adaptation to the new setting, and his/her initiation into the local medium of learning and way of life. But friendship also depends upon a number of arbitrary criteria, defining inclusion in or exclusion from the insiders’ circle. The consequence of attempts to make friends may be acceptance or rejection. Friendship with people of the same ethnic background is viewed as ‘a social context supportive of cultural and other expressions of ethnicity’ (Alba 1990: 234).

Consequently, marginalisation at school can also have implications for classroom performance. Harklau (2000: 36) argues that immigrant learners who are continually being assigned stereotyping identities resist these constructions in favour of more complex subjectivities as they become gradually socialized into the new milieu. In fact, immigrant learners who want to assimilate or identify with members of the host society can be more successful than those who are concerned about retaining their original cultural identity. I agree with Ridge (2003: 1) that ‘life orientation as a learning area’ in the school curriculum can promote closeness among learners. These can thus live by such ‘democratic values as human dignity, freedom and equality’ (South African Constitution 1996, 39 (1) (a)).

In this chapter, I have discussed the relevant literature that underpins the research. In the next chapter, I attempt to provide the methodological frame that influenced the selection of research sites and participants as well as the data collection.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This research is a multiple case study which uses ethnographic-style data collection methods to answer the research questions (see Section 1.4). It is recognized that all methods are ways of asking questions that presume an underlying set of assumptions, a structure of relevance, and a form of rationality. In this chapter, I explain why this study fits a qualitative approach. I also show how I selected the families and or participants and how I collected, organised, and analysed my data. By means of observations and interviews, I explored the FLPs and language practices of four DRC families in their homes.

3.2 Case study research

This research uses qualitative methods of data collection. Silverman (1993: 23) defines qualitative research as a systematic inquiry that occurs in a natural setting, rather than in an artificially constructed one such as an experiment. This means that qualitative researchers attempt to understand actions and meanings in their social context (Bryman 1988; Hammersley 1990). In other words, the events, actions, norms, values are seen from the perspective of the people being investigated (Bryman 1988: 61). ‘Qualitative methods focus primarily on the kind of evidence (what people tell you, what people do) that will enable you to understand the meaning of what is going on’ (Gillham 2000: 10). But what people believe and say is not always what they really do. Qualitative methods have the advantage of field research, of which the main goal is to collect a wide range of data that is contextualised (Knobel and Lankshear 1999: 85). Thus, qualitative research is said to be ‘soft, flexible, subjective, political, case study, grounded’ (Silverman 2000: 2, citing Halfpenny 1979: 799).
Although qualitative research has the advantage of flexibility and field research, it is treated by some critics as a relatively minor methodology (Silverman 2000: 9). While flexibility allows the researcher to be innovative, field research is essentially a matter of immersing oneself in a naturally occurring set of events in order to gain firsthand knowledge of the situation (Silverman 2000: 9, citing Singleton et al 1988: 11). This study explores four cases of people’s language practices in their homes and seeks to answer specific ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions (Yin 1994).

Following Knobel and Lankshear (1999), a case study can be defined as ‘the intense, in-depth and detailed study (in terms of time-span and the details of data required) of a bounded phenomenon such as a classroom, a school, a social group, a family’ (p. 95). It necessarily involves field research. Context in case study research is seen as the sum of meaning-making, identity negotiation, and/or interactions. The context of this case study research is South African immigration. Therefore, this case study is a contextualised enquiry as it investigates language practices as they occur in four research immigrants’ homes in SA. The main purpose of a case study is to enable better understanding of a phenomenon and to make comparisons with similar cases with a view to transferring understanding and applying findings from one context to another (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 96).

A case study can be single (when it focuses on one instance) or multiple (when it investigates more than a single case for comparative purposes). The present study is a multiple case study as it explores the language policies of four DRC families in Johannesburg, the implications for their language practices, and their sense of identity in SA. I wanted to explore language practices in different immigrant families because there is no common language policy in all DRC immigrant families in South Africa. However, while single case studies enable direct focus, this is not so in multiple case studies, which disperse this focus on a number of cases and require a lot of time and effort. Additionally, despite the fact that this research is a multiple case study, generalizations cannot be made with regard to its findings (see Section 3.7).
Although case studies present some advantages, they often pose problems relating to issues such as validity, reliability, and representativeness (Bassey 1999; Knobel & Lankshear 1999; Freeman 1998; Yin 1994; Hitchcock & Hughes 1989). Validity or truth refers to the extent to which the materials gathered represent an accurate picture of the phenomenon being explored; reliability focuses on whether or not the data is the product of the techniques utilised (Hitchcock & Hughes 1989). In this study, the data actually comes from observations (and field notes) and interviews with the research participants. Representativeness addresses the issue of whether particular groups investigated represent wider groups. It should be noted that the selected research families are not intended to be representative of the broader DRC community.

It is claimed that all research is governed by questions of access to people, information and settings (Hitchcock & Hughes 1989: 58). In addition, immigration is experienced differently by different immigrant families. The following section discusses the selection and number of research participants and gives brief profiles of the research DRC immigrant families.

### 3.3 Research participants

#### 3.3.1 The sample

The issue of a study sample is often subject to criticism, in that it is likely to compromise the credibility of the research (see also Arber 1993). Debates on this question, however, provide no guidelines but give the researcher space to define the study sample, depending on the objectives of his or her project, and who or what is being explored. I chose a study sample in relation to the research aims. In other words, the number of participants and research families was dictated by the objectives of my study. It is argued that qualitative research studies utilize comparatively small samples and that they can provide useful insights into complex human and social phenomena in highly specific situations (Deacon et al 1999). The research sample is constituted of, among others, participants who agreed to take part in the study (Section 3.3.2). After collecting family data, it became easy to establish the exact number of participants since this was
done on a site-to-site basis. Fifty-two people took part in the research project. In the research families: from the DRC, there were 29 parents and children; in the schools, there were 6 principals, 7 teachers and 10 South African students. In all, there were 38 focal participants and 14 secondary participants. But how were these participants selected?

3.3.2 Research participants

1. Research families

This study was undertaken in families rather than in the general DRC community in South Africa because families are seen as key channels through which ethnic values, beliefs, norms and knowledge are transmitted to younger generations, especially in the context of immigration. Language is the very means of communication of those values. Parents are language policy initiators while children abide by parental decisions on language choice in the home. Family members are considered the main research participants as they use languages to communicate within the household. They are middle-class families, of whom three live in Berea and Yeoville, which used to be middle-class suburbs in Johannesburg, but no longer are (see Section 3.3.3).

Four families, each with a different language policy, were chosen. Other criteria for the selection of the families were: (i) the consent of both parents and access to their homes, (ii) the parents’ consent to access their focal children’s schools, (iii) both parents’ interest in the project and their trust in me as a researcher, and (iv) the level of education of the parents. To find families, the first points of contact were DRC churches and nationals who could introduce the researcher to some immigrant families. Access to these churches and families was then supported by the Information Letter (see Appendix A) which explains the research. I approached some DRC churches where I met some fellow countrymen and told them of my project. They introduced me to some DRC immigrant families and made appointments for me. On the day of the appointment, they traveled with me to their homes and introduced me to the parents. This resulted in productive or co-operative parent-researcher relationships, in some homes. In other families I was perceived as an ‘intruder’.
The selection of research participants was dictated by the research aims and the research questions. Overall, ten DRC immigrant families were approached. After analysis of the preliminary data, it was clear that six out of ten families did not fulfill the selection criteria set above; some even chose not to participate in the research. After a preliminary investigation of language policies in the ten families, I noticed the following different patterns of language policy:

- English-only policy;
- French-only policy;
- French-Tshiluba policy; and
- Multilanguage French, Lingala, Kipende, Kikongo and English policy.

These are only illustrative of the language policies encountered in DRC families in Johannesburg. Language policies in non-elite families were not investigated. The profiles below give some background information about the research families, obtained during my pre-fieldwork contacts. In terms of generation (G), the family members are grouped into 2 or 3 generations (depending on the family) referred to as G1 (First Generation), TG (Transitional Generation) and G2 (Second Generation). G1 refers to parents and those children who had primary schooling in the homeland languages in the DRC before arriving in South Africa. They also display knowledge of and (some) linguistic fluency in certain DRC languages and thus share some sociocultural experiences of the homeland. While the parents are constructed as adult G1, the oldest children are defined as young G1 because they are their children. Nevertheless, young G1 participants are likely to face the same social challenges of immigration as the adult G1 participants but to a different degree. In contrast, TG (Transitional Generation) refers to youngest children who are identified as such because, although born in the DRC, they had no primary schooling in the DRC and are likely to confront the resettlement and language realities differently. G2 participants are those children who were born in SA; they have no mental image of their parents’ homeland. The background information about each research family reads as follows (see also Appendix I: 354).
**English-only family:** Parents of this family come from different language groups. The father who holds an MA (UK) is a qualified translator-interpreter and a teacher of English. He arrived in South Africa in 1994. In the DRC he was also a director at Kinshasa Centre for Theoretical and Applied Linguistics. The mother holds a secondary school certificate and is self-employed. She is (and was) involved in a small business. The family has 4 sons whose ages range from 9 to 17 and who, together with their mother, arrived in South Africa in 1997 to join the father. All the children in this family are DRC-born, three are first generation and one is transitional generation. The family lives in Brixton.

**French-only family:** Like the English-only family, parents of this family come from different ethnic language groups. The father, who was a lecturer in French literature in the DRC, is a full-time doctoral student in SA. He arrived in South Africa in 1990, and the rest of the family in 1993. The mother, a former businesswoman in the DRC, manages her house and sells beer and soft drinks. She completed primary school, and 4 years of secondary school. The family has 7 children (3 daughters and 4 sons) ranging in age between 2 and 17 years: three are South African-born and thus second generation, and four DRC-born (of which three are first-generation and one, transitional generation). They live in Berea.

**French-Tshiluba family:** In contrast to the English-only and French-only families, this family has contracted an intra-ethnic marriage. The mother, a lawyer by profession, is the founder of a small non-government organization (NGO) and is now practising in an Attorneys’ Office. The father, a teacher by profession, is a full-time Honours (food science) student. He arrived in South Africa in 1992. They have 3 children: one daughter (DRC-born and transitional generation) aged 9 and two sons aged 7 and 5 (South African-born and thus second-generation). The mother and her TG child arrived in SA in 1993 like the French-only family. They live in Berea.

**Multilanguage family:** Parents in this family are also from the same tribal group as the French-Tshiluba household. The father holds a BA Honours degree (International
Relations) and has a trained pilot’s certificate from the USA) and vast experience of flying abroad. He arrived in SA in 1991. The mother holds a secondary certificate and is a housewife. Both parents have been running their own small business since 1995. The family has 7 children (4 daughters and 3 sons) whose ages range between 5 and 18. Of these children, five were born in the DRC (three are first-generation and two, transitional generation), and two are South African-born or second-generation. The rest of the family joined the father in SA in 1995. The family lives in Yeoville.

I was positioned as a friend to the father (and thus called father) in the English-only family because of my previous and current relationships with the father (a former University colleague and friend). In the French-only family I was seen as the father’s brother (in the African sense, i.e. a man from the same area/province of origin as the father). I was seen as a fellow countryman in the French-Tshiluba family, and a tribal brother and a son-in-law (i.e. their son-in-law’s big brother) in the Multilanguage family. Despite the advantages associated with these different positionings, I was viewed with suspicion and was not given access to all the children, especially in the French-Tshiluba family.

2. The focal children
These were chosen only in the selected families. The main criterion was the age of the children which makes them able to understand and answer research questions. In each research family, I considered the eldest child and the youngest child of school-going age, who were likely to understand and answer the interview questions. Since the English-only family consists of boys only, I also focused on the second child, a boy in the French-only family, to obtain an equal number of boys and girls. The following table lists all the research children and highlights the focal ones in bold font.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Possible research children</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-only</td>
<td>Tevora</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jemo</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kisi</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaady</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-only</td>
<td>Cloclo</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peja</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seno</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lepri</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-Tshiluba</td>
<td>Litshi</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bati</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilanguage</td>
<td>Firo</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fafi</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patu</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatou</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 0: Research children

3. Teachers and pairs of focal children
Schools are places where immigrant children acquire literacy in the dominant medium of the host nation. They are important to explore, to ascertain the possible effects of the FLPs on the children’s schooling. The selection of the schools was influenced by the selection of the focal children in each selected family. I traveled to the schools to meet with the principals, to present the Letters of Information (see Appendix B) and Informed Consent (see Appendix C) signed by the parents. I also made the aim of my project explicit and defined my role in the schools. Despite the fact that I did all this, in some schools I was still seen as a ‘spy’ or an envoy of the Department of Home Affairs and thus was denied access. In schools, every contact had to be negotiated with someone in authority over the research participants. The principals, teachers and pairs of two children from each family were selected to enable me to gain insight into the effects of the family’s language practices at home on the children’s socialisation and schooling. The following section deals with data collection methods.
3.4 Data gathering methods

3.4.1 Methods
By its nature, a case study draws on a number of methods in gathering data, namely observations, interviews and informal conversations, and artifacts, which theorists like Denzin and Lincoln (2000, 1994), Gillham (2000), Bassey (1999), Flick (1998), Freeman (1998) and Patton (1990) recommend for such a study. One reason for using multiple methods of data collection was to increase the ‘trustworthiness’ of the findings. From a theoretical and methodological perspective, the study sought the kinds of data that would answer the research questions (Patton 1990:187).

3.4.2 Observations in families and field notes

Preparing for field research
‘Conducting qualitative research, however, does not only mean defining sites as well as describing participants and specific ways to gather and analyse data, but also ‘mediating intrusion and defining the fieldworker’s role in order to accommodate behaviour and create the interpersonal relationships, conducive to effective and manageable fieldwork’ (Kamuangu 2001: 34). It is argued that fieldworkers enter the field with their own emic preoccupations of behaviours and cognitive categories that can impact upon on the fieldwork process (Freeman 1998; Holmes 1998; Van Maanen 1995; Bell et al 1993; Pedersen 1993; Cameron et al 1992).

In this study, any visit to the research families was subject to prior appointments made with the fathers as heads of the household in person or on the phone. In preparing families for the observations during the first days of contact and familiarisation, I paid frequent visits to the participants’ homes in order to become accepted as an integral part of their life and offered to teach or help any child with language or literacy difficulties. This strategy received favourable responses from some parents whose children needed assistance. It was during the early stage of the observation period that I developed an observation schedule (Appendix E). Parents were also advised not to
inform children of my project. Observation time applied differently to each research family, depending upon the availability of family members, the day and time of the meetings. This took account of the time when most family members gathered together.

I consider observations and field notes a useful way to gather information about family language happenings. In addition, observations and field notes are likely to confirm or contradict the participants’ responses to some interview questions and to capture some aspects of linguistic behaviour that the interviewer cannot obtain from the respondents. In other words, people mis-report their language behaviour, and their language practices can thus be authentically recorded in natural settings through observations that are seen as one of the main sources of information in a case study using ethnographic-style data collection methods. It is recognized that data collection begins as early as the researcher has identified the sites and entered the field.

**Conducting observations**

Actual family observations were conducted from July 2002 to October 2002. Observations in each family were conducted three times per week (per family) distributed as follows: during two to three afternoons shortly after children had returned from school and one afternoon at weekends. It should be noted that despite the fixed timetable agreed by the researcher and parents, family observations were often renegotiated; I had to check the school calendars and contact school authorities to negotiate the time that suited teachers and children. The total number of observation hours per family was 48 hours spread over 4 weeks, sufficient for me to gain evidence of families’ language practices.

I conducted a month of intensive ethnographic-style observations in the home, using a tape-recorder in each family. The first week of observation took place without any tape-recording or note-taking. While sitting down and sometimes conversing with parents, I followed the family members’ interactions and memorised the interesting exchanges which I later recorded as journalistic notes. The subsequent weeks were more fully recorded using a tape-recorder and participants got used to seeing it. The recorder was
also introduced to children as the instrument likely to be utilized to record their voices. However, the use of such data collection tools as tape-recorder and the fieldworker’s frequent visits to the participants’ homes are likely to condition the participants under investigation and to alter the quality of data being gathered. To make children feel comfortable and avoid frustration, I sometimes recorded their voices and allowed them to listen back to them.

In the families, I tried to capture essential, repeated language practices, i.e. what they did with language in their families, using an observation schedule (Appendix E). Practically, I looked at the following aspects. Firstly, how did they interact with the researcher, in what circumstances, and where? What cultural symbols appear to be useful for understanding the relationship between culture and identity in the diaspora? Secondly, who uses what languages with whom, when, where and why? Thirdly, what opportunities for DRC language practices (e.g. DRC music, films, storytelling) are available to family members, and how are children apprenticed into parents’ language use or how do they resist opportunities to speak DRC home languages? Finally, how do family members communicate with one another, or avoid communicating? The observational process then focused on whether there is any difference between how participants organize their activities, especially children in small groups.

**Identity markers: artifacts and symbolic images**

Identity markers are the material traces of people’s everyday lives (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 98), and they bear particular meanings to the participants. It is recognized that for a case study researcher any evidence is of value. I therefore listed all artifacts I came across: bibles or books in French or in any other language, music, videocassettes, art, photos, flags, food, and clothing for each family were likely to symbolize, or bear some ties with the homeland, i.e. as signs of their perceived ethnic identity in South Africa. I also sought to obtain school reports of the research children to gain an insight into the effects of the family’s language practices at home on the children’s socialisation and schooling. All the above artifacts constituted important elements to understand how the different members of immigrant families perceive their ethnicity in South Africa.
3.4.3 Semi-structured interviews in families and schools

Preparing for interviews
It is claimed that interviews are key sources of data sources (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 58), in that they allow access to the participants’ opinions, feelings, views, and unveil the assumptions that underlie their family language policies. In this study I used semi-structured interviews rather than (un)structured interviews because of their flexibility. This allowed me to be innovative.

In designing the interview questions and attempting to understand the research field, I drew some useful insights from Lai (2001) about language use and identity of Hong Kong students, based on their attitudes to Putonghua and English; from Ntombeni (1998) on African children’s attitudes to English and African languages in South Africa; and from Armour (2001) on the role of language in the development of identity of some students learning Japanese as a second or additional language after the age of 11. For second language acquisition (in immigration) and identity negotiation in a bi-multilingual milieu, I drew on Spolsky (1989). Families’ life histories also offer information that may establish some links between participants’ family language policies and their identities. Questions involved such categories as views/opinions, perceptions, beliefs and values. In this regard, the works of Miller (2000), Thompson (1997) and Norton (2000) were of importance to me. The final version of the interview schedules was based on my observations of the research families.

Prior to conducting any interview in the families, I had to negotiate the time and day of the interviews with parents, especially the father. This already shows unequal power relations in the family, between the husband and wife. Permission was also requested for the use of a tape-recorder during the process. To motivate the participants to cooperate, the estimated duration of interviews was decided to be 30 to 40 minutes for each parent and 20 – 25 minutes for each child, in families, and 30 minutes for teachers and 20 minutes for children in schools. Since semi-structured interviews are conversations with a purpose, interview questions were memorized by the researcher with a view to giving the interaction a conversational character. I decided to interview
each family member (parents and children) and each principal and teacher separately but to use focus groups for the children's peers at school as negotiated. For ethical purposes, I also invited the parents (or one of them) and teachers to attend the interaction.

Before interviewing the teachers and students, I contacted the school authorities. Approaching the principals is the first and crucial step for a researcher prior to gaining access to teachers and children (Walker 1980: 49). I also negotiated with teachers, i.e. I asked for their permission, to interview South African classmates and to tape-record the interviews with a view to capturing what these children and the teachers and principals think of their foreign peers and learners who do not speak their South African languages and how they perceive them. Because I was a father, professional teacher and mature researcher, I could to some extent identify with the teachers' life and teaching experience. The usual procedure was first to interview the principal, then teachers, and finally learners.

The interviews (Interview Schedule: Appendix C) in the families tended to be on such themes as: (i) general language use (both DRC and South African), (ii) language and ethnic identity, (iii) family language policy and perceptions, (iv) language and power in relation to identity. Questions in these categories provided an overview of various aspects of immigrants' language practices, perceived language policies, and the implications of these. The questions to the focal family members were based upon these issues: (i) life histories of selected families (specifically, parents), including past language policies, (ii) immigrants' knowledge of languages, i.e. what languages they speak and how well, (iii) their opinions or values in relation to different languages, (iv) experience, or how they are perceived by the host society, (v) feelings, i.e. what they actually feel, their emotional responses to life in SA, (vi) their present identities, i.e. a sense of themselves in South Africa, and of their futures. In addition, the interviews with the children sought to understand their attitudes towards their parents' languages, particularly in relation to their future. I also looked at any form of support from immigrant parents that helps their children to use home languages.
I sought to obtain information from the principals, teachers, and two peers about each focal immigrant child in the schools. The interviews with principals sought to understand school language policies, the procedure of identifying immigrant children and language support to foreign children. With teachers the questions were based on their attitudes towards immigrant children’s languages in schools, foreign children’s individual academic performance in using English as the medium of instruction, and their use of English and African languages in schools. I also attempted to understand how immigrant children are perceived within school structures. The interviews with local children focused on their relationships with their foreign peers, on how they perceive their home languages and on how local children are in turn perceived by their foreign peers.

**Conducting interviews**

The interviews were conducted in two places: (i) at home with parents and children separately and (ii) at school with principals and teachers and two South African peers of the respective children separately. Questions were divided into different sets depending on the kind of participants being interviewed (see Appendix C).

In the interviews conducted at home, I first interviewed the children, then the mothers and finally, the fathers. This order helped me to capture children’s opinions about language/s in order to reshape some questions to the parents. In the interviews with immigrant families, the participants were allowed to code-switch for easy expression. I also tried to clarify some statements using the preferred language of the interviewee and make interviewees feel comfortable, using jokes or smiles.

In the interviews with principals and schoolteachers, I sought to understand whether or not school structures contribute to the integration of immigrant children. The other issues included the school language policy, children’s inter-ethnic relationships and the language practices of immigrant learners in schools. With local peers in schools I used pairs of children as this was recommended by the teachers in order to save time and enable children to speak naturally. Pairs ‘can provide rich and detailed data’ (Denzin &
Lincoln 2000: 652). In addition, this format is flexible. Although pairs offer some advantages over individual interviews, it also has some limitations because of the group dynamics. The interaction is dominated by only one person, and the interviewer must encourage all participants to speak, and obtain responses from two participants in order to ensure full participation of all of them. It should be noted that the interviews in the homes as well as in the schools were tape-recorded as this strategy is less intrusive than video-recording.

**Informal conversations**

Informal conversations with research participants are likely to produce useful insights for data analysis and were recorded in field notes. The use of a tape-recorder in any site was negotiated. I carried out conversations in homes during my observation and, after the interviews. At school I conducted interviews with principals, teachers, and learners during break. Some teachers did not want to be tape-recorded but provided useful information. I then prompted relaxed informal interviews and conversations for about 10 minutes. These allowed me to obtain some useful information which a few teachers did not reveal during the interviews.

**Family life histories**

I define life histories as an active construction of the participants' view of their life and language(s) at that particular moment and how they choose to describe this life and language to the interviewer (see also Miller 2000; Thompson 1997). In the biographical perspective, questions of positioning, voice, difference, language, story and ethnicity become central to the research data collection and data analysis. Before the interviews, members of the researched families were invited to answer questions using whatever language they felt comfortable in and I was proficient in and to feel free to code-switch. In addition to English and French, I am proficient in three DRC indigenous languages: Kipende, Kikongo, Lingala and understand two others, Tshiluba and Swahili.

The biographical insights helped me to understand the relationship between multilingual practices and ethnicity in terms of the perceived access to the social and material
networks of the host society. The relations between, on the one hand, the immigrant and the host society and, on the other hand, immigrants' home languages and English, are not ideologically neutral. In the history of the meeting of two or more cultures, the dominant or more powerful culture often (if not always) absorbs the less powerful. Thus, by drawing upon family biographical insights, I attempted to unveil the interplay between the researched participants and the wider social structure in which they are embedded. I utilized the biographical perspective partly to find out the opportunities that were available to the families in the past and those that are (no longer) available in the present, and how those opportunities and constraints have influenced or still influence family language choices and practices. The organization and analysis of data is discussed in Section 3.5.

3.5 Data description and analysis

Data analysis in qualitative research is a process of making sense of, or meaning from the data. The subsequent sub-sections discuss the strategies utilized in the organization, analysis and interpretation of data.

3.5.1 Transcripts of recorded materials

Firstly, all data (observation and interview) were recorded and transcribed in the order in which the interaction took place and following the speaker-respondent strategy, i.e. the question-and-answer principle, modeled on Yin (1994). Such a format allows readers of the thesis to do their own cross-case analysis by following the same question across all the cases. Secondly, observation data were recorded in a small diary or on any paper available but, discreetly, and later transcribed, together with the researcher's comments. Thirdly, the interview data were recorded twice, using notes and a tape-recorder. This technique was intended to prevent any loss, of or damage to the recorded data. Any important elements noticed during the interview and related comments were also transferred into the data book, usually in the evenings. In transcribing, I went through the recordings and notes, comparing responses with a view to not omitting some ideas.
3.5.2 Data analysis and interpretation strategies

It is claimed that qualitative methods are essentially descriptive and interpretive, focusing mainly on evidence; that is, what people tell you and what they actually do (Gillham 2000: 10). In an attempt to provide clear description and analysis of the data collected, I developed a procedure which helped me draw comparisons from all elements described. I separately described the data from each research site in order to highlight specific features. Researchers such as Bassey (1999), Freeman (1998) and Yin (1994) suggest that a case study can be examined from different perspectives. Using the case study research and more than one source of data, I worked inductively from the data collected from the research sites. This helped me develop a theory that is grounded in the evidence gathered, together with Spolsky’s (2004) framework. It helped me to get patterns of practices, matches and mismatches, beliefs and themes for comparative purposes. Spolsky’s work which was used to define a ‘family language policy’ (see Section 1.1, Chapter 1) has also been adapted to frame the data analysis. His work suggests the importance of external forces, power, choice, regulation and identity in the choice and enactment of policy. I have, therefore, used those categories to interrogate the data and to shape the analysis in the chapters that follow.

Each family is analysed separately in chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7. In addition, each chapter was organised on the basis of the main themes (context: external forces; power, choice and regulation; identity) that emerged from a preliminary grounded analysis of the data. The different themes constitute the main sections of each chapter, with a view to uncovering specific features of each research site for comparative purposes. Each chapter starts with an introduction based on the comparison of the families that is likely to give the reader a quick overview of how the choice of a FLP interfaces with questions of context, power, choice and regulation and identity formation in the diaspora. The transcription of recorded interviews and conversations in the question-and-answer format also enabled me to make cross-family comparisons. This technique provided a picture for cross-analysis by following the same question or theme across all research sites and by drawing materials for interpretation in relation to each theme or sub-theme.
The relevant literature in Chapter Two helped to support my understanding and interpretation of the analysed materials.

In general, the method used in the analysis is descriptive, analytical and interpretive. In each Chapter, after the introduction, I provide a brief profile of the family (e.g. generation, geographic location, date of arrival in SA, age). In addition, immigrant participants’ (especially parents’) accounts or life stories and social and linguistic experiences at home and other contexts in the DRC as well as in South Africa constituted a lead-in to data analysis and interpretation, following Armour (2001), Smolicz et al (2001) and Norton (2000). The participants’ statements were analysed with a view to identifying arguments, contradictions, and consistent patterns in their language practices. This strategy was aimed at making the descriptions more nuanced.

In analysing the reasons for FLPs in SA, I drew on Ager (2001) and others (see Section 2.7.2). To understand the inter-ethnic relationships in the schools, I relied upon insights from such researchers as Cummins (1996), Jones (1995), Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1991), and Peshkin (1991) (Section 2.16). To analyse and interpret the language practices of the research families in relation to code-switching and power control, I employed Scollon and Scollon’s (2003) concept of geosemiotics or the use of language in a certain physical environment or emplacement, and in relation to certain events, or ‘platform events’ (e.g. watching TV together, eating, playing) (Section 2.9.2). These different organizational and analytical techniques cluster around aspects of the grounded theory approach. This is a gradual process of abstraction in which I had to proceed from empirical observations to abstract concepts, and to unpack the developing themes (or sub-themes) and concepts from the concrete data. I dealt with these elemental activities of the grounded approach that make up data analysis by coding and naming, grouping (i.e. reassembling the named parts of the data), displaying the data in order to find patterns of practices or beliefs, similarities and differences of practice, and relationships. An interpretation then proceeded from the data description and analysis, systematic comparisons and contrasts of research sites and participants’ views and practices within the same site and across the sites. Based
on the similarities and differences in language practices and policies across the research sites, the findings are discussed in Chapter 8.

3.6 Ethical issues

Before conducting observations and interviews in the research sites, I applied for and obtained ethics clearance (Appendix D) from the Ethics Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand. During the observations, interviews, and conversations, I was guided by Cameron et al's (1992) ideas of how to behave in fieldwork. In addition, Informed Consent (Appendix B) was sought from parents, school authorities, and teachers before observations and interviews commenced. I explained my interests to the prospective research families and schools. I also negotiated and renegotiated the research process and paid frequent visits to the research families with a view to 'immersing' myself in those families and getting to know them (see also Holmes 1998). The entry to research children's schools was also supported by the informed consent, signed by parents and counter-signed by the school authorities. Before interviews took place, an agenda of topics to be covered was explained to research participants who felt free to ask for clarification in any language spoken by the researcher. All the data collected from the research sites were treated in such a way so as to ensure anonymity, moral integrity, dignity and privacy of research sites and participants. To uphold these values, I utilised pseudonyms and coding in the process of data organisation and analysis.

3.7 Research limitations

Although the research provides useful insights into language and ethnicity in immigration, generalisations should not be made from the limited number of research families. Ethnicity and cultural differences or attitudes among the research families and other ethnic groups and in schools may change, depending on the length of stay and the improvement of inter-ethnic relationships in the host society and the host country's
general politics of integration of immigrants. Additionally, each immigrant family is a distinct social unit.

Secondly, all the selected families are elite families (see details in Section 3.3.5) and thus defined as ‘middle-class’. Not all families (both elite and non-elite) contacted at the early stage of this project agreed to give the researcher access to their homes. Thirdly, most family observations were negotiated (over and over) with parents. These knew in advance that they would be visited or observed and could adjust their attitudes and language practices accordingly. Finally, access to one school site and some learners, and one immigrant child was denied to the researcher, thereby impacting on the collection of some important information. This research project involved a limited number of DRC immigrant families. It is, however, possible that there are a number of immigrant families in which language policies and practices similar to those of the investigated DRC immigrant families are experienced in other parts of South Africa.

3.8 Reflection on the fieldwork

In this section I reflect on my field research in families and schools. It should be noted that the data consisted mainly of in-home observation and interviews in the families and schools. Although these two sets of data were not equally successful, they provide an adequate picture of language practices in the selected immigrant families. It is also acknowledged that fieldwork does not occur in a vacuum but is an interpretive process governed by a number of factors such as the fieldworker’s personality, skills and experience, research orientation, and theoretical perspectives (e.g. Holmes 1998; Agar 1995; Kulick & Wilson 1995; Van Maanen 1995; Bell et al 1993). In particular, Holmes (1998) maintains that a researcher’s personal traits like gender and ethnicity play an important role in guiding and assisting the fieldwork process, especially with children. The ways in which the selected families constructed me (see Section 3.4) helped me to move easily and to establish good relationships, particularly with the children and to facilitate data collection.
It is also argued that gender influences one’s ability to move freely through research sites or limits one’s ability to interact with participants, and that teachers of young children are not usually males (Kauppiron-Toropainen & Lammi 1993; Cohen 1990). In my case I believe that gender in particular played little or no role in the field process or data gathering. Rather I believe that the strategies I took to approach families and schools produced positive interactions. There is recognition that the frequent visits of a researcher may influence the participants’ behaviours and thus alter the quality of data being gathered. Although I came to establish a good rapport with families, the explanation of my project and the roles the participants were expected to play might have caused them to modify their attitudes and thus behave accordingly. Similarly, teachers and school children may have been prepared by the principals to respond to the interview questions in a certain manner. In addition, language practices and cultural ideologies of school systems cannot be generalized because the research schools are only illustrative of the school system in South Africa, and each school has a different culture.

I can conclude that field research which is an individual experience requires flexibility in gaining access to the research sites and approaching the participants. All field expectations are likely not to be met because there often is a difference between anticipation and in-field reality, i.e. a researcher’s perception of the participants and their actual behaviours. In addition, the researcher is not fully trusted. Despite some difficulties encountered in the fieldwork and some limitations, this research helped me to increase my field knowledge and to obtain useful information.
CHAPTER FOUR: ENGLISH-ONLY FAMILY

4.1 Introduction

The parents of the English-only family come from different DRC ethnic language groups: Bemba and Kiluba. Both parents are fluent in Swahili and French. In the DRC they decided to use French as the family language because of the high status of French in the DRC. They migrated to South Africa in search of a better standard of living; for this reason they can be described as voluntary economic migrants. The father is an English teacher and interpreter by profession. This, in addition to his perception of English as the language of power and prestige in SA, resulted in his decision to establish an English-only policy for interaction at home. This choice of English is consistent with the family’s commitment to staying in SA and the father’s view that English is important for the children’s schooling. In contrast to the other three immigrant families, this family settled in a South African neighbourhood, away from the DRC community. They nevertheless maintain ties with their ethnic and national identities through their active participation in a DRC church. Compared to the other research families, the English-only family is the most financially stable and the most socially integrated. Despite experiencing xenophobia, no one in this family desires to return to the DRC. They are the only family where everyone is content to stay in South Africa and believes that their knowledge of English enables other global opportunities.

The analysis of the data that follows enables us to understand how the choice of an English-only family language policy interfaces with questions of context (the external forces that effect choices), power (how choices are made, regulated, enacted) and identity formation in SA (see Section 1.1).
4.2 Context: External forces

4.2.1 Life accounts, migration motives and geographic location

This English-only family comprises parents, four sons and a daughter\(^1\) who live as a nuclear family in Brixton, Johannesburg. The parents come from different ethnic language groups: Kiluba and Bemba. The four focal research participants are coded as Finku (father), Anaka (mother), Tevora (eldest son) and Shaady (youngest son). The family members arrived in South Africa at different times and differ in terms of age, educational level, profession and settlement history, as summarised in Table 1 (Appendix I).

Leaving one’s own country of birth for another is often a matter of choice and subject to careful thought, especially where the choice is ‘voluntary’. Finku, for example, was asked to give a short account of his life and the rationale behind his emigration (Interviews: Appendix G):

> After my first University degree, I was an English teacher at High School in Lubumbashi for four years and then became a researcher at Kinshasa Centre for Theoretical and Applied Linguistics (CELTA) as Head of English Section for 10 years. After my MA in UK, I taught English at the British Embassy ‘English Language Centre’ for three years while carrying on my duties at the CELTA and teaching English at the Intercontinental Hotel for two years. This was a way to survive. Because of high inflation rate, economic collapse, political instability and educated people’s despair to live a normal life, I left the country to find a place where I could achieve my dreams. I first wanted to do my PhD and thus do more research on material development, write books. But I went again into teaching ESL at the Language Centre where I have been teaching English for 7 years now. I am also a sworn translator-interpreter. (Interviews1.4: Appendix G)

This concurs with Funkhouser’s (2000) finding that family migrations to a host country are often initiated by one member: Finku was the main migration initiator and also the first individual to cross the national frontiers. He was driven out by financial hardship and the need to improve his family’s life. Finku’s decision is typical of many voluntary African migrants to South Africa. South African immigration literature (e.g. Bekker & Carlton 1996; Mattes et al 2000) has also suggested that poverty or lack of adequate

---

\(^1\) The term *daughter*, as introduced to me by mother, is related to African or Bantu tradition and more inclusive than the Western concept of ‘niece’. It symbolises family cohesion and thus unites and gathers together children born from brothers and sisters of the same family tree or lineage.
employment, as well as political and economic instability in the migrants’ home countries are common factors for migration to South Africa.

On her side, Anaka contends that she came to South Africa to join her husband or ‘papa’ (father), i.e. the 'head' of the family.

*I was a housewife but also involved in small things [i.e. business]. We left the country to join Papa (father). It is normal, isn’t it?* (Interviews1.4: Appendix G)

The paternalistic spirit symbolised by the term ‘Papa’ also places the father in a hierarchal position (Section 4.2). Carliner (2000) posits that ‘women are more likely than men to immigrate to join spouses rather than for economic reasons’ (p. 100). In contrast, children have no choice as to whether or not to go with their parents.

Within the context of this family, making the decision about which country to go to was also crucial. Finku describes how he came to South Africa:

*First of all, I wanted to attend the Book Fair in Harare where I was invited. Then I went to Malawi for two weeks via Zambia. After that, I went to Zimbabwe for the Book Fair and finally came to South Africa. In those countries I went through, I had easy communication because I could communicate in English. But when you speak English, people look at you and identify you as a stranger.* (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)

Finku’s destination was a ‘search-and-find’ strategy across Southern African countries. It is presumed that a combination of some ‘push and pull factors’ (Tollefson 1991) seem to have influenced the decision to move to South Africa. The ‘voluntary’ migration, the determination to improve family life and the job search in other countries may have been the driving force behind the choice of FLP in South Africa (Section 4.2.2). Since the family have clear plans and are committed to staying in SA, they have also made decisions about where to live that will enable them to integrate into the SA community rather than remain in a DRC enclave. Although many DRC nationals in Johannesburg live in Yeoville and Berea, the family chose a SA neighbourhood: Brixton. This is situated away from the usual ethnic geographic concentrations and residential locations of DRC immigrants, in Yeoville and Berea. The rationale behind living in the South African community emerges from Finku’s view that
Living in the ethnic residential areas offers no privacy to family life. Above all, I wanted my children to learn the language as quickly as possible. In practice, living away from our community helped my children to speak English without any homeland language interference, faster and even more easily than they could not if they were in those areas. They had no other choice than to communicate among themselves in English and with us, using English only in family. (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)

This purposeful choice of where to live governs the family’s language choices which in turn are consistent with their commitment to staying in the host land. As Funkhouser (2000) suggests, the level of English language proficiency also plays a demonstrated role in the process of spatial assimilation. As shown in Table 1 (Appendix I), Finku works in South Africa as a teacher of English and a sworn translator-interpreter. The residential location of this household has direct positive implications for the establishment and success of an English-only language policy in the home (Section 4.3). This does not prevent the family from experiencing discrimination.

4.2.2 The ‘Other’, language and ethnic boundaries

Also worth considering in inter-relationship is the host population’s overall valuations of and attitudes towards African immigrants. There is much evidence of rejection in the following excerpt:

Res. Have you ever experienced xenophobia or been personally affected by it?
Finku: Yeah, yeah. Xenophobia. Well, even in your own country, it may happen. But here it could happen with the police, especially at Home Affairs. When you speak English, they look at you as nothing; they call you names. But at the University, they don’t take you as a foreigner. It could happen when you are fighting for the same thing, e.g. job. Then they apply the ‘Affirmative Action’ where they say: ‘This position is reserved for South Africans only. Don’t raise your hand; it’s not your job’. It’s also a kind of xenophobia. People sometimes feel that the money you’re earning is not yours. Things you have are not your things, even though you are working legally. (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)

Anaka shares the same kind of everyday experience, reporting how she is treated:

Pas de considération, sans valeur. Pour eux, nous sommes venus arracher leurs boulots, toutes les bonnes choses. C’est pourquoi ils ne veulent pas des étrangers noirs en Afrique du Sud. [French]
(No consideration, useless. For them we came to grab their jobs, all good things. That’s why they don’t want foreign Africans in South Africa.) (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

These reasons are given as explanatory precursors for embracing ethnicity. Discrimination against African immigrants takes place in the ‘contact zones’ (Pratt 1991: 34), or public places in which these immigrants interact with members of the host
society and seek to access their social networks. Finku contends that his English accent betrays him as a non-South African citizen. From the immigrants’ viewpoint, affirmative action policies are seen as legal provisions for ‘job discrimination based on nationality and color’ (Alba 1990). These policies, which limit the employment of people other than South Africans, can be seen both as structural inequality and the effort to restrict African immigrants’ (voluntary and involuntary) access to socioeconomic resources and, therefore, to social power. Such restriction is compatible with Giddens’ (1987) view that citizenship rights reflect (unequal) relations of power.

In daily encounters, language is important in bridging relationships between the individual and the society (Bourdieu 1977). It is true that speaking the host nation’s language eases communication. But it cannot prevent an intruder from being identified as such. Finku argues:

*I think that English spoken in South Africa has got a local language accent. They clearly find out that you are not from there. They really think that you’re not speaking the way they sound because you don’t have a local African language accent. It’s clear that it makes a difference. They would say you come from somewhere else, although you speak English.*

(Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)

In South Africa, English has ethnic distinctiveness, in that its accent shows who the person is or where s/he comes from. This assumption is compatible with Morgan’s (1997) finding that accent reveals a speaker’s identity. Such a view concurs with Norton (1997), who argues that ‘every time people use oral language to address interlocutors, they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are’ (p. 410). Finku illustrates his first encounters in South Africa:

*It was not easy to communicate with South Africans at the grass roots level. There was this kind of animosity…They expect you to speak one of the indigenous languages. It’s the language they speak to you in. And when you can’t speak, they wonder why? Black people are expected to speak one of the African languages, wherever they come from. This is the perception they have.* (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)

Anaka puts forwards a similar view:

*Quand je suis arrivée ici, je ne pouvais pas sortir parce que je ne pouvais pas parler le zulu. C’est une façon d’éviter d’être identifiée comme une étrangère. Ici ils veulent seulement que vous parliez dans leurs langues partout. Si vous êtes noir, vous devez parler leurs langues. Comme ça, vous êtes accepté.* [French]

(When I came here, I could not go out because I was unable to speak isiZulu. It is a way
to avoid being identified as a foreigner. Here they only want you to speak their languages everywhere. If you are a black person, you have to speak their languages. That is the way to be accepted.) (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

This is a general perception in African communities that African ethnic groups are defined in terms of the languages they speak. But the assumption that all black people speak a South African indigenous language is misleading because all blacks living in South Africa are not South Africans. Additionally, constraining immigrants to use local African languages is evidence of an ethnic power struggle and linguistic domination (see Skutnab-Kangas 1988). In other words, local populations seek to gain power and control over foreign Africans through the strategies of inclusion and exclusion, utilising such boundary markers as ethnicity and language. It is evident that a lack of proficiency in a language impedes interaction with the host population. Agreeing wholeheartedly with Anaka, Finku reports a situation of personal unwelcome. This extract captures the feeling of how language is used to position foreign Africans.

Sometimes the police or someone else greets you in a local African language. You say a word. But the second time you don’t know, you get stuck, and they identify you as a stranger. They can also greet you in a fancy way, e.g. in French: ‘Bonjour’. And when you respond, they find out that you’re not from here. That’s why some foreign African immigrants get themselves into trouble. (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)

Clearly, using a language is not ideologically neutral (Ng & Bradac 1993: 3). In fact, Finku shows how language contributes to the struggle between ‘strangers’ and members of the host society. He feels that language is a verbal trap for a person to be identified either as someone-like-us or the ‘Other’, reflecting the unequal relations of power between insiders and outsiders. Undoubtedly, language is ‘the place where actual and possible forms of social and political consequences are defined and contested’ (Weedon 1997: 21), where immigrants detect xenophobia. This can reduce motivation or investment in learning local languages other than English.

Learning a local African language could also be a necessity, depending on how each research subject reacts in the family. A foreign African seeking integration is more likely to learn the local languages and adopt the local accent and way of life. This process of adoption has come to be known as acculturation (Mesthrie et al 2000). Socially speaking, the lack of knowledge of, or oral fluency in, local indigenous languages
generates frustration and fear of identification as a ‘stranger’. To explore this feeling of insecurity, I enquired as to whether Anaka felt free to speak her homeland languages anywhere. The response is:

(No. Not freely. You will get into trouble. You will be identified as a foreigner. On the bus or in public, I speak English.) (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

In her daily life in the host land Anaka hides her true ethnic identity and avoids being unmasked as an outsider. However, language is not the only means of differentiating between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (see also Lankshear 1998). Physical appearance and other related features like fashion and walking style (Akhtar 1999; Luke & Luke 1998) can also be used to define foreignness. Finku explains:

It is easy to identify a foreigner, not only by the way you speak but also by the way you walk, look at people, react. The body itself is enough for them to find out that you are not from here. … Dress, colour, fashion, hairstyle are taken into account.
(Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

Ethnically speaking, African attire often acts as ethnic self-definition. This view concurs with Barth (1969) who suggests that people seek ways to identify themselves in relation to others. In this regard, Anaka reports her own experience:

Après que je sois arrivée ici, j’étais debout à la porte avec mon bébé au dos, portant les pagnes. Quand un jeune homme m’a vue, il s’est écrié: ‘Kwere-kwere’. J’avais peur et suis rentrée vite dans la maison. Depuis ce jour-là j’ai peur de porter des pagnes. Ici les femmes portent des pantalons et grands essuie-mains, etc au lieu des pagnes. Ils vous identifient facilement. [French]
(After I had arrived here, one day I was standing at the door with my baby on the back wearing the pagnes. When a gentleman saw me, he shouted ‘Kwere-kwere’. I was afraid and got quickly into the house. Since then I feel scared to put on the pagnes. Here women put on trousers and large scarves, etc instead of pagnes. They identify you easily.)

People’s specific attire reflects their historical trajectory and is linked to the cultural apprenticeship that individuals acquire in their primary Discourse communities (Gee 1996). Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1993) adds that ‘different people have their own irreducibly distinct ways of life that shape their historical paths’ (p. xvii), which Gee (1996: ix) describes as different ways of being in the world. However, in South Africa where locals

---

2 Pagnes is a French term used in African French-speaking countries to mean culturally-defined and feminized three-piece garment worn by African women or mothers, covering the body from neck to feet. This is naturalised or socially legitimated women’s attire in those African French-speaking nations.
identify with Africa, ethnic/African attire does not necessarily reveal someone’s ethnic background.

4.2.3 English: power and prestige in SA

Discrimination in its different forms might have precluded this family from learning local African languages (Section 4.3.1) and encouraged the establishment of an English-only policy. Most importantly, in SA English is the gatekeeper to better social opportunities and the dominant language in education, the media, government, technology, and business. It embodies power and prestige and thus is seen as providing linguistic and cultural capital that children need to function appropriately in schools and in the wider society. One has to integrate into the new society in order to obtain access to opportunities that produce material goods or wealth (see Boyle 1995; Pennycook 1994). It should be noted that this family is financially more stable than the other three research households. The choice of English is more integrative in relation to the economy than, say, French, Lingala or a local South African language (see Section 4.3).

4.3 Power, choice, and regulation of the FLP

4.3.1 Family language profiles

The language profiles of family members are based on self-assessments made in interviews (Appendix G). These assessments relate to the four traditional skills, namely speaking, listening, reading, writing, and understanding the languages that members speak, as summarised in Tables 5 to 9 (Appendix I). The profiles indicate what the research family members claim about the languages they know and about their proficiency.
Finku’s proficiency
Finku displays full oral fluency in French and Swahili; he is semi-fluent in Kiluba, his mother language, and can understand Lingala. While Swahili is his primary language and was the medium of instruction in his first two years of primary education, French enjoys the national status and is the main medium of instruction. His literacy capabilities in Lingala and Kiluba are also very limited. Finku explains this limitation of his parental language, Kiluba, (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G):

I grew up in Lubumbashi where Swahili is the lingua franca. My parents spoke to me in Kiluba and I responded in Swahili. (Interviews 1.4)

He was born in his parents’ Kiluba-speaking area but grew up in the urban Swahili-speaking area to which he moved with his family at an early age. In addition to the languages cited above, Finku also learned some Tshiluba and Kisenga in his social milieu. He learned Lingala through his academic research and his stay in the capital city of Kinshasa, and from listening to DRC music and, above all, to the political speeches of the former dictator Mobutu. Mobutu established Lingala as ‘the language of power and domination’ (Ng & Bradac 1993: 3) and the only language of communication within and thus imposed upon the armed forces. Lingala still holds this sociopolitical status.

In his relationships with other Congolese in South Africa, Finku insists that he feels more comfortable in speaking French and English than in DRC African languages but at times switches to Swahili to accommodate less educated fellow countrymen (Section 4.2.2.3). This accommodation is compatible with the position that identity is flexible, dynamic over time and space (Norton 2000). Regarding South African African languages (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G), Finku admits that he can utter only a few words in isiZulu. Some reasons lie behind this lack of motivation and investment. He says:

I was not lucky enough to have friends who could speak African language and I lived in an area where there were no isiZulu users. I had some who spoke English. I want(ed) to speak local languages. I want(ed) to feel at home. Speaking, for example isiZulu, can make you accepted. But it’s frustrating because South Africans don’t want to give foreign Africans a chance to learn their languages. They’ve a policy of exclusion. But people from the neighbouring countries are easily accepted.
(Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)
Once again, Finku blames local populations for his isolation. It is true that discrimination deprives foreign Africans of the opportunities of learning local African languages. This fact acts as a way of conserving material and symbolic power (Bourdieu 1991: 652) by some members of the host society, thus, exerting domination over immigrants. Despite the fact that this family deliberately chose to live outside of the DRC community, this strategy has not led to integration with local Africans.

**Anaka’s proficiency**

Table 9 (Appendix I) shows that Anaka is proficient in French, the dominant language of the DRC, and Swahili, the provincial lingua franca which is also regarded as her primary language. However, she contends that she actually translates from these languages to convey messages in English. She can understand Tshiluba (another official language), Kiluba and Aruund (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G), all DRC indigenous languages. She can read and write French, Swahili, and Bemba very well and Lingala fairly well, and feels more comfortable in Swahili and French within the DRC community. But she confesses:

> Chaque fois que j’essaie de parler français ou anglais, je mélange avec le swahili. C’est ma langue maternelle. [French] (Every time I try to speak French or English, I mix with Swahili. It’s my native language.)

Although she attended an English course at the English Language Centre in Johannesburg, she admits that she has difficulty in reading newspapers and writing in English (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G). But she has acquired enough English to communicate inside and outside the household. In my view, she is not fluent in English; neither has she made friends with South African women. The rationale for not having friends is that

> Ici il est difficile d’avoir des amies. Elles ne nous font pas confiance. On ne nous aime pas. [French] (Here it is difficult to have friends. They don’t trust us. They don’t like us.)

This statement may well be the result of her prejudices rather than her lived experience. Spolsky (1989) suggests that immigrants can acquire the dominant language of the host society easily, depending on how open this society is to them. Anaka has some
exposure to practical English at the Yeoville market where she deals in DRC commodities and exotic African foodstuffs and in the home with her children. Her few contacts with isiZulu or seSotho occur in public places where she picks up some everyday greeting expressions. She does not pick up South African languages at the market because most of her customers and the market salesmen/women are foreign Africans who speak French and English.

**Tevora’s and Shaady’s proficiencies**

While Tevora had primary schooling in French in the DRC, Shaady started schooling in South Africa in English. At the time of my interviews, Tevora had had 4 years of exposure to social English and 4 years of schooling for Tevora while Shaady had had 2 years of schooling in the host land. Tevora says that he speaks Swahili fairly well. In my observations I did not record a single interaction in Swahili but he gives evidence of understanding this language, and Lingala, his former language of socialization with friends. He can follow some conversations in French (his former medium of instruction and primary language) but cannot use it in a productive way. Yet his mother insists:

*Tevora peut parler français et swahili. Il parle swahili correctement.* [French]
(Tevora can speak French and Swahili. He speaks Swahili correctly.)
(Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

However, his literacy capabilities in these DRC languages are really non-existent. My data shows that Tevora no longer speaks Lingala, the language of socialisation outside of his family. In South Africa, Swahili has become his second language while French, the third one. His South African language repertoire is also limited. Since English is also his medium of schooling, he has developed oral fluency in English with a local African accent. At the time of my interview, he maintained that his literacy capabilities are ‘very good’ in English (contrary to his school results: Section 4.2.4) but non-existent in seSotho and isiZulu. He has learnt to speak some isiZulu from friends and a few seSotho words from his English teacher at school (Section 4.2.3). These extracts speak for themselves (Interviews 1.1: Appendix G):

Res: Do your South African peers speak to you in African languages?
Tevora: Yeah, sometimes seSotho or isiZulu.
Res: What’s your feeling?
Tevora: *I feel okay because I can understand them. I can catch some words, e.g. isiZulu: ‘Buya la’: Come here.*
Res: Do they know that you’re Congolese?
Tevora: They know but want me to learn the language.

There is also a confirmation of Tevora’s learning from his Grade 9 teacher and Grade 9 peer (Interviews 1.8; 1.9: Appendix G):

Res: Do you sometimes speak to immigrant children in African languages?
Gr9 Teacher: *Not in the classroom. Maybe asking for some words in isiZulu or seSotho and explain them in English to all learners. I also want them to know seSotho. Immigrant learners mix with other students and learn to speak English. Outside classrooms we have no control of how they interact.*
Gr9 learner: *I teach them some sentences in seSotho. And if they don’t understand, I explain in English.*

This teaching of local African languages is additive, in that it seeks to integrate foreign learners into the society and thus to empower them by giving them an opportunity to negotiate multiple identities. It is also intended to create change in interpersonal and inter-group relations. This is what Cummins (1996: 15) calls ‘collaborative relations of power’. In addition, Tevora reports that he can read Afrikaans, and tries to speak Portuguese because he intends to visit Brazil. Both languages are offered as second and third languages at school. Concerning Shaady, Anaka is fascinated by the way Shaady learns DRC languages as well as local ones easily, better than his older brothers (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G):

*Tevora et Shaady peuvent parler français et swahili. Shaady parle anglais, français, swahili sans problèmes, mieux que ses frères.* [French]
(Tevora and Shaady can speak French and Swahili. Shaady speaks English, French, Swahili without any problems, better than his brothers.)

However, the following extract reveals a contradiction:

Res.: Tu parles quelques fois à tes enfants en swahili. Est-ce qu’ils comprennent le swahili? [French]
(You sometimes speak to your children in Swahili. Do they understand Swahili?)
Anaka: Oui, même le français. Mais ils ne peuvent pas le parler. [French]
(Yes, they do; even French. But they can’t speak it) (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

In the first statement Anaka claims that Shaady or Tevora can speak French without any difficulty and in the third, she reports that they can only understand French and cannot speak it. The children’s knowledge of French (and of Swahili) is receptive, and not productive (Interviews 1.1 & 1.2: Appendix G). Table 5 (Appendix I) explicitly shows
that Shaady as well as Tevora can utter only a few words in French and are not fluent in Swahili. Shaady personally admits that he uses Lingala with DRC peers at school and is apprenticed into French and Swahili by his mother at home. Although he can speak some French, Swahili, and Lingala, he cannot read or write them. The TG member is a passive or receptive bi-/multilingual (see Mesthrie 1995) but appears perfectly proud to be seen using these languages. He is also keen to learn local indigenous languages by picking them up (Interviews 1.1: Appendix G):

Res: What South African languages do you speak, beside English?
Shaady: English, isiZulu, seSotho, Shaangan, Afrikaans
Res: How did you learn them?
Shaady: I copy from my friends. I copy and keep it. I speak isiZulu, seSotho, Shaangan, with my friends at school.
Res: How did you learn Afrikaans?
Shaady: I copy. When people speak, I keep it.
Res: Who speaks?
Shaady: Our teacher, on the telephone

In reality, Afrikaans is offered at school (Interviews 1.5: Appendix G) as a second language. Jones (1995) confirms that young children readily pick up from each other new things and language. Shaady’s understanding of isiZulu is good enough for him to notice that his father’s knowledge of isiZulu is limited, as he reports in this incident:

One day, a traffic cop asked my daddy in isiZulu about the driving license. He just guessed.

In my experience Shaady’s oral production and/or knowledge of local indigenous languages is hardly beyond the usual formulaic expressions of everyday interactions. It should also be noticed that a look at the Tables of language proficiency showing members’ linguistic profiles (Appendix I) implies that DRC languages are disappearing, especially among the young G1 and TG, and possibly more so in the second generation.

4.3.2 Family language policy and practices

Data being analysed in this section come from interviews with the focal subjects (Appendix G) and observations (Appendix F), and school reports (Appendix H).
4.3.2.1 Family language policy in the DRC

The family language policy in the DRC emerges from the following interview extract between the researcher (Res.) and Finku (father), Anaka (mother) and Tevora, their first-born child and son (Interviews 1.3 & 1.4: Appendix G):

Res: What language/s did you use in your family in the DRC?
Finku: French only.
Anaka: Swahili et français entre les parents; français et Lingala avec les enfants, Mais le français était dominant. (Swahili and French between parents. French and Lingala with the children. But French was dominant.) [French]

Clearly, there was not only one language spoken within the household, but three languages, although Finku first claimed having a French-only policy in the DRC, a multilingual country. Two other languages were used: Lingala (Kinshasa lingua franca) was used by and with the children, and Swahili was used between the parents. It is evident that each family member has his/her own view on the languages used at home in the DRC, reflecting different capacities of the members in the family as father, mother, and child; their positioning in the society; and their individual language identities and/or communication needs. In this regard, Hall (1974) refers to a motivational range in relation to language, identity construction and goals.

According to this interview extract, French constitutes the dominant means of interaction at home in the DRC, and thus the language that Finku handled better and encouraged in his interaction with his children and wife. This fact causes him to regard French as the only means of communication in his household between the parents and their children. In addition, it is clear from the next extract that in the DRC, French is the language of advancement. The choice of French is indicated below:

Res: Why did you decide to use French only with your children in the DRC?
Finku: I preferred to speak to them [children] in French to help them at school and become fluent. Apart from that, they could speak Lingala. It was difficult for me to speak Lingala. (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G).

This response contradicts Finku’s previous statement concerning the FLP: the acknowledgement of Lingala as a second language used by and with his children undoubtedly contradicts his French-only policy in the family. The word ‘preferred’
obviously marks a personal choice to fulfill a desire rather than the result of a parental
decision to see all family members speaking French. Finku chose to use French with
his children with a view to helping them have oral fluency in the language of schooling.
He also confesses that he could not speak Lingala. His language incapacity is not the
crucial motive for his preference for French in the home. There are other reasons for
encouraging the use of French in the family (Interviews 1.3 & 1.4: Appendix G).

Res: You almost always use(d) French to your wife. Is French special to you?
Finku: Yeah. When we met for the first time, we started speaking French. Also, she wanted someone
who could express himself in French, and so was I.
Res: So French is special to you?
Finku: Yeah. Swahili is the language of people who don’t know French. When you speak Swahili,
you seem to be someone who has never been to school.
Res: If a decision could be reached to use a DRC indigenous language as a language of interaction
in your family, which one would be implemented?
Finku: My mother language, Kiluba, of course, because in family children identify with the father.
They identify with me. Definitely, they will identify with my language.
Anaka: Bemba, ma langue maternelle. [French] (Bemba, my mother language)

In the first set of statements above French also acts both as a language of intimacy
between the parents, as one of the eligibility criteria sought by Anaka in her partner and
as a marker of DRC elitism or the ‘je-le-connais’ status embodied by Finku. French also
carries an ‘elite’ family image, thus distinguishing the family from less educated people.
It has symbolic power (Bourdieu 1991) in the DRC, in that it is the language of educated
people and élites. It is in this regard that some theorists such as Ager (2001) believe
that certain motives, namely identity, image, goals, ideology, and instrumentality lead to
the choice of a language policy. The elitist image, Brausch (1961) claims, is rooted in
the sociopolitical divide of DRC society created by the colonial language policy and
carried on by the postcolonial elites. The divide fulfills the destructive role of the colonial
languages in subverting the African indigenous languages as underlined by Ngugi wa
Thiong’o (1985), resulting in the acculturation of the postcolonial African élites (Fanon
1967).

The second set of parents’ views embodies a power struggle, i.e. each parent seeks to
exert control over the children in an inter-ethnic marriage. I agree with Norton (2000)
that language is the site for the construction of competing identities. In this struggle
French acts as the neutral language likely to answer members’ communication needs.
From the data analysis, it is clear that there was the family’s French-only policy in the DRC which was not strictly regulated. The analysis is that the father was responsible for breaking his French-only policy by allowing (as he acknowledges) the use of other languages in the family. Such attitudes indicate the gaps between the espoused language behaviours and the enacted ones. Such gaps are also evident in the analysis of their FLP in South Africa (Section 4.2.2.2).

**4.3.2.2 Power, choice, and regulation of the Stated FLP in SA**

The overall process of language choice and decision-making in this family in South Africa reads as follows (Interviews 1.1 – 1.4: Appendix G):

Res: What language do you use in the family?
Finku: English only
Anaka: English
Tevora: English with my father. English, French and Swahili with my mother.
Shaady: English. But with my mother English, Swahili, French.

The responses above show that the stated family language policy in SA is still a policy once more based on the dominant European language in most domains of use in SA. However, despite a special emphasis again put on the word ‘only’ in Finku’s response, the children’s views already place the parents’ claims of stated monolingualism in the home in a contradictory position. The typical case of negation or contradiction about the stated FLP comes out in the following interview excerpt (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G) in which the father unknowingly refutes his previous statement of the English-only policy:

Res: What language/s do you use with your wife?
Finku: We use all languages. It depends on the mood. We can speak Swahili when we have visitors and also talk about interesting stories.
Res: What language do you speak more to your wife?
Finku: I use French, and Swahili when we have visitors.
Res: What language/s does your wife speak to you?
Finku: She does speak Swahili, and she speaks French as well. She got used to it, to both languages, anyway. It depends on the circumstances. When she wants to convey a message when there are visitors, she speaks Swahili.

It is worth noting that the linguistic repertoires of the family in South Africa (SA) no longer include Lingala, which means that Lingala is disappearing. This is discussed later (see Section 4.2.2.3). The data above also confirm that the English-only policy in the household is intended for the children only, while the parents can use any
languages they know to communicate with each other and with the outside world. Both Finku and Anaka acknowledge using French and Swahili within the DRC community in particular social circumstances. Such language behaviours are also evident in the use of the languages by family members (Section 4.3.1). In practice the family is a multilingual household (we use all languages) rather than an English-only family. But why do the parents, particularly the father, still insist on a one-language policy for his family in a multilingual country such as South Africa? (Interviews 1.3 & 1.4: Appendix G)

Res: Why did you choose English as the only language of interaction in the family in SA?

Finku: Because it’s the language of education. It’s a way of promoting direct contact by using the language. Direct communication is one way of helping the children to be fluent, work out the language of instruction from home. It’s a kind of direct switch to the language of schooling used around here. The children become more fluent and do well at school. And the children feel comfortable using English, anyway.


(The problem was that when they [children] arrived here, they were 12 – 13 years (the eldest ones) and old enough to learn English. At the beginning they spoke French only. It was difficult to speak English. We said to ourselves, ‘it is good for them to speak English only’. English will help them in the future, anywhere. Now they need English. They will speak French later after completing their university degree courses. If we speak French from morning to night, it will not help them at school. That’s why we have adopted English.)

In reality, the FLP was (and still is) designed for the children only, i.e. for schooling and, consequently, their oral fluency in English. This fluency is thought to ease early academic difficulties that French-speaking children might encounter in the early stages of schooling in English. But research (e.g. Cummins 1996) has shown that oral fluency does not always guarantee academic success, as it differs from academic language proficiency, which is more demanding than oral proficiency. The school reports reveal that the English-only children do not obtain the good results expected by their parents (see Section 4.2.4 for details). In addition to the consideration of education, Finku (father) puts forward the view of social integration into South African schools when he argues that the current FLP is ‘a direct switch to the language of schooling’ used in SA. In other words, English is chosen because of what it will have to offer the children, this is called a language’s ‘utility and exchange value’, or ‘economic value’ (Dhir and Savage 2002; Coulmas 1992).
The perceived prestige and rewarding value of English, as the medium of education linked to upward mobility in SA encouraged the parents to establish the English-only policy. However, it is said that in any language policy design, power and struggle operate tacitly, mostly to the advantage of the most powerful (Ager 2001). The extract below speaks for itself (Interviews 1.3 & 1.4: Appendix G).

Res. Would you be happy if your children did not speak your DRC languages?
Anaka: Pour moi, je ne voulais pas que les enfants oublient nos langues comme le français et le swahili. Elles peuvent les aider, par exemple, à traduire les documents. S’ils vont au Congo et que quelqu’un leur parle en dans ma langue maternelle, Bemba, et qu’ils ne comprennent pas, ils peuvent utiliser Swahili. C’est pourquoi, je leur parle dans ces langues. [French]
(For me, I didn’t want the children to forget our languages like French and Swahili. These can help them in life, for example to translate documents. If they go to Congo and someone speaks to them in my mother language, Bemba, and they don’t understand, they can use Swahili. That’s why I use these languages with them.)

Res. You are not concerned that your children lose Swahili or French?
Finku: No. They still have it. They just stopped using it in a productive way.

Anaka’s response implies a kind of imposition exercised against her will. It also contradicts her preceding answer in which she believes that the decision to establish an English-only policy in the household is the result of consent between her husband and her. Anaka who apparently was convinced of shifting to the English-only policy in the home is associated later with attempts to ignore the policy and maintain and pass on DRC languages to her children. Such a position expresses an ambivalence in her identity, both as an immigrant mother facing the realities of immigration in the host land and a carrier-conveyor of ethnic values. This finding is similar to the one found in studies carried by Pawels (1997) in Australia and Tsokalidou (1994) in New Zealand. Anaka accepts her husband’s decision with difficulty. She confesses to her daughter:

Anglais, parce qu’elle a aussi besoin d’anglais. Mais quand nous restons seules, nous trichons. [French]
(English, because she also needs English. But when we are left alone, [while laughing] we cheat.) (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

This statement suggests that the policy is regulated. Nevertheless, my observations reveal that she never used English to address her daughter (Section 4.2.2.3). ‘Cheating’ displays lack of her ability in English and her ambivalence. The implication of that inner conflict results in her ignoring the stated FLP by the continued use of French and
Swahili to her children at home. Consequently, Anaka’s utterance ‘we said to ourselves, it was good for them’ (i.e. the children) is ideological (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G).

Res: If I understand well, you are one who initiated the language policy in your family?
Finku: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Definitely, I think that as a teacher of English, a natural way of speaking a language is to make it used by anyone at the family level. And the children find it easy and interesting, anyway.
Res: Did you try to negotiate with the mother?
Finku: I think that mum got used to English, and she sometimes speaks Swahili with the children.
Res: What do you think of your language policy?
Finku: I think there is no dictatorship. It came simultaneously as I did in Congo when I was speaking French.
Res. How do you ensure that everybody is happy with the policy?
Finku: Yes. The children are more than happy. They don’t want to speak to their mother in Swahili. They never reply in Swahili. They have taken a kind of a step forward and express themselves more easily in English than in Swahili. It becomes a second nature. It is something they do at school and at home. No one looks at them. They are free to use the language.

This interview excerpt indicates clearly that the FLP is undoubtedly the prerogative of the father, the family’s breadwinner. It is an expression of gender and patriarchal power which is rooted in particular gender ascriptions, i.e. the ‘pre-established gender roles and identities’ (Mesthrie et al 2000) in traditional African families. My observation confirms that the FLP is successful as the children are fluent in oral English. Though it is true that using English at home can empower the children, this decision also tends to maintain the father’s control over other family members. The father posits that his children never reply to their mother in Swahili. This attitude may result from the constraining character of the FLP that compels them to use English only, overlooking their individual desires. The youngest son and TG, Shaady, and the eldest son and young G1, Tevora, highlight their wish in this excerpt (Interviews 1.1 & 1.2: Appendix G):

Res: What languages do you like speaking everyday?
Res: If you meet your DRC friends and cannot speak French, how will you feel?
Shaady: I will feel bad because I am Congolese.

Res: What language do you use with your sister?
Tevora: French or Bemba. But when I don’t understand, she speaks English.
Res: If you find yourself in the DRC community and cannot speak the language they use, how will you feel?
Tevora: Very bad, because it is not good to be in your community and not understand what they are saying.
In fact the FLP is subtractive as it suppresses the parents’ languages in favour of English only. In view of this, Amati-Mehler et al (1994) speak of children’s psychological exile from their parents’ feelings. Depriving children of their need and right to communicate in ethnic languages is interpreted as cutting them off partially (or totally) from their cultural roots. This idea supports the findings in studies conducted on language use in immigrant families by Smolicz (2001) and Jones (1995).

4.3.2.3 Family language practices in SA

During my fieldwork, there were only a few times when I observed conversations between parents and the focal children. The reason is that parents almost always came home late, save on Sundays. English was the medium of interaction between children who spent most of their time in their bedroom, watching TV, and listening to music. I had no access to their bedroom and also could not violate their privacy (see Field notes: Appendix F). The following section illustrates how the research subjects negotiate their multiple language identities with family members: between parents, and between parents and their children, among children, and other ethnics in the household.

1. Choice of language and patterns for communication

The general pattern of language practices within this family is summarised in Figure 1:

![Figure 1: Communication pattern in the English-only family](image-url)
I observed that parents use different languages depending on the circumstances and the language they feel comfortable in. Each code selection defines a specific identity. Despite the stated FLP, the parents apparently seem to tolerate these patterns, under the pretext of an English-only policy. There are differences between the espoused language behaviours and the enacted ones. The languages and directional arrows in the figure above represent the main language of interaction among particular family members. I also observed that these patterns may be ignored in relation to topics, context, and setting (Field notes: Appendix F). The stated English-only family is in reality a multilingual family where most members use English to communicate. Evidence is discussed in the next section.

2. Language use

Parent – parent interaction

The entire process of communication between both parents, and between parents and their visitors can be found in the following extract (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G):

Res: What language do you use more to your wife?
Finku: I use French. And Swahili when we have visitors
Res: What language does she use to you?
Finku: She does speak Swahili and French as well. She got used to it, to both languages, anyway. It depends on the circumstances.
Res: What language do you feel more comfortable in speaking to her?
Finku: French

Despite the fact that Finku (father) claimed to have an English-only policy in his family in SA, evidence in my research shows that the policy is primarily for the children, not for the parents. Besides, it works only between the father and the children.

Parent – parent interaction (1) (father to mother)
(Discussing the Johannesburg road map) (see Field notes 1: Appendix F)

Finku: Donne-moi la carte de Jo’burg [French]
Anaka: Unajua njila? (Do you know the way?) [Swahili]
Finku: Oui, je sais. Donne- moi d’abord la carte. (Yes, I know. First, hand me the map.) [French]
Laisse-moi lire la carte. (Let me read the map) [French]
Anaka: Unajua? (Do you know?) [Swahili]
Nous risquons de nous perdre. (We may get lost.) [French]
Finku: Toi, tu connais? (Do you know?) [French]
Anaka: Unafata nini? (What are you doing?) [Swahili]
Mais appelle Hilaire pour demander. (But call Hilaire for direction.) [French]
Finku: Ne t’en fais pas. (Don’t worry.) [French]
Anaka: Iko njila i highway? (Is this a highway?) [Swahili, with an English word]
Finku: Non, non. C’est ça le highway. (No, no. This is the highway.) [French – Swahili]
Anaka: Comment y aller? (How to get there? [French]
Tuende (Let’s go) [Swahili]
On ne va pas se perdre. (We will not get lost) [French]

The father uses French consistently, with one sentence only in Swahili, compared to the mother who speaks more Swahili than French. Being aware that French is the language that Finku almost always uses to her, Anaka attempts to use it with a view to convincing her husband to change his mind. Similarly, Finku uses an imperative statement in Swahili to accommodate his wife’s language and draw her attention. This seeks to persuade his wife that everything is all right. However, the parents as initiators of their own policy ignore it by engaging in a dialogue in a language other than English. This conversation takes place at home and suggests that the FLP is really intended only for the children. During the course of the conversation, the shift from Swahili to French and vice-versa also shows the multilingual ability of the speakers, whereas the choice of English word ‘highway’ instead of French counterpart ‘autoroute’ points to the speaker’s knowledge of English. The consistent use of Swahili (by the mother) and of French (by the father) is manifest in the following interview extract (Interview 1.3: Appendix G).

Res: What languages do you use more to your husband?
Anaka: Swahili but he answers in French.
Res: What language do you feel more comfortable in?
Anaka: Swahili

This excerpt reveals the parents’ DRC language identities. It should be noted, however, that multilinguals have language flexibility. The following interaction deals with a number of topics regarding household matters and foodstuff but it displays a variation in the way the parents interact. The transcript confirms Finku’s statement that they use all languages depending on the circumstances.

**Parent – parent interaction (2) (mother to father)**
(Talking about shopping) (see Field notes 1: Appendix F)

Anaka: François, il n’y a pas de fufu. Il faut acheter. [French]
(François, there is no mealie-mealie. We have to buy it.) [French]
Finku: Envoie la fille au shop. Je suis fatigué. Je ne peux conduire. [French]
(Send the daughter to the shop. I am tired. I can’t drive.)
In this extract Anaka has used Swahili almost 70% of the time and French only 30%.
The extract shows some degree of elitism of the interlocutors who, while interacting,
mix French and Swahili. Terms such as ATM do not have equivalents yet in DRC
French, as the banking system is not as advanced as that of the host land, while the
word ‘shop’ is a colloquial one, though it has a counterpart in French.

Parents – visitors interaction

The interview question sought to know what language/s they use to communicate with
their fellow countrymen, and it received the following responses:

Finku: *Swahili, because there are many Swahili speakers in the community. It’s a way
of being respectful, to give them confidence, and to make them feel at ease.*

Res: *Sometimes, a person greets you in Swahili and you respond in French. And or you initiate
the conversation with another person in Swahili.*

Finku: *When you know that someone speaks French, definitely you respond in French because
you know that s/he can speak it. On the contrary, you’ve been with someone and you know
that s/he never opened his mouth in French, it will be offending. I don’t want to sound
insulting. We know which language someone is comfortable in.* (Field notes 1: Appendix F)

In spite of their stated English-only policy, the parents utilise multiple identities when
they welcome visitors. Two sets of observation field notes support the interview above.

Parents – visitors interaction (1)
(Talking about general matters) [Swahili only]

Kipi: Habari, mama? (Hi, mum?)
Anaka: Muzuri (fine)
Kipi: Habari za batoto? (How are the children?)
Anaka: beko bien (They are fine)
Kipi: Habari, Prof? (Hi, Prof?)
Finku: Muzuri: Mambu yote inaenda bien. (Good. Everything is okay)
Muto: Njo leo bariri kabisa? (It’s cold very today?)
Parents - visitors interaction (2)
(Talking about friends still in the DRC)

Kapen: Prof, habari ? (Prof, how are you?) [Swahili]
Finku: Muzuri sana. (Very well) [Swahili]
Kapen: Habari za kazi? (How is your job?) [Swahili]
Finku: Ca va bien. On essaie de tenir bon. (Good. We keep on trying) [French]
Kapen: Habari za Zeng? (How is Zeng?) [Swahili]
Finku: Oui, il va bien. (Yes, he is fine.) [French]
Kapen: Anatelephoner? (Does he give you a ring?) [Swahili + French]
Finku: Mais pas ce dernier temps. Il semble qu’il a été promu. Il serait très occupé avec son nouveau boulot. [French]
   (But not this time. It seems that he was promoted. He would be very busy with his new job.)

Clearly, parents use their indigenous languages as they like. In contrast to the parents, the children seem to use English only all the time. This does not mean that there are no exceptions to this pattern. In one situation that I observed, Finku shifted from French to Swahili to express compassion.

Parents - visitors interaction (3)

(At Finku’s: news of a deceased)
Visitor: Ko ko ko (Knocking at the door)
Anaka: Karibu. Habari [Swahili] (Welcome. How are you?)
Visitor: Prof, bonjour. [French] (Hi, Teacher)
Finku: Bonjour. Comment ça va? [French] (Hi. How are you?)
Visitor: Pas tellement. [French] (Not good.)
Finku: Semaka [Swahili] (What’s wrong?)
Visitor: Le bébé de notre frère-là est décédé. [French] (That brother’s baby is dead.)
   (Our God. Why do you allow such a situation?)
Finku (to researcher): Mon cher, nous devons aller là maintenant.
   (My dear, we must go there right now.) (Field notes 1: Appendix F)

In the above extract, the use of Swahili at the start of the interaction choice indicates the conventionalized formula of welcoming a visitor in the ethnic group. In contrast, the shift from Swahili to French signals a particular construction of identity in relation to Finku in order to express emotions. The subsequent interventions in French define the need to accommodate the interlocutor’s language in order to show balance in communication between people who are fairly or highly educated. However, Finku’s
term ‘semaka’ here is a full Swahili sentence or imperative form intended to express compassion and to construct an ethnic identity in such events.

**Father – children interaction**

In another interview, the father reports that he uses only English, and not DRC languages to his children. This is supported by the father’s and children’s language behaviours in the following extracts (Field notes 1: Appendix F).

1. **Finku:** Tevora, did you get any homework?
   **Tevora:** Yes.
   **Finku:** Have you already done, or you want Papa Giasuma to help you?
   **Tevora:** It’s already done. We’ve already done it. We are finished.
   **Finku:** What about Kisi and Shaady?
   **Tevora:** Their teacher helped them.
   **Finku:** What is going on here? You are too quiet. Anything wrong?
   **Tevora:** No, papa. We are just relaxing, listening to music. Others are watching TV.

2. **Finku:** Shaady, Where’s Diba?
   **Shaady:** She is not in. She went to Yeoville.
   **Finku:** What for?
   **Shaady:** She is in the market with mum. Mummy said she must join her.
   **Shaady:** Daddy, will you go out with me when you take Papa Giasuma back?
   **Finku:** Yeah, if you have already done your homework.
   **Shaady:** Yes, I am finished. Ask Papa Giasuma.

3. **Kisi:** Daddy, we need some money for coke. Please.
   **Finku:** Get the key and look in the car.
   **Kisi:** Thank you, daddy.
   **Shaady:** What about me? For all of us?
   **Finku:** Yes. But leave some for mummy and your sister.
   **Shaady:** Thank you, daddy.

Through this conversation with his children, the father and the children remain consistent in using only English, without code switching. The result is that the FLP in respect of the children has succeeded in producing fluent oral speakers. In contrast, the mother breaks the policy by using Swahili and French, when speaking to her children. Answering the researcher’s question, Anaka posits (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

*La plupart de temps l’anglais et quelques fois le français, le swahili, ou mélange l’anglais et le français.* [French] (Mostly English and sometimes French, Swahili, or mix English with French.)

**Res:** Why do you use these languages with them?

**Anaka:** Parce que l’anglais est la langue de l’éducation pour les enfants. Le swahili est ma langue de
naissance. Même quand je parle [français], je mélange avec le swahili. [French]
(Because English is the medium of learning for the children. Swahili is my native language.
Even when I speak, I prefer mixing with Swahili. It is my native language.)

In Section 4.2.1 (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G) Anaka argued that she feels more comfortable using Swahili, the language of her primary socialisation in the DRC, as well as French. Lack of proficiency in English is also one of the factors that prevent Anaka from communicating appropriately in English with her English-speaking children. In contrast to her statement that ‘mostly I speak English with my children’, I did not record a single sentence in English. This does not mean that she cannot speak English with her children. It is possible that she feels more comfortable and fluent in her DRC languages, as the following extracts show (Field notes 1: Appendix F).

Mother – Children interaction (Miscellaneous)

(1)
Anaka: Shaady, qu’est-ce que tu fais là ? Ton prof est déjà ici. [French]
(Shaady, what are you doing? Your teacher is already in here.)
Shaady: I’m coming.
Anaka: Dépêche-toi. Tevora, dis-lui de sortir vite. [French] (Be fast. Tevora, tell him to come out quickly)
Tevora: He has finished.
Anaka: Tevora, donne-moi de l’eau fraîche. Angaria mu frigo. [French – Swahili]
(Shaady, give me some fresh water. Look into the fridge.)
Tevora: It’s frozen. All is frozen.
Anaka: Mets-y de l’eau du robinet. [French] (Put in some water from the tap.)
Anaka: Ngu patiye biscuits, ni gâteau. [Swahili + French] (Bring me some biscuits and cake.)
Tevora: Where are they?
Shaady: I can see them in the kitchen.
Kisi: So go and take them.

(2)
Anaka: Ngu patiye basani ya mbele (Give me some plates) [Swahili]
Tevora: (silence).
Anaka: Unasikiya? (Do you understand?) [Swahili]
Tevora: Where are they? [English]
Anaka: Angaria mu kikuku. (Look in the kitchen) [Swahili]
Tevora (acts without saying a word).

(3)
Anaka: Kisi, ngupatiye tricot yangu. Il fait froid. [Swahili - French] (Kisi, bring me my jersey. It’s cold)
Kisi: (Silence – seems not to hear)
Anaka: Unasikiya? [Swahili] (Did you catch me?) [Swahili]
Kisi: Where is it? [English]
Anaka: Kuna ku chambre. Angaria mu chambre yetu. [Swahili + French word]
(Over there, in the bedroom. Look in our bedroom.)
Kisi (brings the jersey without saying a word)
What is surprising is that, in contrast to the mother’s claim, Tevora (the eldest son) does not utter a single word in French or Swahili. One thing is certain: Tevora does understand a little Swahili and French (Interviews 1.2: Appendix G) but he no longer speaks them (Section 4.2.1; Interviews 1.2: Appendix G). This may be due to the imposition of one language of interaction in the family, which affects Tevora’s multilingual ability as well as that of other children. My observations confirm the children’s consistency in the use of the English language, the only authorised means of communication at home (Field notes 1: Appendix F).

**Children – children interaction**

The following extracts show the children’s consistency in the use of English and thus their proficiency in the language. This suggests the success of the FLP.

1. (Discussing the children’s movie on SABC Education, in the kitchen)
   Jemo: Hey, did you watch that movie?
   Tevora: Yeah, I like it. It was great, wonderful.
   Jemo: I liked more the cartoon part. The way those animals, the pets were jumping.
   Shaady: I liked the superman. You know, when he flew to save that woman, you know. Hey, it was great.
   Tevora: My friends told me they watch this movie every Thursday.
   Kisi: Hey, you always want to watch TV but don’t finish your work. Wait, your teacher will punish you tomorrow at school.
   Shaady: Oh no. He does not. I will finish tonight before I go to bed.
   Kisi: When? You always say so. Wait. Our daddy is coming. Hah, you’ll see.
   Jemo: Do you know how he speaks? Wait. Hah, wait. You’ll see.
   (Daddy comes in, and all keep quiet.)

2. (Discussing the washing of dishes)
   Diba: Who is going to wash the dishes today?
   Tevora: It’s Kisi’s turn.
   Kisi: No, it’s Shaady.
   Shaady: No, no. Mummy said I should not do it.
   Kisi: Why? You don’t eat?
   Shaady: Because I am too young to do it. I cannot do it well.
   Tevora: So, what can you do well, eating only?
   Shaady: If I don’t do it, Diba is going to do it.
Tevora: That's fine. She can do that for you.
Diba: Okay. I can do it. But who's going to cook?
Shaady: And if she does it, you will not eat until mummy comes back.
Jemo: But you can wash them. It's easy. You must try to do it.
Shaady: No, no. It is too early for me. I'm too young. Do it.
Jemo: When will you know?
Shaady: No. If I break some, mummy will blame you. I will tell daddy that.
Diba: Okay, Tevora, do that. Mummy and daddy will be back soon. I have to cook.
(Finally, Tevora and Jemo obey and wash the dishes, following their older sister's instructions.)

These extracts indicate clearly that the children in this English-only household have acquired oral fluency in the language of schooling. Consequently, the FLP seems to have produced partially the results expected.

The following extract illustrates the usual formulaic greeting between the researcher and children (Field notes 1: Appendix F):

**Researcher – children interaction**

(1)

Diba: Shaady, your teacher is waiting for you.
Shaady: I'm coming. I'm taking my books.
(All the sons come out to greet the researcher.)
Res: Hi. How are you? (to each son)
Sons (in turn): Fine.
(With the older son, inside the house)
Res: What are you doing inside there?
Tevora: We are watching TV. But others are doing their homework.
Res: Why don't you come out and are always shut in your bedroom?
Tevora: Because we like watching movies on TV, children's programmes: cartoon, education, and listening to music. We have our own TV. But sometimes we do work in the kitchen.

The use of English acts as the unmarked choice among people who can communicate only through this dominant language. In this context English is defined as the neutral medium of interaction (Myers-Scotton 1993). It places the children in a new identity frame. Many interactions between the focal subjects and the researcher were limited to only a few interventions because of their enclosure. I observed some code switching and mixing (see examples below) which seem to have been influenced by the setting, topic or context, thereby allocating different social identities to the interlocutors. The dominant language used between the adult G1 and TG members and the researcher was English. But French was often used especially by the mother and sometimes by the daughter Diba to mark ethnicity, as illustrated below:
(2)
(At the gate, with the older daughter)
Diba (daughter): Bonjour (Good morning)
Res: Bonjour. Papa et maman sont là? (Hi. Are dad and mum in?)
Diba: Ils sont sortis. Mais Shaady et les autres sont là.
(They are out. But Shaady and the others are there)
Res: Ça va. Je suis venu pour Shaady. (Ok. I came for Shaady)
(Field notes 1: Appendix F)

The use of French in SA is generally perceived both nationally and inter-ethnically as a neutral medium of communication among DRC nationals, and not as an index of ‘je-le-connais’ identity (Section 4.3.1.). But in this family, it seems that English and French (as well as Swahili) have territorial boundaries within which they have to be used. The young adult G1 (i.e. Diba) in the following extract uses different codes when she opens the gate for the researcher and when she enters the house.

(At the gate, then in the house and finally at the exit, using French, Swahili and then English)
Diba: Bonjour, Papa [French] (Good day, father)
Res: Bonjour [French] (Good day)
Diba: Karibu. Shaady is having a shower. [Swahili – English]
(Come in, please. Shaady is having a shower.)
Res: All right. I can wait.
Diba (to Shaady): Shaady, Shaady, your teacher is here.
Shaady: I am finished.
Diba (to researcher): He is coming.

(Researcher is leaving the house)
Res: Can anyone open the gate for me?
Diba: Ah, vous partez déjà? (Are you leaving?) [French]
Res: Oui. Au revoir. (Yes. Bye) [French] (Field notes 1: Appendix F)

Although the daughter is not a focal subject, the extract shows that this is a cultural practice honoured in this English-only family and which is likely to construct DRC identities for the children who are focal subjects. Diba uses the ‘Karibu’ greeting ritual, (see also Section 4.3.1.2.). It is important to note the practice which is that French is used at the entrance to, as well as on leaving, the house. The house is ideologically a protected area within which English is the only authorized language for communication with and among children. Most inter-actions between Shaady and his older brothers and the researcher take place in English. Additionally, I did not record any data in DRC languages produced by the children in their interaction with their parents and/or their
siblings. However, in the course of my tutorials Shaady, the TG member, unexpectedly used other languages, which I consider to be exceptions (Field notes 1: Appendix F).

Researcher – Shaady interaction

(1) [Tutorial]
Res: Hi. How are you?
Shaady: Fine.
Res: Are you ready for me today?
Shaady: Yes. My big brother also wants you to help him with his homework.
Res: Oh, that’s lovely.
Res: Please do your work.

(While performing the task)
Shaady: Papa Giasuma, mina isha. [Swahili] (Papa Giasuma, I am finished)
Res: Muzuri. Unasemaka Kiswahili? [Swahili] (Good. Do you speak Swahili?)
Shaady: Yeah. But a little. What about you?
Res: Kidogo, a little. Who taught you (to speak) Swahili?
Shaady: Myself. When people speak, I copy. I speak with mummy.
Res: And with your daddy?
Shaady: No, no, English. With my daddy, I speak English, and with my mum, English, French and sometimes Swahili.

(2)
(Performing a task on a different day)
Res: Just the last exercise.
Shaady: I’m finished. Mina’enda kubamba mu chambre. [English – Swahili + French]
           (I’m finished. I’m going to relax in the bedroom).
Res: How well do you speak DRC languages?
Shaady: A little.
Res: Can you say something in French?
Shaady: Bonjour. Comment ca va? [French] (Good day. How are you?)
Res: Qu’est-ce que tu fais là? [French] (What are you doing over there?)
Shaady: Mina liya. [Swahili] (I’m eating)
Res: Good.

Shaady’s language practices in DRC Swahili and French are a clear indication of his knowledge of and/or ability in the languages that he learns by interacting with his mother. The FLP does not encourage the use of DRC languages. Regardless of this fact, Shaady, who is the youngest child and perhaps the closest to his mother, maintains that he ‘copies’ (his own word) from the mother. As a carrier-convener of ethnic values, Anaka’s attempt to convey her ethnic values, including her languages, to her ‘baby son’, Shaady, appears to have worked.
4.3.3 School language policies and their impact on immigrant learners

This section draws entirely on data gathered from interviews with principals, teachers and non-immigrant learners in schools. It discusses the school language policy, how immigrant learners are perceived, and how they negotiate identities within peers at school. In this section, I use the terms ‘learners’ and ‘children’ interchangeably. Children’s schools are referred to as Shaady’s school and Tevora’s school.

Shaady’s school

Shaady’s school defined as a community primary school is located in an area populated by immigrant and refugee families. It was established in 1993 to welcome returning ANC (African National Congress) children from exile. Currently, in the pursuit of its objectives to serve the community, the school welcomes not only South African learners but also immigrant or refugee children, mainly foreign Africans. The principal (Princ) and Grade 2 (Gr2) teacher’s responses to the question about general language policy of the school and the ways immigrant children are identified (Interviews 1.5: Appendix G) are summarised as follows (Interviews 1.5 & 1.6: Appendix G):

Res: What languages are recommended in the school?
Princ: English is most recommended at school. We also offer Afrikaans and in Primary School because we are guided by what they do at High School. Until High School changes, we can't do anything.
Gr2 teacher: English, with Afrikaans as second language.
Res: How do you know that this is an immigrant's child?
Princ: Name, language and parents' documents at registration
Gr2 teacher: By the name or the way they speak/use English.

The teaching of Afrikaans as a second language is dictated by the high school’s language policy. To some extent, this influences learner or parent attitudes to African languages in education. It can be extrapolated that Afrikaans still has more educational value in South Africa than local African languages. But as the Grade 2 teacher says (Interviews 1.6: Appendix G):

Outside classrooms we [teachers] have no control of how children use language.

This means that other languages may be spoken or learned during the children’s play time. Foreign languages such as French, the DRC medium of instruction, are not offered by this school. In Africa, naming practices differ from one ethnic group to
another. This view concurs with Chambers (1994: 133) who argues that ‘in language we inhabit, construct and extend our realities’. On my request to interview non-immigrant peers, both the principal and Grade 2 teacher interrupted me, saying (Interviews 1.5 & 1.6: Appendix G):

Princ: All children are equal in importance. A child is a child. It is hard sometimes to see that this is an immigrant child.
Gr2 teacher: This is not an issue at this level. Children mix up and apparently don’t know anything about [ethnicity/discrimination]. Maybe if they were in Grades 5 – 7. They don’t make any difference among themselves.

As Jones (1995) reports, this melting-pot philosophy does enable the children to make friends among peers. In the statements above, it also emerges that Grade 2 learners are not contaminated by the play of ethnicity (see Peshkin 1991). Yet Shaady’s strategies in negotiating his identities within the school (this Section later) and in defining himself with pride as a DRC national (Section 4.3.) indicate that Grade 2 learners are aware of their ethnicity and how distinct they are from others. This view echoes Denscombe et al’s (1993:127) finding that ‘pupils from the age of 4 tend to establish ethnic awareness and that this awareness develops in subsequent years’. The school ethos blinds the school administration to the realities of ethnicity or ethnic discrimination among learners of various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. In developing my interest in immigrant learners’ language, I also sought to understand how immigrant learners were assisted by or integrated into the school (Interviews 1.5: Appendix G).

_We do nothing special for foreign students because we are one school, one family. No special treatment. Children come to school and know how to speak English. Children are integrated from the beginning. No discrimination among children. But we use plays, songs in different languages in a choir, theatre, about names called on foreign Africans, e.g. Makwere-kwere. There’s no problem of mixing, no distinction._

The statement indicates that the school is unaware of the learning difficulties and social problems that foreign students are likely to encounter in their new education environment. ‘Being one school’ does not deny the facts of ethnic diversity and differences. For example, using plays about name-calling signifies that foreign children do to some extent experience rejection in the society. It is true that the use of plays and songs is a way of acknowledging the value of and creating positive attitudes in these
learners and their languages, recalling ‘collaborative relations of power’ (Cummins 1996: 15). However, it is known that any person new to a language encounters problems. The question to the Grade 2 teacher about Shaady’s academic performance received this response (Interviews 1.6: Appendix G):

*Immigrant children have language problems. Shaady is average. He’s repeating but improving. As a French-speaking immigrant child, he has first to acquire the new language and then to adapt to the system [of education].*

This assumption is also well documented in the immigration literature (e.g. Carliner 2000). The fundamental question is how the TG immigrant learner negotiates his identities within the school. Obviously, the school does not have the affective atmosphere of the home and related behavioural patterns. Negotiating identities in schools involves the compromise of primary selves and feelings (Peshkin 1991), and power sharing through local peer networks, ethnic friendship and/or use of homeland languages (Interviews 1.1: Appendix G):

Res: Do you have Congolese friends at school?
Shaady: Yes, e.g. Ndaya.
Res: What languages do you speak?
Shaady: French and Lingala.
Res: Do you have South African friends?
Shaady: Yes, many.
Res: Are they happy when they hear you speaking DRC languages?
Shaady: No o. They say what languages you speak. Sometimes they call us ‘makwere-kwere’.
Res: What does it mean?
Shaady: Foreigners.
Res: What do you do when your friends don’t understand your DRC language?
Shaady: When they don’t understand, I hit them.

The word ‘makwere-kwere’ heard at the edge of any social interaction with foreign Africans is a persistent reminder of immigrants’ marginalised status. It enters the frame of ‘coercive relations of power’ (Cummins 1996: 15). Stereotyping causes foreign learners to resort to ethnic friendships and the use of home languages at school. This strategy enables immigrants to resist the devaluation of their culture and languages and to affirm their ethnic and national identities. This finding is reflected in Bullivant’s (1987) work. In addition, feeling like a Congolese in school still constitutes, for the DRC immigrant learners, a mark of social distinctiveness, a source for defining and locating their common history and identity. In the excerpt above, Shaady insists ‘*When they*
don’t understand, I hit them’. On the one hand, this use of violence is likely to increase mutual mistrust; on the other hand, it is allows peers to recognize ethnic diversity and other people’s language rights. As a result of mis-recognition, Shaady also shows great interest in his homeland official language, French, reaffirming his ethnic self and taking pride in it. This quote speaks to the point (Interviews 1.1: Appendix G):

*I prefer French to isiZulu. I wish all teachers could become French teachers.*

In the light of cultural and linguistic realities, encouraging immigrant learners to learn languages of non-immigrant peers/friends or vice-versa definitely leads to mutual cultural infiltration and understanding. Promoting critical awareness of how learners perceive themselves and are perceived by others in terms of language and physical or ethnic differences breaks hidden social and cultural barriers. Similarly, learning local languages and English by talking to peers and making South African friends creates positive interpersonal and inter-group relations. Jones (1995) found that friendship is the source of meaning and the source of identity in schools (Cummins 1996). The principal reports (Interviews 1.5: Appendix G):

*I did a survey in some schools in this area. Academically immigrants’ children are okay, good. Men are okay; they go out of home and learn English. Women are closed, have few friends. They can’t help children because they are always in the house. But they need to learn English to help children. DRC learners’ language is good. Parents push children academically while the Angolan parents have no support.*

Immigrant parents, particularly from the DRC, are praised for providing various forms of assistance for their children’s studies. I also observed that the father in this English-only family revises the day’s lessons with his children and/or checks their copy books to evaluate their progress while the mother often handles household matters. While praising DRC parents in general for the support they offer to their children, the principal focused on the degree of contribution or power attribution between immigrant men and women to the empowerment of their children at home in terms of access to the language of upward mobility. She points to the inequitable relations of power between women and men, inherited from the African tradition (Elliot 1996). Norton (2000) also found that housework and childcare prevent immigrant mothers in Canada from accessing the language of power and thus its rewards.
Tevora’s school

In comparison with Shaady’s institution, Tevora’s school is a long-established public high school situated in Berea. Each school has its own organizational philosophy and/or ethos, i.e. a ‘system of implicit and deeply internalized values likely to define attitudes towards cultural capital’ (Bourdieu 1973: 32) that it conveys to its learners. The first dimensions to explore are the language policy and the construction of immigrant learners in school.

The school language policy and the process of identification of foreign learners (Interviews 1.7; 1.9: Appendix G) are summed up in the following interview:

Res: What languages are recommended in school?
Princ: English. In class they must speak English. Until now we offer other languages: Afrikaans as a second language and Portuguese as a third language to help those Learners from Angola and Mozambique.
Gr9 teacher: English as the medium of education, Afrikaans as second language, and Portuguese as an alternative to Afrikaans for Portuguese-speaking children.
Tevora: English. But they teach us Afrikaans and Portuguese. (Interviews 1.2: Appendix G)

Res: Do you have immigrants’ children here?
Princ: Yes
Res: How do you identify foreign learners?
Princ: We look at the documentation at application time and verify if the documents are authentic [i.e. genuine]. Gr9 teacher: Names from the class list, accent, especially for learners from DRC, North Africa. (Interviews 1.7: Appendix G)

Gr9 peer (boy): They are open to us, about where they come from. In other class sessions: culture and drama, they tell us about how they behave, what they eat, how they live [at home] (Interviews 1.9: Appendix G).

Res: Sometimes names and documents or language cannot tell you anything, how do you know?
Princ: Language accent, as soon as they try to speak or start speaking.
Res: Do school structures allow for easy integration of immigrants’ children?
Princ: Absolutely. (Interviews 1.7: Appendix G)

Among additional languages offered at this school, French is excluded, meaning that DRC learners have to struggle with English only; the change of medium of instruction often brings about difficulties. While the principal refers to the nationality of learners revealed by their parents’ identity documents, the teacher actually checks her class list to distinguish between common South African names and those that sound foreign. In contrast, local peers think in terms of classroom activities that produce an opportunity to
learn about other people’s ways of life and at the same time reveal the lines between insiders and outsiders. In terms of oral language, the length of stay and a number of years of schooling in South Africa can make the differentiation difficult. Tevora mentions this lack of differentiation in his response (Interviews 1.2: Appendix G):

Res: Is there anything that makes you different from South African children?
Tevora: Ah, no. I think the (homeland) language I speak.

This assumption finds support in the Grade 9 teacher’s statement (Interviews 1.8: Appendix G):

Immigrant learners learn English easily in class. I encourage my students to learn and work hard, to hang around with others who speak English and get some support from family.

But this does not prevent them from encountering difficulties in adjusting to the local education. Understanding the academic performance or social relations of immigrant learners was worth considering. Both the teacher and the principal complimented them (Interviews 1.7 & 1.8: Appendix G):

Princ: Referring to academic work, they are hard-working.
Gr9 teacher: They are lovely, respectful, committed to work.

The epithet ‘hard-working’ may result from foreign children’s frustration with their language insufficiency at the early stages of schooling and from collaborative power relations created by the intervention of the school and families. It may also result from the child’s personal strategies in learning and in conducting interpersonal relations within the school. Jones (1995) acknowledges that such relations can have a powerful influence on academic motivation. Tevora came to South Africa at the age of almost 12 (Section 4.2.1) and acknowledged having some problems learning English and adapting to English literacy practices. But during my interview, he was confident that he was performing quite well, a view confirmed by his teacher as well as his overall academic performance (Field notes: Appendix F). Since immigrant children’s language problems were highlighted, it was important to look at what was being done to assist them. The excerpt below addresses this concern (Interviews 1.7: Appendix G):

Res: Do school structures allow for easy integration of immigrant children?
Princ: Absolutely
Res: What do you do to achieve this?
Children are not separated but mixed with others in classes. Immigrants’ children have language problems. We encourage them to go to the language lab after school. Participation is free.

Gr9 teacher: No special programme, but English courses for students struggling with English. Children at high school are totally immersed into language level and socially integrated. (Interviews 1.8: Appendix G):

Tevora: Yeah. For example, pool party. (Interviews 1.2: Appendix G):

This school uses the same melting-pot philosophy as Shaady’s school to empower foreign learners. Passing through lower grades does not necessarily imply that stereotyping of foreign learners or their language problems are totally eradicated. Yet the construction of Tevora in terms of skin colour (see next extract) contradicts what his teacher says. These patterns are likely to re-shape their future social relationships. Similarly, the literature on ethnic encounters in schools (e.g. Bullivant 1987) acknowledges that minority learners are received by the dominant peers with mixed feelings. In order to understand the quality of Tevora’s relationships with his South African peers at school, I wanted to know how he was treated by his friends. The response in this interview extract speaks for itself (Interviews 1.1: Appendix G):

Res: Do you have South African friends?
Tevora: Yes, I do.
Res: How many?
Tevora: Many, but I walk with one friend because one is better than more.
Res: South African?
Tevora: Yes.
Res: Do South African children like you?
Tevora: Yeah, most of them. Others … just..
Res: What? Do they call you names?
Tevora: Yeah, sometimes.
Res: For example?
Tevora: I’m very black. I come from Congo under the volcano. I was cooked by the Volcano.

Tevora’s last response is reiterated by the Grade 9 teacher who confirms the way immigrant children are constructed by their peers. The partial exclusion evoked by Tevora is based upon his physical appearance. Denscombe et al (1993) believe that as part of the fabric of public prejudice, stereotyping discourse categorizes and attributes mental emotions. In social interactions, colour is recognized as a basis for inclusion or exclusion. It is also one of the major features of racial differentiation between local populations and newcomers (Akhtar 1999). Reference to skin pigmentation within the school acts as a continual reminder of the lower social status of African immigrants. It
appears that any feature that ‘makes a child different from the other is used for bullying’ (La Fontaine 1991: 13). The principal, Grade 9 teacher and learners add credence to the name calling issue raised by Tevora, contending that there is xenophobia among learners within the school (Interviews 1.7 & 1.9: Appendix G):

Res: Have you ever received any complaint about immigrant children being called names?
Princ: Possibly, sort of xenophobia. But we encourage students to accept everybody through religious, values, gender,. School is very open and we accept everybody. There might be kind of xenophobia.
Gr9 teacher: I must be honest here. Students ridicule them, laugh at them because of their accent, they call them names. The teacher’s duty is to make students understand that there is nothing bad to be immigrant.
Gr9 peer (boy): Sometimes they [foreign learners] fight if they follow the story. Even among us South Africans, we call each other names and fight.

The Grade 9 male learner sees name-calling as a natural phenomenon in social relationships and an inevitable response to his ‘Otherness’. However, language used among local learners is ideologically less sensitive than the stereotyping of immigrant children in schools because those foreign African children are accorded a lower social status. All those images of marginalisation or denigration are stored in the children’s minds, and create social categorization and lead to the formation of ethnic awareness (see Tajfel 1974). In contrast to Shaady’s school, Tevora’s institution reveals clear evidence of mistrust between local learners and their immigrant peers. Spindler and Spindler (1989) believe that such prejudice can damage self-esteem and slow academic progress. Instead, through informal conversations with Tevora, it became obvious that those ‘coercive relations of power’ (Cummins 1996) have affected his academic achievement positively and increased his motivation to work towards a better future. Stereotyping usually arises when immigrants’ children use their parental languages in school. But local peers’ attitudes to these languages are actually mixed (Interviews 1.9: Appendix G):

Gr9 peer (girl): I want them to speak a language I understand. Sometimes, they gossip about You. It is visible when they look at you and laugh.
(boy): I am a keen person. I ask about what they are speaking. I want to study political sciences and go anywhere. It’s better to learn other languages.

Clearly, attitudes to immigrants’ languages also depend on their future plans, and within the school, ethnicity manifests in diverse ways with implications for peer relationships.
In Tevora’s school identities are also negotiated using different strategies. To reverse the language problems, the school has taken serious steps by offering supportive special English courses. In addition, the Grade 9 teacher acknowledges that she encourages foreign learners to interact with others who are fluent in English. Both remedial courses and friendship create for all learners a new sociocultural environment conducive to effective learning.

4.3.4 Implications of the FLP for schooling

The English-only policy was designed to assist the children to operate appropriately in their new educational system by acquiring oral fluency. This means that the children could be expected to do better than those in the other research families. Oral fluency is, however, only one variable in relation to academic success and the children’s school reports show that ability in English is not a sufficient condition for achievement. The 2002 school reports (Appendix H) indicate that children in this English family do not perform better at school, particularly in English. Tevora’s Grade 9 2002 School Report (Appendix H) revealed that Tevora was below average in English, scoring 44.30% and 39.85% in Afrikaans and 31.40% in Mathematics (Promotion Grade Average). Although he was promoted to Grade 10, the marks obtained in most subjects do not do justice to the investment in the stated FLP. The poor marks in mathematics also indicate that the immigrant learner experiences language difficulties. After a few years of schooling in SA and considering the FLP, Tevora should have been able to read, understand numeracy terminology, and to understand other subjects. It is worth noting that other factors are likely to infringe on an immigrant child’s performance in school.

Similarly, Shaady, the youngest child, who started schooling in South Africa failed Grade 2 and it was recommended that he repeat the grade. The 2002 School Report (Appendix H) also showed that he could not cope with numeracy, listening, reading comprehension, expression, and writing. In reality, using two or more languages in the home does not necessarily impede academic progress. Anaka in particular acknowledges (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G) that
This view contradicts what she had said before concerning the reasons for establishing an English-only policy in the home. It concurs with Appel and Muysken (1987) who argue that if immigrant children have a reasonable degree of balance between the two languages, their overall intellectual development is not hindered but is, in fact, in many ways enhanced. Nevertheless, Anaka admits that the policy is an imposition on the family. Academic success may be influenced by ‘factors such as intelligence and access to opportunity’ (De Avilla 1986), not only by oral fluency. The FLP is certainly the product of an elitist father, the shift of symbolic power to English.

4.4 Identity

4.4.1 Identities based on language and culture

The data analysis reveals that the language in each situation confers upon individual family members specific personal and social identities. These are associated with the reasons for the FLP (Section 4.2 above) and are thus interpreted in the light of Ager’s (2001) concepts of image projection, protection and maintenance of identity, integration and instrumentality, insecurity, ideology and attitudes. I also draw on Layder’s (1993) constructs of ‘context, setting and situated activity and self’.

English and local African languages

The main aspect of the family’s ‘situated self’ relates to the family’s English-only policy. In the light of data analysed (Section 4.2), the first form is the projection of family image or identity as highly educated and middle-class to groups inside and outside of the ethnic community. Finku wants to see his family using English only within South Africa. In this regard, Ager (2001: 74) sees image as ‘the reflection of people’s identity and (at the same time) an intended projection of that identity’.

The second ascription of identity worth considering is the protection and maintenance of élite or je-le-connais identity in the family. In the diaspora there is a shift from French as
the elite language to English as it is the language of power and the medium of learning (MOL) in SA. To work positively towards the success of the protection and maintenance of their collective and personal élite identity, Finku resorts to an empowerment strategy encouraging mother and daughter to acquire English language communication skills at a Language Centre. It is believed that such a strategy offers the entire household equal opportunities for internal interaction and a collective identity. Despite this, not all members have the same oral fluency.

The third form of identity is an instrumental one (Norton 1997). In SA English has economic capital. The new family language policy aims to help children gain the ability necessary to answer the exigencies of the new system of education. It then confers upon family members power and confidence (Bourdieu 1991). The FLP is, therefore, adopted because in South Africa English is a means of upward mobility as well (de Klerk 2002). As a teacher of English and interpreter-translator (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G), Finku came to South Africa for socioeconomic mobility. In addition, English is Finku’s language of work and profession: the teaching of English as a second language, and interpreting-translation. Anaka insists that English will help the children in future wherever they go (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G).

Ager (2001) assumes that the creation and constant recreation of social identity and the willingness to act in conformity with expectations are the key elements in language policy motivation (p. 198). In this regard, Norton (2000) has found that an individual’s identity may change in accordance with changing social and economic conditions, in that these influence the way individuals understand the world and their possibilities for the future. Speaking English at home in SA is actually attached to family’s social mobility. It is widely accepted among family members. The family’s overall attitude to this prestigious language is more positive than to the DRC languages.

English in SA also has ethnic distinctiveness, in that its speaker’s accent may reveal who the person is or where s/he comes from. Knowledge of English accords subjects a certain security of identity that is likely to help this family to hide their primary identity.
Anaka said (Section 4.1.2; Interviews 1.3: Appendix G) that on the bus or in public, she speaks English to avoid being unveiled as a foreigner. Immigrants can be rejected if they speak DRC or ‘alien’ languages. Anaka observes the world around her and understands and disguises herself within it, using English in public places. Unfortunately, her accent unmasks her. Her children, however, are able to acquire local South African languages from their teachers and peers. This chameleon identity helps people to manifest sequential multiple selves, and to navigate through different multiple identities. I call this flexible, fit-in phenomenon ‘identity elasticity’, to mean that people in multiple circumstances display different multiple selves. This is certainly in tandem with the view that identity is a repertoire of possible selves.

**French and Swahili**

These languages used within the family framework also confer specific identities to their speakers. The use of homeland languages in the host land rests in ‘utilitarian value’ (see Coulmas 1991). French and Swahili link the English-only family to the DRC community and church. While English is the language of national representation in South Africa, French is the language of ethnic representation. French allows participation in activities organized by the DRC ethnic community, recreating the ‘imagined nation’ (Anderson 1983). Because French is the lingua franca for DRC nationals in South Africa, it is no longer perceived by DRC migrants as a marker of elitism but of nationality, or common belongingness and ethnic distinctiveness. That is, ethnic members who cannot speak certain DRC vernaculars resort to French to communicate with other DRC migrants. However, in this English-only family, French bears special meanings, i.e. it also carries the identity of love. It is the language of intimacy (Ager 2001) for the parents. Finku admits that *when we first met, we started speaking in French*.

In contrast, Finku’s negative attitude to Swahili (as the language of illiterate people) implies the status of indigenous languages created to the image of the enlightenment and colonialist vision of the West. Pennycook (2002) calls this vision *protectionism*, or ‘the ways in which mother language has been intertwined with particular ways of..."
constructing the ‘Other’ (p. 13). Despite his negative attitude to Swahili, it was the language of his primary socialization in his parental home (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G). Socially speaking, to be a je-le-connais, you must speak French. Reflecting on this divide, I agree with Janks (2000) that language, and other symbolic forms, can act as a powerful means of maintaining unequal relations of power. The wide acceptance of English as a home language and the denigration of African languages suggest that the parents are complicit in destroying their own languages (Bourdieu 1991; Ngugi 1986). The suppression of the parents’ languages in the home influences the language practices of members and impacts on their individual identities (see Section 4.3).

Drawing on the principle of ‘identity elasticity’, French and Swahili also allow parents to navigate through diverse identities depending on the circumstances. Regardless of the new FLP, French and Swahili are maintained because if family members have a secret, they use Swahili. Anaka uses English and Swahili to the children who respond in English or just keep silent. In practice, Swahili confers on Anaka lasting pride in her ethnic language that imparts to her specific values and norms, although it is denigrated by her husband.

Regarding DRC languages Anaka in another interview posits that my second son can speak but he refuses to. It is my belief that the second son has lost interest or fluency in the DRC languages because of the new FLP. Additionally, with education and literacy practices in English and exposure to English-speaking media and music in South Africa, the children in this family become unwilling to speak DRC languages. Carliner (2000) also suggests this in his research. The progressive loss of DRC languages in favour of English is acknowledged by both parents and their oldest son (Interviews 1.2, 1.3 & 1.4: Appendix G):

Finku: They still have it. They just stopped using it in a productive way. (Finku)
Anaka: Ils ont déjà le français en eux et devront seulement s’en rappeler. Ce ne sera pas une nouvelle langue pour eux. Ils ont arrêté de l’utiliser par ce que nous leur avons demandé de le faire pour faciliter leurs études en anglais. Ils le comprennent mais ne peuvent pas parler. Ils ont perdu l’habitude de parler.  [French]
(They already have French in them and will only have to recall it. It won’t be a new language for them. They have stopped using it because we have asked them to in order to facilitate their studies in English. They understand it but cannot speak it. They lost the habit of speaking it.)
If you want to go to the DRC, will you improve your spoken French {since it the dominant language)?

Tevora: No. I understand almost all words but cannot say some of them.

Res: Do you understand Lingala?

Tevora: I can’t speak Lingala but can understand it.

A parental language which is not used productively, Fishman (1991) argues, can become extinct from children’s memories, especially in the second generation.

4.4.2 Symbolic identity markers and practices in SA

My analysis shows that the symbolic elements of these subjects’ ethnic identities, in addition to their language practices are grandparents’ photos, the DRC flag, food, music, clothing, the DRC church.

**Karibu: Embodied greeting ritual**

During my observations, I noticed that the older daughter, Diba, performed cultural practices of meeting or welcoming someone. The cultural practice (both verbal and non-verbal) turns around a key concept of ‘Karibu’ embodying an entire cultural text. The verbal language is accompanied by an intricate set of non-verbal signals, or bodily communication (Argyle 1975), to make specific meanings. The cultural practice is divided into 4 phases: (1) attention attracting, (2) distant salutation, (3) body language and (4) words of offering/permission-giving. It was performed like this (as I observed) (Field notes 1: Appendix F):

She sets the table and comes near you and waits for a while to attract your attention. Then she ensures that you see her standing. After this, she walks/does one step back, half-kneels on her right leg while leaning on the other leg. Finally, she claps her hands smoothly once or twice, uttering ‘Karibu’.

The Swahili word ‘Karibu’ defines the speaker’s ethnic identity and homeland values of hospitality in the DRC Swahili-speaking tradition. It constitutes the usual ways of greeting someone or offering the guest something to drink or eat. The term ‘Karibu’ covers a range of meanings and is utilised in multiple circumstances. It means more than mere ‘Welcome’, ‘Feel at home’, ‘Bon appétit’, or ‘Cheers’. Although the family has an English-only policy, the phases of ‘Karibu’ cannot be transferred into the English language because it is culture/language-bound and thus would be decontextualised.
But it is evident that the older G1 children in this English-only family still keep their ethnic culture. Gans (1991: 75) also claims that people seek ‘ways to express identity that suit them best, opening the possibility of voluntary, diverse or individual ethnicity’. The excerpts that follow discuss focal children’s present nationality (Interviews 1.1: Appendix G):

Res: Now you are in SA, are you more South African than Congolese?  
Shaady: Congolese. At school they know that I am Congolese.

To this query Tevora responds in the same way (Interviews 1.2: Appendix G):

Tevora: Congolese  
Res: Why?  
Tevora: Because I was born in the DRC.  
Res: If you obtain SA citizenship, will you still consider yourself Congolese?  
Tevora: Yes, Congolese because that’s my country; it’s where I was born.

Nationality is a symbolic attachment to the DRC and its language/s in South Africa and seems to be merely ‘a nostalgic allegiance to the culture of the native nation, a love or pride felt and not practised in everyday life’ (Gans 1991: 76). This constitutes ‘appropriate or acceptable ways of behaviour’ (Mesthrie et al 2000: 19). Regardless of the lack of proficiency in DRC languages, the children still identify themselves as DRC nationals. Such a feeling supports the idea that ethnic identity can survive the loss of language (LePage & Tabouret-Keller 1985; Mesthrie 1995) and that someone may lose his/her ethnic language/s but still belong to that ethnic group. Moreover, nationality has nothing to do with the language an individual speaks. Speaking English does not turn a person into a British citizen. Similarly, a South African Congolese may not know or speak DRC languages but still feel Congolese and/or display passive multi-/bilingualism.

In my interview (Appendix G), Anaka compared the ‘DRC African women’s attire’ with that of her South African peers, which she believes is more westernised. Such symbolic identity which operates in the individuals’ behaviours in terms of ‘we do this’ and ‘they do that’ (Thomson et al 1993) is both positive (we do this) and negative (we don’t do this). Similarly, the utterances ‘as we do in our African countries’, or ‘I know that women in our African countries wear the pagnes’ naturalises, reifies or immobilises African
women’s fashion or clothing in contemporary Africa. Clearly, the way of life of the social milieu in which we find ourselves influences our habits, customs, values and beliefs. In the context of immigration, beside fashion, artifacts like ethnic food and music are also used to ease the anxiety of uprooting. Finku expresses his feeling in the following way:

Finku:  *DRC food makes you feel… at home.* (Interviews 1.4: Appendix G)

The same feeling is expressed by Tevora in the following interview extract (Interviews 1.2: Appendix G):

Res: Do you have anything that reminds you of your homeland?
Tevora: Mostly, we eat DRC food.
Res: How do you feel?
Tevora: I feel good.
Res: What else?
Tevora: Music. My grandparents’ photo, the flag. There was a flag but they removed it.

‘DRC food’ influences children’s eating habits and creates a certain re-presentation of the homeland in the diaspora. Photos and flag remind the children of where they come from. In the pursuit of ethnic belongingness and symbolic attachment to the DRC, the family members also resort to ethnic organizations, like the church. This, in addition to comfort, material and spiritual support, offers an opportunity to perpetuate their ethnic languages, listen to homeland news and worship comfortably in their language (Field notes: Appendix F).

### 4.4.3 Ethnic and linguistic identity maintenance and hybridization in SA

The ethnic and linguistic identity in SA is apparently maintained in Swahili and French and for various reasons (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G; Section 4.3.1.2) such as relationship with relatives in the DRC, memories of home places, connections with ethnic communities in SA, family intimacy and closeness and instrumentality. In addition, the children maintain their ethnic and national identity through their DRC church and trips to the homeland, in that the whole family returns annually to the DRC and sings in French and Swahili in their Church’s choir in SA.
By seeking to empower their children, parents actually contribute to the loss of their ethnic languages in SA. Harding and Riley (1989) claim that the astonishing ease with which young children learn a second language is only paralleled by the speed at which they can forget a language. This is compatible with Saunders’ (1982: 2) finding that immigrant families who shift to English hardly pass on ethnic languages to their children, and that the shift to the use of English is even stronger in the second generation. The chances of languages other than English being maintained on a long-term basis will decrease because children will in time lose emotional links with and/or mental images of their native land. But Anaka insists (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G):

*Même s’ils vont dans un groupe congolais, ils ne seront pas frustrés parce qu’ils comprennent.*

(Even if they go into a DRC group, they will not be frustrated because they understand [DRC languages].)

As indicated in Section 4.2.2.3 (Interviews 1.3 & 1.4: Appendix G), parents use other languages with each other and English with their children. As a result of the continuing use of homeland languages between parents, children may end up learning some Swahili and French in order to understand what is being said and to survive in the wider ethnic community. Research conducted by Clyne (1977a, cited in Appel & Muysken 1987) within the Australian context of immigration has shown that immigrants over 60 years revert more and more to their first language. She attributed this reversion to a clear decline in ability in their second language and that communication with children may be hindered if these have lost the ability to speak the homeland language. In South Africa, children will acquire a reasonable knowledge of English. However, Anaka believes that speaking DRC languages in SA carries memories of the homeland for the children (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G):

Res: Est-ce que parler les langues du Congo a un impact sur vos relations avec tes enfants?

[French]

(Does speaking DRC languages have an impact on your relationships with your children?)
Anaka: *Cela les rend plus proches de nous.* [French] (It makes them closer to us.)
Res: Cela leur rappelle-t-il quelque chose? (Does it remind them of something?)
Anaka: *Oui. Quelques fois Kinshasa et Lubumbashi où ils ont vécu.* [French]

(Yes. Sometimes Kinshasa and Lubumbashi where they had lived.)
Res: Quelle est, selon vous, la meilleure langue pour éduquer vos enfants en Afrique du Sud?

[French] (What do you think is the best language to educate your children in South Africa?)
Anaka: *Ma langue maternelle. Malheureusement, je ne la parle pas bien, excepté le Swahili. Je leur parle souvent en Swahili.* [French]

(My mother language. Unfortunately, I don’t speak it well, except Swahili. I often speak to them in
In her traditional role as a keeper of culture, Anaka (the mother) attempts to ignore the language policy she supported, by encouraging children to speak Swahili and to a lesser extent French (Section 4.2.2.3). Parents’ attitudes towards their native country and homeland languages are vital to the politics of language maintenance in the diaspora. This is what both parents and their oldest son, Tevora, say about their plan for a possible return or that of their children to the DRC (Interviews 1.2 – 1.4: Appendix G):

Anaka: Visiter? Oui. Nous pouvons y aller mais pas rester là pour le moment. Ce serait une grande erreur parce que les enfants étudient déjà en anglais maintenant et auront à réapprendre le français. Travailler là? No. Peut-être faire des affaires. A moins que ils [les enfants] décident eux-mêmes d’aller travailler là. 'est pas aux parents de suggérer. [French] (Visit? Yes. We can go but not stay there for the time being. It would be a great mistake because children are studying in English now here and will have to re-learn French. Working there? No. Perhaps doing business. Unless they [children] decide themselves to go and work there. It’s not up to the parents to suggest.)

Finku: They should trace their roots, and we’re not here to live and stay. We’re here to prepare for the future. If they really want to go back, why not? Those who want to stay here can. But going back to Congo will be one of the best things they would do. When we get older, definitely we’ll go back to Congo.

Tevora: I might go there (DRC) to visit but not to stay because I am planning to go to another country like Brazil. I try to speak Portuguese. Portuguese is a bit like French.

Parents' views engender complex identities in the research subjects. The mother who encourages her children to learn DRC languages is opposed to the return to the homeland, in contrast to the father who initiated the English-only FLP. For Anaka migration seems to be ‘a one-way trip’ (Chambers 1994, citing Stuart Hall). Accordingly, Said (1990) claims that ‘migrancy and exile involve a discontinuous state of being, a form of picking a quarrel with where you come from’ (p. 365). Obviously, a return to the DRC is not feasible now.

In the extract above Tevora shows less interest in returning to the DRC and displays investment in language as a means of planning his future by learning Portuguese. Saunders (1982) suggests that the lack of permanent or temporary return to the homeland by the children can result in loss of ethnic languages and, therefore, cuts them off from close contacts with their relatives still living in the homeland and emotionally with their country of origin. This family’s children are not cut off from their
homeland because they return annually to the DRC. Additionally, they are linked to the ethnic community through their DRC church where they sing in French and Swahili, and English in a choir.

The imposition of an English-only policy at home in the host nation receives mixed feelings among family members. Despite the use of English in the household, the family refuses to assimilate culturally as highlighted in this interview extract (Interviews 1.4; 1.3: Appendix G):

Res: Do you think parental authority can escape from them if they speak South African languages only?
Finku: I teach my children not the English way. I teach them the way I learned it from my parents or home. I don’t want to be away from our own culture. I try to teach the culture I was brought up in by using another language [i.e. English].

(No. French, they know. We can also use English to educate children.) [French]

Grosjean (1982) has suggested that a bi-/multi-lingual may use a lingua franca to express essentially the culture of his ethnic group. It may be deduced that linguistic shift does not necessarily bring about a shift in primary identities and/or parent–child relationships (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). People have multiple selves and use them in different situations. In addition, it is difficult to determine conclusively how much can be used to transfer ethnic culture or values from ethnic languages into the English language. Eva Hoffmann (1998) reports her sociocultural experiences of being ‘lost in the translation’ of cultures in Canada. But it is evident that there is some difference between DRC culture and SA culture at the level of childrearing as Anaka indicates in the following interview extract (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G):

Res: Y a-t-il une différence entre la culture sud-africaine et la culture congolaise? [French]
(Is there any difference between South African culture and DCR culture?)
Anaka: Oui. Les filles apportent les copains à la maison. Ici les enfants sont conseillés d’appeler la police si les parents les blâment, etc. [French]
(Yes. Girls bring boyfriends home. Here children are advised to call the police if parents blame them, etc.)

Smolicz (2001) has found that the maintenance of homeland languages in immigrant families in Australia mainly aimed at transferring or nurturing ethnic values. In this regard, language is linked to culture (Ngugi wa Thiong’o 1993, 1986). Similarly, Swahili
is seen as the language of utilitarian morality that can confer upon the family members ethical beliefs in the new land with the ethnic exigencies of appropriate behaviours.

**Hybridization of identity**

Because of the social demands exerted over them by the home, school, and the wider South African society, the identities of immigrant children are likely to change.

Res:       Est-ce que les enfants ont changé depuis leur arrivée en Afrique du Sud?
(Have children changed since their arrival in South Africa?)

Anaka:    Pas du tout. Ils sont encore tous respectueux. Sauf le deuxième garçon. Il est trop exigeant. Quand il voit quelque chose avec ses amis, e.g. nouveaux habits, nouvelles chaussures, il doit les obtenir. Il a un peu changé. Il est toujours avec ses amis. Mais ils n’ont pas changé du point de vue culturel. [French] (Not at all. They all are still respectful. Except the second son, he is too demanding. When he sees something with his friends, e.g. new clothes, new shoes, he must get them. He has changed a little. He’s always with his friends. But they have not changed from the cultural point of view.)   (Interviews 1.3: Appendix G)

What should be noted is the acquisition of new meanings and new language behaviours. As Hall (1990: 235) claims, living in a foreign country is a process whereby new meanings, new values, new practices, and new significances are continually (re-) created.

4.5 Conclusion

The data analysis in this chapter has shown that three factors, namely external forces, power, regulation and identity impact on the family’s different generations and on their expectations. The power and prestige of English in SA, likely to provide material rewards, have influenced the father to impose a monolingual English language policy at home. But the FLP is not really regulated as other languages are used in the family. Nevertheless, it seems it that has been successful, given that since all members can speak English and they have hybridized identities. The language practices of this English-only family differ from those of the French-only household (see Chapter 5) and the other research families.
5.1 Introduction

Like the parents of the English-only family, the parents of this family are from different ethnic language groups: Sakata for the father and Mongo for the mother. Both are fluent in Lingala but have different levels of proficiency in French; the father is more fluent than the mother. Like the English-only family, this family also elected to use French at home in the DRC where it is the language of the elite. In contrast to the English-only family, this family migrated for study purposes rather than for economic reasons, and therefore can also be defined as voluntary migrants. The father is a French teacher and a doctoral student in French literature. It is interesting that both fathers (i.e. English-only and French-only) chose the language that they teach for the family’s language policy. Unlike the father in the English-only family who chose the high status language of the host land, the father of this family opted for the homeland’s language of power and prestige. It is the father’s view that French is important for the children’s global aspirations and for maintaining their national and ethnic identity in SA. Because the parents are not comfortable using English, they were unable to manage xenophobic encounters. For this reason they elected to live in a DRC neighbourhood and to confine their activities there. This resulted in a high level of enclosure in the DRC community which is evidenced through their leadership in the DRC church and participation in DRC organizations. This family has not done as well as the English-only family in South Africa but they are not able to return to the DRC, although the parents would like to, because of the political instability there. The parents have, therefore, become accidental refugees. The choice of French is consistent with their desire to return to the DRC. The children, who go to a school with many South African children, are becoming integrated and do not share their parents’ interests in DRC church affairs; neither do they wish to return to the DRC. While they speak and understand French, they prefer to speak English among themselves. In fact, one of the research children is fully integrated and speaks Afrikaans and isiZulu.
The following data analysis provides an understanding of how external forces, power, policy regulation and identity govern the French-only language policy in their home in South Africa.

5.2 Context: External forces

5.2.1 Life account, migration motives and geographic location

This French-only family consists of a couple and seven children. They live in Berea (Johannesburg), an area which is second to Yeoville in terms of being a popular destination for foreign Africans, particularly French-speaking nationals, including DRC citizens (mainly refugees and asylum seekers). Like the English-only family, the parents of this household come from different ethnic language groups: Sakata and Mongo. The focal members of this family renamed Jate (father), Tebe (mother), Peja (eldest son), Lepri (youngest daughter) for the sake of maintaining anonymity arrived in the host land in two groups: the father, and later on the mother and their children.

There are always several reasons for people leaving their native land for another. As in the English-only family, the father was the one who suggested the idea of immigration and was the first family member to migrate. In the following extract (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G) Jate (father) explains how he arrived in South Africa:

_J'étais Chef des Travaux à l'Institut Supérieur Pédagogique de Mbandaka où j’enseignais les langues et littérature françaises pendant des années. En 1991, Président Mobutu a signé une ordonnance portant fermeture des universités et collèges d'enseignement supérieur dans lesquels les étudiants avaient marché ou s'étaient révoltés. Donc j’ai décidé de quitter le pays pour l'Afrique du Sud. D’abord je suis allé à Wits University pour ma maîtrise. Ensuite, je suis rentré au pays pour voir si la situation avait changé. Mais elle n’avait pas changé. Finalement, je suis revenu ici avec un visa touristique._ [French]
(L was a senior lecturer at Mbandaka College of Higher Education where I had been teaching French Literature and Language for years. In 1991, President Mobutu signed a decree closing all universities and colleges of higher education in which the students marched or revolted. So I decided to leave the country for South Africa. Firstly, I went to Wits University for my MA. Then I went back to the country to see if the situation had changed [i.e. whether the closed institutions were reopened]. But it did not change. Finally, I came back here. [i.e. to South Africa] on a tourist visa.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

These circumstances are what Tollefson (1991: 34) describes as ‘push factors’. Jate came to South Africa in early 1991 and undertook two attempts of exploration and
settlement. The first voyage was a ‘come and see’ trip while the latter was motivated by sociopolitical circumstances (Adams 2001). In contrast to Finku (father: English-only family) who chose to leave the DRC in search of a better life, Jate does not underline the economic conditions of his life in the homeland, which both Jate and Tebe describe as ‘good’. However, Jate’s second migration arose from the worsening of the DRC’s socio-economic and political situation, confirming Mattes et al’s (1999) view. He reveals:

En 1992, j’avais appris qu’il y a eu des pillages terribles pendant lesquels des femmes et des filles étaient aussi violées. Alors j’ai décidé d’aller les prendre à partir de Brazza. Nous avons voyagé par avion. [French]
(In 1992 I was told that there were terrible pillages during which women and girls were also raped. So I decided to go and get them from Brazzaville. We traveled by plane.)
(Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Tebe agrees wholeheartedly with Jate:

(I was first a primary school teacher and then I resigned. I was doing small business. We came here after the pillages when Jate came to fetch us from Brazzaville. There was a terrible pillage in Kinshasa. At that time life became impossible. Then Jate sent us some money for visas. We did not expect that. He asked us to leave for Brazzaville where we joined him and flew to South Africa.)
(Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Because of the looting in the DRC at that time, Jate’s social status in the host land changed from that of voluntary migrant to that of an accidental refugee\(^3\) (Elovitz & Kahn 1997, in Akhtar 1999: 167). The socio-political crisis, for foreign Africans from undemocratic nations, is seen as one of the major factors for migrating into SA (Crush 1996). While Tebe’s immigration history is influenced by Jate’s decision, the minor children in this French household had to immigrate with their mother to escape sociopolitical insecurity and misery. Lepri (the TG) and Peja (the young G1) aged about 3 years and 7 years respectively had no knowledge of the reasons for leaving their native country, insisting (Interviews 2.1 & 2.2: Appendix G):

Peja: Je ne me souviens de rien. J’étais trop jeune. [French]

---
\(^3\)An accidental refugee, according to Elovitz and Kah (1997), a person who arrived in a foreign country for a visit or any other business but because of changed (socio-political) situations in the country of origin can no longer go back there.
(I remember nothing. I was too young.) (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G)

Lepri: I don’t know anything. (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G)

However, they were aware that the father was living in another country. It is recognized that new migrants tend to settle in the areas where fellow countrymen live. Although theorists of SA immigration (e.g. McDonald et al 2000, 1998) report that migration to South Africa is often prompted by fellow countrymen who arrived earlier in the country, Jate did not experience this.

Res: Before coming to South Africa, did you have any friends or connections?
Jate: Non. Mais quand je suis arrivé ici, j’ai cherché des concitoyens. [French]
(No. But when I arrived here, I looked for fellow countrymen.)
(Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

It is true that Jate did not have any connection with the migration chains in South Africa. However, on his arrival he looked for fellow countrymen in the very popular ethnicized areas. His reasons for this choice emerge in this excerpt (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G):

Res: Where did you first settle?
Jate: Esselen, Résidence de Wits University à Hillbrow. Ensuite, je suis allé à Ponte City, Berea, où je vis depuis 10 ans près. [French]
(Esselen, Wits University Residence in Hillbrow. Then I went to Ponte City, Berea, where I have been living for almost 10 years.)

Res: Why?
Jate: Parce que nous étions marqués et agressés et devrions donc aller où la plupart des congolais vivaient. J’étais aussi encouragé ou conseillé par des compatriotes qui y vivaient. [French]
(Because we were marked and assaulted and thus had to go where most DRC nationals were living. I was also encouraged or advised by fellow countrymen who were living there.)
(Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Since his arrival in South Africa in 1991, Jate as the migration initiator, unlike Finku and his family, had been living in the heart of a DRC ethnic area. Ethnic concentration has implications for the language policy in the family (Section 5.2.2), in that it promotes the maintenance of homeland languages and some cultural links with the homeland, allowing newcomers to be apprenticed into the new life (Funkhouser 2000: 489). For this family, living in an ethnic area provided companionship and protection against hostility and rejection and softened the effect of the shock of uprooting and resettling in a new socio-cultural milieu. This concurs with Taylor and Barlow (2000: 135) who claim that ‘having family and friends in SA is supportive in two fundamental ways: it helps the new immigrants to find immediate support in the form of housing, community, local
information, and it is an opportunity to be initiated into the host society’s worldview’ (p.160). The geographic location of this household undoubtedly has an impact on the FLP in SA.

However, difficulties with the English language have been one of the main reasons for settling in the ethnic area (see Section 5.2.1). Jate said:

\[I\text{avais certaines difficultés pour comprendre l’accent de leur anglais et aussi pour parler de façon compétente.} \text{[French]} \]

(I had some difficulty to understand the accent of their [South Africans’] English and also to speak competently.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Hunter (2000) insists on the role of language ability in the process of assimilation and settlement. The details of the family’s background information appear in Table 4 (Appendix I). Jate’s experience with English, the local dominant language, is also the first experience with defining or delimitating his boundaries, or repositioning himself in SA.

5.2.2 The ‘Other’, language and ethnic boundaries

Jate underscores the good treatment that DRC nationals (then Zairians) enjoyed from the white South Africans in the apartheid era in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

\[En\text{ route et même ici, les relations étaient bonnes. Nous Zaïrois étions bien considérés, bienvenus, particulièrement par les blancs. Les noirs étaient réservés. Les congolais n’avaient pas besoin de visas à partir du pays ou de Kinshasa mais les obtenaient à la frontière.} \text{[French]} \]

(On the way and even here, relationships were good. We Zairians were well-considered, welcomed, particularly by Whites. Blacks were reserved. Congolese nationals did not need to apply for visas in their country or in Kinshasa but obtained them at the port of entry.) (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

In contrast, his first contacts with some local Africans were marked by rejection and stereotyping defined by the single term ‘amakwere-kwere’ which he elaborates:

\[Honnêtement, je me sens mal à l’aise. A mon avis, nos frères ne comprennent pas ce qu’ils appellent ‘amakwere-kwere’. Pour eux, ‘amakwere-kwere’ sont des gens qui parlent des langues inintelligibles. Et pourtant, quand ils parlent isiZulu ou seSotho, nous ne comprenons pas non plus ou quelques fois comprenons un peu. Finalement, je me demande qui est ‘amakwere-kwere’ et qui ne l’est pas. Pour eux, un étranger noir, c’est quelqu’un qui a quitté son pays et est venu arracher leur travail, etc. Ce qui est incroyable, ils ne considèrent pas les blancs et les autres comme étrangers, seulement les étrangers noirs africains.} \text{[French]} \]

(Honestly, I feel at unease. In my view, our brothers don’t understand what they call ‘amakwere-kwere’. According to them, ‘amakwere-kwere’ are people who speak unintelligible languages. Yet when they speak isiZulu or seSotho, we don’t understand or sometimes understand a
little. Finally, I wonder who is ‘amakwere-kwere’ and who is not. For them, a black foreigner is someone who left his native land and came to grab their jobs, etc. What is unbelievable is that they don’t consider Whites and other foreigners as strangers, only foreign black Africans.)
(Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Language is an important parameter of differentiation between locals and foreigners. Mpe (2001) confirms that black foreigners are labeled so ‘on account of a sound that their unintelligible foreign languages were supposed to make’ (p. 20). Referring to the recent past, Bloom (1998) speaks of the emotional damage of apartheid. The past differences led (and perhaps still lead) the oppressed to develop defensive behaviours leaving the population internally divided and psychologically mistrustful. Despite some improvement in inter-ethnic relationships, Jate is still upset by the negative attitudes he first encountered. In contrast to the English-only family that was able to manage xenophobia and seek better opportunities through integration, this family only feels safe in its ethnic enclave.

Tebe (mother) describes her first contact outside of the national borders in terms of the physical environment, language, and clothing:

Awa namonaki difference na environnement: ba ndako ya minene, banzela,banzela ya minene, bamagasins ya minene. Lisusu, anglais ezali pasi. Minoko na bango pe ezali different na oyo ya biso. Okoki’ko comprendre yango te. Jate motu abandaki kolobela biso. Na mboka na biso, bamama balataka na ndenge ya respect mpo na kolakisa que bazali mariées. Awa bazo lata bajupes yamikuse, pantalons serrés, bajupes transparentes. Balobaka lisusu que okoki kovanda na mobali moko te bambula ebele. [Lingala – French] (Here [i.e. South Africa] I was amazed at the difference in the built environment or infrastructure: buildings, roads, highways, larger shopping malls. Again, their languages are different from ours. They are hard to understand. Jate managed to interpret for us. In our country, mothers dress up in a respectful way to show that they are married. Here they wear short skirts, tight trousers, transparent skirts. They also say that you cannot live with the same man for years.)

Not only does she experience differences in the built environment, she also has difficulty in understanding local languages. She insists that she does not understand English, and South African African languages (see Section 5.2.3) are different from the DRC Bantu languages. She confirms that in South Africa communication is mediated by Jate (her husband). Additionally, she pinpoints cultural differences. These conflict with her native land’s gender specific ‘ways of behaving, thinking, being, believing, saying’ (Gee 1996: ix), which are inculcated into children in the early stages of socialization.
The cultural differences then become both markers of identification and/or rejection, as the following interview extract indicates.

Res: As a foreigner, how are you perceived?
Jate: Je suis considéré étranger avec toutes les réalités que nous rencontrons ici. (I am constructed as a foreigner with all realities we are facing here.) [French]
Res: What are those realities?
Jate: Nous les vivons chaque jour. Dans la rue à cause de l’habillement vous êtes appelés ‘makwere-kwere’. A cause de votre habillement, vous êtes agressés et volés, et aussi à cause de l’utilisation des langues sud-africaines. [French]
(We face them everyday. In the street, because of attire you are called ‘foreigners’. Because of your clothing you are assaulted and robbed, and also because of the use of South African languages.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Elaborating on inter-ethnic relations, Tebe adds credence to Jate’s assumption, saying:

(We are easily identified because of our clothing: bubu, maputa\textsuperscript{4}. They dislike foreign [black] Africans but like foreign Whites only. We are as Black Africans as they are, with the same culture. But they call us ‘makwere-kwere’. They also say that we came to steal their jobs. That is why they do not like us.) (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Visible differences sometimes lead to physical violence. Such unpleasant social experiences still persist in some encounters between foreign Africans and local Africans. It is claimed that physical appearance and such cultural elements as clothing (Akhtar 1999; Luke & Luke 1998) can be used to construct an individual’s ethnic group. It is true that African fashion sometimes defines a person’s origin. Jate’s and Tebe’s experiences are similar to Anaka’s (mother: English-only family). They fear xenophobia.

Using a ‘stranger’ language within a given area often generates inter-ethnic conflicts. Intonation (Morgan 1997) and language proficiency (Carliner 2000) are features of ethnic membership, in that they serve as markers for self-definition as do visible differences such as clothing and bodily characteristics (Akhtar 1999). This gives rise to various forms of discrimination and prejudice (Nann 1982). Both Jate and Tebe resent their marginalisation because they are also black Africans. While resistance to such stereotyping allows the participants to maintain a certain mental balance and thus
minimize the effects of their uprooting, the fear of being identified as an ‘Other’ causes Tebe to hide her true self, claiming (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G):

Soki nake wenze, nalataka pantalons po na mibomba et po na koéviter curiosité.  
[ Lingala – French]  
(While shopping I wear trousers to disguise myself and also distract curiosity.)

Tebe adopts the same camouflage strategy as Anaka (mother: English-only family) to fit into the host society unnoticed. The effects of such behaviour are anxiety, homesickness, and self-isolation (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G).

Res: When you are marginalised, what do you think of?  
Jate: Je pense à mon pays et me dis que je dois rentrer dans mon pays et me sentirais plus à l’aise là-bas. [French]  
(I think of my country and say to myself that I must go back and would feel more at ease there)

Tebe comments:

Tebe: En tout cas kuna na mboka tozalaki bien. Tozangaki eloko ata moko te. Tozalaki bien. Mbongo tozalaki na’ngo. Kuna pe ba occasions eza ebele. [Lingala - French]  
(In reality we were well settled there. We lacked nothing. We had money. There are a lot of opportunities in the homeland.)  
(Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Res: Can you one day return to the DRC?  
Tebe: Oui, awa baétrangers balingi bango te. Il faut tozonga na mboka parce que soki paix ezali, tokoki kozua makambu ya bien kuna, promotion kuna que awa. [French - Lingala]  
(Yes. Here foreigners are not accepted. We can get better opportunities, social promotion there if there is stable peace.)  
(Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Yet ‘feeling more at ease’ (i.e. socially safer) is what the parents lacked in their homeland, resulting in their leaving the DRC for SA. Despite her anxiety, Lepri is not ready to return to her native land which she defines as a ‘bad country’ (Section 5.2.3). Immigrants know that ‘in a secular and contingent world, homes are always provisional and that borders and barriers which enclose them within the safety of familiar territory can also become prisons’ (Said 1990: 365). So both Jate and Tebe still nurture the idea of a possible return to their homeland where they hope to recover their former socio-economic status. However, drawing on Stuart Hall, Chambers (1994: 9) contends that migration is a one-way trip, meaning that the return is always uncertain and in some cases impossible.

---

4 Bubus are West-African large gown-like clothes worn both by men and women and covering the entire body from the neck to the ankles while Maputa is a DRC Lingala word for the French ‘pagnes’ (Chapter 4: Section 4.1.2).
Unlike the English-only household, Tebe blames some members of the local society for her poor material conditions, ignoring the fact that her isolation is self-imposed. However, Jate attempts to understand the cause of the stereotyping of foreign Africans. He links this to the mistrust in people’s relationships created by the political regime of the recent past:

> Je pense que ceci est dû aux souffrances qu’ils ont endurées pendant l’apartheid. Certains disent que ‘quand nous souffrions, les noirs ne nous ont pas aidés’. Mais ceci est le contraire. Je pense aussi que les statuts sociaux de différents groupes ethniques sont encore encrés dans leurs esprits. Voilà pourquoi ils tolèrent les blancs. [French]
>(I think that this is due to the sufferings they endured during the apartheid era. Some say that while we were suffering, foreign blacks did not assist us. But this is the contrary. I think that the social statuses of different ethnic groups are still rooted in their minds. That is why they tolerate whites.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

The parents’ view is the same as that of the English-only family, except that here Jate (father) goes deeper into the hatred from local peers. Kent (2002) believes that ethnic group members need to have an ‘Other’ as differences increase awareness of who a person really is and what s/he looks like to others.

In the context of migration, parents’ experience of resettling in the host land differs from that of their children. Lepri (the TG member) argues that the use of French at school causes her local peers to believe that they (foreign children) are swearing at them (see Section 5.2.3). Peja, the young G1, has this to say (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G):

Res: Do you sometimes feel rejected or hated in any way or another?
Peja: Non (No)
Res: How are you considered in South Africa?
Peja: Comme un sud-africain, sauf quand nous sommes arrivés ici pour la première fois, nous étions appelés ‘makwere-kwere’. [French]
>(As a South African, save when we arrived here for the first time, we were called ‘makwere-kwere’.)
Res: Meaning?
Peja: Etrangers (Foreigners) [French]
Res: How did you feel at that time when you were called ‘makwere-kwere’?
Peja: Je n’avais rien senti parce que je ne savais pas ce que cela signifiait. J’étais trop Jeune pour comprendre. Même maintenant je ne sens rien. [French]
>(I felt nothing because I did not know what it meant. I was too young to understand. Even today I feel nothing)
If the parents (unlike those of the English-only family) want to return to the DRC, their children conversely desire to stay in SA. Peja’s actual confidence is rooted in his knowledge of English, Afrikaans and isiZulu (see Section 5.2.3).

5.2.3 Power and prestige of French in the diaspora

Unlike the English-only family who chose the dominant language of the host land, this family establishes French as the language of interaction at home in SA. The postcolonial elites in the DRC spread the idea that a cultured person is one who speaks (good) French and assimilates French culture (Brausch 1961), a view that Fanon (1967) is critical of. While French is the language of educated people and provides prestige and material rewards to its speakers in the DRC, it is a leveler in SA because it acts as the neutral medium of communication between the DRC nationals who cannot communicate in a lingua franca other than French.

5.3 Power, choice, and regulation of the FLP

5.3.1 Family language profiles

The language repertoires of the French-only family are as varied as those of the English-only household and are described in Table 6 (Appendix I). The father's language repertoire is larger than that of the other family members. The analysis of Table 6 (Appendix I) reveals that children's knowledge of their parents' DRC indigenous languages (such as Kikongo, Lingala, Swalkili, Sakata) is almost non-existent. This also indicates that these languages are disappearing for the children.

In contrast to the English-only family (Chapter 4, Section 4.2.), French serves as a link language shared by the different generations (G1, TG, G2) in the family. It should be noted that all children have French as their primary language but also speak English, the medium of instruction. Some children (especially TG and G2) have passive multilingualism in their language repertoires; they can hear and understand Lingala but are unable to speak, read and write it. The lack of oral fluency can be partially attributed
to the language policy implemented in the family. The language proficiency of focal participants in their homeland languages as well as local languages is represented in Table 6 (Appendix I). It should be noted that bi-/multilingual people do not use all their languages in the same way. Let us now consider Jate’s language proficiency.

**Jate’s proficiency**

Jate’s profession and proud elitism made French the dominant medium among different family members. Beside his fluency in French, Kikongo, Lingala and Swahili, he speaks some Sakata, his mother language but his literacy skills are more developed in the four official languages (cited above) than in Sakata. The reason is:

*Parce que nous sommes partis tôt et vivions en ville où le kikongo et le français sont tous deux des langues d’instruction. C’est pourquoi je parle plus Kikongo que Sakata. Mes parents me parlaient en Sakata et je répondais en kikongo ou français.* [French]  
(Because we moved to and lived in an urban area early where both Kikongo and French were media of instruction. That’s why I speak more Kikongo than Sakata. My parents spoke to me in Sakata but I responded in Kikongo or French.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

It is clear that language loss can result from movement inside the DRC. Jate’s loss of Sakata is similar to Finku’s relation to his mother language Kiluba. Jate also maintains that he can understand Tshiluba that he learned together with Swahili and Lingala in the neighbourhood. In South Africa, he can communicate in English and contends that he can read and write this language without much difficulty. His literacy capabilities in English are obviously sufficient for his needs. Jate feels more comfortable in French, the language of his academic research and profession. Despite his long stay in the host land, he can only speak a little isiZulu, nothing beyond some formulaic expressions that he learnt in the streets and public places needed for everyday interaction. He attributes the lack of knowledge of African languages to the local Africans’ attitudes towards foreign Africans and insists that he does not have South African friends:

*Nous sommes traités d’étrangers. Les relations n’ont jamais été vraiment franches.* [French]  
(Not friends as such but comrades. There’s that feeling of rejection, resentment, where we are treated as foreigners. Relations have never been really frank.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Friendship relies upon life selection criteria (Peshkin 1991). Jate believes that the best way to learn local languages is to:
This assumption is compatible with Spolsky (1989) who argues that the learning of the host society’s dominant language by immigrants depends on how open this society is to immigrants. It is also true that immigrants’ self-isolation can impede social integration and the means of acquiring local languages (Heller 1987).

**Tebe’s proficiency**

Tebe (the mother) claims that she speaks French fluently but my observations show that she usually speaks and feels more comfortable in Lingala, her primary language, which she comments on with ethnic pride: *Nazali Mungala* (I am Mungala, i.e. from the Bangala ethnic group in which Lingala originated). She can hear and understand Kikongo and can read and write Lingala very well and French fairly well, arguing that ‘*na français, il faut kokanisa liboso okoma*’ [Lingala – French switch] (in French, first you have to think before you write). The shift from Lingala to French shows a certain degree of schooling. In addition, she speaks almost no English or isiZulu beyond a few formulaic expressions. In the interview extract below she states that she does not make the effort to learn to speak English and local African languages ‘because of childcare or housework’ (see also Norton 2000) and, most importantly, because of the marginalisation of foreign Africans by some members of the host society.

*Ba mots mike kaka ya anglais, mpo naza na ngai intéressée te n’anglais. Nalingi yango te.*

_Eza malamu te._ [Lingala - French]

(Few words from English because I am not interested in English. I don’t like it. It is not good.)

(Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

When asked about the rationale behind this dislike, she commented:

*Mpo na ndenge bazo considérer biso neti ba étrangers. Bayinaka biso mpe balingi minoko na biso te.* [Lingala - French]

(Because of the way we are treated as foreigners. They hate us and also don’t like our languages.) (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Ager (2001) found that any new cultural and linguistic demand poses stress. Tebe decides to maintain indifference to both South African society and its languages. Such an ethnicised position actually disempowers her during family interactions and in her
confidence to communicate with non-French and/or non-DRC language speakers. It also prevents her from developing her social networks and acquiring the material resources she needs. Heller (1982: 3) notes that ‘ethnicity may limit someone’s ability to participate in some of the social networks of the host society’. However, Jate disapproves of Tebe’s extreme position:

*Parler les langues sud-africaines est une façon de s’intégrer dans leur milieu social pour mieux comprendre les réalités locales.* [French]

(Speaking South African languages is a way of integrating into their social networks in order to better understand local realities.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Clearly, Tebe’s personal isolation prevents her from making friends with South African peers. Similarly, Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1991) found that isolation, linguistic poverty and reluctance to social mixing limit immigrant parents from becoming part of the social system in which they live’ Stressing her recalcitrance to learning local languages, she says:

*Eza volonté na ngai, mpo na b’habitudes ya basi ya mabala. Balingi ba boyfriends, et pourtant Babala, ndenge na bango ya kolata: bacollants, bajupes ya mikuse. Lisusu, y’olingi bango kasi bango balingi bino te. Yango wana natika na ngai, nafanda na ngai.*

[Lingala – French with English borrowing]

(It’s my will, because of married women’s behaviours. They need boyfriends, and yet they are married, their way of dressing up: tights, very short skirts. Also, you like them but they don’t like you in return. That’s why I dropped everyone. I live by myself [i.e. without local female friends]) (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

The adaptive demands upon an adult female immigrant can be difficult, in that she has to learn a new ‘woman and mother role’ as defined by the cultural values of the host society (Nann 1982: xi). The first part of Tebe’s statement signals cultural conflict concerning specific ways of being and believing. Her reflection on African women’s outfits is fixed, reified and narrow. At the same time, it indicates the different practices into which African women are historically socialized in their ethnic communities. In the second part of her account Tebe claims that she tries to make friends but in vain because she feels marginalised as a foreign African woman. As a result, she loses the opportunity to learn English. However, later in an interview Tebe says (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G):

*Na koyekola yango. Na tango nayaki n’Afrique du Sud, nazalaki kaka na ndako, mpo nazalaki lisusu na zemi. Moyen na bima libanda te mpo nayekola anglais. Bana batangisaka ngai*
(I will learn it. When I arrived in SA, I was always in the house and also pregnant. So I could not go out and learn English. The children also teach me English because they want me to speak it, especially the youngest [i.e. the SA-born] because they speak good and simple, clear English. They teach me and say that I am stubborn and don’t want to keep it. The older ones say: ‘other mums who arrived here after you know how to speak English, except you. Why?)

Age at the time of immigration and motivation are important factors in second language acquisition (Baker 2000). As a mother of young children, Tebe finds herself shut in at home and in her ethnic community. This delays motivation to communicate in the dominant language of the host nation. Such a view is compatible with Norton’s (2000) findings that housework and childcare impede mothers from learning English and empowering themselves. Fluency in English and Afrikaans serves as the gatekeeper to job opportunities in South Africa while South African African languages allow possible integration into local African communities. It is recognised that learning a new language leads to learning to be part of a new social system, its cultural values, and norms in order to function appropriately.

Peja’s and Lepri’s proficiencies
Peja and Lepri were aged respectively almost 7 years and 3 years old when they arrived in South Africa. Peja, the young G1, had almost two years of schooling in French in the DRC and some knowledge of Lingala, the Kinshasa lingua franca. Observations and interviews revealed that Peja spoke French very well. He acknowledges that he speaks Lingala fairly well but I did not capture a single instance of his use of Lingala. This may result from the establishment of a French-only language policy at home (Section 5.2.2.2). Peja also contends that his literacy capabilities are more developed in French, his former medium of instruction and primary DRC language, than in Lingala. He is defined by his teacher (Section 5.2.3) and defines himself as a ‘fast-take’ multilingual person (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G).

Res: What South African languages do you speak?
Peja: Anglais, Afrikaans, isiZulu (English, Afrikaans, isiZulu.) [French]
Res: How well do you speak them?
Peja: Anglais: très bien, Afrikaans: bien, isiZulu: un peu. [French]
(English: very well, Afrikaans: well and Zulu: a little.)
Res: What languages can you understand?
Peja: seSotho and Tswana.
Res: How did you learn all of them?
Peja: Anglais comme langue d'instruction, Afrikaans comme deuxième langue, isiZulu, seSotho et Tswana avec des amis à l'école. [French]
(English as the medium of instruction; Afrikaans as a second language and isiZulu, seSotho, Tswana with friends at school.

Walking with and making friends with local peers lessens frustration and the sentiment of exclusion and encourages the learning of local African languages. As a result, Peja believes that he is taken to be a South African citizen (Interviews: Appendix G).

Lepri speaks a little French and understands Lingala (Section 5.2.2.2). She started schooling in English, her second language, which has actually become her primary language and French, a second language. Although she can speak French, Lepri is unable to read and write it. She insists that she feels more comfortable in English than in French in which she has limited oral proficiency (Interviews 2.1: Appendix G):

Res: What language do you feel comfortable in?
Lepri: English
Res: What languages do you like speaking?
Lepri: English.
Res: Why?
Lepri: Because it's easy (i.e. easier than French).
Res: What language do you use to your brothers and sisters?
Lepri: English.
Res: Why?
Lepri: Because we (i.e. I) understand it better.

This is explained by the English language policy of the school which requires her to spend hours of socialisation and apprenticeship, and to the media, especially television, which provide children with opportunities for language acquisition through diverse genres such as music, comedy, soaps, movies, educational programmes. But she still encounters difficulties with reading and writing English. Beside English, Lepri also admits that she can hear and understand ‘bits of isiZulu’ and seSotho that she learns from her friends at school, and particularly from her teacher (Section 5.2.3).
5.3.2 Family language policies and practices

5.3.2.1 Family language policy in the DRC

The family language policy (FLP) in the DRC was French-only and is summarised in this extract (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G):

Res: Who recommended the languages to speak in family in the DRC?
Tebe: Jate
Res: Was it imposed?
(In Kinshasa, they [i.e. children] were schooling at a private French-medium school. We maintained the language in family. I was once a primary school teacher in the DRC. So we decided that our children should speak French only.)

Compared to public institutions, private schools in the DRC provide tuition in French only. Initiating children into the language of instruction with a view to minimizing future learning problems was clearly the major rationale behind the French-only policy in this family. This is what Cummins (1996) refers to as ‘collaborative relations of power’ (p. 15). Tebe uses the inclusive ‘we’ to justify a negotiated language policy. But she ignores the fact that French does not have the same status in SA as it has in the DRC, and thus it will not play the same role. In Tebe’s words, the decision of language choice was negotiated in the family. The interviews reveal that language policy in the DRC resulted from the negotiated decision of both parents. Elitism is the major reason for establishing a French monolingual household. To my question about the use of an African language in family interactions, Jate was more explicit:

"Tu n’es pas cultivé si tu ne parles pas ou ne connais pas le français. Lingala, c’est la langue des illétrés, des voyous, moins éduqués. Et puis moi, je suis professeur de français. Les enfants qui parlent français sont même plus intelligents que les autres qui ne parlent pas. [French]
(‘You are not cultured if you don’t speak or know French. Lingala is the language of the illiterate, the delinquent, the less educated. Also, I am a French teacher. Children who speak French are even more intelligent than others who don’t.’) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

In Jate’s understanding the phrase ‘to be cultured’ designates a person who has assimilated French culture and the language. The literature on colonial language policies (Ngugi wa Thiong’o 1986) highlights the negative influence of those policies on indigenous African languages. It is understood that French offers its users all the benefits associated with it: power as well as material rewards. Despite the fact that the
mother says that she decided on the policy with the father, Jate’s competence and academic interest in French, coupled with his breadwinner status, is likely to place him in a strong position to exercise control and power over the inter-ethnic household.

5.3.2.2 Power, choice, and regulation of the Stated FLP in SA

The language policy in the family in the host land is the same as that in the DRC, based on the dominant DRC language and main medium of instruction, French (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G).

Res: What is the language policy in this family?
Jate: Français (French)
Res: Why?
Jate: Nous venons d’un pays francophone où la langue officielle est le français. Et puis, ils ont commencé l’école en français. Et ici l’anglais est la langue dominante. C’est pourquoi je veux qu’ils maintiennent le français. [French] (We come from a French-speaking country where the official language is French. Also, they started schooling in French. And here English is the dominant language. That’s why I want them [children] to maintain French). (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Tebe: Biso awa tolobaka kaka français. Bana nyonso babosana Lingala. [Lingala] (Here we speak French only. All children have forgotten Lingala). (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)
Res: Did you discuss the policy?
Tebe: Tosololaki. Toyokanaki na likambo yango. [Lingala] (We talked about it. We agreed on that issue.) (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Clearly, French reflects national identity, link with one’s country of origin, and a mark of ethnic identification in Johannesburg (Interviews: Appendix G). But Tebe forgets that she responds and almost always speaks to me, using Lingala. Thus, breaking the stated policy at home. In SA a search for ethnic integration and fellow feeling within the DRC community, beside the threat from the social status of English, constitutes another reason for establishing the French-only policy. French allows access to ethnic networks and thus social support and comfort.

In contrast to the English-only family where English is established to reduce children’s learning difficulties, the French-only family nurtures ethnicity, thus indirectly promoting French-English bilingualism in their children. In this context English becomes an additional language on the children’s linguistic repertoire (see also de Klerk 1995). But my analysis shows that the young daughter, Lepri (TG) is losing her French.
In Section 5.2.2.1, Jate reports that *Lingala is the language of the less and/or illiterate people* (Interviews: Appendix G). By saying so, he seeks to re-project the ‘je-le-connais’ image and to reflect the prestige associated with using French in the DRC. However, in SA French does not have the same status as it has in the DRC. With regard to this, the FLP in SA is Jate’s own imposition over the other family members, although Tebe (mother) claims that the policy was negotiated. The effective implementation of the stated language policy in the family depends on the collaboration between both parents (see Baker 2000). What Tebe says in the extract above is the opposite of her utterance at the beginning of this section (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G). What is surprising in this French-only household is that the mother is the least fluent of all members. The implication for such a policy is that family members will ignore it, particularly the mother, who almost always speaks Lingala (see Section 5.2.3.2). The following extract (Appendix G) also shows that the FLP is an imposition.

Res: Do you think that if you speak Lingala they will blame you?
Lepri: No. But mum doesn’t like you to speak Lingala.
Res: Do you know ‘why’?
Lepri: Yeah. For example, if you speak to me in English or French, I’ll be able to answer.

Obviously, the family language policy is not made explicit to the children who feel that they are forced to use a language in which their mother is not proficient. The children express their desire to speak their mother’s primary language (Interviews 2.1: Appendix G).

Res: Can you speak Lingala?
Lepri: I sometimes speak Lingala, but they don’t allow me [looking at her father].
Res: Who?
Lepri: My mother. She always tells me to speak French or English. [Mother is absent.]
Res: Why?
Lepri: I don’t know.
Res: What about your father? [Looking at the father]
Lepri: I don’t know [Looking back at the father]

This extract reveals that the policy is to some extent regulated. In contrast to Anaka (mother: English-only family), Tebe prohibits the use of DRC indigenous languages in the home. Her surveillance contradicts Pawels’ (1997) and Tsokalidou’s (1994) findings about immigrant mothers’ attitudes to their ethnic languages. Besides, Jate insists that his children must speak French because they come from a French-speaking country. In
addition, he does not tolerate the use of DRC vernaculars at home in South Africa. Denying immigrant children their primary ethnic identities when they need them is a form of symbolic violence (Bourdieu 1991), likely to occasion psychological identity crises (Amati-Mehler et al 1994). Similarly, it is argued that 'changing people’s habits, ideas, people’s language, people’s beliefs, people’s emotional allegiances is to some extent deliberate violence' (Mead 1943, cited in Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba 1991: 35). The implications of such violence are the rejection and invalidation of children’s cultural identity and their native language (Section 5.3). This is what the children claim in separate interviews:

Res: How would you feel if you were in the DRC community but can’t speak or understand DRC languages? 

Lepri: Bad (Interviews 2.1: Appendix G) 

Peja: Mal à l’aise. Il n’est pas bon d’être dans un endroit où les gens parlent les langues que vous ne comprenez pas. [French] (Interview 2.2: Appendix G) 
(Uncomfortable. It’s not good to be in a place where people speak languages that you don’t speak.)

Lepri and Peja believe that not speaking ethnic languages makes one feel like a stranger among one’s fellow countrymen. Heller (1987) acknowledges that language is the first principle of ethnic identity formation, allowing participation in activities organized by the ethnic community. Ideologically speaking, the policy also allows parents (especially the father) to exercise control and power over their children, who in South Africa have been empowered with English. The parents’ plan to return to their homeland some day is a further motive to help maintain some links with the home country through the use of French and receptive competence in Lingala (Section 5.2.2.3).

Res: Will you one day return to the DRC? 

Tebe: Oui, awa baétrangers balingi bango te. Il faut tozonga na mboka parce que tokoki kozua makambu ya bien kuna, promotion kuna que awa soki paix ezali. [French] (Yes. Here foreigners are not accepted. We can get better opportunities, social promotion there if there is stable peace.) [Lingala – French] (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G)

Jate: Absolument. C’est leur pays d’origine. Il n’y a pas de mal d’y rentrer et y travailler. [French] (Absolutely. It’s their country of origin. There’s no wrong to go back and work there.) (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G)

Two diametrically opposed language behaviours emerge in this family: parents want
their children to speak French and at the same time they (parents) use Lingala with them.

Growing up in an English-speaking society and also having English as the language of schooling provides children with oral fluency that is likely to affect negatively the use and the maintenance of the homeland languages. Although French is used in the DRC, it is a ‘colonial’ language and does not embody all the emotions associated with speaking DRC indigenous languages.

5.3.2.3 Family language practices in SA

1. Choice of a language and patterns of communication

During my fieldwork in this family, I observed that children used French with their parents but English among themselves, especially when doing their homework or watching a movie on TV. The general pattern of language behaviour in the family reads as follows:

This graph shows that French is dominant in the interactions while Lingala is given little attention and is said by the mother with the father and her children. In this family each parent speaks different languages with the children, thereby promoting ethnic bilingualism in the home, despite their defining the FLP as French-only. The older siblings speak both French (the stated language in the family) and English (the medium
of schooling) to G2. By so doing, they teach both languages to their younger brothers. Although the mother uses Lingala to her children, she does not allow them to use it at home, as Lepri insists:

*I sometimes speak Lingala but they don’t allow me. ….My mother tells me to speak French or English.* [Interviews 2.1: Appendix G].

To draw on Tollefson (1991), any language policy offers opportunity to some people while denying it to others. Although the FLP is said to be French-only, in their interactions family members occasionally look trilingual: French, English and Lingala. French is the common language shared by all family members of G1, TG and G2.

2. **Strategies for communication**

In my attempt to understand the language practices of members in the family under discussion, I found the use of accommodation, varied code shifts or mixing and some borrowing. As a result of the differences in the participants’ language repertoires, multilingual code switching or mixing often occurs in their conversations. All children know that, when answering a question put in Lingala, they must not respond in this language which is prohibited at home. The following examples of language practices in French are typical of repeated inter-action patterns.

**Parent – parent interaction (1)**
(father – mother)

Jate: Amenez du pili-pili-pili à Papa Alfred. [French- African word borrowing]
(Bring some peri-peri for Papa Alfred)
Tebe: Bosilisa fufu wana. Ezali ya bino mibale. Etikala te. [Lingala]
(Please eat that meal. It is for you. It must be finished.)
Jate: To ko meka Mama. [Lingala] (We will try, Mum)
Tebe: Te. Bo zo travailler mingi: *il faut* bolia mingi mpe, bozua makasi ya mosala. [Code-mixing Lingala – French]
(No. You are working hard: you have to eat much, become strong for the work (academic))
Jate: Mais toi aussi, viens manger. [French]
(But come and eat with us)
(No. That is yours. I will eat later. Papa Alfred is single. He has no wife here)
Jate: Oui. Surtout lui. [French]
(Yes. Especially him)
Jate: Nalingi Mama Annia aya kosuanisa ngai te: *que* natalaka ye te.
(I don’t want Mama Annia to blame me that I don’t take care of him)
Parent – parent interaction (2) (mother to father)

[Talking about the university]

(1)

Tebe: Jate, lelo okokende université te? (Jate, you are not going to university?)

[Lingala – French borrowing]

Jate: Parfois, c’est fatiguant de faire des tours, surtout quand on sait qu’on n’a pas grand chose à faire là. [French]

(Sometimes it is tiring to make trips there, especially when you don’t have a lot to do there.)

Tebe: Alfred, eza pe malamu ko pema moke ata mokolo moko. (Alfred, it’s also good to relax a little for at least one day.) [Lingala]

Jate: C’est pas facile d’étudier à cet age-ci. (It’s not easy to study at this age) [French]

Tebe: Okosala nini? Il faut obongisa avenir ya famille na yo. Il faut osala sacrifice. [Lingala – French]

(What can you do? You have to improve your family’s standing of living. You have to sacrifice yourself.)

Jate: Je l’espère. (I hope so.) [French]

These two extracts confirm the usual strategies of communication between the father and the mother, and their individual level of language proficiencies (Section 5.2.1; Interviews: Appendix G). It appears that the parents in this French-only family remain consistent in the use of their preferred language, i.e. French for Jate and Lingala for Tebe. But because the mother has been educated to a certain level, she also uses some French. The same pattern arises in the following excerpt.

(2)

[South African weather, and miscellaneous]

Tebe: Lelo penza, malili. Hah, mboka oyo! [Lingala] (It is cold, very cold today. Hah, this country!)

Jate: Mais c’est ça l’Afrique du Sud. Chez toi il fait très chaud. Ici, c’est le contraire. [French]

(But this is what we call South Africa. In your country it is very hot. Here, it is the contrary.)

Tebe: Tokende kaka na Jumbo koluka biloko ya kolia, lokola ozali na motuka. [Lingala]

(Let us go to Jumbo to buy food as we drive.)

Jate: Mais tu as dit qu’il fait froid. Je voudrais travailler un peu à la maison, revoir ce chapitre t imprimer demain à Wits. [French].

(But you said it is cold. I would like to do my work at home, fix this chapter and print it out tomorrow at Wits.)

Tebe: Kasi toza na motuka. Tokowumela te. Eza mosika te. [Lingala]

(But we are driving. We won’t be long. It is not so far.)

Jate (hesitating, thinking)

Tebe (in a sweet voice): Quelques minutes seulement, pas même deux heures. Après tout, je suis ta femme, n’est-ce pas? [Lingala – French]

(Just some minutes, not even two hours. After all, I am your wife, am I not?)

Jate: Ça va, tokende noki. Zua documents ya voiture. Je ne veux pas qu’Alfred me condamne. [French – Lingala code switch]

(Fine, let’s be fast. Take the driving licence. I don’t also want Alfred to blame me.)
These language practices start with a discussion on the weather and lead into the negotiation of a trip out of the house. But what needs to be highlighted in this extract is the strategy that Tebe adopts later to convince her husband to go shopping despite his reluctance because of the bad weather. Tebe exploits her husband’s language needs and uses French in her last statement to persuade him to accept her request. Eventually, Jate accommodates Tebe’s language choice by shifting to Lingala in his last response. The presence of the visitor is likely to produce a positive response from the husband. Similarly, in interacting with their father, the children are aware of his language competence and preferences. They converse in French, the preferred channel of communication in this family.

Father – children interaction

(1)
Jate: Seno, regarde s’il y a quelque chose dans le congélateur. Donnez-nous avec Papa Alfred. [French]
(Seno: See if there is something in the refrigerator, give us) [French]
Seno: Oui, mais c’est pas froid. [French]
(Yes. But it is not chilled)
Jate: Regarde bien là en dessous. Tu peux trouver quelque chose de froid pour nous. Dépêche-toi. [French]
(Look well there at the bottom. You may find something chilled for us. Be quick) [French]
Seno: Papa, essaie ça. Ça va? [French]
(Dad, try this. Is it okay?) [French]
Jate: Oui. Mets-ça pour nous. Prisca, amène-nous les verres. [French]
(Yes. Put it for us. Lepri, bring us glasses.
Lepri: Combien, Papa? [French]
(How many, dad?)
Jate: Même deux. Merci. [French]
(Even two. Thank you)
Jate: Seno. Allez, sers-nous. [French]
(Seno, do serve us)
Sega: Papa, je peux vous servir? [French]
(Dad, can I serve you?)
Jate: Non, merci. [French]
(No, thank you)

(2) [Switching the television on]
Jate: Sega, il n’y a pas match de football à la télé? [French]
(Sega, isn’t there any soccer match on TV?)
Sega: Oui, il y en a. [French]
(Yes, there is)
Seno: Did you see it? [English]
Sega: Yes. [English]
Seno: Do you see it? Hey, move from there. [English]
Jate (to Sega): Essaie encore bien. (Try again well) [French]
Sega: *Papa, tu vois ça?* [French] (Papa, do you see this?)
   Let me check. I know, leave me. Pap sent me, not you.
   [Fighting with Seno and searching for the right channel]

   (Move away. Move away. Move!)

Sega: (Obeys without saying a word.)

In this second extract of father – children conversation, the father appears to be a little isolated as the DRC-born (Seno) and SA-born (Sega) children shift to English, turning the interaction to their own advantage. Two codes are used: French with the father and English among the children. Fluency in French displays national identity in the diaspora while English attributes South African identity to the children. A mixture of French and English in the same sentence by the children indicates their flexibility in switching from one language to another thus indicating their oral fluency in both languages. However, the switch from French to English points to the exercise of power of one child over the other and reflects their new language identities.

**Parents – children interaction**

[Sending children to buy bread]

   (Be quick. You're going to buy some bread.)

Sega: *Nous, on va acheter du pain.* (We are going to buy some bread.) [French]

Peja: *I want to go there alone.*

   (No. Go all of you. Seno. Sega. Chris, go with Peja.)

Seno: *Sega, put this jersey into the bedroom and bring me the yellow one. Be quick.*

Sega: *Ça? Look. This one? (This? Look. This one?)*

Seno: *Yes*

Jate: *Peja, faites vite. Gardez bien les enfants.* (Peja, be quick. Take care of the children.) [French]

Jate (to the researcher): *Mon cher, ici il faut être sérieux pour l'éducation des enfants.* [French]
   (My dear, here you must be serious about the children's education.)

These rare bilingual interactions include responses and strategies of social actors who struggle to re-define and defend their own social spaces, boundaries and positions within the wider field of power. The use of English by Peja and Seno (young G1) in interacting with their SA-born siblings is a way to exert power over them, while the French-English code switch is intended to re-negotiate Peja and Seno's decision to accept their company. Long (1992: 37) posits that identity is an ongoing transformational process that is constantly reshaped by specific conditions. Remarkably, the G2 SA-born, Sege, fits into a well-established French setting. With
social mobility and education, English plays a large role in the life of the French-speaking children.

**Mother – children interaction**

Tebe: *Botshiela bango miziki ya Koffi.* [Lingala] (Put on Koffi’s music cassette for them.)

Seno (inserts the video cassette and tries to fix the screen.)

Tebe: *Otshiela bango miziki ya Koffi?* [Lingala]

(Did you put Koffi’s music in for them?)

In this extract the term ‘miziki’ is borrowed from the French word ‘musique’ or English ‘music’. Although the word may have its counterpart in Lingala, ‘miziki’ is the usual term utilized in Lingala.

**Children – children interaction**

[SA-born children playing in the balcony]

Lepri: (watching them)

Sega: *Look. C’est le sucre.* (Look. It is sugar.)

Khriss: *On the door! Sega, pas comme ça.* (Khriss, not like that.)

Sega: *Mets ça dedans.* (Put it in.)

Khriss: Let’s do it again.

Sega: Yes, of course.

Khriss (to the toy): *You can stop beating me: pow pow pow.*

The use of language by the SA-born children may be regarded as a way of checking their own bilingual abilities. Playing games is an (unconscious) exercise of language development and/or assimilation (Hwang et al 1996). The switch in this play can be understood in two ways. First, the children were playing with a small toy car which was personalized, as they were addressing it. Consequently, they could imagine that their interlocutor spoke English but could understand French. At the same time the two brothers communicate with each other, using both languages in which they are orally fluent, French and English.

**Parents – visitors interaction**

(1)

[Peja’s academic performance: actors seated in the lounge, conversing in French]

Jate: Peja a fait 90% des points. (Peja got 90% average.)

Cithe: Il a fait 90%? (He got 90%?)

Jate: Oui. Il a été 2ème de la classe. Le premier a eu 92%.

(Yes. He got second position. The first student got 92%.)

Cithe: C’est un *challenge* dans une école où il y a des blancs.
(It’s a challenge in a school where there are white learners.)

Jate: Mais oui. Pendant les vacances il ne se repose pas.
(Of course. On holidays he does not relax.)

Cithe: C’est pas possible. Parmi les blancs?
(Not possible. Among whites?)

Jate: Oui. Le 1er a eu 92%.
(Yes. The first learner obtained 92%)

Maurice: C’est sa 1ère année dans cette école?
(Is it his first year at that school?)

Jate: C’est pas sa 1ère année. Mais c’est sa 2ème année, je crois.
(It is not his first year. But it is his second year, I believe)

Cithe: Aah. Il est maintenant en 3ème?
(Aah. He is now in Grade 9?)

Jate: Non. Il est maintenant en 4è ou Grade 10. Il a fait 90%.
(No. He is now in Grade 10. He got 90%)

The beginning of the conversation marks accommodation on Cithe’s part to indicate ethnicity. Using French is the usual way of speaking among literate DRC nationals. However, the word challenge (a word borrowed from English) used in French serves to emphasize a particular point in the conversation.

(2)

Tebe: Prof, boni? (How are you, Prof?) [Lingala]

(Fine. And you?)

Tebe: Bien kaka. Jate aza na chambre. [French – Linagala]
(Very well. José is in the bedroom)

Jate: Dis mais nge, on ne sait pas te voir. Ton cellulaire sonne, personne ne prend.
(But. You, it’s hard to see you. Your cellphone rings but no one responds.

Res: Je crois que la batterie était faible. Je suis toujours au Graduate School.
(I think the battery was weak. I am always in the Graduate school)

(3)

[Conversation goes on about Peja’s schooling]

Cithe: C’est sa première année là-bas? (Is it his first year at that school?)

Jate: Non, c’est sa deuxième année. Il est en 3ème. La fois passée, il a demandé: ‘Papa, qu’est-ce que tu veux que je fasse? [French]
(No, it is his second year. He is in Year Three [i.e. Grade 9]. Last time he asked me: ‘Papa, what do you want me to do?)

Cithe: Comme études universitaires? (As university studies?) [French]

Jate: Oui. Mu nde, ‘toi, que veux-tu faire d’abord? [French Switch]
(Yes. I said ‘ what do you want to do first? He responded: medical doctor or chartered accountant. I said: ‘you have to choose one of them.)

Cithe: Oui, il doit choisir.
(Yes. He must choose.) [French]

Jate: Ya nde non. Je dois faire les deux. Je tiens à avoir les degrees dans les deux. [code-switching Kikongo – French]
(He replied: no. I must do both. I want to get degrees in both disciplines)

Cithe: Et Cloclo? [French] (And Ciacla ?)

Jate: Cloclo, elle aussi veut devenir … nani, hôtesse de l’air ou quelque chose de
computer. [French mixed with Kikongo]
(Clacto also wants to become something like air hostess or something computer.)

*Mu nde* ‘I say’ (extract parents – visitors 3 above) and ‘ya nde’ (he says) are the usual ways of reporting a story in the Kikongo language when an individual is reporting something that someone else said more authentically. It embodies a change of attitude warmth of brotherhood and/or friendship. The use of the phrase ‘mu nde/ya nde’ implies ethnicity or tribal identity while ‘nani’ (what) expresses hesitation.

### 2. Code-switching and power

Code-switching was sometimes used to distribute power and to allocate specific identities to the speakers. In the following extract language becomes a cultural tool for exercising power, that is, to influence the interlocutors’ attitudes and behaviours.

**Mother – children interaction**

(2)

[Turning on the stove: actors seated in the lounge]

Tebe: *Lepri? Debout. Va à la cuisine.* (Lepri? Stand up. Go into the kitchen.)

Lepri: *One minute, I am watching cartoons.*

Tebe: *Telema! Kende na cuisine kotia moto.* (Stand up! Go into the kitchen and switch on the stove!) (high pitched)

Lepri (first hesitates and then obeys).

Replying in English (the language in which the mother is not fluent) instead of French embodies an indirect resistance to instruction. Williams and Snipper (1990) report that a positive feeling may not be attached to a language used by parents to scold the child. Tebe does not have a good command of French; neither does Lepri (Transitional Generation). So Lepri probably cannot converse easily with her in French. Lepri attempts to use her linguistic capital to temporarily control the interaction. Considering her lack of knowledge of English, Tebe resorts to her power-identity as ‘mother’ and to Lingala, her usual medium of conveying ethnic values to her children to assert control over the interaction. Finally, she is heard. Similar language practices occur between the mother and one of her SA-born children:

(3)

Tebe: *Khriss, attention. Je vais te taper.* (French)

(Khriss, pay attention. I will hit you.)
Khriss (does not seem to understand or stop doing what he was busy with) 
   (You, I will hit you. Pay attention)
Khriss  (this time obeys.)

As is claimed, power is the production of intended effects (Ng & Bradac 1993: 3). The following extract shows two interlocutors (Seno and Sega) equipped with the same language, English, displaying unequal degrees of linguistic competence. The event is listening to the DRC popular music.

(4)
[Putting music on by mother’s order]
Tebe: *Botshiela bango miziki ya Koffi.* [Lingala] (Put on Koffi’s video-cassette for them.)
Seno (inserts the video cassette and tries to fix the screen.)
Tebe: *Otshielo bango miziki ya Koffi?* [Lingala]
   (Did you put Koffi’s music in for them?)
Seno: *Ça ne se voit pas.* [French] (The TV screen is not clear.)
Tebe: *Sala yango malamu.* [Lingala] (Fix it well.)
Seno: *Mais ça ne se voit pas. Regarde toi-même.* [French] (But it is not clear. Look.)
Sega  (first SA-born son): *Laisse-moi faire cela.* [French] (Let me do it.)
Seno: *Laisse. Quitte.* [French] (Leave it. Go away.)
Sega: *But I know.* [English]
Seno: *You see. Did you see it? Did you see it? Leave it!* (with anger-like expression, high intonation, pushing him away.) [English]
   Jate (to Sega): *Laisse ta grande soeur le faire.* (Let your big sister do it.) [French]
Seno: *You see, there is nothing. C’est pas clair.* (You see, there is nothing. It’s not clear.)
Peja: *C’est pas clair, papa. It is not clear, you see.* [French – English]
Sega (obeys without resisting again.)
Jate: *Okay. Mets-nous de la musique alors.* (Okay. Then play the music for us.) [French] Tebe: *Botshiela bango radio cassette.* (Switch on the radio cassette for them.) [Lingala – French]
Seno: (turns the radio cassette on, playing DRC music.)

This extract indicates that language use includes the right to speak, make oneself heard, and be believed, be obeyed (Mesthrie et al 2000). The SA-born child, and Seno’s younger brother, intervenes as a problem-solver but is denied access to the TV set. Then he shifts to English with a view to being heard. Seno first attempts to accommodate using French but does not seem to be obeyed. Consequently, to exercise authority over Sega, she switches to English in order to exercise power. Linguistically, Seno acts as the most equipped in English and thus more powerful to control the structure and social consequences of interaction, echoing Mercer’s (2000) view that linguistically powerful speakers control the ways in which interaction is performed.
During another platform event, i.e. listening to American pop music, the mother orders her eldest child (and oldest daughter) to switch off the music and turn on the TV set. The following extract embodies a distribution of power among the social actors:

(5)
(Turn the volume down. Turn the radio off.)
Peja: Mais maman, on écoute la musique. (But mum, we are listening to music.)
Tebe: Cloclo, bokanga miziki! Botiya television.
(Cloclo, turn off the music! Switch on the television.)
Cloclo: (hesitates and then obeys mum, i.e. turns the radio off and then switches TV on.)
Peja: Leave it! Switch off the TV! Put on the music.
Seno: No. We like music. It is nice.
Cloclo: (resists her siblings’ wish.)
Peja (in aggressive high voice): Switch on the music!
(Negative facial expressions of anger, and gestures)
Cloclo: (obeys Peja’s command reversing her mother’s.)
Tebe (keeps silent.)

There are social norms for obeying or disobeying parents’ instructions. In DRC cultures it is actually considered not polite to counter parents’ instructions and requests, or to answer back. Peja’s behaviour violates the family’s moral values and ethnic childrearing practices. It contradicts the mother’s expectation. Scollon and Scollon (2003) call this language deviation ‘transgressive discourse’, in that it subverts the pre-established and legitimated ethnic norms of hierarchal respect in the family. As I observed, to control the inter-action flow to his advantage, Peja used threats, facial expressions and body gestures, supported by Seno’s (young sister) persuasive style:

(6)
Peja: I like that music.
Seno: Yeah, it’s nice.
Tebe: (utters no word but keeps silent.)
(Peja and Seno carry on commenting in English, to the exclusion of their mother.)

Peja’s linguistic capital (i.e. relative fluency in French, English and Afrikaans) causes him to exercise power over the interaction. Drawing on West (1992), Norton (2000) believes that people who have access to a range of resources in a society will have access to power and privilege, in turn influencing how people understand their relationship to the world. The lack of English knowledge excludes Tebe (mother) from pursuing the conversation and thus condemns her to silence (Bourdieu 1977: 652), although, silence can also encode power. Tebe’s silence is not evidence of
powerlessness but also a way of avoiding a confrontation between her son and herself, especially in the presence of a visitor (i.e. the researcher).

5.3.3 School language policies, and their impact on immigrant learners

Lepri’s school
This school is for girls only and welcomes immigrants’ children mainly from Africa. These children are from diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. It is important to explore the ways in which these non-African children are known as such.

The teaching of Afrikaans is compulsory because it is the only second language offered, meaning that learners have no other choice. In the past both French and Portuguese were offered to assist children from the DRC, Angola and Mozambique. Currently, only Portuguese is offered. Although both the teacher and the principal claim that English is the main medium of instruction, they have no control over the languages used in the playground. Lepri says that she learns some isiZulu and seSotho from her friends (see Interviews: Appendix G). Table 6 (see Appendix I) indicates that foreign learners are defined in relation to, among others, accent and fluency, as summarized in the following responses given separately by the principal (Princi) and Grade 5 teacher (Gr5T) (Interviews 2.5 & 2.6: Appendix G):

Res: Do you have immigrant children?
Res: How do you know that they are immigrants?
Princ: Parents inform us at registration time that the children are foreigners. Normally, it is the father who tells us. Also because of different ideas, cultures, different ways of doing things. In culture classes, they tell their religion, way of life in their home countries.

Gr5 Teacher: By the tone, the language. They think first before speaking.
Res: Why?
Gr5 Teacher: Because of language difficulties. But with time, it is hard to identify them.

Obviously, processing information in a second language is a daunting task. The same question was asked of the immigrant children’s South African peers (Interviews 2.7: Appendix G).
Res: Do you have friends among immigrant children?
Gr5 Peers: (1) Yes. From Mozambique, France
(2) From France, Mozambique
Res: How do you know them?
Gr5 Peers: They are our friends. We talk to them.
Res: Is it important to make friends with them?
Gr5 Peers: (1) Yes, to know more about other countries, languages, if they
speak different languages like here.
(2) Good, because I want to know about Africa and things happening there.

In the statements above, the principal considers the admission procedures, while the
Grade-5 teacher looks at the culture-based classroom tasks, and local peers distinguish
foreign learners by their language proficiency, and accent (Interviews: Appendix G). In
the following extract, the principal adds that immigrants’ children have language
difficulties at the beginning. She says:

At the beginning, immigrant children have language problems. After that, they are quick to
pick up the language. Lepri, in particular, is doing well. She is clever and obtained 60% in English,
60% in Afrikaans and 63% in mathematics last term. [Interviews 2.5: Appendix G]

The Grade 5 (Gr5) teacher supports the principal’s view. Lepri also agrees on her
competence in English:

Res: Where did you start schooling?
Lepri: Here, I’m comfortable in English. I am very good at English. At the beginning I was not
good because of French. [Interviews 2.1: Appendix G]

Any learner embracing a new system of education with a different medium of instruction
is likely to encounter language difficulties, as acknowledged by one of the school
principal’s interviewed (Section 7.2.4). Learners thus need a transitional period, also
called an adaptation period. In addition, the school can also find ways to solve the
immigrant children’s linguistic difficulties:

Princ: We place them in a class with someone who speaks their language or can interpret. It’s
the teacher who does that and teaches tolerance with other children. There’s a culture
day where different groups share different dances. [Interviews 2.5: Appendix G]
Gr5 Teacher: Some teachers teach their languages, e.g. Portuguese. [Interviews 2.6: Appendix G]

The school encourages peer socialization; however, involving student interpreters to
help ethnic mates solve their language problems may distract the learner interpreter. It
is a misconception to regard the melting-pot philosophy or the teaching of Portuguese
as an efficient means to solve foreign learners’ language problems. Ethnic relations in
school are often subject to stereotyping (Peshkin 1991). Both the principal and the teacher were consequently asked about stereotyping of foreign African children (Interviews 2.5 & 2.6: Appendix G):

Res: Have you ever received any complaint from foreign learners about being called names?
Princ: No complaint. I have never had any complaint.
Gr5 Teacher: Yes, all the time. But I don't get involved. I tell them to go back and solve it. This is the best way to allow them to negotiate and reconcile.

The principal seems to be unaware of ethnic prejudice and its practice within the school, concurring with Peshkin's (1991) findings elsewhere. The ways in which immigrant learners are constructed in schools suggest inequalities in the wider South African society. However, some learners like Lepri may perform better in spite of such marginalisation. Friendship is a nexus of identity negotiation within the school (Interviews 2.1: Appendix G).

Res: Do you have South African friends at school?
Lepri: Yes.
Res: Do they know that you are not South African?
Lepri: Yes, they do.
Res: How do they know that?
Lepri: I told them. Most of my friends come from Congo.
Res: What languages do you speak with them?
Lepri: Sometimes we speak English for others to understand.
Res: When you have something secret, what language do you use?
Lepri: French. Like when people speak, we don’t care. But when we speak, they say we are swearing them. For example, if we say ‘Tais-toi’ (Be quiet!), they say we are swearing at them. Others care but we don’t care. It’s our own language; we can speak it anywhere, anytime.

Spindler and Spindler (1989: 13) argue that ‘school is borne, endured, survived, accomplished, because it is geared to success, not failure, and because success means a place, a productive, acceptable place in the social, economic and honorific scheme of things’. This statement indicates that immigrant learners consider school as another environment of struggle for negotiating (ethnic) identities in so far as these are to some extent mis-recognised. Despite stereotyping, Lepri displays her pride in the national identity embodied by the dominant language of her native land. French within the school boundaries is thus both defensively and offensively utilized successfully to communicate rejection of xenophobia and to project ethnic identity. Anyon (1983: 19) posits that ‘the inter-relationship of accommodation and resistance is an element in the
response of all oppressed groups’. Friendship with people of the same ethnic background is seen as ‘a social context supportive of cultural and other expressions of ethnicity’ (Alba 1990: 234). Such expressions draw individuals into ethnic networks. The issue of inter-ethnic relationships at school between Lepri and her local friends emerges from the following excerpt (Interviews 2.1: Appendix G).

Res: Do your friends call you names?
Lepri: Yeah. Sometimes they do. They tease me.
Res: What, for example?
Lepri: Pripri, instead of Lepri.
Res: How do you feel?
Lepri: Sometimes bad.
Res: Don’t they call you ‘kwere-kwere’?
Lepri: Sometimes.
Res: What does it mean?
Lepri: Foreigners.
Res: Why?
Lepri: I don’t know.
Res: When they call you ‘kwere-kwere’, how do you feel?
Lepri: Sad.
Res: What happens then? How do they (local peers) feel?
Lepri: They feel happy. Sometimes they laugh.

Calling Lepri ‘Pripri’ amid laughter may be regarded as teasing and not stereotyping. It can also be a strategy of inter-ethnic identity negotiation. But this does not mean that foreign learners experience some exclusion from her local peers. As discussed earlier (see last extract on p.159), Lepri says that the use of French within the school makes her local classmates believe that they are being sworn at. But one cannot conclude that such behaviour necessarily impacts negatively on her interpersonal relationships at school.

**Peja’s School**

Peja’s school accommodates boys only. It is an inter-ethnic institution where white, black, Indian, and coloured children (as defined in South Africa) are socialized according to the new South African ethos of non-discrimination. But this does not mean that discrimination is non-existent. The issue of language policy (Interviews: Appendix G) emerges in this interview excerpt (Interviews 2.5: Appendix G):

Res: What is the language policy of the school?
Princi: English as the medium of instruction, and Afrikaans as second language.
In Lepri’s school as well as in the English-only children’s schools, Afrikaans is offered as a compulsory second language. It thus shows the power that Afrikaans, compared to the local African languages, still enjoys in South Africa. This symbolic market value (Bourdieu 1991) draws on ‘the dialectics of value’ (Marchand 1982) based on the principle of ‘use and exchange’ (Eiss & Pedersen 2002). As a multi-ethnic institution, Peja’s school identifies immigrants’ children, as indicated in the extract below (Interviews 2.5-7: Appendix G):

The identification strategies are almost the same as those in the schools of the English-only family’s children, except that here the Grade 9 teacher gives a tailor-made description of her immigrant learner. The term ‘beautiful’ used in the extract above does not refer to physical build but rather to the child’s intellect. It describes Peja’s academic performance in a number of school subjects (2002 School Report), which is far better than that of the English and Afrikaans first-language speakers. Such academic performance does not, however, prevent Peja from being defined as a stranger.

The general comments received from some teachers of English (Engl) and Afrikaans (Afrik) sum up Peja’s abilities as follows (Interviews 2.7: Appendix G):
always cheering at others.
Gr9 Engl teacher: He is a nice boy [showing me marks], well-behaved, fits in, impeccable manners. This is the kind of student we need for our country to go forward. It is hard to know he is non-South African.

Success in schooling depends on such variables as intelligence, access to opportunity (De Avila 1986), and on personal motivation, family encouragement, school support. Friendship with peers is a crucial factor.

Considering the scope of ethnicity, La Fontaine (1991) asserts that ‘any difference from the ‘Other’ can be used for bullying’ (p. 13). Additionally, negotiating relationships through friendship networks tends to break prejudice in school and empower the newcomers. The whole process of identity negotiation at Peja’s school is condensed in the following interview excerpt with local Grade 9 (Gr9) peers (Interviews 2.7: Appendix G):

Res: Have you made friends with foreign African learners?
Gr9 A & B: Yes
Res: Why? Is it important?
Gr9 A: We would like to know about their culture.
Gr9 B: To know where they come from, to know about their abilities they are good at and be able to use them.
Res: What are your attitudes towards immigrant children, i.e. what do you think of them?
Gr9 A: Just inside that they are from other countries. But they are not different.
Gr9 B: Most of them are our friends; we treat them as others [i.e. as we treat other students]
Res: What do you think of their languages? Do you mind if they use them?
Gr9 A: We don’t mind when they speak their languages as they don’t when we speak ours.
Gr9 B: We want to know their languages in exchange for them to learn ours.
Res: Do you sometimes or any other mates call them names?
Gr9 A: We don’t call them names as to insult them. But we all call one another names just to joke and not to insult one another. (Interviews 2.7: Appendix G)

Name-calling is taken positively in the school as a friendly technique to attract friends from other nations. Teasing may also be an invitation to social integration and a way to establish dialogue rather than an occasion to denigrate foreign African peers. Tollefson (1991: 23) shows that immigrant learners who want to assimilate, who value and identify with members of the host society are generally more successful than those who are concerned about retaining their original cultural identity (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G).

Res: Do you have DRC friends?
Peja: Oui. Mais pas des amis comme tels mais des connaissances. Je ne veux pas
This extract shows that Peja’s choice of local peers as friends aims at a social group of which he wants to adopt the identity.

5.3.4 Implications of the FLP for schooling

This family’s FLP appears to have no overt impact upon the children’s education in SA since it was not designed to assist the children to perform better academically. However, as Cummins (1996) and others argue, the use of children’s first language exercises an influence over immigrant learners. As is known, a child with good literacy in a first language is likely to transfer that knowledge to learning a second language. As a result, the children in this family perform well at school, although this success may be linked to other factors such as intelligence, motivation to succeed in the adopted land, home and school environments conducive to good learning.

5.4 Identity

5.4.1 Identities based on language and culture

English and local African languages

Although Jate initiated the French-only policy in SA, he nevertheless acknowledges the vitality of English and the potential and status attached to it. For upward mobility in South Africa, he argues (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G):

*Je pense que c’est l’anglais parce que nous vivons en Afrique du Sud. Mais la connaissance de, par exemple: Zulu, Sotho, serait aussi avantageux parce que les noirs sont au pouvoir.* [French]
(I think that it is English because we are living in SA. But the knowledge of, e.g. isiZulu or seSotho, would be advantageous since Blacks are in power.)

While the choice of African languages is locally politically motivated, that of English embodies prestige and rewards (Pennycook 1998; Phillipson 1994). This perception encourages Tebe (the mother) to motivate her children to speak French or English,
instead of Lingala. She personally insists (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G):

\[
\text{Anglais eza bien. Muana akoki koutiliser anglais partout po eza language internationale. [Lingala – French]}
\]

(English is good. A child can use English anywhere because it is an international language.)

Regardless of her lack of fluency in and lack of adequate knowledge of English, Tebe finds comfort in seeing her children speak English fluently. English has also ascribed specific identities to the children who seem to have adopted it (Baker 1995). Drawing on Gaganakis (1992: 41), I find that the identity of immigrants becomes fluid, context-dependent and situationally bound, subject to particular local influences. Peja identifies somewhat with the English language and or culture (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G).

\[
\text{Je me suis américanisé (I have americanised myself). I only listen to American music.}
\]

\[
\text{Culturally inclined to the American way of life.}
\]

Consequently, English is a new language that he adds to his linguistic profile; he sees it as playing instrumental and integrative roles. English has also become the expression of his child rights (Section 5.3.2; Interviews: Appendix G). He has integrated to some extent with the host society since he can speak English and Afrikaans without any difficulty. In addition, he converses in isiZulu a little (Interviews, Appendix G). In Section 5.2.1 Lepri’s position is more instrumental than integrative. She reports that English is easier because she understands it better but she does not see English as affecting her primary identity as she remains strongly DR Congolese (Section 5.3.2). Further, her investment in English is more additive than subtractive.

\[
\text{French and Lingala}
\]

In interpreting members’ selves in South Africa in relation to DRC languages and in the light of Ager (2001), I arrived at some identity constructions. This is what Jate thinks of the use of French in SA and Tebe of Lingala (Interviews 2.4 & 2.3: Appendix G):

Jate:  \[\text{Il représente mon pays, ma culture, ma tradition. Il est très important pour moi. [French]}\]  
(It represents my country, my culture, my tradition. It is very important to me.)

Res:  And for the children?

Jate:  \[\text{Quand ils parlent français et lingala, c’est comme s’ils parlaient leur propre culture. [French]}\]  
(When they speak French and Lingala, it is like speaking their own culture.)

Res:  How do you feel when you speak your DRC languages in SA?

Tebe:  \[\text{Na sepelaka n’ango penza. (I really enjoy them.) [Lingala]}\]
Res: Which language do you feel more comfortable in?
Tebe: Lingala. (Lingala) [Lingala]

These identities reflect the educational backgrounds of both parents. But speaking to the children in French rather than in Lingala, her first language in which she feels competent and comfortable, as Baker (2001) argues, leads to artificial, impersonal identity. Overall, Jate’s account in the extract above reveals a strong sense of DRC elitist identity. The je-le-connais image is based on the colonial language French that invented and imposed an imaginary soi-même (self) on the experience of the culturally uprooted and linguistically dominated élites indigènes. To draw on Hall (1996: 394), this ‘imaginary plenitude’ of knowledge is set within the political trends of the colonial masters and against indigenous languages and thus cultures. In ascribing a new view of cultural identity, colonial language policies set up a deep and significant divide between ‘what we really are and what we have (to) become’ (Hall 1996: 394).

Another identity ascription is solidarity or fellow feeling. French and Lingala are seen as closer to the ethnic community in the diaspora. These two languages confer upon members a sense of integration into the ethnic community in South Africa (Interviews 2.1 & 2.2: Appendix G).

Res: How do you feel when you speak French or Lingala?
Lepri: I feel more comfortable because they are languages I can understand.
Res: What would you feel if you are in the DRC community but can’t speak or understand DRC languages?
Peja: Mal à l’aise. C’est pas bon d’être dans une place où les gens parlent des langues que tu ne comprends pas. [French]
   (Uncomfortable. It’s not good to be in a place where people speak languages that you do not understand.)

The third sense of oneself is national or ethnic. French allows members to create links with the nation left behind and on return re-confers on the family that high social status accompanying those using it in the DRC. In addition, Lingala confers upon Tebe a specific ethnic identity, tracing her ancestral roots. Her language practices in South Africa are pragmatic responses to the imperatives of her position in the local social structures. The global aspect of French is not overlooked, in that French can open job opportunities internationally to the children because they are English-French bilinguals (Section 5.3.2.).
5.4.2 Symbolic identity markers and practices in SA

Ethnic identity often arises in the presence of an ‘outsider’, the ‘them’ as opposed to ‘us’, against whom we struggle and whose potential threat engenders the necessity of ethnic cohesiveness. The family members’ symbolic elements in South Africa are evident in the following extract (Interviews 2.1-4: Appendix G):

Res: Do you remember how old you were when you arrived in SA?
Lepri: I can’t.
Res: What things in SA remind you of your native country?
Lepri: Language, photographs, music
Peja: Oui, la langue. (Yes, language) [French]
Jate: Les habits, la langue, la musique, la nourriture, l’église. [French]
(Clothing, language, music, foods, church)
Tebe: Miziki, biloko na biso ya kolia (eza parfois importé mais cher), kolata, monko, etc.
(Music, our food [sometimes imported but expensive], clothing, language, etc.)

This family’s cultural artifacts are the same as those of the English-only household. While language often acts as a symbol of ethnicity in the diaspora, enabling immigrants to recreate their nation (Anderson 1983), it is not the only marker of symbolic identity. Ethnic beliefs and values, modes of dress, taboos, ethnic cuisine or food may also be considered as markers of distinctiveness. However, in a multicultural nation like South Africa, eating patterns are not necessarily confined to ethnic cuisine.

Res: In SA, do you feel more South African or Congolese?
Lepri: Half SA but more Congolese.
Res: How do you feel Half-South African?
Lepri: (No answer)
Res: Do you consider yourself Congolese or South African?
Lepri: No, Congolese.
Res: Why?
Lepri: Because I’m Congolese. It is where I was born. (Interviews 2.1: Appendix G)

Despite the confusion arising from the lack of mental imagery of the DRC, Lepri ends up acknowledging that she is Congolese. There are also signs of symbolic attachment in terms of watching DRC movies, listening to DRC music (Stokes 1994) and to Lingala used by their mother.
5.4.3 Ethnic and linguistic identity maintenance and hybridization in SA

In the context of South African immigration there are a number of reasons for seeking to maintain homeland languages (e.g. Smolicz 2001). The fundamental motive behind maintaining the French-only policy in SA resides in the statements below (Interviews 2.3 & 2.4: Appendix G).

Res: Can you allow your children to go back to the DRC?

Tebe: Oui, pourquoi pas. Il faut bayeba mboka na bango. Oyo eza mboka mopaya. Soki kimia ekoti na mboka et que tozongi, I faut bayeba kosolola na bakoko na Bango, bato nyonso kuna. [French – Lingala]
(Yes, why not? They must know their homeland. This is a foreign country. If there’s peace in the home country and that we go back home, they must be able to communicate with their grandparents and everybody there.)

Jate: Il représente mon pays, ma culture, tradition. C’est important à moi. [French]
(It represents my country, culture, tradition. It’s very important to me)

Lingala is also used in the private domains of the family life. Bosher (1997: 593) believes that the degree of maintaining ethnic identity is seen as a crucial factor to the children’s self-esteem, psychological well-being, and successful adjustment to their new society (Interviews 2.3 & 2.4: Appendix G).

Res: If you have something secret in the family, what language do you use?
Tebe: Français, to Lingala, ezo dépendre nani aza wana. [Lingala]
(French, or Lingala, depending on who is there.)

Res: Is it important to have a common language of communication in family?
Jate: Absolument. C’est bon en ce sens que s’il y a un problème et que vous voulez communiquer devant les gens qui sont étrangers à la famille, vous pouvez utiliser cette langue-là. S’il y a un secret, une personne hors la famille ne comprendra pas. (Absolutely. It’s good, in that if there a problem and you want to communicate before people who are strangers to the family, you can use that language. If there is a secret, a person outside of the family won’t understand.)

There is another rationale behind encouraging children to speak their homeland language in SA. Possibilities for ensuring the children’s future emerge as one of the reasons to maintain French in the host land.

Res: Why do you speak French or Lingala to the children?
Tebe: Eza ba langues na bango, donc il faut bayeba yango. [Lingala – French]
(These are their languages. So they must know them. If there is peace at home and we go back, they know to communicate with their grandparents, everybody there)

Jate: Je veux qu’ils maintiennent le français et parlent l’anglais parce que n’importe où ils seront capables de communiquer dans ces langues. Les deux langues pourront aussi les aider dans le futur. [French]
(I want them to maintain French while speaking English because anywhere they will be able to communicate. Both languages French and English can also help them in
Both parents decide to maintain their children’s primary language and former medium of instruction in the host land as an opportunity to maintain ethnic and linguistic ties. Also, the mother’s lack of fluency in French produces pride in seeing her children’s acquire oral proficiency in French. Tebe, in particular, recognises the benefits of multilingualism (Interviews 2.3: Appendix G).

Res: What are the advantages of using many languages?
Tebe: *Partout okoki koloba monoko oyo ekoki. Ba kozua yo neti ndeko na bango ya muaso to mobali soki olobi monoko na bango, e.g. Zulu, Afrikaans, Sotho, anglais, français, Lingala.* [Lingala – French]
(Anywhere you can use the appropriate language. You will be considered a sister or brother if you speak their languages like Zulu, Afrikaans, Sotho, English, French, Lingala.)

These children who already speak French at home will be able to participate with no difficulty in community life when they join their fellow countrymen. They can also function in English. It is important to know how interested the immigrant children are in their parents’ languages. In Section 5.2.3 both parents confirm that their children like the homeland languages. The most interesting aspect of the issue is their attitudes to a possible return to the DRC. Asked about this point, the children disagreed with their parents (Interviews 2.1 & 2.2: Appendix G):

Res: Will you one day go and work or visit relatives in DRC?
Res: But if your parents advise you?
Peja: *Ah, je ne sais pas. Je ne suis pas sûr de l’avenir là-bas. Je ne peux pas aller vivre en RDC. Je ne sais pas.* [French]
(Ah, I don’t know. I am not sure of the future there. I can’t go and live in DRC. I don’t know.)
Res: Anything else?
Peja: *Je voudrais aller aux États-Unis. C’est pourquoi je m’américanise.* [French]
(I want to go the USA. That’s why I want to Americanize myself.)

Peja expressed doubt about returning to the DRC. To the same query Lepri, the TG member, offered similar views (Interviews 2.1: Appendix G):

Lepri: *Ah, no.*
Res: Why?
Lepri: It’s a bad country.
Res: And if your parents decide to return home, can you go back with them?
Lepri: *No, just for one week.*
Res: Don’t you like your country?
Lepri: Yes, I do. It’s where I was born.
Res: Can you remember how old you were when you arrived in SA?
Lepri: *I don’t know.*

The French-only policy in the family has implications for children’s selves. There is minimal interest in the DRC, despite the parents’ efforts to help their children to love their homeland, as the following extract points out (Interviews 2.4: Appendix G):

Res: To keep the language/s, they have to love it. Is there anything likely to help them to maintain their homeland languages?

Jate: *Oui, la pratique de la langue, la musique. La musique est très importante. Je leur dis ‘voici votre musique’. [French]*

(Yes: language practices, music. Music is very important. I tell them: ‘listen to your music’)

However, Peja contradicts his father, insisting (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G):

*Je n’écoute seulement la musique américaine. Je n’aime pas la musique congolaise. Culturellement parlant, je suis attaché au mode de vie américain. Disons, je suis moitié congolais, moitié américain.* [French]

(I don’t listen to American music only. I don’t listen to DRC music. Culturally speaking, I am inclined to the American way of life. Say, I am half Congolese, half American.)

Learning a language receptively by listening to music and/or occasionally using the language orally does not necessarily produce competent users (Saunders 1988). Peja (the young G1) disagrees with his father. The outcome of the stated FLP may be the progressive loss rising from a lack of both motivation and practice, as attested to by these two excerpts (Interviews 2.3 & 2.4: Appendix G):

Res: What language do you often use with your children?

Jate: *Français, et anglais de temps en temps* (French, and English from time to time.) [French]

Res: Why?

Jate: *Par ce que la plupart d’eux ne maîtrisent plus le français. Et très souvent à l’école ils parlent anglais avec des amis. L’anglais les aide à communiquer facilement. Ils perdent la compétence en français.*

(Because most of them no longer master French. And at school they use English with friends. English helps them to communicate easily. They are losing competence in French.)

Res: Do they understand when you use Lingala to them?

Tebe: *Oui, mais il faut oloba malembe po ba comprendre, surtout oyo ya mike.* [French - Lingala]

(French or Lingala, depending on who is there.)

This extract confirms that the immigrant children in this French-only family are losing their oral fluency in French. Saunders (1988) argues that an immigrant child who is forced to abandon his/her parents’ primary language in favour of the dominant European language will be unable to express him/herself appropriately in that language.
Hybridization

Most of the research family members, especially the parents, insist that they and their children have not changed in respect of their DRC culture. Yet in Section 5.1.2 (Interviews: Appendix G), Tebe says that when she goes shopping, she puts on trousers to walk unnoticed (as a foreigner). She also believes that her children have not adopted the local way of life. For example, when asked, Tebe argues:

Po na respect, te. Malgré que bayaka très jeunes, bazalaka te lokola bana ya awa.
[Lingala –French]
(For respect, they did not change. Although they came here young, they do not behave like local children.) (Interviews 2.1 & 2.2: Appendix G)

Despite this, there is some evidence that language practices arise from the interaction between her children and her, especially Peja and Seno display some disrespect towards Tebe (see Section 5.2.3.2; Field notes: Appendix F). Further, Peja admits that he likes American culture and thus dislikes his parents' way of life. Since language attitudes are acquired through socialization, immigrant children understand the ways of life that they observe in South Africa. All those ways of life are likely to influence their vision and image of childhood acquired at an early stage of their primary socialization. Practically, migrancy calls for ‘a dwelling in language, histories, in identities that are constantly subject to mutation' (Chambers 1994: 5). Consequently, Chambers (1994) adds that 'the immigrants’ culture is under the impact of the inhabitation by other voices, histories and experiences' (p. 68).

5.5 Conclusion

Marginalisation of foreign Africans (engendering ethnic enclosure), homesickness, elitist and national identity, and the global status of French emerge as the motives for establishing a French-only policy in SA. This family’s enclosure negatively affects its exposure to the host society, and their opportunities for improving their material conditions in South Africa. The FLP is successful as all children are fluent in both French and English. The mother is the least fluent member of the family. But for the children, English is rapidly taking over French. Most of the children aspire to global identities, in contrast to the parents’ desire to see them maintained ethnic/national
identity. The language practices and identities of this family may not be the same as those of the bilingual French-Tshiluba (Chapter 6).
6.1. Introduction

In contrast to the English-only and French-only families, the parents of this family come from the same ethnic language group: Tshiluba. Both parents are fluent in French but the mother is not fluent in Tshiluba. In the DRC, they chose to use French as the language of communication at home as did the English-only and French-only families. Like the English-only and Multilanguage families (yet to be discussed), they decided to migrate to SA in search of a better standard of living and were, therefore, initially described as voluntary economic migrants. The mother, a lawyer, runs a non-government organization (NGO) for refugees while the father is a teacher by profession and a postgraduate student in Food Science. In contrast to the English-only and French-only families, the parents decided to use both French and Tshiluba for interaction at home in SA: French for the mother and Tshiluba for the father. This choice reflects their places of birth and upbringing: Belgium for the mother and DRC for the father. This is consistent with the father’s view that this family language policy helps the children to maintain tribal identity with the use of Tshiluba and, as with the French-only family, national identity with the use of French in the home. The father and the children are rapidly acquiring fluency in English from their university studies and primary education respectively. The mother is less fluent in English than the father. Compared to the other research families, this is the only family that had experienced ethnic racism in the DRC before coming to South Africa. They live in Berea, where unlike the French-only family, they are not disturbed by xenophobia. To forge links with South Africans, this family chooses to attend a South African church, while living in a DRC community.

The analysis and interpretation of the data in this chapter enables us to understand how the choice of a bilingual French-Tshiluba language policy in this family works in practice and how issues of context, power and identity formation are interrelated.
6.2 Context: External forces

6.2.1 Life accounts, migration motives and geographic location

This French-Tshiluba family consists of the parents and their three children (a daughter and two sons). Like the French-only family, this family lives in Berea (for information on the family background, see Table 7 in Appendix I). The selected family members are coded as Tilo (father), Loma (mother), Litshi (first child and daughter) and Bati (second child and first-born son). Like the other two families, the French-Tshiluba family also left the DRC for SA in search of better opportunities. As is recognized, sociopolitical conditions form the foundation of inter-state migrations in Africa and elsewhere. Recounting his story, Tilo says:

\[\text{J'était fonctionnaire de l'Etat, enseignant de profession. Et j'étais aussi impliqué dans le syndicat des enseignants. D'abord, le pays commençait à dégringoler économiquement et politiquement. Alors, quand Mandela est sorti de la prison, on s'est dit que pourquoi ne pas aller à l'extérieur, en Afrique du Sud? Est-ce que c'est une porte d'entrée pour quelque chose de meilleur dans le futur? [French]}\]

\[(I\ was\ a\ public\ servant,\ a\ teacher\ by\ profession.\ And\ I\ was\ also\ involved\ in\ the\ teachers’\ union.\ Firstly,\ the\ country\ [i.e.\ DRC]\ started\ tumbling\ economically\ and\ politically.\ And\ when\ Mandela\ was\ released\ from\ prison,\ we\ said\ to\ ourselves ‘why\ not\ go\ abroad,\ to\ South\ Africa?\ Perhaps,\ it\ is\ the\ gate\ to\ better\ opportunities\ in\ future?)\ (Interviews\ 3.3:\ Appendix\ G)\]

Tilo’s choice to leave his native land was primarily voluntary; besides, he initiated the migration. His power to decide is embodied in the patriarchal concept of ‘papa’ (father) (see Loma’s story below). Political and economic instability as push factors and the release of Mandela from prison as a pull factor seem to be the major motives for emigrating to South Africa (Mattes et al 2000). His social status later changes from voluntary to refugee status, due to the change of circumstances in his country of origin (see Elovitz & Kahn 1997, in Akhtar 1999). In addition, Tilo’s account confirms the refugee’s testimony of other refugees in that initially many of the immigrants came to South Africa because of Nelson Mandela’s release from prison. More exactly:

\[\text{We came for Mandela. We rejoiced in the victory of the people against the apartheid government and Mandela is also African symbol of freedom. South Africa would be a Garden of Eden, a respite from the madness back home. (Adams 2001: 40)}\]

For some African immigrants, moving into South Africa, resembles moving from one bedroom to another of the same house. They regard Africa as one nation, thereby
sustaining the idea that Africa spreads from Cairo (in Egypt) to the Cape of Good Hope (Adams 2001). Such a conception draws on the ideology preached by the father of Pan-Africanism, Kwame N’krumah (Phillips 1960). In fact, with its relative socio-economic and democratic development, South Africa represents the hope for the new life that foreign Africans (and others) immigrated for.

If Tilo left his homeland because of political or economic reasons, Loma, like Anaka (mother: English-only family) and Tebe (mother: French-only family), came to SA to join her husband (see Caliner 2000). She briefly reports:

Je suis juriste de formation et étais avocate à Kinshasa. Et je suis une femme mariée et mère de famille avant même de venir ici. Nous avons suivi Papa. [French]
(I am a trained legal expert and was a lawyer in Kinshasa. And I am a married woman and mother before coming into South Africa. We came to join Papa (the father.)
(Interviews 3.2: Appendix G)

Like the mothers in the English-only and French-only families, Loma, together with their children, came to South Africa to join her husband. This idea concurs with Carliner’s (2000) finding that (married) women migrate less for economic motives. Considering her career as a lawyer in the DRC and the prospects offered by this career, Loma did not want to leave the DRC for SA. Leaving a good job behind produces uncertainty for the future in a new land. Although she is more educated than the father, she also subscribes to African patriarchal values as symbolised by the term ‘Papa’. This concurs with the wives in the other research families.

Planning to travel to South Africa presupposes some knowledge of or exposure to English, the language of wider communication in SA. With regard to this, Tilo reports his first-contact experience in SA:

Je pouvais balbutier un peu d’anglais et me faire comprendre, cet anglais appris à l’école secondaire. Et puis, j’ai la facilité de langues. [French]
(I could speak some English and make myself understand, that English learned in secondary school. Also, I learn languages more easily and faster.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

This secondary school English consists mainly of everyday English based on greetings and other formulaic expressions for phatic purposes. In addition to the use of English, finding accommodation and settling in the host land is of utmost importance; this means
deciding on the area to live in. There are overt reasons for the choice of a particular geographic location by foreign Africans. Tilo says:

Je pense que le choix est clair. Premièrement, quand on est nouveau dans un pays, on se sent perdu quelque part, n’est-ce pas? Tout devient différent: la culture, la nourriture, la mentalité. Il faut d’abord chercher les compatriotes pour être initié aux langues et culture du milieu, trouver du logement. Et surtout, on ne connaissait pas bien l’anglais, encore moins le zulu. Il faut bien connaître le milieu avant de pouvoir chercher le boulot et consort. Enfin, devant les atrocités perpétrées contre les étrangers noirs, on ne peut que se réfugier auprès des siens pour trouver consolation et protection. [French]
(I think that the choice is clear. Firstly, when you arrive in a new country, you get lost somewhere, don’t you? Everything becomes different: culture, food, way of thinking. You have first to seek the fellow countrymen to be initiated into languages and culture, to find accommodation. And above all, we could not speak English well, neither isiZulu. You have to know the milieu well before applying for a job and looking for other things. Finally, in view of all the atrocities perpetrated against black Africans, we have to seek refuge with our own ethnic members with a view to obtaining comfort and protection.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

Since their arrival in SA, the family has been living in Berea, within the DRC community in Johannesburg. Research on the geographic location of immigrants (Soja 1996; Gregory 1994) suggests that when individuals arrive in an unknown land, they experience changes in almost all aspects of their life, they must then learn to transit from their ethnically-defined values to the host land’s ones. Initiation into the new way of life is facilitated by first ethnic settler members. Responding to the same question, Loma (mother) argues:

En tout cas, on n’avait pas de choix. Papa avait déjà trouvé une place qu’il croyait convenable. Nous avions simplement adopté le lieu. Mais je crois qu’avec tout ce que nous sommes en train de vivre, il avait raison. On se sent un peu en sécurité quand on vit à coté de nos frères et sœurs. On peut s’entraider, se consoler et avoir des nouvelles du pays. [French]
(In all cases we had no choice. Papa had already found a place that he thought convenient. We simply adopted the place. But I believe that with everything we are facing he was right. We feel somewhat more safe when we are living next to our brothers and sisters. We can assist one another, comfort one another and get news from home.) (Interviews 3.2: Appendix G)

Security and comfort become important issues related to the anxiety of uprooting and marginalisation. This view echoes Hunter’s (2000) assumption that new immigrants tend to settle in the geographical areas inhabited by their fellow countrymen. Burnett (1998) believes that language plays an important role as a determining factor in settlement success. People have a sense of the community they belong to, engendering a social tie or attraction. The parents’ statements display the collective identity that is shared through certain beliefs and practices that many immigrant families
Belonging to a particular ethnic group provides a sense of extended kinship vis-à-vis a collective fate. Such a view led Rex and Drury (1994) to posit that, in response to marginalisation, immigrants develop ‘heightened levels of group consciousness vis-à-vis the host society’ (p. 15). This is an ideological response to a set of discriminatory practices and prejudice towards foreign Africans, and translates into ‘ethnicity’ (Heller 1987: 181).

6.2.2 The 'Other', language and ethnic boundaries

Tilo’s very first experience with the ‘Other’ in SA actually commences, while attempting to interact with the local citizens:

D’ailleurs quand tu ouvres déjà ta bouche, on sent vite que tu es étranger. La langue, ah, ça accuse les gens. On ne parle pas de la même manière, même si tu essaies de camoufler le ton, on le saura, quoi? La façon dont on te regarde te fait voir également que tu es étranger. [French]
(By the way when you open your mouth, they immediately realise that you are a foreigner. Language, of course, accuses you. We do not speak the same way, even if you try to hide the accent. The way they look at you also shows that you are a stranger.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

This viewpoint is similar to what Finku (father: English-only family) (Section 4.1.2: Interviews: Appendix G) put forward. But it contradicts Anaka’s view that she speaks English in public places to disguise herself. From this story it becomes clear that language (Morgan 1997) is one of the salient elements in South Africa, setting up boundaries between the ‘insiders’ (the ‘us’) and the ‘outsiders’, the people-not-like-us.

However, in another statement, Tilo acknowledges that he is often taken for a South African and is thus greeted in local indigenous languages. He provides the reason for this in the following interview extract (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):
In what languages are you addressed in your neighbourhood or while shopping?

Tilo: Généralement en anglais; très souvent en langues africaines locales. [French]
(Generally in English; very often in local African languages)

Res: Why?
Tilo: Je ne sais pas. Peut-être que je leur ressemble quelque part.
(I don't know. Perhaps I look like some of them in some ways)

Foreign Africans are generally seen by local populations as ‘darker’ than them. In regard to this, Tilo refers to his light complexion (or mixed blood called ‘coloured’ in SA). In Section 4.2.4 (Interviews 1.2: Appendix G), Tevora (the young G1 in the English-only household) argues that he was defined by his local Grade 9 peers as ‘very black’, ‘cooked by the volcano’. This is another construction that legitimates the stereotyping of foreign Africans. Skin pigmentation (Akhtar 1999) also arises as a criterion of identification of the stranger, and therefore, of inclusion or exclusion.

The encounter between people of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds occurs in the centre of their everyday lives (see Pratt 1991). In my experience foreigners are easily identified on their arrival in the host nation before they adopt the local way of life and languages. It is evident that in a cosmopolitan city like Johannesburg in which black Africans of different ethnic groups meet, live together and whose cultures interpenetrate, it is sometimes confusing to distinguish foreigners from locals. In the following excerpt, Tilo attempts to explain why local Africans greet foreign black people in SA Bantu languages (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G).

Res: Why do you think they speak to you in those languages?
Tilo: C’est dans leur culture. Quand on voit un noir, on se dit qu’il est leur. Quelque part, quand on voit mon teint clair qui ressemble à celui des sud-africains, on se dit que je suis sud-africain, leur frère. [French]
(It is their culture. When they see a black person, they say to themselves that s/he is their sister or brother. Sometimes they look at my skin complexion that resembles that of South Africans and, they think I am their brother.)

Greeting an African person in Bantu languages is perceived as a sign of closeness and sameness and brotherhood or sisterhood. This concurs with Myers-Scotton (1993) who found that when a speaker thinks that the interlocutor is (or may be) a member of his/her ethnic group, s/he uses the ethnic language. But it is also true that the skin pigmentation (Akhtar 1999) (Section 6.3) is sometimes used as a criterion for
differentiating and defining strangers. However, in a multiethnic nation such as South Africa where black Africans constitute the majority of the population, it is sometimes difficult to draw a clear line between physical traits of the local black Africans and those of the strangers. Additionally, many black Africans look alike, i.e. they have similar physical build. In this situation (oral) language occasionally arises as the primordial discriminatory element likely to unveil the stranger. However, language is not the only feature of differentiation in the experience of the newcomer.

Quand je suis arrivé ici, venant de mon pays, Jo'burg était trop grande. Il y avait une propreté telle que je me disais ‘sommes-nous sur terre ou dans un autre monde’? Parce que partout on ne pouvait pas voir un morceau de papier. On ne pouvait pas voir quelqu’un faire n’importe quoi dans un coin, par exemple: faire pipi ou se soulager. Mais maintenant … Aussi, quand je suis allé à Windhoek, je suis rentré 30 ans en arrière quand mon père fut encore étudiant à Lovanium. [French]

(When I arrived here, coming from my country, Jo’burg seemed too large. There was such cleanliness that I said to myself ‘are we on another land or another world’? Because everywhere you could not see waste papers. You could not see someone doing anything in a corner, for example: urinate. But now … Again, when I visited Windhoek [Namibia], I remembered Lovanium University 30 years ago when my father was still a student there. (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

The ethnic boundary between ‘us’ and the ‘Other’ is also reflected in the dress, that is, traditional attire. Tilo argues:

Il y a une certaine légèreté liée à leur culture mais très mal prise par d’autres personnes. Par exemple, l’habillement court chez les zulus, lié à leur culture traditionnelle. C’est tout à fait différent. Si nous comparons ce que nous avons chez nous, alors c’est différent. Mais quelque part en tant que Bantu, nous avons quelque chose de commun, par exemple, du point de vue culture: les noms des zulus ou sothos, il y a quelque chose de semblable chez les Bakongo. Aussi quand une jeune fille arrive et trouve les hommes, elle s’adresse à vous, se courbe avec beaucoup de respect, s’incline pour saluer. Elle vous parle sans vous regarder. Quand vous allez dans la profondeur des choses, il n’y a pas tellement de différence. C’est pas tellement très loin de nous. [French]

(There is a certain laissez-faire linked to their culture but misunderstood by other people. For example, short clothes for Zulus, connected to their traditional culture. It is very different. If we compare with what we have in our homeland, it is quite different. But at some points as Bantus, we have something in common. For instance, from the culture viewpoint, Zulu or Sotho names are similar to those of the Bakongo ethnic group. Therefore, when a young girl comes and finds men, she addresses them, bows with much respect, almost kneels to greet them. She speaks to you without looking at you. When you go deeper into the things, there is not much difference. It is not really far from us.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

There is recognition that most South African African ethnic groups historically come from Central Africa. Despite this fact, individual differences exist in a number of areas. The ethnic fashion of the host society is likely to lead immigrants to shock, and to disrupt their ethnic images. Local citizenship and local people’s rights are also a critical
dimension to consider. Despite the fact that Tilo physically looks like a local South African, he experienced xenophobia. The national politics of employment does not spare the newcomer from being discriminated against.

Res: Have you ever faced xenophobia or any kind of marginalisation?
Tilo: Oui. J’enseignais quelque part dans une école et j’ai dû arrêter. Après les vacances, je ne sais lesquelles, quand nous sommes rentrés, on nous dira ‘voilà les gens de l’éducation étaient passés ici et ont trouvé qu’il y a beaucoup d’étrangers ici à l’école. Ils ont trouvé que nous devons employer les locaux. C’est une façon d’être rejeté. A partir de ce jour-là j’ai eu une idée d’aller dans d’autres domaines. Peut-être que là je n’aurai pas assez de concurrents. [French]
(Yes. I was teaching somewhere in a school and I had to stop. After holidays, I don’t remember which ones, when we resumed, we were told ‘look, people from the Department of Education came here and found that there are so many foreigners at this school. They said that we have to hire local teachers only’. This was a way to get rid of us. From that time, I told myself that I must do something different. Perhaps I will have no competitors.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

Discriminatory practices were also raised in the interviews with the English-only and French-only families. These practices are reported as well by such researchers as Adams (2001) and Mattes et al (2000). Employment discrimination under the umbrella of ‘Affirmative Action’ is thought to provide little incentive to reduce discrimination (Bekker & Carlton 1996). Rather, it intensifies exclusion and/or negative feelings against foreign Africans. This policy of exclusion, which was also raised by Finku and Jate (respectively English-only and French-only fathers), prevents foreign Africans from obtaining the material rewards they had expected. It can de-motivate immigrants from learning local languages. The discriminatory behaviour is experienced and/or inculcated into the TG member, Litshi, as reflected in her response to my question about her interest in local African languages (Interviews 3.1: Appendix G):

They are not nice. I don’t like them.

Baker (1995) reports that attitudes predispose a person to act in a certain way and that they are learned. But these attitudes can be modified by the integration of immigrants into local social networks. However, as a result of ongoing rejection, the immigrants are likely to resort to their ethnic community. Asked about the issue of rejection, Tilo explains the ideology surrounding the struggle for freedom (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: What do you think are the reasons for rejecting the foreign Africans?
Tilo: Il faut d’abord se dire que c’est tout à fait normal. Pourquoi? Parce que le peuple
Drawing on Tilo's account, any behaviours of an ethnic group are the outcome of their historical trajectories. People use languages that powerfully affect their sense of being. Tilo locates the roots of the marginalisation of African immigrants in the apartheid system. In a democratic and multilingual/multicultural nation such as SA, people cannot be discriminated against on any arbitrary grounds, be it educational, moral or economic.

It goes without saying that conflicts of interest emerge when social opportunities become scarce and have to be competed for (Verma et al 1994: 4). Tilo explains:

Tilo thinks that some local Africans believe that they were betrayed by their fellow foreign Africans. This is what Bloom (1998) calls the psychological 'damage of apartheid'. However, Tilo acknowledges that the inter-ethnic conflict is a universal phenomenon. He illustrates the DRC inter-ethnic conflict in the 1960s as the legacy of the colonial political system of the DRC:
Et puis, il ne faut pas rêver. Il n'y a que chez nous avec Mobutu qui disait que nous sommes hospitaliers. Evidemment, effectivement, le peuple congolais est hospitalier. Il s'était décidé de ne pas être hostile envers les autres. Mais c'est à prendre avec un peu de réserve. Quand on voit un peu ce qui s'est passé au Shaba avec les Kasaïens. Encore les années 60, les Kasaïens étaient considérés comme des immigrants. Dans mon propre pays, être considéré comme réfugié? Quand vous allez quelque part, vous ne pouvez pas vous attendre à être accueillis à bras ouverts par tout le monde. [French]

(Again, don’t dream. Only in our homeland with Mobutu who kept on saying that we are hospitable. Evidently, truly, the Congolese people are hospitable. They have decided not to be hostile to others. But you have to be cautious. When we look back at what happened in Shaba with the Kasaïans. Again in the 60s, Kasaians were regarded as immigrants. In my own country being treated as a refugee? When you go somewhere, you cannot expect to be warmly welcomed by everyone.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

In reality, stereotyping of foreigners is often used to serve the political interests of the powerful. In this regard, Ng and Bradac (1993) argue that language can be powerfully used to position the ‘Other’.

6.2.3 The ideology around bilingualism

The family bilingual language policy aims, on the one hand, to project the mother’s ‘je-le-connais’ image with French and on the other hand, to preserve tribal identity with Tshiluba in the diaspora. As in the French-only family, the inclusion of French in the FLP of this family embodies aspects of nostalgic identity. But in SA, French does not have the status it is given in Belgium or the DRC. However, as an international language, the maintenance of French coupled with the knowledge of English is likely to offer children better opportunities in a global market.

6.3 Power, choice, and regulation of the FLP

6.3.1 Family language profiles

People learn languages in different milieux and for diverse goals (for selected family members’ language repertoires5 and language proficiency, see Tables 7 and 11 in Appendix I). It is suggested that bilinguals are not equally fluent in all languages (Grosjean 1982). Similarly, some languages are used in specific situations or with

---

5 Frenc: French; Engl: English; Tshilu: Tshiluba; Swah: Swahili; Linga: Lingala; Kikon: Kikongo; LoMo: LoMongo
specific persons. The language interests of immigrants in South Africa vary from one member to another and also in terms of generation because they relate to the needs of their users. Similarly, an individual member can display different degrees of language competence in different languages. In the ensuing section, I describe the language profile of each of the family members.

**Tilo’s language proficiency**

Table 7 (Appendix I) indicates that Tilo (father) displays the largest language repertoire, due to his social experience in the DRC. He is proficient in 5 national DRC languages of which 4 are African: French, Tshiluba (his parents’ native language), Lingala, Kikongo and Swahili. He also speaks LoMongo (an ethnic language in Equateur Province, northwest of the DRC) fairly well. However, his literacy capabilities are more developed in French and Tshiluba than in the other DRC indigenous languages. His exposure to those languages stems from the fact that his father was a public servant, moving with his family from one DRC province to another. He also insists that ‘j’ai aussi la facilité de langues’ (I also learn languages easily (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G). The literature on bi-/multilingualism (Baker 2000, 1995) also reports that a child can learn several languages easily at the same time.

As to South African languages, Tilo contends that he speaks English better than he writes and reads it. He adds that he is not fluent in isiZulu and seSotho, positing:

> C’est quelqu’un de s’intéresser. Bon. Mais dans un premier temps, j’ai été du coté du nord ou l’on parle Sotho. On s’est familiarisé avec des gens là-bas. Les gens là-bas sont plus bien et plus faciles à intégrer ou s’intéresser à quelqu’un qu’ici. Ici, c’est un milieu cosmopolitain où il y a tant de monde. Les parleurs du zulu semblent prédominer. La population n’est pas très accueillante. Le rejet qu’ils nous donnent a aussi une réaction dans l’autre sens, quoi? [French]

(I am not interested in them. Well. But firstly, I was in the north where Sotho is spoken. We got familiar with people there. They are better and easily integrate or are more interested in someone than here. Here, it is a cosmopolitan milieu where there are so many people. Zulu speakers seem to predominate. The population is not very kind. The rejection that they project onto us has a reverse negative impact on us, hasn’t it?) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

As is assumed, integration, and social openness are pre-requisites for successful second language learning (Spolsky 1989) whereas a certain degree of self-isolation and/or exclusion impacts negatively on the learning of the dominant language/s of the
receiving nation. Motivation is a fundamental factor in such a situation. Languages are also easily acquired in an environment where there are many speakers of those languages. This is a crucial issue that caused Tilo and his family, while living within the ethnic community, to join an English-speaking church rather than an ethnic church. This positioning acts as a way to re-negotiate acceptance in the host society and to improve their English.

Loma’s language proficiency
In contrast to Tilo, Loma is proficient in French, one of the two official languages of her native land. Born, raised, and schooled in Belgium, she has only limited knowledge of Tshiluba, Lingala and Swahili. As a daughter of a university professor and thus of a true ‘je le connais’, her language identity is mainly reflected in French in which she feels more comfortable (Interviews 3.2: Appendix G) and is rooted in a Belgian way of life which she often comments on with pride (Section 6.3.1.1). Nevertheless, she speaks Tshiluba (her parents’ native language) fairly well but cannot write or read it. She says that she learned Tshiluba at home and some Swahili and Lingala in the society on her return to the DRC after completing her university studies. Her knowledge of South African African languages is non-existent. But she tries to use some English as a chairperson of a small non-government organization and recently as an assistant lawyer.

Litshi’s language proficiency
Litshi was born in DRC and arrived in South Africa at the age of almost one year and, as a TG member, she had practically no social experience of language use in DRC. She speaks French well but has no literacy abilities in it. She says that she can speak some Tshiluba, which she learned by interacting with her father. She also speaks French in her interaction with both parents, particularly her mother. This practice concurs with the findings of Baker’s (2000) and Harding and Riley (1989). In my experience, I did not capture a single instance of her using Tshiluba to her father, although she responds positively to the father’s instructions (Section 6.3). As well, Litshi reports that she is fluent and feels more comfortable in English, the medium of
instruction at school (Interviews 3.1: Appendix G). As is evident, she preferred to be interviewed in English rather than in her parents’ primary language, French. Although she says that she speaks English well, Litshi states that she has a problem with reading in this language (Interviews 3.1: Appendix G). She insists that there are things that she does not understand and has to ask her teacher to explain them to her. She does not know any local African language. The reasons for her interest in English and lack of interest in the indigenous African languages are highlighted in the following extract (Interviews 3.1: Appendix G).

Res:     What South African languages do you speak?
Litshi:  *None, except English.*
Res:     Why?
Litshi:  *I don’t like them. They are not nice.*
Res:     Don’t you have South African friends?
Litshi:  *Yes, but we speak English only.*

It is evident that Litshi has had no opportunity to learn local languages other than English. She may also have been influenced by the attitudes and experiences of the adult immigrants in her community, particularly her parents. Her attitude to some local languages is likely to affect negatively her future inter-personal relations and thus her social opportunities in SA. However, given that Litshi is schooling in SA, she may later change her attitude to local South African African languages.

**Bati’s language proficiency**

I observed that Bati (G2 or South African-born child) is fluent in French and English (Section 6.3). However, no accurate and full information could be gathered about his language repertoire because access was denied to the researcher by the father, claiming that at the age of 7 Bati could not understand issues regarding ethnicity. Yet it is reported that ‘pupils from the age of 4 tend to establish ethnic awareness and that this awareness develops in subsequent years' (Denscombe et al 1993: 127).
6.3.2 Family language policies and practices

6.3.2.1 Family language policy in the DRC

The language policy of this family in the DRC is said to have been French-only. The process of language choice in the family emerges from the following parents' responses in separate interviews (Interviews 3.2 & 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: What language policy did you establish in the family in the DRC?
Tilo: La langue que nous parlions en famille au pays était le français. Le français est la langue nationale la plus dominante et la langue des hommes instruits ou intellectuels. Je voulais que mes enfants parlent français pour les aider aussi dans leurs études. En plus, mon épouse était née en Belgique et parle français en famille. Mais le Tshiluba était aussi utilisé avec d'autres frères et sœurs tribaux dans des conditions spéciales. [French]
(The language that we spoke in the family in the DRC was French: French is the dominant national language and the language of the highly educated or élites. I wanted my children to use French to help them in their schooling. In addition, my wife was born in Belgium and got used to speaking French in the family. But Tshiluba was also used with our [ethnic] brothers and sisters in special conditions.)

(In all cases for me the choice was clear. I often or always speak French. I was born, grew up and schooled in Belgium. In the family we spoke French only. Even in the DRC we often spoke in French. It is question of habit, isn’t it? It is their father who wants them to know Tshiluba. I learned to speak Tshiluba in the DRC.)

Fanon (1967a: 18) argues that ‘a man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language’. He adds that when you learn (to speak) a language, you acquire to some extent some degree of that language’s culture and a certain appreciation of the way of looking at and reading the world. Speaking French in the family in the DRC, as I said in the previous chapters, also helps distinguish the elites from the non-elites. The fundamentally hidden reason for establishing the French-only policy in the DRC was ideological (Ager 2001), as French served to set the family apart by projecting an elitist image (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

La raison est que le français est la langue officielle de l’éducation et la langue des intellectuels. Nous sommes quand même mieux éduqués pour ne pas laisser nos enfants parler les langues que même les non-éduqués, les enfants de rue parlent. Aussi, c’est pour les aider dans leurs études. Nous savions aussi que le Tshiluba, ils finiraient par le parler au contact de leurs grand-parents et autres personnes de notre ethnie. C’était inévitable. (The reason is that French is the official language of schooling and the language of the intellectuals or élites). By the way, we are also so highly educated/schooled that we cannot let our children use languages that uneducated people or street children speak. Also, it was intended to assist them in their studies. We were aware as well that they would end up speaking Tshiluba through the
interaction with their grandparents and other fellow countrymen. This was inevitable.) [French]

Using a language in which parents feel confident has implications for the improvement of the children’s esteem for their parents (Saunders 1988). In the next extract, we see that French also defines the educational level of parents, and Loma’s social status and primary identity. Loma says (Interviews 3.2: Appendix G):

"Mon père est professeur d'université. Je suis habituée à ne parler que le français. Je me sens plus à l'aise en français. D'ailleurs, je ne parle pas très bien Tshiluba." [French]

(My father is a university professor. I got used to speaking French only. I feel more comfortable in French [than in Tshiluba]. In fact, I do not speak Tshiluba very well.)

Here it is clear that parents with such backgrounds are likely to help and encourage their children to use the dominant language. Consequently, they can succeed in implementing their desired family language policy. However, in the DRC, children can use another language for socialization with friends outside of the home. The chance of remaining monolingual is very small. Similarly, through interaction with the neighbourhood and their grandparents, the children can easily learn to speak Tshiluba. This view echoes Baker’s (1995) assumption, concerning language acquisition in a multilingual society.

6.3.2.2 Power, choice, and regulation of the Stated FLP in SA

The family’s language policy in SA is said to be bilingual French-Tshiluba. It reflects the parents’ primary selves, attitudes, and goals. Overall, the reasons for setting up a bilingual French-Tshiluba policy in the family arise in this extract (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: Why did you decide that your children learn to speak French and Tshiluba in the family in SA, instead of English?
Tilo: Non, non, non. Je considère d'abord la langue comme un ricochet. Le Tshiluba, c'est leur langue maternelle ou paternelle. C'est une langue, à mon avis, que les enfants ne doivent pas oublier ou ne pas connaître. Pour quelque chose de privé, on peut se le passer en Tshiluba. [French]

(No, no, no. I regard language as a link. Tshiluba is their mother language or father language. It is a language, in my view, that the children must not forget or have to know. For something private, we can say it to each other in Tshiluba.)

The father encourages Tshiluba to be used for family intimacy and/or closeness. Ricento (2002: 1) says that ‘we learn who we are and what we are through language/s
and the speech communities in which we are raised’. But this may be transmitted in another language other than the parents’ native languages. In contrast to Pawels’ (1997) findings that immigrant overseas-born mothers play a greater role in the maintenance of their ethnic languages, in this bilingual family the father maintains the indigenous language in the diaspora. The reason for this is articulated below (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Tilo: Par ce qu’ils doivent reconnaître leur racine. Ils doivent savoir qui ils sont. Quelque part, on dit aussi que je suis conservateur. Oui, je suis conservateur parce qu’il ne faut pas qu’on perde notre origine. Les Juifs, par exemple, qui sont nés aux USA et ont fait des siècles ou des années là-bas, n’ont pas oublié leur culture ou racine. Quelque part-là ils sont américains mais juifs. Ça, c’est un exemple. Même dans la Bible, on nous donne la généalogie des Juifs. Je crois qu’il y a une raison pour cela. [French]

(Because they must know their roots. They must know what they are. Somewhere people also say that I am conservative. Yes, I am conservative because we must not lose our origin. Jews, for example, who were born in the USA centuries or years ago, have not forgotten their culture or roots. Somewhere they say that they are Americans but also Jews. This is only an illustration. Even in the Bible, we read the genealogy of the Jews. I believe that there is a reason for that.)

By regarding human interactions as ‘a series of acts of use and exchange’ (Eiss & Pedersen 2002: 284), we also accept that these acts influence, govern, or affect our ‘identity or sense of self’ (Weis 1990: 1). It is evident that the bilingual policy fulfils the parents’ desire to interact with their children naturally in the ethnic languages that each of them (parents) used as children. Tilo’s conservative positioning draws on the persuasion of such theorists as Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1986), showing a relationship between language on one hand and culture and ethnic identity on the other hand. On her side, Loma has another view of the FLP in South Africa (Interviews 3.2: Appendix G).

Pour moi, le choix est clair. Je ne parle presque toujours qu’en français. C’est la langue dans laquelle j’ai été élevée et ai grandi. Le Tshiluba, c’est leur papa qui leur apprend à parler. Je ne connais pas bien l’anglais que les enfants parlent très bien. [French]

(For me, the choice is clear. I almost always speak in French only. It is the language in which I was raised and grew up. As to Tshiluba, it is their father who teaches them to speak.)

Clearly, Loma is not concerned about what her husband invests in the children to help them to speak an indigenous language. In addition to their social and educational backgrounds, Tilo’s and Loma’s respective primary identities result from their own childhood practices in the DRC and Belgium (Gee 1996). This is reflected in the FLP in South Africa. In other words, the policy is rooted in the social environment in which
each parent was raised and its language philosophy. Tilo and Loma agree that their children speak French and Tshiluba at home.

As recognised, an immigrant parent who speaks an ethnic language to his/her children needs to have a good command of that language, so that s/he can converse easily about almost every topic with them. Having proficiency in the ethnic language can also assist the parents in imparting some cultural values authentically to the children. But Loma lacks proficiency in her own parents’ native language, Tshiluba. Neither is she fluent in English, the children’s medium of learning. To better understand the family’s reasons for the policy, I draw again on Ager’s (2001) set of motives and Hall’s (1974) motivational range in relation to language and identity construction. The hidden motives in the French-Tshiluba policy appear to be the maintenance of the elitist and the representation of ethnic selves, on the one hand, by the use of French, the language of the ‘je-le-connais’, and on the other hand, by Tshiluba. Using Tshiluba in the family in SA is for Tilo ‘a love for and pride in a tradition felt but not incorporated in everyday behaviour’ (Gans 1991: 76). The instrumental role of French instrumentality (i.e. future opportunities for the children) is another motive for the FLP.

Le français, comme c’est une langue internationale, c’est quelque chose de positif que les enfants auront. Comme cela, ils ne la perdront pas. [French]
(French, because it is an international language, it is something positive that the children will need. In that way, they will not forget it.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

By encouraging the use of French, the parents pave the way for the possibility of employment in the international market for their children. Additionally, French and Tshiluba adopted in SA can produce cohesiveness within the immigrant DRC community. Similarly, a child who speaks to one parent in one language and the other parent in another may develop close relationships with both parents (Baker 1995) and intimacy within the family. Loma contends (Interviews 3.2: Appendix G):

Très souvent je parle français, sauf quand papa me parle ou a quelque chose de secret à me communiquer. Parfois nous parlons Tshiluba quand nous recevons les nôtres, une façon de les accueillir à la manière de chez nous, surtout que nous sommes loin du pays. [French]
(Very often I speak French, save when papa speaks to me or has something secret to tell me. I got used to speaking French only. Sometimes we use Tshiluba when we receive our fellow countrymen, a way of welcoming them as we do in our homeland, particularly as we are far from home.)
Since English operates as a gatekeeper to better opportunities in SA, it threatens the immigrants’ homeland languages. Consequently, the French-Tshiluba policy offers some balance in family interactions and thus allows the parents to exercise some control over their fluent English-speaking children, as Tilo confirms:

*Pour nous, c’est pour équilibrer. A l’école, c’est toujours l’anglais. Le français étant une langue pour leurs parents, mais pour leurs grand-parents, ils sont obligés de connaître le Sud. Nous sommes de passage.*  
(For us, it is to balance. At school, they always use English. French being a language of parents, but for their grandparents, they must know Tshiluba to communicate with them. Don’t forget that in SA we are in transit.)  
(Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

Tshiluba in particular indicates the links with relatives left behind and is associated with ethnic culture. As is claimed, the culture of childhood in each family consists of ‘a number of images and normative expectations held by a particular family member regarding what a child is, how he or she has to act and feel, what they need and want’ (Fantini 1991: 97). Tshiluba is the means through which those tribal images and expectations are conveyed, accessed, and perpetuated. Parents can pass on their experience and their cultural heritage; their children in turn can carry forward the language heritage of the family. Tilo insists:

*Nous sommes de passage à moins que certaines personnes ne soient venues vous dire que vous êtes sud-africains. Sud-africains, vous pouvez le devenir mais c’est sur papier. Mais quelque part là-bas quand on vient te dire qu’on a tué autant de personnes chez toi, tu ne seras pas indifférérent. Voilà tu peux avoir des papiers comme sud-africain. Mais quelque part quand tu montres tes papiers, on te dit: ‘In your country, there is something wrong’. Ça te touche directement. Tu es congolais d’origine, n’est-ce pas?*  
(We are in transit unless some people come and tell you that we are South Africans. You can become South African but on paper. But somewhere when they tell you that such a number of people were killed in your homeland, you will not remain unshaken. Well, you can have papers as South Africans. But somewhere when you produce your identity papers, they tell you: ‘In your country there is something wrong’. It touches you immediately. You are Congolese of origin, aren’t you?)  
(Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

Uncertainty about the future in the host land reinforces the idea of a possible return and the re-creation of an imaginary nation through ethnic languages. Despite the fact that Tilo claims that SA is a stopover, they have been living in this country for almost 9 years. Returning to the DRC is uncertain; it depends on a number of factors. In South Africa the politics of difference focuses mainly on differences between ethnic groups that compose the society (Morrow 1998). Tilo insists that obtaining SA nationality does
not confer upon them (foreign Africans) acceptance in the host society. Consequently, he still believes in a possible return to the homeland and inculcates this idea into his children.

Res: Can you one day allow your children go back to the DRC for work or visit to relatives?
Tilo: Quand on te dit que les enfants doivent connaître leur origine, c’est pas parler seulement. Qu’ils aillent voir la grande famille. [French]
(When we say that children must know their origin, it is not speaking our languages. They have to go and visit the great family.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

A similar view was also put forward by parents in the other research families. But nothing suggests that the children will go and visit their parents’ country of origin. The parents’ own attitudes to their homeland may also change in time and space, if their social and economic conditions improve. On the other hand, marginalisation and other experiences also engender homesickness, causing immigrants to maintain their homeland languages. Furthermore, the children may accept or reject the FLP, depending on what the languages offer to them because they have no mental image of the parents’ homeland. The children’s attitudes to the language policy is summarized in the following father’s response, as captured below:

 Ils sont tous contents d’apprendre et de parler nos langues. D’ailleurs ils insistent déjà que je leur parle du Congo, bien qu’ils soient nés ici. Je leur ai demandé l’hymne national et ils ont dit ‘Nkosi sikeleli Africa’. Je dis ‘non’; c’est le ‘Debout Congolais’. Je leur ai donné le texte et ils chantent déjà. [French]
(They are happy to learn and speak our languages. By the way, they already insist that I speak to them about Congo, although they [sons] were born here. I asked them about the national anthem, and they responded ‘Nkosi sikeleli Africa’. I said ‘no’. It is the ‘Debout Congolais’ [Stand up, Congolese!]. I gave them the text and they have already started singing it.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

Obviously, immigrant parents who desire that their children maintain their ethnic identity attach importance to its acquisition by means of language (Alba 1990). Singing also acts as language practice. The children’s interest in their parental homeland is confirmed by Litshi’s response to my question (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: Do you know the DRC?
Litshi: Yes
Res: Where is it?
Litshi: In the middle of Africa.
Res: When you complete your studies, will you go back to the DRC?
Litshi: Yes
Res: Why not stay in SA?
Litshi: I don’t like it. Just like that, I’m not free.
It is worth noting that Litshi left the DRC when she was almost one year old. Not only have the children developed the love of their homeland; they also seek ways to learn or practice their parents’ tribal language, Tshiluba. This extract speaks for itself (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: What languages do your children use when talking to you?
Tilo: Français. (French.)
Res: Not Tshiluba?
Tilo: Tshiluba, quand ils sont en train de poser des questions en français pour dire: ‘que signifie ceci, comment est-ce que ceci s’appelle, comment est-ce qu’on appelle cela?’ Mais il y a des jours où ils ont vraiment envie de parler Tshiluba. Alors là ils parlent carrément le Tshiluba. [French] (Tshiluba, when they are asking questions [in French] to say: ‘what does this mean’, ‘how do you call this’, ‘what does that mean’? But there are days when they really desire to speak Tshiluba. Thus they truly speak Tshiluba.)

Regardless of Tilo’s claims, I did not observe the use of Tshiluba in the conversations between him and the children (Section 6.2.3). Tilo’s statement may be an expression of his children’s curiosity to learn Tshiluba in search of their ethnic roots. It should be noted that the child only hears the language at home for a short time, usually at weekends. I also observed that there were no equal amounts of investment in each language or each situation of language learning. To continue encouraging his children to speak Tshiluba in South Africa, Tilo posits:

Quand ils jouent, ils parlent anglais. Pour intervenir, je leur parle aussi en anglais. Parfois je joue avec les enfants. Et on se rend compte qu’au lieu de continuer de jouer avec les enfants en anglais, on stoppe pour revenir en Tshiluba. On dit ‘ce que tu as dit là, en Tshiluba, c’est ceci’. C’est une façon de leur enseigner la langue. [French] (When they play, they speak English. To intervene, I also use English. Sometimes I play with the children. And then we realise that instead of carrying on in English, we stop [speaking English] and return to Tshiluba. I say ‘what you said is this in Tshiluba’. It is a way of teaching them the language.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

In fact, the dominant language of the host land is acquired and developed faster than the homeland language when immigrant children start schooling. With many hours spent at school, the opportunities for learning to speak Tshiluba diminish. The children thus develop receptive bilingualism, i.e. they can hear but cannot speak it (Baker 2000). But during play, members with shared interests use a language to think or act collectively. The games are actually developed through language use. While playing, Tilo uses appropriate words in Tshiluba to teach the children his native language. But this practice ensures less exposure to Tshiluba, and thus to its long-term maintenance
in the diaspora.

6.3.2.3 Family language practices in SA

1. Choice of a language and patterns for communication

The general pattern of language practices in this family reads as follows:
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Figure 3: Communication pattern in the French-Tshiluba family

This figure shows that French is used in almost 7 out of 9 communication channels in the family. That is, Tshiluba is used by the father only with his children who hardly understand it, while English (in addition to French) is used as the means of interaction among the children and with their friends. Observations in this family also indicated that the mother almost always addresses her husband and children in French whereas the father speaks French and sometimes Tshiluba to his wife who chooses not to respond in the ancestral language. Although French is the dominant medium for communication at home, in South Africa it is generally perceived ethnically as a neutral medium of communication among DRC nationals rather than as an index of 'je-le-connais' identity. Usually, each parent speaks his/her preferred language to the children, i.e. Tshiluba or French to the same child and is consistent in his/her language choice. What is motivating for this bilingual immigrant family is that both parents are primary speakers of French and practically create orally productive bi-/tri-lingual French-Tshiluba and English children, thus offering them a flexible identity (Section 6.3.1).
2. Strategies of interaction

Since language practices involve the world and the identities of the selected multilingual participants, in this family as well as in the other research families, interactions involve some accommodation and code switching or borrowing. These extracts illustrate accommodation.

Parent – parent interaction (1)
[Topic: miscellaneous]

Tilo:     Tatu, bishi? [Tshiluba] (Father, how are you?)
Bantu:  Bimpa. [Tshiluba] (Good)
Tilo:     Comment ça va, mon frère? [French] (How are you, my brother?)
Gik:     On tient bon. (All right) [French]
Tilo (to Bantu): Ça marche à l’université? [French] (What about your university studies?)
Bantu: Cela semble marcher bien. (It seems to work well.) [French]
Loma (to Bantu and Gik): Bonjour. Ça fait bien des jours. Tu as disparu. Tu nous as oubliés? [French]
           (Hi. We have met for days. You disappeared. Did you forget us?)

Tilo (to wife): Maman, est-ce que tu peux nous donner quelque chose à boire? [French]
           (Mum, can you please give us something to drink?)
Loma (to Bantu and Gik): Que prenez-vous, s'il vous plaît? [French] (What do you have, please?)
Bantu: Du sucré pour Gik, et de la bière pour moi. (Soft drink for Gik and beer for me.) [French]
Loma: Quelle bière? (What kind of beer?) [French]
Bantu: N’importe laquelle. (Any) [French]
Tilo (to Loma): Tu as quelque chose avec toi? (Do you have something [some money]?) [French]
Loma:   Je crois que oui. (I believe so.) [French]
Tilo:      Achète quelques 3 bières pour nous et 2 boissons sucrées pour Gik et toi. [French]
           (Buy 3 beers for us and 2 soft drinks for Gik and you.)
Loma:   Je peux prendre cela chez notre voisin? (Can I get them from our neighbour?)
Tilo:     Non. Essaie ailleurs. Son congélateur ne marche pas bien. (No. Try elsewhere. His freezer does not work well.) [French]
           Vois un peu au 3 ème niveau chez ce sénégalais-là. (Just check on the 3rd Floor at that Senegalese’s?)
Loma:   Il est souvent sorti. Mais je vais quand même vérifier. (He is often out. But I can check.) [French]
Tilo:     Essaie d’abord. S’il y a un problème, on saura quoi faire. (Try first. If there is a problem [i.e. if he is out], we will sort it out.) [French]
Tilo (to Bantu). Ici, c'est pas comme chez vous à Yeoville où il y a des bars partout. (Here, it is different from Yeoville where there are pubs everywhere.) [French]

In this extract, Tilo realises that the interlocutor is a member of his tribe and thus greets him in Tshiluba. The conversation then shifts to French. This code-switching is twofold. Firstly, Tilo uses French with the other visitor because it is the neutral medium of communication between people of different linguistic backgrounds in the DRC. The continuation of the interaction in French thus acts as a way of allowing Gik to participate in the conversation. Secondly, the shift to French is also intended to accommodate
Loma’s preferred medium of interaction as she joins the group. The interaction in French between Tilo and Loma confirms this assumption. Additionally, Tilo uses the term ‘maman’ (mum) to show respect to his wife defined as the manageress of the household. The word usually recalls the ethnic or traditional way of defining a mature woman of child-bearing age. This does not mean that she behaves towards her husband as a mother, nor does she overlook the man’s traditional authority.

**Parent – parent interaction (2)**

[Talking about the children]

Tilo: *Ma’mu, mpesha remote control.* [Tshiluba – English] (Mum, give me the remote control)

Loma: *Où est-il? Je ne le vois pas.* [French] (Where is it? I can’t see it.)

Tilo: *Regarde un peu en chambre. Peut-être que les enfants l’ont déplacé.* [French] (Please look in the bedroom. Perhaps the children put it there.)

Loma: *Je crois qu’ils l’ont mis quelque part.* [French] (I believe they put it somewhere else.)

Tilo: *Tangila à côté de la garde-robe.* [Tshiluba-French] (Look near the wardrobe.)

Loma: *Enfin, il est là. Les enfants mettent les histoires n’importe où. Ils ne s’en font même pas.* [French] (Finally, I found it. Children put things anywhere. They don’t even care.)

Bantu (to Loma): *Le boulot, ça va? Tu t’adaptes quand même avec l’anglais?* [French] (What about your work? Do you adjust to the English language?)

Loma: *J’essaie de m’adapter. Au début, c’était difficile pour moi. Mais maintenant, ça marche. Je dois parler l’anglais; c’est l’outil du travail.* [French] (I keep trying. At the beginning, it was difficult for me. But now it seems to work. I must speak English; it is the tool of work.)

Tilo (intervenes): *Elle se débrouille un peu bien pour le moment. Sauf que parfois on la regarde un peu avec dédain puisqu’elle est étrangère.* [French] (She speaks a little well this time. Save that she is sometimes looked down because she is a foreigner.)

Loma: *Oui, de fois. Les gens croient que parce qu’on est étranger, on ne connaît rien. Mais mon patron m’apprécie. Et certains comprennent que c’est la langue qui faisait défaut. Chez nous, en Belgique, les études sont sérieuses. C’est pas comme dans les autres pays européens. Il faut travailler dur pour obtenir son diplôme. Mais j’ai négligé l’anglais. C’est pourquoi j’ai des problèmes ici.* [French] (Yes, sometimes. People believe that because you are a foreigner, you know nothing. But my boss has good impression of me. And some other people understand that the problem was the language. In our country, Belgium, studies are serious. It is not like in the other European countries. You have to work hard to get your degree. But I overlooked English. That’s why I have problems here.)

Tilo: *Je crois qu’elle a raison. Quand vous travaillez bien, il ne sera plus question d’étranger. Mais on va apprécier le travail que vous produisez. Quelques fois nous avons souvent des préjugés sur ce point-là.* [French] (I believe she is right. When you work well, it will not be a question of foreigner. But we will appreciate the work that you produce. Sometimes we have often prejudices on this point.)

Loma: *Cela arrive n’importe où. On ne vous connaîtrait pas bien, c’est pas facile de vous faire confiance. Vous devez vous confirmer.* [French] (It happens anywhere. They don’t know you well; it is difficult to be trusted. You have to assert yourself [by your ability])

This excerpt indicates that Tilo attempts to borrow an English word: ‘remote control’. This term may have a counterpart in French, but code mixing is frequently used by
foreign multilinguals to display some knowledge of English. In the extract above Tilo also attempts to engage Loma in speaking Tshiluba, but she is still consistent in her use of French. Loma’s language behaviour does not mean that Loma cannot understand and speak Tshiluba, her parents’ native language. She constantly confirms her pride in her ‘je-le-connais’ Belgian identity: ‘in our country, Belgium’. Interacting in French only is Loma’s usual behaviour at home. In the same excerpt Loma says that she can now speak English. It is true that she can communicate and make herself understood using formulaic expressions, though she has not yet acquired mastery of oral English. Frequent contacts with South African English speakers at work are likely to help her improve on her oral English as well as written legal English.

**Father – children interaction (1)**

(Advising children)

(Pay attention. Don’t move out of the house. It is cold.) [Tshiluba]

Bati: *Non, papa. Je n’ai pas froid.* (No, daddy. I am not feeling cold.)

Tilo (again): *To. Ambila balunda betu bapinga ku mabu kidjiba dja kunanya to. Compris?*  
(No. Tell your friends to go back home. It is not the right time [for you] to play. Understood?) [Tshiluba - French]

Bati: (Obey and lets his friends go back)

Tilo: *Bati, mais que fais-tu mu nzubu wabulala?* [French - Tshiluba]  
(Bati, but what are you doing in the bedroom?)

Bati: *Rien, papa* (Nothing, daddy)

(Oh, no. Not like that. Don’t jump. You are disturbing us.)

Loti: (Stops playing in the lounge)

The father mixes Tshiluba and French as a way of inculcating ethnic and national identity in his children. By using Tshiluba to the children, Tilo intends to check his sons’ understanding of the language and invites them to speak the language. At the same time he gives instructions, thus mixing Tshiluba with French by using the French words ‘*Attention*’ and ‘*Compris*’. Despite the fact that Tilo encourages his children to speak Tshiluba, he does not get the expected result. They respond in French, the DRC language in which they feel fluent. But one thing is true: the children attempt to understand what their father says.

Bantu (to Tilo): *Est-ce qu’il te comprend?* (Does he understand what you say?) [French]

Tilo: *Ils doivent parler Tshiluba à la maison. Badji bakula anglais mu kalasa.* [French - Tshiluba]  
(They must speak Tshiluba at home. They have English at school.)
In this context, French gives the interlocutors their intellectual status, while Tshiluba brings about some closeness and ethnicity. In practice, Tshiluba is an invitation to the interlocutor to recreate the home-feeling.

In another instance, Tilo (father) attempts to use Tshiluba and French to exercise power over his G2 child.

**Father – children interaction (2)**

(Sit down and watch the TV. Keep silent. Keep silent. The fathers are watching television.)

Bati: (Acts without resisting)

Tilo (on another occasion): *Hey. Luaku lukasa, ela tonton Peter moyi.* [Tshiluba - French]
(Hey. Be quick. Come and say hi to Uncle Peter.)

Tilo (to Litshi): *Stop doing that. C’est pas bon.* (Stop doing that. It is not fair.) [English – French]
(With insistence): *Lekela kwenza manku. Ki bimpa to.* (Stop doing that. It is not fair.) [Tshiluba]
Litshi (obeys without saying a word)

Here, language operates to construct relations of power (Scollon & Scollon 2003; Ng & Bradac 1993). The immediate behavioural effect is compliance by the G2 and TG children. This change is consistent with Ng and Bradac’s (1993) claim that language impacts upon people’s actions. By using both French and Tshiluba, the father also hopes to teach the indigenous language while maintaining power.

The following conversation extract indicates the usual interaction between Loma and her children. French is the only language that she speaks fluently and can use with the children. Although Loma can speak little English (section 3.1.3), during my fieldwork I recorded no interaction in which English was used between her and other members of the family.

**Mother – children interaction**

Loma: *Litshi, est-ce que je peux avoir du savon dans la douche, s’il te plait?* [French]
Litshi, may I please have the soap from the bathroom?)
Litshi: *Quel savon, maman? De toilette?* [French] (What soap, mama? Bathroom soap?)
Loma: *N’importe lequel. Viens donner au papa pour se laver les mains.* [French]
(Any. Give it to Papa to wash his hands.)
Bati: *Maman, je peux aller jouer avec mes amis en bas?* [French]
(Mum, can I go and play with my friends on the ground floor?)
Loma: *No, pas maintenant. As-tu fini ton devoir? Montre-le moi d’abord.* [French]
(No, not now. Have you finished your homework? I have to see it first.)
(Mum, you see? I am through. Can I go, mum? Please, mum.)
Loma: *Vas-y mais pas pour longtemps.* [French] (Go but not for a long time.)
Bati: *Merci, maman.* [French] (Thank you, mum.)

This is a sample of the language practices of the French-Tshiluba children at home.

**Children – children interaction**
(Playing outside home)

Litshi: *Go and play outside. I am watching TV. Your friends are waiting for you.*
Loti : *Papa a dit que nous ne sortions pas dehors. Il va nous punir. Moi, je ne vais pas.* [French]
(Papa said that we should not go outside of the home. He will punish us. For me, I won’t go out.
Bati: *I can go. Yes. Come on. Uncle is here. Papa will not punish us.*
(But be careful, No dangerous games. Be quick. Don’t be long.)
Bati: *Vous voyez. J’avais raison. You see, uncle is nice. He will tell papa, Let’s go. Cham is already here.*
Litshi: *Et si l’oncle part avant que papa n’arrive, que ferez-vous ? Vous verrez. C’est votre problème.* [French]
(And if uncle goes back before papa comes back, what will you do? You will see. It is your problem)
Bati: *Okay, I go.*
Loti: *Me too. But I am coming soon.*

French serves as a medium of interaction at home the household, especially between the parents and their children. But these children are being schooled in South Africa where English is both the medium of learning (MOL) and the dominant language in the main domains of use. The Tshiluba identity that the father wants his children to acquire is unlikely to manifest clearly, especially if the children stay longer in South Africa. The identity of the children is likely to remain symbolic through the children’s attachment to their parents.

**Parents – visitors interaction (1)**

Tilo: *Moyi weba manseba. Udji bishi? Bishi ku kalasa?* [Tshiluba]
(How are you, uncle. How are you? And your studies?) [Tshiluba]
Bantu: *Bintu bionso bimpa.* (Everything is alright.) [Tshiluba]
Loma: *Bonjour, tonton. Ça fait beaucoup de jours. Quoi, tu étais malade?* [French]
(Good morning, uncle. We haven't met for days. What, were you sick?)

Bantu: *Non. C'est question de temps simplement. Nous sommes étudiants, et il a trop d'exigences académiques, comme vous le savez.* [French]
(No. It is matter of time only. We are students, and there are too many academic requirements, as you know.)

Two patterns of language practice appear in the extract, reflecting the FLP and the parents’ specific identities. Tilo identifies the interlocutor as a member of his tribe and thus feels more comfortable in his native language. This general pattern is very common in DRC nationals. On the other hand, to indicate a certain degree of elitism or to talk to a person outside one’s tribal group, French is used as a neutral medium.

**Parents – visitors interaction (2)**

Loma: *Bonjour, papa. Tu as quand même songé à nous aujourd’hui.* [French]
(Hi, dad. You have surely thought of us today.)

Kika: *J’étais très occupé avec mon travail. Je ne me sentais pas bien non plus.* [French]
(I was busy with my dissertation. I was not feeling well, too)

Loma: *Papa, tu connais ces gens-là?* (Papa, do you know those people?) [French]

Bantu: *Pas très bien. Mais ce sont des compatriotes.*
(Not very well. But they are our fellow countrymen.)

(And some time later, the conversation changes the medium between ethnics.)

Tilo: *Manseba, kuneku makelela udji bikola. Bantu badji mu malu makola.* [Tshiluba]
(Uncle, here life is hard. People are complicated)

(Yes, father. The children must have good schooling here. The future is in our country. They don’t like us.) [Tshiluba]

The use of Tshiluba in SA unites people of the same ethnic or linguistic background and creates intimacy. In the DRC the words ‘Papa’ and ‘Tatu’ (both meaning *father*), ‘Tonton’ and ‘Manseba’ (both meaning *uncle*) used in the statements above show respect and social distance. It is also the legitimate customary way for women and men to address mature people in DRC (Tshiluba) communities. Although the visitor (Bantu) belongs to the same tribe, Loma speaks French because it is the only language that she really handles well while Tilo converses easily in Tshiluba. The term ‘kalasa’ used in Bantu’s last sentence derives from French ‘classe’, as no equivalent exists in their language. In my experience, there is more code-switching and borrowing than accommodation, indicating the bilinguals’ usual way of conversing (Baker 1982).
6.3.3 School language policies, and their impact on immigrant learners

Bati and Litshi’s school

This school is situated out of the ethnic area and welcomes learners of diverse ethnic, linguistic, and social backgrounds, including the children of immigrants. In any school there are always ways to distinguish foreign learners from their local peers. The philosophy surrounding the construction of foreign learners by different school category members emerges from the following extract (Interviews 3.4-6: Appendix G):

Res: How do you know that these are immigrants’ children?
Princ: This is a small school and we know everybody by name. The school knows the family’s background and checks ID documents. Most children come here from poor families: no food, family sharing a room, high risk areas. Children are very traumatised, and we consider this. Some are abused by adults known to them.
Gr4 teacher: First of all, it is the surname and the accent. There are also other features: You look at them and know these are not South Africans. You will be able to distinguish: faces structure, body structure, colour of skin darker than that of South Africans, hairstyle.
Gr2 teacher: Sometimes, the homeland languages of the immigrants are mixed with English, come in when they talk. But very soon they pick it up because of peer group influence. They do sort of peer group in sport.
Gr4 peers: They tell us and they don’t speak our languages and look a bit different.

In this process of identification, the principal looks at the identity documents and information provided by the parents while the Grade 2 and Grade 4 teachers (Gr2 & Gr4) look at the surname, language proficiency and physical traits (see also Akhtar 1999). These methods are similar to those reported in the other selected families.

The data show that English is the medium of learning while Afrikaans is used as a second language. The compulsory teaching of Afrikaans results from the recent past when it was a language of power likely to provide higher socioeconomic status in SA. In this school, Afrikaans still has more power than local indigenous languages, which are marginalised, as this excerpt shows (Interviews 3.4-5: Appendix G):

Res: What languages are recommended at school?
Princ: English as the medium of instruction and Afrikaans as a second language
Res: Do you sometimes speak to immigrant children in SA languages, apart from English?
Gr4 teacher: No. Students have to work hard and we cannot get anybody to speak those languages, except English. But outside classrooms teachers have no control.
Learners with little knowledge of English have to struggle to understand and perform school tasks. In the first extract, the Grade 4 teacher (Gr4) underlines how difficult it is for foreign African learners to cope with English. It is important to see how the school assists them.

Res: Do they have language problems?
Gr4 teacher: If they have language problems, they are sent to extra-classes, afternoon classes organised by volunteer teachers.
Gr2 teacher: Immigrant children mix home languages and English when they talk. Afrikaans is difficult for them and is offered as a second language. (Interviews 3.5: Appendix G)

This school attempts to remedy the language problems of the foreign learners. As a multiethnic and multilingual school, this is a place in which immigrant children have to negotiate their (ethnic) identities and conform to the culture of the host land. It is important to know what the school does to accommodate them (Interviews 3.4-5: Appendix G).

Res: Do school structures favour the integration of immigrant children?
Princ: Nothing special. But there are mixed with others.
Gr4 teacher: Nothing at all, nothing at this school. In fact because …
Gr2 teacher: It does because of the circumstances and because of the war-torn areas, the school accommodates them and gives them something like clothes. The school does something like school fees. Some are brought to school by the Red Cross, and the school exempts them from fees and provides clothes.
Res: So, you don’t have any special programme for them?
Gr2 teacher: No. Immigrant children are treated the same and not classed separately.

From the teachers’ accounts, contradictory views emerge. However, it is evident that an effort is made to integrate the learners. Jones (1995) reports that melting-pot practices promote friendships among children of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. An equally important point concerns the immigrant children’s self-image with regard to interpersonal relationships with their teachers and local peers. But as is claimed, friendship is the source of meaning and the source of identity (Jones (1995). In this context, it is necessary to establish the quality of Litshi’s relationship with her local peers (Interviews 3.5: Appendix G).

Res: Are the immigrant children accepted by their peers?
G4 teacher: There is no problem of acceptance at all. There is no differentiation.
G2 teacher: There’s no differentiation among themselves. They are easily accepted and their mothers, e.g. if they don’t know speaking English, they bring interpreters, a neighbour or a friend, or anybody that can translate. Parents are grateful to teachers they know because children are fully fitted, accepted. They come to a school where they will
receive good education and other needs are accommodated. They appreciate that.

The Grade 2 teacher in this school particularly points out that they have always built up positive inter-personal relationships with their immigrant learners and provided support for their social integration. The teachers and principal were also asked of the quality of relationships between local children and their foreign African peers (Interviews 3.4-5: Appendix G).

Res: Have you ever had any complaint from the immigrants’ children about being called names?
G4 teacher: No. They are easily accepted by teachers and peers. But they come from different cultural backgrounds.
Princ: Yes. They call them ‘amakwere-kwere’. Some South African parents don’t like them because their parents obtain school fees exemption from the Department.
Res: Do they sometimes fight?
G4 teacher: No. It does not affect them at all

While the principal acknowledges the denigrating discourse, the teacher is blinded by the school’s ethos. Litshi (the TG) is unaware of xenophobia at school, a fact confirmed by her classmates (Interviews 3.1: Appendix G).

Res: Do you have South African friends?
Litshi: Yes.
Res: Why?
Litshi: To know them and their culture.
Res: Do you have DRC friends?
Litshi: Yes.
Res: Can you speak French at school with them?
Litshi: Yes.
Res: Do your local friends worry about it?
Litshi: No. They ask me to teach them: ‘Hello – How are you? – What’s the matter with you?’
Res: Do you also ask them to teach you isiZulu or seSotho?
Litshi: No.
Res: Why?
Litshi: Just like that. They are not nice. isiZulu is not important in SA, not for me.
Res: Which language is nice, or important?
Litshi: English, because everybody can speak it.
Gr4 peer: We treat them as brothers and sisters. We also want to learn their language and culture. But they don’t like ours.

Because of its socioeconomic status as a means to better opportunities, English is always viewed by the TG member as being ‘nice’. Such behaviour is rooted in the negative prejudice towards indigenous languages inherited from the colonial language policies in Africa (Motala 1997; Ngugi wa Thiong’o 1986, 1993). Litshi’s attitudes to local African languages may stem from her parents’ attitudes towards the host society.
and their languages. English creates educational opportunities for the immigrants’ children in South Africa.

Res: What do you think of immigrant children?
Gr4 teacher: We do not differentiate. They come with no English and we put them with other children instead of getting someone to interpret for them. They come very young and learn English; so to learn English is not a problem for them.
Gr2 teacher: They are eager to learn, display responsibility, and are artistic. As a teacher who cares, we teach them as anybody. We hold extra-English classes. We sympathise with them. We ask for an interpreter to explain in their language in class what kind of word it means. (Interviews 3.5: Appendix G)

Teachers’ views in this school are similar to those expressed by the teachers in the schools of the English-only and French-only families.

6.3.4 Implications of the FLP for schooling

The family language policy in this French-Tshiluba family does not seem to have had a negative impact on the children’s education in SA. The following interview excerpt indicates this point (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: Do you think that if a child speaks two or more languages s/he cannot perform well at school?
Tilo: Non, c'est pas la raison. D'ailleurs, à leur niveau je pense que l'enfant ne pose pas tellement de problèmes de langue. Puisque j'ai la facilité de langue, je n'ai jamais rencontré cette incompatibilité. [French]
(No, this is not the reason. By the way, at their age I think that a child doesn’t have much difficulty. Since I learn languages faster, I never faced such incompatibility.)

All parents, except those in the English-only household, do not believe that their family language policies impact on their immigrant children’s schooling. Academic success relies on factors such as intelligence, motivation, and first language literacy ability (Cummins 1996; De Avilla 1986). Children in this family perform well at school (see 2002 School Reports: Appendix H).
6.4 Identity

6.4.1 Identities based on language and culture

Some languages are more dominant than others because of their socioeconomic status as well as ethnic and linguistic maintenance in the milieu. However, the data analysis reveals that each language confers on each user specific identities, depending on the situation. These identities are discussed below.

**English, Afrikaans, and African languages**

Acquiring proficiency in English and the South African dominant language helps immigrant parents and their children to enter new social networks, they remain isolated and disadvantaged socio-economically. Although differences may persist, there are benefits attached to learning English (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G).

Res: Why did you choose to join the English-speaking community?
Tilo: Bon, pour des raisons personnelles. C'est une façon de perfectionner l'anglais. Tout le monde sait que l'Afrique du Sud est un pays anglophone. Un jour nous pourrions quitter l'Afrique du Sud et rentrer chez nous pour occuper des postes de responsabilité. Il ne faut pas que quand on me donne soit un petit texte à traduire, que je commence à recourir à quelqu'un d'autre ou à hésiter, que je balbutie. C'est mieux aussi d'évoluer dans une communauté anglophone pour des avantages sociaux.
(Well, for personal reasons. It is a way of improving English. Everybody knows that South Africa is an English-speaking country. One day we would return to our homeland and hold management positions. It is no good getting a small text to translate and then resort to another person, or hesitating. It is better to live in an English-speaking community for social advantages.)

The parents have conducted a cost-benefit analysis of English and decided to join an English-speaking religious community. This enables them to be exposed to a new culture and identity. But the reason for joining that community is that the parents believe that knowledge of English will lead to increased access to mainstream networks, and for that matter to the material rewards and/or economic resources accorded to any groups using English. The family seeks social integration and tries to share power held by the local population by negotiating their identities. It should also be noted that in SA, knowledge of several languages allows immigrant family members to display multiple selves in multiple situations.
DRC languages: French and Tshiluba

Through the use of Tshiluba and French, the parents also hope to transmit their history, ethnic values, patterns of interpersonal behaviours, childrearing practices, and patterns of communication (Hughes 1993). Equally, the knowledge of these languages allows members to navigate between multiple identities and to attribute to their interlocutors their specific identities, depending on the situation and different ‘platform events’ (Scollon & Scollon 2003: x). Tilo and Litshi are explicit about this fact in their responses (Interviews 3.2-3 & 3.1: Appendix G):

Res: In what language do you feel more comfortable?  
Loma: Comme d’habitude, en français. (As usual, in French)  
Tilo: En Tshiluba, la langue maternelle et aussi en français. En dehors de ma famille, quand je suis parmi les gens de mon coin, j’utilise ma langue maternelle. En tout cas, je me sens plus à l’aise en Tshiluba. En dehors de ceci, cela dépend. Le Congo est un pays multiligüe. Quand je suis avec les swahiliphones, je parle Swahili et avec les lingalaphones, j’utilise le Lingala, et ainsi de suite. (In Tshiluba, my mother language and French as well. Outside of my family, when I am among people from my area of origin, I use my mother language. In all cases, I feel more comfortable in Tshiluba. Beside this, it depends on the interlocutor. DR Congo a multilingual country. When I am with Swahili-speaking people, I speak Swahili and with Lingala speakers, I use Lingala, and so on.)

Res: What languages do you use to your wife?  
Tilo: Français, inconsciemment et Tshiluba consciemment. (French unconsciously and Tshiluba consciously)

Res: In what languages does she speak to you?  
Tilo: Français (French)

Res (to the TG): What language do you use with your daddy?  
Litshi: French and Tshiluba  
Res: And with your mum?  
Litshi: French

This extract reflects each parent’s primary identity and an intended projection of that identity’. It is the ‘generation of a possible external opinion on what and who people are’ (Ager (2001: 74). The parents’ individual identity is rooted in the parents’ primary socialisation and the cultures of the particular milieux in which they were raised (see Section 6.2.2). It allows the children to grow up bilingual. Additionally, in Section 6.2.2, Tilo considers Tshiluba as a reservoir of his family’s culture and the basis of childrearing, setting boundaries between their worldview and that of other ethnic and linguistic groups. As Mwaura (1980) maintains, 'language influences the ways in which we perceive reality, evaluate it and conduct ourselves with respect to it' (p. 27). This perception implies that family members will behave towards the world in different ways.
Tilo wants his children to be apprenticed into the Tshiluba way of life while growing up in SA, as the following extract states (Interviews 3.1: Appendix G):

Res: What DRC languages do you like much?
Litshi: Tshiluba
Res: Why Tshiluba?
Litshi: Because it is nice.
Res: What languages do you often use with your family when you go out?
Litshi: French
Res: Why French, and not Tshiluba?
Litshi: Because I speak it better than Tshiluba.

Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1986, 1993) sees ethnic values as a key component to culture, and language as the primary medium to maintain it. However, despite her interest in the parental language, Litshi lacks fluency in her parent’s tribal language. In fact, the medium of learning powerfully impacts on the child’s language practices at home. The children use English and French among themselves. It is believed that the (European) language of schooling transposes onto the African child its foreign thought, influencing him/her to see the world as defined through the culture of the colonial language (Ngugi wa Thiong’o 1986: 17). By talking to the children in Tshiluba or French, Tilo hopes to create a positive attitudinal orientation in their language behaviours, thus making the ethnic language a symbol of their DRC cultural identity and heritage in South Africa.

Res: Your wife almost always speaks French. Any reason for this?
(No. I don’t think so. Perhaps … She was born in Belgium. She knows Tshiluba, speaks very well. But maybe it is a question of habit or the environment in which she grew up where everybody speaks French. It has become a primary language for her.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

This response echoes Fanon’s (1967a) argument that when a person speaks a language, s/he acquires to some extent that language’s culture and a certain appreciation of their way of looking at and reading the world. It is recognised that people often use language to identify themselves and to define their social milieu. Language thus acts as a specific feature of self-differentiation, offering a group and individual identity, carrying people’s histories (Ngugi wa Thiong’o 1986). This is the perception of language use that is still deep-rooted in Tilo’s mind and his childrearing practices. But such a view is challenged in the context of immigration. Following my
observations the ethnic language seems to be spoken by the father only. In addition, the value and utility of an ethnic language (Baudrillard 1972) in the immigrants’ everyday life in SA may not be significant and the sense of group identification weakens in time.

6.4.2 Symbolic identity markers and practices in SA

In the context of South African immigration, homeland languages and histories carry only that infantile image of primary socialisation or feelings. Away from the homeland, the symbolic identity markers can compensate for nostalgia. The French-Tshiluba family members’ symbolic identity elements are mostly the same as those in the other research families, namely ethnic language, clothing, fashion, foods. There are also abstract symbols such as music, homeland culture, mores or values, except that here the family has joined a South African church.

In the diaspora all these cultural elements have communicative value (Stokes 1994: 5) to the research subjects, in that ‘any mode of ethnic identity is valid as long as it encourages the feeling of being ethnic’ (Gans 1991: 75). Maintaining Tshiluba and French in SA reflects respectively ‘symbolic ethnicity’ and ‘instrumental ethnicity’ (Oommen 1997: 21). In other words, French as an international language can provide the children with material rewards (instrumental and symbolic) while Tshiluba is rooted only in the anxiety to preserve one’s cultural identity (only symbolic). In other words, Tshiluba becomes a medium of family self-representation in SA and within the DRC community, and of joint social activity, while French remains a symbol of elitism (particularly on the mother’s side).

Ethnic fashion and churches (Stokes 1994) are also used as markers of self-definition. Churches particularly tend to offer a system of support and ‘provide affective compensation and help immigrants to maintain a social life’ (Compani 1994: 144). As noted earlier, the research family attends an English-speaking church rather than an ethnic one. Such a choice is a way to re-negotiate identities and to achieve social integration with the local people.
6.4.3 Ethnic and linguistic identity maintenance and hybridization in SA

Despite their systematic devaluation, immigrants manage to maintain a positive sense of themselves, resisting marginalisation. In this family ethnic and linguistic identities in SA are maintained at home through the FLP (French and Tshiluba).

Section 6.2.2.2 (Interviews: Appendix G) indicates that in SA, DRC languages are used to ensure a link with the country of origin and to communicate with relatives left behind. The father believes that maintaining French as an international language opens international opportunities for their children while creating ethnic identity in SA.

Nurturing pride in and love (Gans 1991) for the homeland (Section 6.2.2.2; Interviews: Appendix G) and a possible return to the native country emerge as other factors for adopting a French-Tshiluba policy. Tilo is explicit about this in the following excerpt (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: Do you personally plan to go back home?
Tilo: Absolument, absolument. Évidemment, avant de rentrer, je dois d’abord moi-même y aller voir. Ça fait 10 ans que j’ai quitté le pays. Il y a des gens qui disent que le pays a changé et qu’il faut y aller. Je sais que j’ai perdu tout ce que j’avais là. Il faudra reprendre à zéro. [French]
(Absolutely, absolutely. It is true that, before going back, I must first go there and see personally what is happening. I left the country ten years ago. People say that the country has changed and we have to go back. I lost whatever I had there. We have to start afresh.)

The possible return of Tilo’s family is subject to conditions related to the social change in his homeland. Such a plan encourages Litshi, her first daughter, to learn Tsiluba and keep on feeling Congolese, as she reveals her nationality in the following extract (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Res: You are now living in SA. Do you feel South African?
Litshi: No. Congolese.
Res: Why?
Litshi: Because I speak French and Tshiluba.
Res: A Nigerian or Cameroonian can also speak French but he is not Congolese.
Litshi: Because I was born there and because of the names.

Despite lacking a mental image of the DRC, Litshi still identifies herself as a DRC national. Names have specific territories, which in turn convey national or ethnic identity. South African African names differ from those of the DRC Africans and link
members to their ethnic and linguistic group. The TG’s love for the country of origin may change in time under the exigencies of life in a new space. In addition, in the context of immigration homeland languages can be maintained only if there are support mechanisms likely to create motivation to the immigrant children. Tilo reveals his own strategies.

Res: What do you do to maintain Tshiluba?
(Form time to time I speak in Tshiluba. I ask them for stories in Tshiluba. And one thing for which they must hold on, there are prayers in Tshiluba: For instance, ‘Our Father’. We say it in Tshiluba. It depends on who leads the prayer in Tshiluba or French or even in English. All these three languages are used’. ‘I greet you Mary’, ‘Credo’.) (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

Tilo also admits to taking conscious steps to encourage his children to speak Tshiluba in addition to French and to maintain it. In Section 6.2.2.2 (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G), Tilo speaks about playing with his children. Playing is another strategy for using language as a psychological and cultural element of self-definition. By doing so, he is aware of his role as a ‘source of Tshiluba’ in the family. If the parents persist in using their preferred homeland languages to their children, this is likely to develop their active knowledge. Tilo justifies his view (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G):

Quand ils seront grands, ils ne pourront pas oublier. Ils doivent connaître, par exemple, que notre pays est situé là. Nous vivons pour le moment dans la misère. Mais c’est un pays riche, et cette misère est causée par ça, ça, et entretenue par tel, tel individu. Ils vont grandir avec ça au lieu qu’on lui dise que c’est un pays pauvre. Non, non.
(When they grow older, they will not forget. They must know, for example, that our country is located there. We [our country] are living in misery for the time being. But it is a rich country, and this misery is caused by that, that, and created by certain individuals. They have to grow up with that instead of being told that it is a poor nation. No, no.)

The implications for the Tshiluba-French policy are that the children are likely to speak Tshiluba, depending upon the father’s singular determination to transmit it to his children and the children’s own motivation or interest in the language. Baker (1995) agrees that children in families speaking an ethnic language with the majority language outside the family have the advantage of carrying on the heritage language of the family. Multilingual children can be bridges within the nuclear household and the
extended family, the community and across the social and ethnic and linguistic groups. Another advantage is that the family lives within the ethnic community and very often speak their languages with other DRC immigrants. For an immigrant child to become an orally fluent bi-/multilingual speaker, there must be plenty of stimulating experiences of the ethnic languages.

**Hybridization**

Brah (1996) confirms that cultures in contact are likely to change but in different directions and at a different pace, leading to cultural mixtures and hybrid selves. To the question regarding a possible change in behaviour because of contact with the new culture and languages, Tilo states:

*Je ne crois pas que nous avons changé, ma femme et moi. Nous sommes toujours les mêmes. Changer, parce que nous sommes à l'étranger? Ça, non. Nous gardons encore notre culture. Voilà pourquoi nous parlons nos langues et culture ici et enseignons notre manière de vivre, notre pays à nos enfants. Ils ont un comportement différent.* [French]

(I don't believe that we have changed, my wife and me. We are always the same. Changing, because we are abroad? No. We are still keeping our languages and culture here. That is why we speak our languages here and teach our children our way of life, our country. They [children] behave differently [from local children].)  (Interviews 3.3: Appendix G)

Loma (mother) puts forward the same view (Interviews 3.2: Appendix G):

*Je n'ai pas changé du tout. On ne peut pas changer comme cela, surtout que nous sommes exclus, pas intégrés. Nous vivons chacun dans son coin.* [French]

(I have not changed. We cannot change like that, given that we are excluded, not integrated. We are living each group separated from the other.)

Despite the fact that members of this family claim that they did not change, they find themselves in ‘a configuration of meanings which gives them access to and locates them within a [South African] culture’ (Clarke et al 1981: 54). This is constituted of the ‘actions and results of humans in society, the way they interact in their communities, and the addition the immigrants make to their new society’ (Shor 1993: 30). Immigrants’ culture is influenced by other voices, histories, experiences, roots and norms and values. To survive in the host land, immigrants have to adopt local selves. However, in a situation of stereotyping it is difficult to suppress people’s history and ways of life. Language becomes the heritage of individual immigrant members. Since identity is an ongoing transformational process (Long 1992), it is constantly reshaped by the
conditions that it encounters. Immigrant children also have to navigate through a hybrid displacing space (see Brah 1996) developed in the interaction between the ethnic culture and languages and those of the receiving nation. In the multiple social spaces ways of life interpenetrate one another.

6.5 Conclusion

Chapter Six has shown that Affirmative Action policy in South Africa (as a push factor), ethnic community and geography (as pull factors), a strong sense of elitism (on the mother’s side), and tribal/ethnic identity (for the father) are the major reasons for the adoption of the dual French-Tshiluba policy in this family. The family’s decision to join a South African Church, however, is seen as an attempt to re-negotiate social integration and reject total ethnic enclosure. If the FLP seems to work for the parents, it has not been very successful for the children with regard to Tshiluba as they are unable to speak it and can only understand a little. Because the FLP of this family is based on DRC languages, their practices are different from those of the Multilanguage family, which constitute the subject in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN: MULTILANGUAGE FAMILY

7.1 Introduction

The last family in the study resembles the other research families, in that it is middle-class. Like the others, migration was voluntary, and they experienced xenophobia. Similar to the French-only and French-Tshiluba families, this family lives within the DRC community, in this case in Yeoville. As voluntary economic migrants, they had some expectations of achieving better material conditions in SA. But these were not fulfilled because the father, a former pilot, was not allowed to fly in SA and he had to settle for a small-scale venture with his wife. This has resulted in some disaffection with South Africa. The parents of this family, like those of the French-only and French-Tshiluba families, want to return to the DRC while all the other children, except one, prefer to stay in South Africa. Like the French-Tshiluba family, the parents come from the same ethnic language group: Bapende. These parents are fluent in French, Lingala, Kikongo, but only the father is fluent in English and Kipende.

Despite the many similarities with the other families, this family has adopted a multilanguage policy, which reflects an open, flexible attitude to language choice in SA. This decision results from the parents’ view that knowledge of many languages allows flexible identities and is important for their children’s future. A Multilanguage family policy will enable the children to maintain their ethnic and national selves in SA, while enabling them to also move outside the ethnic enclave. Although the children can speak most of the languages they know at home, they are not allowed to use local African languages at home. The children are allowed to use DRC languages, though they often speak English among themselves and do not wish to return to the DRC. Compared to the other children in this study, the children of this family are the most hybridized.

In a more detailed analysis that follows, I examine the reasons for, and consequences of this family’s choice of a Multilanguage policy in relation to context, power, and
identity.

7.2 Context: External forces

7.2.1 Life accounts, migration motives and geographic location

This family consists of eight children, one of whom is the father’s nephew\(^6\) (or father’s older brother’s son). The selected research participants in this family are referred to as Lufo (father), Mafo (mother), Firo (1\(^{st}\) child and daughter) and Fatou (5\(^{th}\) child and 4\(^{th}\) daughter). The selected members are grouped into two different generations and have various educational backgrounds, as shown in Table 4 (Appendix I). As indicated earlier, the family lives in the very heart of the Johannesburg DRC community, Yeoville.

Leaving one’s country of origin to settle in another is not always a deliberate decision, as Lufo (father) argues (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

*J’étais pilote de l’air en RDC et pour des raisons personnelles j’ai décidé de ne plus voler. Je suis devenu directeur d’opération pour m’occuper des avions au sol. A cause de l’instabilité politique la société a commencé à tomber en faillite. Et aussi à cause de violences au pays j’ai décidé de quitter la RDC pour l’Afrique du Sud.*

(I was an air-pilot in the DRC and for personal reasons, I decided not to fly any more. I became a field manager dealing with planes on the ground. The company started going bankrupt due to the political instability. And also because of violence in the country, I decided to leave the country for South Africa.)

Undoubtedly, a number of ‘push factors’ (Tollefson 1991: 107: ) caused Lufo to leave his country of origin for South Africa. He had known this country through his trips to SA as a pilot but only superficially. As to the other family members they came a few years later to join Lufo. Mafo (mother) says:


(At first I came in 1994 to visit Papa [i.e. her husband], and then in 1995 with the children by road forever.) (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G)

\(^6\) As in the English-only family (Section 4.1.1), following the Bapende tradition, a brother’s or sister’s child is seen as one’s own children and thus constructed as a ‘son’ or a ‘daughter’ and not as a ‘nephew or niece’. This philosophy is situated in the frame of creating a sustainable bond and/or cohesiveness among children born from the same paternal grandparents, thus encouraging the spirit of mutual aid and caretaking for the survival of the larger family or clan.
It is clear that Mafo first came to Johannesburg to visit her husband. But in reality it was a form of preparation for immigration to SA, as it provided her with useful information about the route to follow. Her second trip to South Africa in the company of all her children is the achievement of the dream, a planned move designed to enable the family to join the head of the family, ‘papa’ (father). As with the other families, this is compatible with Carliner’s (2000) findings on patterns of women’s migrations. Finding accommodation is the first step to settling in a host nation. The literature on South African migration (e.g. MacDonald et al 2000) suggests that there are always tangible motives for new immigrants settling in areas inhabited by their fellow ethnics who had arrived earlier. Violence against the ‘stranger’ is apparently the most cited motive. Lufo is explicit about this (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

_Ici la criminalité envers les étrangers augmente chaque jour. Il faut trouver un lieu où vivent les compatriotes pour la solidarité. Et puis quand on vient dans ce pays, on se sent isolé. Donc il faut être ensemble pour avoir les nouvelles du pays et se supporter mutuellement._

(Here crime against foreigners increases every day. We have to find a place where fellow countrymen live for solidarity. In addition, when we come into this country, we feel isolated; so we must be together to receive news from home and mutually support one another.)

To the same question, Mafo (the mother) adds explicit details, referring instead to the management of the house and daily strategies for survival in South Africa:


(Papa, here we are a little fine. If you want something to eat from homeland, you will get it easily. For example, fish, fresh green vegetables. For the business we are doing, the items we sell come from our country. You cannot get this quality here. The items come via our brothers’ forwarding agents located here in Yeoville. Again, if you have a problem, your fellow countrymen are able to assist you.)  

(Interviews 4.3: Appendix G)

Obviously, it is not only for security reasons or protection against violence perpetrated against (African) immigrants by some members of the host society (Mattes et al 2000) that the family decided to settle in the heart of the DRC community. They also settled there for business motives. Above all, it was to obtain comfort and assistance from other ethnic members. Thus, the DRC community in Yeoville and peripheral Bellevue attempts to re-create the ‘imagined home nation’ (see Anderson 1983) in the diaspora in order to compensate for the anxiety and nostalgia of ‘dissemination’ (Bhabha 1990: ).
7.2.2 The ‘Other’, language and ethnic boundaries

As in the other research families, there are always motives for individuals to leave their country of origin for another. In principle as a pilot, Lufo had some pre-immigration experience of South Africa but no idea of the quality of inter-ethnic relationships in post-apartheid South Africa. He says:

> Effectivement, la situation en Afrique du Sud était différente. C’est un autre monde, des cultures et langues différentes, excepté l’anglais dans lequel je pouvais communiquer. (Effectively, the situation was different. It [i.e. SA] is another world, with different cultures and languages, except English in which I could communicate.) (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G)

The host nation is defined as ‘another world’ not because of language or culture differences, but certainly from the point of view of hospitality to foreign Africans. Elaborating on the ways in which foreign Africans are treated on their arrival, he maintains (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

> Hah, comme étranger ici c’est problématique par ce qu’ils ne font pas confiance aux étrangers. Ils ne les intègrent pas, ni les assimilent. Dans certains milieux, les étrangers ne sont pas acceptés. Ils croient que les étrangers sont venus pour dérober leurs boulots et ressources. (Hah, as a foreigner here, it’s problematic because they [members of the host society] don’t trust foreigners. They don’t integrate them or assimilate them. In certain milieus foreigners are not accepted. They believe that foreigners came to grab their jobs and resources.)

In the context of immigration, ethnicity emerges whenever immigrants come into contact with members of the host society and attempt to enter the local social networks. The idea that foreign Africans come to grab jobs, houses and material rewards acts as a stereotyping discourse. Thinking of first inter-ethnic encounters, Chambers (1994) argues that immigrants are ‘always in transit, the promise of homecoming becomes an impossibility’ (p. 5). Further comments come from Mafo (the mother) (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G):

> Ici la situation est très différente de celle des Etats-Unis, Canada, et France où les enfants nés là-bas deviennent des citoyens de ces pays. Ici, nos enfants sont traités comme des étrangers parce que leurs parents sont des étrangers. Ils ne sont pas acceptés comme sud-africains, par exemple, mes enfants qui sont nés ici. Ils sont encore réfugiés malgré leurs certificats de naissance. Mais les blancs et les autres sont acceptés à cause de leurs peaux claires. (Here the situation is very different from that of the United States of America, Canada, and France where children born there become the citizens of those countries. Here, our children are still considered foreigners because their parents are foreigners. They are not accepted as South Africans, for example: my children who were born here. They are still refugees despite their birth certificates. But Whites and others are accepted because of their light complexion.)
This excerpt discusses foreign nationality, the rights for foreigners and their children (born in SA), and race. For Giddens (1987), citizenship rights reflect unequal relations of power. Mafo’s account contradicts Klaaren (1999) who also defines South African citizenship in terms of ‘jus soli’, i.e. the birthright or being born on South African soil. Elaborating on ‘citizenship and migration’, Castles and Davidson (2000) define such receiving nations as the USA, Canada, France and Australia as ‘nations of immigrants’, in that most of their inhabitants are immigrants that they continue to receive every year. It is claimed that immigrants and status-granted asylum seekers, called refugees in those countries are re-formed in a ‘melting pot’, that is they ‘become a new people bound not by a common ancestry but by a common destiny to build a new nation based on freedom, equality and opportunity’ (Gitlin 1995: 56). This is what Castles and Davidson (2000) consider a ‘multicultural nation’, i.e. a nation in which ‘individuals of different origins, save in USA, can belong as citizens without giving up their ethnic and linguistic distinctiveness’ (p. 160).

Although South Africa is a multicultural nation, it is still far from integrating ‘refugees’ and the like in local networks. Mafo complains that the marginalized social status accorded to them as immigrant parents unjustly deprives her SA-born children of their citizenship rights. However, it is not evident that white immigrants are easily accepted in the way she describes. Besides, Mafo also mentions the skin pigmentation as another crucial factor for the inclusion-exclusion of African individuals and groups who are struggling for power and prestige in the midst of ethnocentric feelings. Colour is a barrier to citizenship for these SA-born children. These behaviours of exclusion engender ‘ethnicity’ (Heller 1987) and anxiety (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G):

Res: How old were you when you arrived in South Africa?
Firo: Between 13 and 14 years.
Res: How did you feel then?
Firo: I felt bad. I felt like I was not welcome and wanted to go back.
Res: Why?
Firo: Because everybody looked different, their reactions; everything was different.
Res: What do you mean?
Firo: Culture, people, food, weather, behaviour.
Immigrants also face exclusion when they attempt to speak their own languages. The fear of interacting in their homeland languages leads Lufo particularly to contend that he cannot freely speak his ethnic languages in public, arguing:

\[ C'est \text{ très dangereux. Vous serez facilement détecté comme un étranger. Pour couvrir votre origine, vous devez parler l’anglais.} \]

(It’s dangerous. You will be easily detected as a foreigner. To cover up your origin, you have to speak English.) (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G)

The term ‘dangerous’ used here refers to violence perpetrated against foreigners once they are identified as such. Lufo wants to say that the English of foreigners is also marked as ‘foreign’ because of their accent. This assumption is compatible with Morgan (1997) who found that accent can define a person’s ethnic and linguistic background. Therefore, speaking English does not hide an alien’s identity. There are ways to identify foreigners, as Lufo posits (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

\[ Par \text{ intuition. On peut savoir par l’accent. Ici, l’anglais tire son accent sur les langues locales Bantu. Quelques fois quand vous ne répondez pas en zulu ou ne parlez pas le zulu.} \]

(By intuition. One can know by accent. Here, English draws its accent from local Bantu languages. Sometimes you do not respond in isiZulu or don’t speak isiZulu)

In her attempt to interact with members of the host society Mafo used Lufo as an interpreter, insisting (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

\[ Papa \text{ était obligé d’être avec nous partout pour interpréter.} \]

(Father was compelled to be with us anywhere to interpret.)

But practically, she translates her feelings of the first encounters into a form of ‘culture shock’ as follows (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G):

Res: What were your first feelings about your first contact with the South African society?
Mafo: Des gens se baisant en public. Les enfants disaient que ceci n’existe pas dans notre pays. Le rejet : Nous ne sommes pas acceptés. Des voisins tels que des Zimbabweens, Mozambicains et autres sont plus acceptés que nous à cause de quelques langues et cultures communes, voisinage. Par exemple, au marché les Zimbabweens sont tolérés et peuvent payer l’avance sur le loyer et plus tard le solde, mais pas les Congolais. Si tu es en retard d’un jour pour payer le loyer, ton magasin est fermé jusqu’à ce que tu paires la totalité du montant. Les Zimbabweens nous appellent même ‘makwere-kwere’ pendant qu’ils sont aussi étrangers. Nous étions les premiers à ouvrir ce marché-là. Nos articles viennent du Congo, i.e. l’argent entre aussi en Afrique du Sud.
(People kissing in public. Children said that this does not exist in our homeland. Rejection: We are not accepted. Neighbours like Zimbabweans, Mozambicans, and others are more accepted than us because of some common languages and cultures, neighbourhood. For example, at the market, Zimbabweans are tolerated and can pay a deposit and the balance later on, but not
Mafo points to two ways of life: Europeanized mores espoused by local populations and African traditions of public behaviour. It also highlights the notion of language identity construction. It is apparent that the parents, in particular Mafo, are uprooted. In addition, the ‘makwere-kwere’ stereotyping reinforces an ‘us-and-them’ view and is reproduced through repeated daily experiences. Stereotyping leads to social distance and social boundaries, thereby maintaining and rationalizing the immigrants’ marginalisation. Mafo also speaks of selective xenophobia, which is exerted over a particular group of African foreigners only. She refers to the foreign Africans from the neighbouring nations who are more easily integrated than those African immigrants from afar, including DRC immigrants. This view echoes Carliner’s (2000) position that ‘sharing the same language is usually a prerequisite to successful interrelations’ (p. 63) as well as Verma et al’s (1994) view that ‘sharing a common cultural or geographical heritage’ brings about a certain degree of tolerance towards immigrants and of integration into the local social networks. Language is a crucial aspect in ascribing ethnic identity (Makoni 1996). The fear of other foreign Africans seems to originate in the recent past, as interpreted by Lufo (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

This statement touches on colonial history, linguistic history and racial oppression. Lufo seeks to understand why foreign Africans are marginalized by some members of the host society, suggesting that this can be attributed to the apartheid regime that generated social stratification, with the whites occupying the top and the blacks the
bottom (Bloom 1998). This vertical classification was based on the skin colour; but there are indeed differences of skin colour between local Africans and foreign Africans.

7.2.3 Power of multilingualism in this family

The Multilanguage policy of this family is intended to re-create the coherence of their own primary sense of identity, that is, to remain and give an impression of who they actually are. By allowing the use of many languages, the parents not only seek to convey some ethnic values and create closeness among family members, but also give family members (particularly the children) power to negotiate multiple identities in multiple situations.

7.3 Power, choice, and regulation of the FLP

7.3.1 Family language profiles

The research family speak the DRC home languages such as French, Lingala, Kipende, Kikongo and Swahili as well as some local languages such as English, isiZulu, seSotho, and Afrikaans (Table 8, Appendix I). As shown in Table 8, the language repertoire of the G1 adults is larger than that of the young G1 (Firo) and the TG (Fatou). The same imbalance occurs in the members’ language proficiency. The selected members of this family have different degrees of language proficiency (Table 12: Appendix I). This may be due to their exposure to various languages. The situation already points to the progressive disappearance of certain DRC languages among the children. For example, although family members may understand a language, they may not be able to use it in productive speech (Mesthrie 1995), as illustrated in Tables 8 and 12 (Appendix I).

Lufo’s language proficiency

Lufo commands the largest language repertoire in the family, due to not only his academic background but also his professional background. The analysis reveals that he speaks Kipende (his parents’ mother language) fluently, French (the language of
learning), Kikongo (his native province lingua franca), Swahili, and English, the dominant language of South Africa, in which he communicates without difficulty. He understands Kintandu (a Kikongo variety) and Tshiluba (another DRC indigenous language). As well, his literacy capabilities are more developed in French, Kipende, Kikongo and Lingala than in Swahili. While French and Kikongo were languages of learning, Kipende was the medium of interaction in the family and the other languages were learned in society. French Kikongo, Lingala or Swahili serve as a medium of communication with members of his DRC community in South Africa. Lufo learned English while undertaking his studies as a flight pilot in the United States of America.

His knows very little local African languages. He also asserts that he can understand a few words in isiXhosa and isiZulu that are common to many Bantu languages. For example, the word ‘Vula’ in isiZulu sounds and means the same as ‘Vulula’ (open) in Kipende, also meaning ‘open’. He attributes his lack of knowledge of local African languages to the lack of regular contact with local Africans.

Si nous étions intégrés ou facilement assimilés dans la société sud-africaine, nous parlerions ou apprendrions les langues sud-africaines sans problèmes. Nous vivons séparément, c'est-à-dire les étrangers d'un côté et les sud-africains de l'autre. C'est difficile de parler ou apprendre ces langues facilement.

(If we were integrated or easily assimilated into the South African society, we would speak or learn South African African languages without any problems. We live separately, i.e. foreigners on one side and local Africans on the other side. It is difficult to speak or learn those languages easily.) (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G)

Ethnic isolation has a negative impact upon learning the languages of the host land (Spolsky 1989). This means that DRC participants are partially to be blamed for their lack of integration in SA.

**Mafo’s language proficiency**

As an adult G1, Mafo speaks fluent French, Kikongo and Lingala and speaks Swahili fairly well. Similarly, she displays better literacy capabilities in the first three languages than in Swahili. While French was the medium of learning in the DRC, Kikongo (the vernacular of her province of origin) and Lingala (the lingua franca of Kinshasa) were learned in the family and Swahili in Lubumbashi. Mafo maintains that she can also
understand spoken Kipende, her parents’ native language, and Tshiluba. She reports that she is often addressed in Lingala and French and sometimes in Swahili in the DRC community and feels more comfortable in Lingala and French. Her language repertoire also comprises South African languages, particularly English and Afrikaans. She says that she speaks these languages a little and speaks (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G)

\textit{Anglais avec les enfants à la maison. Ils me forcent de parler. Ils me parlent aussi en anglais. J’essaie aussi de bricoler ou parler avec les clients au marché. Afrikaans, je bricole avec les clients, j’apprends au marché.}

(English with the children at home. They force me to speak. They also speak to me in English. I also try to speak with the customers at the market. Afrikaans, I try with customers, I learn at the market.)

I did not observe a single instance of interaction in English between Mafo and her children. Instead, Lingala mixed with French was the common language of interaction. In the interview, Mafo adds that she prefers to use English to local African languages because there is no opportunity to speak the latter (Interviews: Appendix D). This accords with Spolsky (1989), who contends that integration is a prerequisite for successful acquisition of the host country’s language. Mafo adds that the reason for the lack of interest in local African languages is the rejection experienced by foreign Africans (Adegoke 1999) as already mentioned by other research participants (in English-only, French-only, French-Tshiluba families). Although knowledge of English allows immigrants to penetrate the social networks of the host land and also communicate with other people living in SA, knowledge of local African languages will help her to make friends with local African women and be more socially integrated.

\textbf{Firo’s and Fatou’s language proficiencies}

Firo, a young G1 proficient multilingual, displays some level of oral competence in French, Kikongo, and Lingala as well as English. In addition, she speaks a little Swahili and can read and write French and a little Lingala. French and Swahili were her former media of learning with French as the main language of schooling. Kikongo and Lingala were learned in the family and Swahili in the neighbourhood. In her account, Firo says that she enjoys speaking Kikongo, which she learned from her grandmother in the DRC and continues using it with her parents and cousin (mother’s niece) in South Africa (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G).
Res: Who taught you Kikongo?
Firo: *My grandmother in the DRC.*
Res: Who do you use Kikongo with in SA?
Firo: *My mum, dad, cousin.*

She admits that in SA, French and Lingala are used in the family and interactions with some members of the DRC community. In her linguistic repertoire, Firo also believes that she speaks English well and that she knows a little isiZulu and seSotho. She had studied isiZulu for a year and learned a little seSotho from friends at school. In my attempt to find out the reasons for her not speaking English fluently, considering the number of years of schooling in South Africa, she argues:

*I can’t speak it thoroughly. I am not used to it.* (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G)

Firo admits that she has a serious problem with reading English (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G), as a result of which she failed Grade 11 and had to repeat the class. This poor academic performance and Firo’s lack of oral fluency in English are confirmed by her Grade 11 English teacher (Interviews 4.6: Appendix G).

Fatou is a multilingual TG who undoubtedly has full understanding of French and Lingala but limited oral production in these languages. Her literacy capabilities in the DRC languages are non-existent. She contends that she learns Lingala and French through listening and speaking to her mother. Regarding local languages, she has achieved oral fluency in English only, adding that ‘*there are words that I can’t understand. I just try in English*’ (Interviews: Appendix G). Fatou’s difficulties with reading and writing in English may stem from her not being a native speaker of English, although she started schooling in SA.

Knowledge of English is a means to full participation in social life of South Africa and thus the channel through which access to local social networks and educational domains is gained (VandenHeinvel & Wooden1996). Elaborating on her language repertoire, Fatou reports that she can understand a few isiZulu words and read a little Afrikaans which is a compulsory subject taught at school as a second language, but she cannot write it. She learns some isiZulu by interacting with her local peers.
7.3.2 Family language policies and practices

7.3.2.1 Family language policy in the DRC

The family language policy in the homeland is said to be multilingual and the rationale for its implementation is underscored in this excerpt (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G).

Res: What was the language policy in the family in the DRC?
Cela dépendait de l’interlocuteur. (We spoke several languages: Kipende, Lingala, Kikongo, French, and Swahili as well. It depended on the interlocutor.) [French]

Res: Why did you choose to speak many languages in the family instead of only French?
(A matter of habit. They were born in an environment where Lingala and French were dominant. Outside of the family with friends, they spoke French and Lingala. It was hard for us to teach them or impose our mother language, Kipende. French. Lingala predominated. That is the way our mother language gets lost. In the family I often speak to them in French. We also learned to speak Swahili in Lubumbashi.) [French]

Mafo (mother) adds (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G):

Tolingaki bayeba kosolola na bakoko na bango. Bayeba minoko nionso oyo bato bazo loba na esika bozali kovivre. On leur parlait aussi et les encourageait aussi à parler français à la maison pour faciliter leurs études.
(We wanted them to know our languages to be able to communicate with their grandparents. They have to know languages spoken in their living community. We also spoke to them and encouraged them to speak in French to facilitate their studies.) [Lingala – French]

The parents in this Multilanguage family come from the same tribal group. But they do not have the same proficiency in Kipende. The reason for this is that they were raised in different places (Interviews 4.3 & 4.4). By establishing a multi-language family policy in both the DRC and SA, parents hoped to give members flexibility in negotiating identities inside and outside of the household, thus drawing on the languages of the living area.

This Multilanguage family believes that their language policy maintains the relationships in the extended family and national pride. By using ethnic languages in the family, parents can easily tell their children about their family histories and talk about ethnicity in a larger sense. Similarly, parents can oversee their children’s behaviours by inculcating ethnic values using the appropriate language. Speaking a range of
languages within the same household also has the advantage of enacting the principle of linguistic rights (Skutnabb-Kangas 1987). In other words, the family seems to promote linguistic democracy or the right to use any language to function effectively in a specific situation. The family members thus can communicate in a language in which they feel more comfortable and shift to an appropriate language of the interlocutor. In addition, other motives such as intimacy and closeness within the family (Interviews 4: Appendix G) may serve to justify the family language policy. There is also a certain dimension of the father’s elitism shared with the children as he admits ‘Je leur parle souvent en français’ (I often speak to them in French). Such enacted behaviour marks a ‘je-le-connais’ identity and thus separates the family from the less educated (but ironically not in SA).

7.3.2.2 Power, choice, and regulation of the Stated FLP in SA

The language policy in this household is similar to that in their homeland, except that new languages have been added. About the design of their family language policy in SA, both parents negotiated (Interviews 4.3 & 4.4: Appendix G):

Res: What language/s do you speak in the family in SA?
Mafo: Nionso toyebi. (All languages we know.) [Lingala]
Lufo: Nous parlons beaucoup de langues, souvent français, lingala, Kikongo, anglais, swahili, et Kipende. (We speak many languages, usually French, Lingala, Kikongo, English, Swahili, and Kipende.) [French]
Res: Why have you chosen to do so?
Mafo: Les enfants doivent savoir d'où ils viennent, et aussi pour leur réadaptation en RDC. Ce sont nos langues et ils doivent les connaître. Children must know where they come from, and also for their re-adjustment in DRC. They are our languages and they have to know them.) [French]
Lufo: Nous sommes dans un pays anglophone. Et nous parlons souvent l'anglais pour communiquer. Mais si nous ne parlons pas nos langues ici en famille, nos enfants les perdront et auront des problèmes plus tard quand ils rentrent dans notre pays. (We are in an English-speaking country. And we often speak English to communicate. But if we don’t use our languages here in the family, our children will forget them and later on will have problems when they go back to our country.)

Lufo’s statement resembles Jate’s (Section 5.3.2.2) opinion. Immigration researchers like Alba (1990) claim that immigrant parents who desire some ethnic identity for their children attach some importance to its acquisition through ethnic language acquisition. Similarly, what shapes the child’s view of the social and cultural environment, in Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba’s (1991: 13) view, is home socialization, i.e. the process of
discovery of the world through the eyes of family members. The use of several languages in SA can be seen as a survival strategy. African languages, ideologically speaking, have been accorded lower value. But this family thinks that they still have vitality in the diaspora. Elaborating on the advantages of multilingualism in South Africa, Mafo posits (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G):

En Afrique du Sud, c’est pour communiquer facilement avec diverses personnes dans des différentes langues, et pour avoir l’ouverture dans la société. Dans la communauté congolaise ou ailleurs, ils n’auront pas de difficultés pour communiquer et donc n’auront pas besoin d’apprendre ces langues encore. Ba kozala pe na facilité ya kozua mosala na anglais to na français.
(In South Africa, they will interact easily with different people in different languages, to have access to the society. In the DRC or elsewhere, they will have no difficulty to communicate and thus won’t need to learn those languages again. They will also have the opportunity to work in both English and French languages.) [French – Lingala]

Mafo believes that by using many languages, the children are connected with the DRC. Further, she also acknowledges the economic value of multilingual abilities for their children, focusing on elite global languages.

This family chooses to maintain their homeland languages in order to gain access to their ethnic community’s networks. It is suggested that using the parents’ language/s within the household increases the children’s esteem for them (Saunders 1988). As pointed out in Section 7.2.1 (Interviews: Appendix G), Mafo says that living in an ethnic area allows family members to feel somewhat at home and to share the anxiety of displacement. Such motives as a feeling of linguistic insecurity, linguistic instrumentality, defence of a specific identity (Ager 2001) engender solidarity, ethnic friendships, or companionship in SA; such feelings lead to ethnicity (Heller 1987). In an attempt to maintain the DRC languages, parents of this multilanguage policy family also aim to re-create the coherence of their own primary sense of identity, to remain and give the impression of who they actually are. The use of ethnic languages in the family also helps parents to convey some ethnic values and create intimacy or closeness among family members:

Res: If you have something discreet to tell mum or children that other people cannot understand, what language do you use?
Lufo: J’utilise une langue que personne ne peut comprendre, dépendant de quelle langue les gens connaissent. Mais souvent j’utilise Kipende avec Maman.
(I use a language that no one can understand, depending on what language people know. But often I use Kipende with Mum.) [French]


(It depends. We can use a DRC language that no one else can understand. Papa often speaks to me in Kipende.) [French - Lingala] (Interviews 4.3 & 4.4: Appendix G)

Despite the fact that the family uses any language to interact with their community, Kipende is still used to convey intimacy. In contrast to the English-only family’s thinking that speaking many languages can affect the immigrant children’s academic performance, this family has a different view (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

Res: Do you think that speaking many languages can prevent children from performing better at school?
Lufo: Non. Le cerveau sait comment emmagasiner et dissocier les connaissances. Parler plusieurs langues est pour l’ouverture au monde. C’est très important.

(No. The mind knows how to store and dissociate knowledge. Speaking several languages is for openness to the world. It is very important.) [French]

It is true that the family is seen as the primary site for the formation of ethnic identity. Parents may decide one day to return to the DRC: this is another motive for a multilanguage policy in the family (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G).

Res: Can you one day send or advise your children to visit or work in and or go back to the DRC?
Lufo: S’il y a la paix, nous devons rentrer chez nous. L’avenir est dans notre pays d’origine. Il y a beaucoup d’opportunités, plus d’argent là-bas qu’ici. Vous pouvez travailler ici à l’étranger pendant des années mais vous ne seriez pas capables d’épargner ou gagner beaucoup d’argent si vous n’êtes pas sages.

(If there’s peace, we have to go back home. The future is in our homeland. There are many opportunities, more money than here. You may work for years here abroad but might not save or gain more money if you are not careful.) [French]

In contrast to Finku (father: English-only household), Lufo seems to be dissatisfied with his economic circumstances in SA and thus nurtures nostalgia. It is worth noting that immigrant parents’ own ethnic identity plays a crucial role in inculcating a sense of ethnicity into their children. As recognised, attitudes and behaviours are culturally acquired, often in the home environment and transmitted through socialisation using ethnic languages (Ngugi wa Thiong’o 1993, 1986). Parents’ attitudes towards their own languages can influence their children’s behaviours. The Multilanguage family parents’ views concerning the implementation and acceptance of the language policy emerge from these extracts (Interviews 4.3 & 4.4: Appendix G):
Res: What are the children’s attitudes towards DRC languages?
Lufo: *Ils les acceptent facilement et sentent que nous sommes en famille, et non pas à l’étranger. Quand ils sortent de la maison, ils sentent qu’ils ne sont pas dans notre pays.*
(They accept our languages easily and feel at home. When they go outside of the household, they feel that they are not in our country.) [French]
Mafo: *Positives. Ce sont les langues de leur pays d’origine. Nous leur disons toujours qu’un jour nous rentrerons chez nous.*
(Positive. They are languages of their homeland. We always tell them that one day we will go back home.) [French]

It is assumed that homeland languages bring about family closeness in SA and, therefore, help parents to converse with their children about their country of origin. Parents attempt to re-create their homeland (Anderson 1983) in SA by influencing their children’s attitudes. But the question is: for how long are the children going to maintain those languages? Under pressure of the host land’s ways of life and social change, immigrant children are likely to re-orient their language behaviours. This is of concern to the parents (Interviews 4.3 & 4.4: Appendix G).

Res: Would you mind if your children speak DRC languages less than English in the home?
Lufo: *Oui, je m’en ferais. La famille est la seule place où nous devons maintenir nos langues. Mais s’ils ne les utilisent pas dans la maison, ils les perdront complètement. Et l’anglais prédominera dans la maison. Elles doivent être parlées et maintenues ici parce que c’est la seule zone où elles peuvent être apprises et maintenues ici en Afrique du Sud.*
(Yes, I would. Home is the only place where they can maintain our languages. But if they don’t use them in the home, they will lose them completely and English will predominate in the home. They must be maintained in here because it is the only zone where they can be learned and maintained in South Africa.) [French]
Mafo: *Non. Ils ont des devoirs de l’école à faire en anglais, qui est aussi la langue d’instruction. Mais ils doivent connaître nos langues.*
(No. They have schoolwork to do in English, which is also the medium of learning. But they must know our languages.) [French]

The reasons given by the parents for using DRC languages at home in most research families are exactly the same as those put forward by Anaka (mother: English-only family) and Tebe (mother: French-only family), except that here the use of several languages in the household is the stated policy. As I observed, the children often used English, particularly in the lounge when doing homework and in the kitchen when cooking.

Nevertheless, the use of homeland languages, according to the parents, is imperative because the family appears to encourage multilanguage practices at home. These practices are, however, limited to only those languages that parents can understand. It
should be noted that family members from different generations have different attitudes to the languages of the country of origin and immigration conditions. In fact, Fatou, the TG member, does not have a positive opinion about her native country; moreover, she has no mental image of this land. The following excerpt illustrates this point (Interviews 4.1: Appendix G):

Res: Do you have an idea of the DRC?
Fatou: No.
Res: When you grow up, do you think one day to go and visit relatives in the DRC or work there?
Fatou: No.
Res: Why?
Fatou: I don’t feel like going back.
Res: Do you feel comfortable here?
Fatou: Yes

This extract has nothing to do with her attitudes to her parental languages but with the choice of the lived space. In contrast, to the question about her possible return or visit to the DRC, Firo, the young G1 and the oldest daughter, appears to be attached to the DRC. Firo is also the only child in the four families that is determined to go back to the DRC. As the oldest child and daughter and thus the closest to the mother, she has certainly acquired some gendered identity by interacting with her DRC-born mother. Foreign-born immigrant mothers are considered by Tsokalidou (1994) to be the carrier-conveyers of the ethnic languages and values in the diaspora.

Res: When you complete your studies, will you one day visit your native land or relatives?
Firo: Yeah.
Res: Why?
Firo: That’s where I was born. (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G)

It is believed that ethnic languages may begin to recede in importance in time and space. However, in the following extract, Mafo insists that her children will not forget their homeland languages (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G).

Res: Can your children forget their homeland languages?
Mafo: Non. Bakoko na bango bazali kuna. C’est une erreur que beaucoup de parents commettent par ce que leurs enfants ne seront jamais acceptés ou intégrés. Deuxièmement, il y a moins d’argent dans ce pays que dans notre pays. Nous leur disons toujours qu’ils doivent travailler dur pour rentrer et occuper des meilleurs postes au Congo où ils seront acceptés facilement par ce que c’est leur pays natal. [Lingala - French]
(No. Their grandparents are still there. It’s a mistake that some parents make because their children will never be integrated or accepted. Secondly, there is less money in this country than in our country. We tell children that they have to work hard in order to go back and get better positions in Congo where they will be easily accepted or integrated because it is their homeland.)
As in the other families, the parents continue blaming local populations for their lack of social integration but mis-recognise their self-imposed isolation in SA. Despite this, they encourage their children to have good education.

### 7.3.2.3 Family language practices in SA

#### 1. Choice of a language: patterns for communication

Although this family defines itself as multilingual, a choice of language is made when interacting with their the interlocutors in terms of the speaker’s language knowledge and the addressee’s linguistic comfortableness. The overall pattern of inter-communication within the household is represented diagrammatically in Figure 4 below:

![Communication pattern in the Multilanguage family](image)

Children in this Multilanguage family acquire languages additively, which are used interchangeably in given situations or separately in particular circumstances (Lambert 1983). From my observations, all the children in this family are comfortable using French and can understand Lingala (except Fatou) which their mother often uses with them. As previously indicated (see Section 4.3.1), Lingala is the widespread indigenous medium of communication among DRC immigrants because of its political history in the DRC. My observation in this family suggests that children are orally proficient multilinguals in some languages and partially multilingual in others, in that they have full understanding of some languages but cannot speak them (Baker 2000), a process termed ‘asymmetrical or unbalanced multilingualism’, in that a multilingual child or
person speaks a language or some languages better than others. This phenomenon presupposes different degrees of oral proficiency and literacy.

2. Strategies of interaction

During my observations, as in the other research families, I noticed that the general pattern of interaction among family members involved accommodation, i.e. the listener responded in the language that the speaker used. At times there was code-switching to express power and control over the interaction; this is the usual way of interacting for multilingual speakers. The following conversation extracts are samples of the many ways the family interacted. Because this is a multilanguage policy family, the pattern of language use differs from those of the other research families.

Parent – parent interaction

The following extract shows the unmarked choices made by Lufo (father) and Mafo (mother) who use mixed languages regularly as the norm (Mesthrie 2000).

[Miscellaneous]
Lufo: Anto, dépêche-toi maintenant. Tozongisa mesa oyo. [French – Lingala]
   (Anto, be quick. Let’s put this table back in its right place.)
Lufo: Jules est très compliqué. Mu ke zaba ve kana nki mpila yandi ta vivre na nkento na yandi. Il est vraiment irresponsable. [French – Kikongo - French]
   (Jules is very complicated. I don’t know how he will be living with his wife. He is truly irresponsible.)
   (Do you understand? Someone living with you but cannot communicate with you. He can’t even ask for advice from his father. Again, he likes some children and dislikes others. I don’t accept that.).
Lufo: Qu’est-ce que tu prends? Beto ke na vin, ti jus. [What do you take? We have wine, juice] [Code switching/code-mixing: French – Kikongo - French: vin ‘wine’]
Res: Le vin me va. [Wine is okay for me] [French]
Mafo: Ah, pourquoi ozo pesa ye vin ya moto. Ewuti frigo te. Tia ngo nano na frigo.
   (Why do you give unchilled wine? It is not from the refrigerator. Put it first into the fridge before you give it to him) [Codemixing: French-Lingala]
Lufo: Ou bien tosomba coca omelanger. [Or we can get coke for you to mix] [French-Lingala]
Res: Non, ca va comme cela. [No, it is okay like that] [French]
Lufo: Hey, boyela biso ba verres noki. [Can someone bring us glasses?] [Lingala – French ‘verres’]
Mutu: Papa, je veux aussi prendre? [Papa, I also want to take wine] [French]
Lufo: No, it is not for children. Go and get juice from the fridge.
Lufo (to Anta): You, go there, outside and do your homework.
Mafo: Papa, tolongola nano biloko oyo. [Papa, let’s remove these things from the table] [Lingala]
In contrast to Goyvaerts and Zembele’s (1992) finding from a study conducted in the east of the DRC, the family members in the account above mix four languages of which two are DRC indigenous (Kikongo and Lingala) and two are colonial languages (French and English). Parents use multiple identities in this interaction. While the shift to French indicates a certain degree of schooling, the use of (and shift to) Kikongo identifies the interlocutor as a member of the parents’ province of origin. It should also be noted that switching from a language to another is the usual linguistic flexibility of multilinguals (Cummins 1996; Heugh 1995). At the end of the exchange, Mutu, the SA-born son, seeks to take part in the conversation but is interrupted by his father who uses English. The use of English in such a situation attributes to Mutu his current identity as a South African child, as opposed to the parents who converse in their DRC languages. It is also intended to exert some power over him, using the language that Mutu understands better.

Father – children interaction

(1)

[Talking about coming home late]

Firo (to her father): Bonjour, Papa. (Hi, Dad)
Lufo:  *Bonjour* (Hi)
Firo (to researcher): *Bonjour, Papa.* (Hi, Dad)
Lufo:  *Pourquoi tu viens en retard maintenant?*  
(Why are you returning home late now?)
Firo:  *J'étais punie parce que je suis arrivée en retard à l'école. Je devais ramasser les papiers après les cours. Je n'étais pas seule, mais avec les autres.*  
(I was punished because I arrived late at school. So I had to pick up all waste paper. I was not alone, but with other schoolmates.)
Lufo:  *Bien. Cela t'apprend à arriver à l'école à temps.*  
(Good. That teaches you to arrive at school on time).
Firo:  *Nous étions nombreux.* [French]  (Many students were also punished.)
Lufo (to researcher):  *Avec les filles, il faut toujours être prudent. Ici les valeurs morales sont renversées.*  
(With girls, you must always be careful. Here moral values are reversed [i.e. contrary to ours])

In this excerpt Firo (oldest daughter) responds to Lufo (father) in French. My explanation, on one hand, is that the use of French marks here the family’s educatedness and, on the other hand, social distance or a sense of politeness towards the parents. In the DRC, responding to the parents in a different language may indicate a sign of disrespect to them (parents).
Lufo: *Mutu, allez jouer là-bas.* [French] (Mutu, go and play over there.)
Mutu: *Où, Papa? À la cuisine?* [French] (Where, Papa? In the kitchen?)
Lufo: *Oui. Kobima libanda te!* [French – Lingala] (Yes. Don’t go outside of the house!)

In this extract, the father attempts to switch to Lingala with a view to being obeyed through the sending of strong instructions to the children.

**Mother – children interaction (1)**

[Talking about foodstuff]

Mafo: *Alpha, yaka awa … Ozo sala nini?* [Lingala]
(Alpha, come here… What are you doing?)

Mafo (speaking out): *Tuna nano Papa soki asombaki ‘mbisi ya kokawuka’.* [Lingala]
(Ask Papa if he bought smoked fish)

Alpha: *Papa, Mama wants to know if you bought ‘mbisi ya kokawuka’.* [English - Lingala]
(Papa, Mama wants to know if you bought smoked fish)

Lufo: *Ehin. Look in the refrigerator. There is a black plastic.*

The extract above suggests that the Kikongo phrase ‘mbisi ya kukawuka’ can only be translated inaccurately into English, ‘smoked fish’. In addition, the mother uses Lingala to her daughter, which she (mother) regards as the ethnic language of childrearing in South Africa (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G) whereas the child addresses the father in English, the language in which she is more fluent. This expression represents the name of a DRC dish, involving not only the ‘smoked fish’ but the whole cooking process as well as all the ingredients. The following extract of the field notes (Appendix F) provides the reason why Alpha who cannot speak French in the family speaks Lingala, while her two SA-born youngest members of G2 speak French.

**Mother – children interaction (2)**

[Shopping]

Mafo (to youngest son): *Yaka ozua mbongo osomba mapa.* [Lingala]
(Come and get money, and go and buy loaves of bread.)

Mutu (SA-born son): *Maman, c’est moi?* [French] (Mum, is it me?)

Fatou: *Tokende osokola na douche.* (Go and have a shower) [Lingala + French]

Mutu: *Tika ngai. Ah non. Laisse-moi. Leave me alone.* [French & English]
(No. Leave me. Ah no, Leave me alone)
This extract shows Mutu (SA-born, 7 years) displaying his multilingual abilities. By shifting gradually from Lingala to English through French, Mutu exploits his oral fluency and seeks to share power with his mother.

**Parents – visitors interaction (1)**

In ethnic encounters a speaker is always welcome or very often greeted in a common language, as these extracts note:

1. **Lufo (father):** Ginathu ayemuzali (Uncle, there you are!) [Kipende]
   Res: Hein (yes)
   **Lufo:** Gutshi? Ngina. (How are you? Come in, please) [Kipende]
   Res: Muabonga (Fine) [Kipende]
   **Mafo (mother):** Ngushi, ebwe? Nge ke bien? (Uncle, how are you? Are you fine?) [Kikongo – French]
   [Kikongo + French mixing: *bien* ‘well, fine’]
   Res: Mu ke mbote Maman. (I’m fine, Mum) [Kikongo]
   **Mafo:** Nge ke na chance. Beto me katuka na *shop* sesebi yayi. Eh, be’ nata nsapi beno kanguila Papa. Bokende kofongwela Papa. (You’re lucky. We’re just back from the shop. Hey, take the key, go and open for Dad. Go and open for Papa) [Kikongo – English - Lingala]

2. **Lufo:** Ginathu, gudimona ndo. Gikwatshi? [Kipende] (Uncle, we no longer meet. How are you?)
   **Res:** Eihn. Muabonga (Yes. Fine) [Kipende]
   **Mafo:** *Mbote, papa. Nge me kuisa. Ebwe?* [Kikongo]
   (Hi, papa. Welcome. How are you?)
   **Res:** *Mbote.* (Hi. Fine) [Kikongo]
   **Lufo:** *Ebwe na nzo, makambu na nge ya classe.* [Kikongo-French]
   (How is your home, and your research?)
   **Res:** *Mua mbote.* (A little fine) [Kikongo]

3. **(Researcher comes in)**
   **Mafo:** *Nguashi mbote. Kota sii.* (Uncle, good day. Do come in) [Kikongo]
   **Lufo:** *Beto me katuka na zandu sesebi yayi kaka.* (We are just back from shopping) [Kikongo]
   **Res:** Ah bon. (Are you?) [French]
   **Mafo:** Nguashi kwenda na salon. Beto ke kuisa. (Uncle, go to the living room. We are coming.)
   **Mafo:** *Ehein, nguashi beto ke na kukuisa.* (Emphasis: Uncle, we are coming back in a few minutes) [Kikongo]

In the above excerpts, the father adapts to Kikongo (used by his wife) after speaking Kipende. This serves to create a balance in the conversation. Both parents also greet the researcher in two different ethnic languages; this is the usual natural way of welcoming a member of one’s ethnic group. But while the father uses Kipende, his wife Mafo (who is from the same ethnic group) converses in Kikongo (the lingua franca of
their province of origin) as she is not fluent in Kipende. Because multilingual speakers have flexibility in their choice of language (Baker 2000), they are likely to borrow words from the embedded language into the matrix language (Kikongo). Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that any form of code switching is viewed as an unconscious awareness as this results from tacit knowledge of internalized code of the speaker’s repertoire. A more explicit illustration emerges from this conversation extract (in French):

**Parents – visitors interaction (2)**

[Discussing children's language proficiencies]

Res: You don't speak French very well, do you?
Alpha Not very well.
Kele (to father): Celle-ci ne parle pas français? (She doesn’t speak French?)
Lufo: Celle-ci parle plus en anglais qu'en français.
       (This one speaks more in English than in French.)
Anaka: Ah. C'est pourquoi elle mélange anglais et français et Lingala.
       (Ah. That’s why she mixes English and French and Lingala.)
Lufo: Mais elle comprend et parle aussi lingala. Elle est faible en français mais le lingala, elle comprend.
       (But she also understands and speaks Lingala. She is not good at French but she understands Lingala)
Res: Pourquoi cela? (Why?)
Lufo: Leur maman ne leur parle qu’en lingala.
       (Their mother speaks to them in Lingala only.)

This extract in French shows a certain degree of educatedness. The following set of language practices (French, Lingala and Kikongo) indicates the typical way of speaking among family members, especially the adult G1. It often occurs when bi-/multilingual people from the same ethnic background converse with each other.

**Parents – visitors interaction (3)**

[Visit]

The last set of language practices concerns the distribution of language identities to the specific interlocutors in the family by an ethnic visitor.

Mustafa (to mother): Bonsoir, tantine. (Good evening, Auntie) [French]
Anaka: Bonsoir. (Good evening) [French]
Mustafa: Bonsoir, Papa (Good evening, Papa) [French]
Lufo: Bonsoir. (Good evening)
Lufo (to Mustafa): Comment ça va? (How are you?) [French]
Mustafa: Ça va bien. (Fine) [French]
Mustafa (to mother): Boni, tantine? Mikolo ebele. (How is it, Auntie? I have seen you for long) [Lingala + French ‘tantine’]
Anaka: Ah. Mais yo oyaka nayo awa lisusu te. (But you longer come here)
Mustafa: *Nayaka oh; mais ozalaka nayo te.* (I do come but you are always not there)
Anaka: *Boni classe na yo?* (Good. What about your classes/studies?)

Mustafa: *Nazo approfondir nano ba’Anglais na bango. Tokolisa nano langue.*
Dans l’entre-temps, na zo travailler.
(I am improving my English. Let’s first improve the language. In the meantime, I am working)  

The extract above signals the distributive identity, in that the father is attached to French while the mother enjoys speaking Lingala, reflecting respectively the elitist identity and the ethnic identity. This finding echoes Pawels’ (1997) findings concerning the perpetuation of ethnic languages in the diaspora by immigrant mothers. This perpetuation is tied to the maintenance of ethnic values, as illustrated in the following extract (Field notes: Appendix F).

**Parents – visitors interaction (4)**

[Talking about SA and DRC cultures]

Mafo: *Papa, bana na ngai na yebisaka bango que epayi na biso BaPende bana basi il faut bazala vierges ti libala. Okoyeba nionso na ndako ya libala, ndako ya mobali na yo. C'est ça l'éducation de chez nous.* [French – Lingala]
(Papa, I always tell my daughters that in Pende culture young girls should remain virgin until marriage. You will know about/experience sexual act in your marriage. This is our education/culture) [Lingala mixed with French & French]

Kele: *Oui, c'est en principe ça l'éducation chez nous.* (Yes. In principle this is our culture).

Mafo: *Bakoki ko changer te parce que tozali na Afrique du Sud. Tout ce qu'on leur dit à l'école, elles viennent me demander les explications. Par exemple, la piqûre anti-grossesse appliquée ou imposée à l'école. Elle n'existe pas dans nos écoles du pays.* [French – Lingala]
(They cannot change because we are in South Africa. Everything they are told at school, which they don’t understand they come and ask for explanations from me. For example, the anti-pregnancy injection applied or imposed at school doesn’t exist in our home country’s schools).

Kele: *On leur donne ça à l'école?* (Do they recommend it at school?) [French]

Mafo: *Oui. Les enfants leur ont dit qu’avant d’accepter, il faut la permission de la maman. Et les autres filles se moquaient d’elles. Elle m’en ont parlé et j’ai dit: ‘non’. C’est une façon de pousser les filles a chercher les hommes. Le lendemain, on se moquait d’elles encore à l’école. La maîtresse et les autres n’ont compris.* [French]
(Yes. Children replied that before accepting, they should seek permission from our mum. And the other girls were laughing at them. They told me about it and I said ‘No’. Next morning, they laughed at them again. The teacher and others could not understand this) [French]

Kele: *Mama, nge lenda permettre kima ya mpila yai ve. C'est un encouragement au mal.* [Kikongo – French]
(Mum, you cannot allow such a thing. It encourages the evil behaviour)

(Here you may come across a mother, a married woman wearing thighs and or a very short skirt. Not in our culture/country) [Kikongo & French: code-switching & code-mixing]
In this family, the children are under pressure to conserve the parents’ values that often conflict with the liberal value system of the host land. But they also have to adjust to the milieu in which they live. Mafo expresses contradictory views while referring to the anti-abortion injection.

3. Code-switching and control over the interaction

My observations reveal that during the interaction, the speakers code-switched to exert power over the interlocutors. In other words, the marked code switches constitute attempts to negotiate the balance of power based on such factors as age and status (Blommaert 1992). Language flexibility actually indicates the advantage which multilinguals have over monolinguals (Cummins 1996). In the following extract the selected children exploit their linguistic capital to control the interaction.

Children – children interaction

(1) [In the living room]
Firo:  *Na silisi. Bokende kosukola basani.* (I’m through. Go and wash the plates) [Lingala]
Alpha: (No response/reaction. Watching a movie on TV)
Firo:  *Ozoyoka te? Allez laver la vaisselle.* (Don’t you understand? Go and wash the plates) [Lingala – French]
Alpha:  *I’m watching a movie.*
Firo:  *Mets-toi debout! Vas laver les assiettes.* (Stand up! Go and wash the plates) [French]
Alpha: (Murmur)
Firo:  *Stand up! Go to the kitchen!* (high tone) Stand up now or I switch off the TV.
Alpha: (After murmurs, stands up and moves to the kitchen.)
Firo:  *Attendez. Je vais dire à Maman. Don’t play with me.* (Wait, I will tell Mum. Don’t play with me) [French – English]

While Firo code-switches to French, a language that Fatou hardly knows, this TG resorts to English, the language of power and the only one she can handle well. The use of English by Alpha seems to be a form of intimidation or indirect rejection of the instruction. To be heard, Firo switches to English. Language shift obviously works to construct relations of power and goes through gradual attempts of conveying power. In order to be heard and thus obeyed, Firo starts using requests, then persuasion or argumentation but does not obtain the expected response. She then resorts to threats and draws on her varied language repertoire and competencies by shifting to the
language of power, English, which she is supposed to handle more competently than Fatou. The language and language style bear the burden of this mission embedded in the rising tone and facial expressions. The overt behavioural implication is persuasion and compliance by Fatou. This view echoes Ng and Bradac’s (1993) assumption that language provides a conventional resource for impacting on individuals’ behaviours. In the following extract Firo addresses a Grade 5 sister:

(2)

(Again, in the living room)

Firo:  *Yo osali déjà devoir na yo?* [Lingala + French: ‘déjà devoir’]  
(‘Have you already done your homework?’)

Fatou:  *Te*  
(‘No’ [Lingala])

(‘Then go to the kitchen. Go to the kitchen’)

Fatou:  (No response, but executes the order)

By mixing French (the language she knows better) and Lingala Firo attempts to recreate social distance without which her authority is not easily executed. Between Firo (the eldest child and oldest daughter in Grade 11) and Fatou (the youngest daughter and fifth child in Grade 5) there is distance based on age and thus different degrees of proficiency of the English language. Both forms of social distance described above enable Firo to exert power over Fatou, engendering what Hargreaves (2001: 33) called ‘the emotional geographies of human interactions’. The implications for such actions and frictions are undoubtedly the speaker’s expected response and listener’s compliance to the desired behaviour. Besides, as the eldest girl-child, she also asserts her authority as the second household manager just behind the mother to look after her siblings.

7.3.3 School language policies, and their impact on immigrant learners

**Fatou’s school**

Fatou’s school is a public school that enrolls children from diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. It is located on the periphery of the foreign Africans’ community. However, the researcher was denied access to the school and thus could not gather the desired data.
Firo’s school

Firo’s school is a public institution that also welcomes immigrant learners mainly from Central Africa, West Africa, and Mozambique. In this multi-ethnic school, the students’ experience varies enormously, depending upon individual factors like intelligence, degree of motivation as well as academic and family support. The following extract describes the school language policy, which is similar to those in the other research schools and how the immigrant learners are constructed by the school (Interviews 4.5 - 7: Appendix G):

Res: What is the language policy in this school?
Princ: English is the medium of instruction, and Afrikaans is the second language. We also offer French for the learners from the DRC, West Africa, and Portuguese for those from Angola and Mozambique, as an alternative to Afrikaans.

Res: How do you know that this is an immigrant child?
Princ: At registration time, physical structure, face. When I look at them, I can say they are not South African. You, for example, you don’t have a South African face. Sometimes, language accent. Some have language difficulties. Sometimes names: Angolan and Mozambican children have Portuguese names while DRC children have African names similar to those of Black South Africans.

Gr11 Engl teacher: Their English accent. Some don’t understand English. Also, walking style, atmosphere around those children: character, personality, attitudes, clothing, many reasons.

SA peers (girl): They speak their own languages, their English accent. (boy): The way they behave. We also do communicate with them.

The principal’s and teachers’ descriptions of immigrant children are exactly the same as those given in the previous data analysis chapters, except that here the Grade 11 teacher and SA learners add the view of foreigner linked to mannerism, walking style, attitudes and to the clothing of the African immigrant children. As in the other chapters, the principal, in particular, focuses on language deficit, nationality, and race linked to names and physical build.

In Firo’s school (as well as in the schools of the previous families), English is the medium of learning and Afrikaans is a second language. Because the school accommodates children from other countries in Africa, it offers part-time tuition in French and Portuguese for learners who do not want to take Afrikaans. The Portuguese teacher who offered to participate in the interview for a few minutes added (Interviews 4.6: Appendix G):
South African Constitution recommends that learners do their language within 5 years of their High School. But they must pass English and Afrikaans, English and French or Portuguese (in our school), and mathematics and science.

No local African language is offered, meaning that Afrikaans still has more educational and economic value, while French and Portuguese are alternative subjects to Afrikaans. Local African languages are marginalized in education (de Klerk 2002). The principal acknowledges:

*We don’t encourage African languages (in class) because English is the medium of instruction. But it would be easier for a teacher to shift to, for example, isiZulu and explain to the learners in class.* (Interviews 4.5: Appendix G)

In contrast to Murray’s (2002) pleading for a multilingual policy in South African education, this school does not offer African languages and thus does not open the doors to the indigenous cultures of South Africa attached to them. Although English is the main language of interaction within the school, the use of languages outside of the classroom (i.e. the playground) is not under teacher surveillance. The principal was asked whether he was concerned that foreign learners speak their own languages in the school, to which he replied (Interviews 4.5: Appendix G):

*No, except in class. I’ve just spoken Afrikaans to an Afrikaans woman because I know she can speak Afrikaans. As people of the same culture, we speak in the same language, except when we are in a school meeting. But when interacting during break, we speak in our own languages. You feel comfortable in that way. Children also do the same. During break Portuguese-speaking children meet and speak in Portuguese, French speakers meet and speak in French. When, for instance, a French teacher or Portuguese teacher meets his/her students, she/he speaks Portuguese or French to them. It is natural for people of the same culture.*

The use of a common language by people of the same linguistic and cultural backgrounds brings about some closeness and creates some identity security. Both the Grade 11 English teacher (Gr11Eng) and Grade11 South African peer (Gr11 peer) confirm the immigrant students’ self-isolation:

Gr11Eng teacher: *They are in a group in the classroom. But they have to know about other cultures and mix up to speak English. They only speak English in class.*

Gr11 peer (girl): *They sit separately.* (Interviews 4.7: Appendix G)

In other words, they do not seek to integrate socially. Such behaviours can lead to complex inter-ethnic relations among learners, thus contradicting Peshkin’s (1991) perception of inter-ethnic friendship. By holding on to ethnic friends, foreign African
learners continue to feel the lack of equal status and thus perpetuate their own marginalisation. Similarly, being in a group in the classroom can also indicate an opportunity for those immigrant children to assist one another when performing class tasks, using ethnic languages.

Since in a situation of displacement, immigrants' children are likely to face difficulties of adjustment to the new educational system. It is important to know what the school does to integrate the newcomers. The principal, the Portuguese (Por-) teacher, the Grade 11 English (Gr11 Eng) teacher and the Grade 11 SA peer posit (Interviews 4.5-7: Appendix G):

Princ: They are mixed in class with other students. They are seen as same students.
Por-teacher: This is a government school. When they come here, they go to their own language class. They open up to each other.
Gr11 Eng teacher: We have sports, drama and chess.
Gr11 SA peer (girl): We treat them as bothers and sisters. Some African boys are dating them.

In talking to the school principal, the Grade 11 English teacher, and the Grade 11 SA peer, I received contradictory information: on the one hand, ‘self-isolation’ and, on the other hand, ‘melting-pot’. My explanation of this is that ‘self-isolation’ is the result of their marginalization or stereotyping. It can also create ethnic awareness and closeness among foreign learners. In contrast, the ‘melting-pot’ system is likely to help the immigrants’ children to make friends among their classmates (Jones 1995) and to produce ‘collaborative relations of power’ (Cummins 1996: 15) through the practice of English. This collaboration is supported by such activities as sports, drama, and chess; it helps immigrant children to learn English, to use it to negotiate their identities, to construct solid friendships, and to change their perceptions of one another. In the next interview excerpt, Firo (the young G1) expresses a complex integration into her local peer networks (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G).

Res: Do you actually feel integrated, or how do you feel at school?
Firo: I feel great because some of them (i.e. local peers) have been around me. But sometimes you feel uncomfortable, especially if you are not South African. They make you feel that you are not one of them.

However, despite the activities cited by the Grade 11 English teacher (previous extract), foreign learners can still experience marginalisation and difficulty with understanding
(and or speaking) English in the classroom, particularly in the early stages of school socialization. But the learning difficulties seem to be attended to by the school.

Princ: Teachers of immigrant children offer extra-classes. There are also private English classes elsewhere for those who can afford. But because most immigrant children are refugees and cannot afford, that’s why we offer extra-classes.

Gr11 Eng teacher: Language teachers encourage extra-classes and send them to the language laboratory. (Interviews 4.5: Appendix G)

This school provides some support for immigrants’ children, depending upon the good will of teachers. But the idea of self-isolation discussed in the preceding paragraphs encouraged me to find out how immigrant African learners are perceived socially and academically.

Res: How do you define immigrant learners, academically and socially speaking?

Gr11 Eng teacher: They are pushy, fine and do all works. But some don’t understand what they read. South African peers look them down. They don’t like them in class because foreign Africans are hard workers. That is why they don’t like them. Some foreign Africans live by themselves without parents here. They work hard. Others do not manage and fail. English is the problem. They struggle with English and keep on speaking Portuguese or French instead of English. They struggle with grammar, comprehension or reading. They don’t have adequate vocabulary to put it correctly. When they don’t manage in Grade 8, the rest is a problem. If they are good, they are good. They are among the top learners.

Princ: There are two groups. Mozambicans are stronger academically because they understand English better. The Angolan students are weaker. Their English is worse. About French speakers, there are two groups: refugees and voluntary migrants. Refugees’ children tend not to do better. They have difficulty to work; they have lots of problems. They also have language problems and emotional problems because they were traumatized in the past. There are those students who are sent by their wealthy parents to come and study in South Africa. They tend to do better. But among them, they are those who are ‘spoiled’ children, i.e. those who come with a lot of money, rent a flat, buy a car and live as they like. These tend not to do better and fail. (Interviews 4.5 -6: Appendix G)

Some contradictory views about foreign African learners’ academic ability are revealed in the statements above. Foreign learners (particularly refugees’ children) are described as being in deficit in terms of their English language ability, but good, ‘pushy’, hardworking and ‘among the top learners’. The principal, on the other hand, discusses foreign African parenting. She blames ‘wealthy’ foreign (DRC) parents because of their irresponsibility in sending their ‘spoiled’ young children to SA to study without exercising any control over them. The implication of such irresponsibility is that most of these ‘spoiled’ children perform poorly. Another group of foreign African children who perform poorly consists of refugees’ and asylum seekers’ children. Past trauma and new
language of schooling are not the only causes of such performance. Poor living conditions and/or immigration experience in the adopted land may also impact negatively on their academic performance.

Elaborating in particular on the DRC immigrant children’s language problems, the principal argues (Interviews 4.5: Appendix G):

If you take me to France or the DRC and put me in a school, I will fail because I don’t know French well. That’s why we offer extra-classes for them.

This is another view of language ability linked to nationality. Successful academic performance depends upon a number of variables like medium of learning (MOL), intelligence, personal motivation, school environment, and family support are seen as very important. Asked about Firo’s performance, the English teacher said (Interviews 4.6: Appendix G):

Firo is quiet and never asks questions if you don’t ask her questions. It is evident that she has difficulty speaking English. She struggles with talking. Some of her works are good but the exams and tests are not really good.

Trueba (1989: 41) argues that cultural change can also place self-esteem in serious jeopardy. But academic failure of this immigrant child cannot be the result of English only; it may also result from many extrinsic social forces. I believe that the lack of self-esteem and self-isolation are likely to engender the difficulties experienced by Firo. These difficulties come out during the transition period from homeland learning culture and practices to the host land’s ones. Firo could not function effectively at school because of the culture of difference and the conditions of uprooting and pressure to integrate into the mainstream. The following extract confirms the Grade 11 English teacher’s view (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G):

Res: How do you perform in English at school?
Firo: Pas tellement bien par ce que je dois répéter Grade 11 à cause d’anglais. Ils m’ont dit que je dois trouver quelqu’un pour m’enseigner en anglais et dans ma langue. Je suis bonne à l’oral et par écrit. Mais je ne peux pas lire et comprendre ce que je lis.
(Not quite well because I must repeat Grade11 because of English. They told me that I must find someone to teach me in English and my language. I am good at speaking and writing. But I cannot read and understand what I am reading.)
Res: So you wish you could learn in French?
Firo: Oui, par ce que quand je fais le français comme langue seconde. Je travaille bien par ce que
Firo’s 2002 and 2003 Grade 11 School Reports (Appendix H) show that Firo performs better in French (with an average of 70% in 2002 and 65% in 2003) than in English where she obtained an average of 43% in 2002 and 41% in 2003 in Grade 11. Yet she was promoted to Grade 12. Drawing on Valdés (1998), a child with a substantial writing and reading capabilities in L1 (first language) may be eager to learn and/or assimilate English with less difficulty than those with no sufficient reading/writing experience in the first language. Additionally, the host society’s attitudes to ‘strangers’ cannot be overlooked. Speaking of the adjustment of new learners, Spindler and Spindler (1987) particularly believe that ‘rejected students may acquire deficits in self-esteem, be damaged by negative perceptions and low expectations of them by teachers’ (p. 41). Answering the query about the immigrant children’s relations with their peers within the school, the Grade 11 teacher says:

_They don’t mix with South Africans. The main reason is that they are scared of crime._
_They live isolated._ (Interviews 4.6: Appendix G)

Stereotyping engenders frustration and self-isolation. Asked about the marginalisation of foreign learners within the school as one possible reason for self-isolation, the principal and the Grade 11 English teacher and the Grade 11 local peers responded (Interviews 4.4 - 7: Appendix G):

Res: Have you ever received any complaint from immigrant children being called names?

Principal: _They are always seen as different. They are called ‘makwere-kwere’, although they are Africans. They are victimized._

Gr11 Eng teacher: _No. But sometimes they fight, not because of xenophobia but just because they are children, joking._

Gr11 peer (boy): _Yes, sometimes insulting, joking. Sometimes because we are different people and we speak different languages, they think we are talking about them. In class we are all friends._

Gr11 peer (girl): _Yes, because they look at you and point to you. For example, one day I did my hair, and they talked about me. It bothers me when they speak their languages._

By acknowledging xenophobia at school, the principal and the Grade 11 male peer link name-calling to foreign nationality and language. Local peers’ views produce complex identities. Name-calling tends to make immigrants’ children feel threatened in school.
While the school head and the local peers acknowledge the stereotyping practices, the Grade 11 English teacher holds a different view, undoubtedly drawn from the school ethos that blinds some teachers to the reality. But when applied to foreign peers who already feel stereotyped by the society at large, name-calling can cause frustration.

It is important to know what the school does to address the issue. The principal maintains (Interviews 4.5: Appendix G):

*Stereotyping is part of curriculum. That’s why this country is called a ‘rainbow nation’. Stereotyping is taught depending on the subject.*

The principal's response coincides with Castles and Davidson's (2000) idea of a multicultural nation. The inter-ethnic abuse most commonly called name-calling, and other forms of verbal abuse are rooted in ethnicity. Prejudice towards African immigrants (Bekker & Carlton 1996) makes inter-ethnic relationships in schools complex. The most important point is how learners themselves negotiate identities among themselves. Asked about friendship in school, Firo gave the evidence of intra-ethnic preference in terms of close friendships but also of inter-ethnic friendship, as this interview extract recounts (Interviews 4.2: Appendix G):

Res: Do you have South African friends?
Firo: Yeah
Res: Do they like you?
Firo: Yeah. *They want me to teach them French, and they also want me to learn Zulu.*
Res: Do you feel free to speak your DRC languages anywhere?
Firo: Yeah, *with my DRC friends.*
Res: Do other schoolmates worry about it?
Firo: No. *When they bother me, I tell them ‘I can't speak your home languages’.*
Res: How do they bother you? How do they react?
Firo: They laugh and say: ‘your language is funny’.
Res: Do they sometimes call you names?
Firo: Yeah, *only some of their friends who are not my friends. Yeah, for example, sometimes ‘kwere-kwere’.*
Res: What does it mean?
Firo: They say it means ‘immigrant’ or something like that. *They say we do bother them*
Res: In this case what do you think of?
Firo: I feel like I could go back to my home country.

This extract shows how immigrant children define themselves and how they respond to their local peers’ negative attitudes towards their languages. By drawing on ethnic friends and using French, immigrant learners express a distinct ethnic identity, while
maintaining positive interrelationships with local peers. As Harklau (2000) argues, immigrant learners who are continually being assigned stereotypical identities resist these constructions in favour of more complex subjectivities as they become gradually socialized into the host community.

7.3.4 Implications of the FLP for schooling

The Multilanguage policy in this family does not aim explicitly to empower the children academically but to allow for identity flexibility in multiple situations. However, reading and writing capabilities in L1 (first language) are, according to Valdès (1998), likely to impact positively on the learning of English. Despite the fact that Firo performs well in French at school, this literacy experience in L1 does not bring about the expected results. Her poor results, particularly in English (2002 and 2003 Grade 11 School Reports in Appendix H) may be due to such factors as intelligence, self-motivation and the lack of integration in the new society. In contrast, her younger sister Fatou performs well at school. This may result from her having had more schooling experience in SA.

7.4 Identity

7.4.1 Identities based on language and culture

*English, Afrikaans and local African languages*

As a reflection of inequitable social relations of power, stereotypes set a divide between ‘us’ and the ‘Other’, favouring the linguistic exclusion of immigrants. But the immigration experience is different for the different member of the family. This influences some members’ attitudes to local languages. To illustrate, both the TG (Fatou) and the G1 (Mafo: mother) undoubtedly focus on the greater power of English over local African languages (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G).

Res: What do you think of, or what are your attitudes to Zulu or Sotho?

Fatou: I won’t be able to talk to somebody else. I need English for work and can talk to someone else.

Mafo: Sotho ou zulu sont seulement pour l’Afrique du Sud. Mais s’ils doivent aller à l’étranger, ils ont besoin d’anglais. Cette langue peut les aider à étudier aux Etats-Unis et ailleurs. (SeSotho or isiZulu are just for South Africa. But if they [i.e. children] have to go abroad, they
Both Mafo and Lufo acknowledge the importance of English in the global market and encourage their children to learn English rather than the local African languages. In SA the mastery of English by immigrant children becomes the predominant issue in everyday social experience and the key to succeeding in their studies and life. Identity, according to Hall (2000), is ‘a psychological discourse of the self [which] is the ground of action’ (p. 144). There are potential economic advantages of being fluent in English, in that a variety of jobs are available to the multilingual speakers (of international languages), especially in this globalising world. Through English the immigrant children in this family acquire not only a new language but are at the same time socialised into the existing relations of power and new ‘ways of behaving, speaking, thinking, acting, saying’ (Gee 1996). Similarly, knowledge of English seems to be an imperative to both parents as it sounds the right way for them to be involved in their children’s schooling from home. It is known that people assess the rewards and costs of languages and make a choice. The knowledge of several languages helps interlocutors to assume different language identities in different situations or contexts, depending on the social status of the members in the wider South African society.

**French, Lingala, Kikongo and Swahili**

These DRC languages confer specific selves upon the immigrants in the diaspora and carry a certain utility for them. All the languages mentioned above help members to negotiate multiple identities in multiple settings and circumstances, depending on the interlocutors. In the following extract the selected children express their attitudes to the homeland languages (Interviews 4.1-2: Appendix G):

Res: How do you feel when you speak DRC languages?
Firo: Very nice, very comfortable
Fatou: I feel fine because it’s a language that I can speak
Res (to Fatou): And if you cannot understand or speak?
Fatou: Unhappy.
Res: Why?
Fatou: Because if they say something I won’t be able to understand.

While DRC languages confer upon Firo (older girl) DRC identity, Fatou seeks integration into the community. Knowing homeland languages is also a way of
remaining a DRC national and functioning appropriately within the ethnic community. As is recognised, ethnic differences are entirely learned. These differences set the boundaries between ‘people we actually are’, the ‘we’, and ‘what others are or appear to be’, the ‘they’. In this excerpt Lufo articulates a view of language tied to culture.

Res: What is the meaning of homeland languages to you in South Africa?
(They represent our culture. They are also an element of comparison with other South African languages or cultures. Otherwise we would abandon them.)

Res: What is the best language to educate children in SA?
Lufo: Nous devons maintenir notre langue maternelle parce qu’elle représente notre culture et doit être maintenue.
(We must maintain our MT because it represents our culture and must be maintained.)

This extract supports Ngugi’s (1993, 1986) essentialist view and contrasts Finku’s (father: English-only family) assumption. Finku believes that ethnic values can be conveyed in another language, for instance, English. But during the interaction, each speaker attributes to the interlocutor a particular language that reflects his/her language identity depending upon the circumstances and setting. Lufo reveals this pattern of interaction (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

Res: What languages do you use with your wife and/or children?
Lufo: Personnellement, je parle français. Avec Maman, souvent français, lingala, kikongo, swahili parce que nous parlons ces langues correctement. Nous pouvons commencer, par exemple, avec le lingala et finir avec le swahili. Quelques fois nous entrons dans une langue que personne ne comprend. Avec les enfants, en général, les plus jeunes ou ceux qui sont arrivés en Afrique du Sud plus jeunes, je parle en anglais parce que quelques fois les écoles les obligent de parler anglais à la maison ou n’importe où. Quelques fois aussi je les interromps en français ou lingala pour les encourager à parler aussi nos langues. Tous les enfants parlent français et lingala. [French]
(Personally, I speak French. With my wife, I often speak French, Lingala, Kikongo, Swahili because we speak all those languages well. We can start with, for example, Lingala and finish with Swahili. Sometimes we shift into a language that no one understands. With children, in general, the youngest or those who arrived in South Africa at a young age, I speak in English because schools sometimes oblige to speak English at home or anywhere. Sometimes I also interrupt them in French or Lingala to encourage them to speak our languages. All the children speak French and Lingala)

In contrast to what Lufo claims above, not all the children can speak French and/or Lingala. During my observations, the father used certain languages with specific children (Appendix G) below. To my question Lufo (father) gave contradictory information (Field notes: Appendix F):
Alpha et Fatou, par exemple, sont venues en Afrique du Sud très jeunes. Alpha parle l’anglais et le lingala mais comprend le français tandis que Fatou parle l’anglais et un peu de français et entend le lingala. Toutes les deux pensent plus en anglais qu’en français qui devient leur seconde langue. Je leur explique des choses en anglais parce qu’elles le comprennent facilement. Mais tous les enfants nés ici connaissent le français, le lingala et entendent le kikongo. [French]

(Alpha and Fatou, for example, came to SA very young. Alpha speaks English and Lingala but understands French while Fatou speaks English and little French. Both children think more in English than in French which becomes their second language. I explain things to them in English because they understand it easily. But all the children born here know French, Lingala and understand Kikongo.)

My explanation of the contradiction is that Lufo is aware of his children’s inabilities in certain DRC languages but wants to express pride in using these languages in SA. These ethnic languages help to establish communication between the children and their parents regarding childrearing. It should be noted that in the diaspora family members seek to maintain to some extent a borderline between ‘what we are’ and the way of life in the host land. The meeting of this culture and the homeland’s one is likely to cause confusion. Mafo’s (mother) gives explicit details.

Les enfants discutent tous problèmes des jeunes pendant que je suis là. Les enfants sont informées à l’école qu’il faut appeler la police quand les parents vous blâment et de prendre des piqûres anti-grossesse, i.e. d’avoir des relations coupables. Elles sont aussi informées par leurs amies d’avoir des copains et de ne pas demander la permission aux parents pour sortir. Je leur dis toujours qu’elles doivent rester vierges jusqu’à ce qu’elles soient mariées. Dans notre tribu les Bapende, les filles doivent demeurer vierges jusqu’au mariage. Vous saurez tout dans votre mariage. Elles disent: ‘Ah, c’est pourquoi Papa t’aime beaucoup’? Je dis ‘Oui’. Je communique ouvertement avec elles et les conseille de rapporter tout ce qu’on leur dit à l’école ou par des amies en vue d’avoir une bonne direction. [French]

(Children discuss youth problems while I am there. Children are told at school to call the police if parents blame them, and to have anti-pregnancy injections, i.e. to have sex. They are also told by friends to have boyfriends and not to ask for permission from parents to go out. I always tell my children that they have to remain virgins until they get married. In our tribe Bapende, girls should remain virgins until marriage. You will know [i.e. enjoy] everything in your marriage. They say: ‘Ah, that’s why Papa loves you much’. I say ‘yes’. I communicate openly with them and advise them to report anything they are told at school or by friends in order to get the appropriate advice) (Field notes: Appendix F)

Mafo discusses a number of issues relating to tribal traditions. She mentions culture shock, or the challenge to their ethnic/family values and way of life that immigrant parents encounter in SA. She cites contraception as an example. In this case immigrant parents feel caught between their homeland childraising and the more democratic and consultative approach to childrearing extolled by the South African Constitution (SA Government 1996). Similarly, in this family the children are under pressure to conserve
the family/ethnic values (Section 7.4.1.) that often conflict with the liberal value systems
of the host land. In Section 7.3.3.2 (Field notes: Appendix F) Mafo (mother) disagrees
with the SA culture (e.g. contraception injection suggested at school) inculcated into the
children in one of her daughters’ schools).

A number of immigrant parents do no know how to read what children tell them in a new
country. Lufo (father) gives credence to Mafo’s concern, adding:

Lufo: Ici c’est autre chose. C’est tout à fait différent de chez nous. Les filles sont libres Avec les filles, il
faut toujours être prudent. Ici les valeurs morales sont renversées. [French]
(Here, things are different. It is quite different from our home/culture. Girls are free. With girls,
you must always be careful. Here moral values are reversed, i.e. contrary to ours.)

Kele: Voyez comment l’éducation des enfants peut se gâcher. Chez nous, c’est pas comme cela
(See how children’s education can be spoiled. In our country, it is not like this) [French]

Kele: Ici, ils ont une autre culture, autres valeurs et leur façon de se conduire, s’habiller et de penser;
c’est la culture anglophone. [French]
(Here, they have a different culture, different values and ways of behaving, clothing and
thinking. It is the Anglophone culture)

Lufo: Mais awa ils ont une autre conception de la vie, une autre mentalité. C’est complètement
différent de la nôtre. Mama aza na responsabilité monene po na ba filles. C’est pourquoi la
prière est nécessaire pour donner une ligne de conduite aux enfants. Autrement, c’est la
débandade familiale. [French - Lingala]
(But here they have another conception of life. It is totally different from ours. Mum has a great
responsibility for the girls. That’s why prayer is necessary in order to re/shape children’s
behaviour. Otherwise, it is the family destruction.) (Field notes: Appendix F)

Lufo adds the view of foreign parenting dilemma in the diaspora. In South Africa parents
must learn new roles and at the same time maintain their ways of life and transmit these
to their children. Bourdieu (1991) argues that the world operates in terms of cultural
practices. The new way of life can impact upon the children’s homeland values, in
relation to parent-child inter-relationships. However, the views put forward by the three
interlocutors above (Lufo, Anaka, Kele) cannot be generalised. Although SA is a
democratic country, all the local parents do not have the same parenting practices since
they belong to different ethnic groups and thus have different cultural and religious
beliefs. But it should be noted that, with globalisation, the freedom accorded to children
by the SA Constitution and taught in schools is likely to impact upon the lives and ethnic
values of the immigrant children.
7.4.2 Symbolic identity markers and practices in SA

Research on immigration (e.g. Gans 1991; Stokes 1994) indicates a certain relationship between cultural elements and ethnic identity formation. The analysis of data (Interviews: Appendix G) reveals the same cultural practices as in the other families, except that this household adds nationality, tribal art and mores.

Practically, culture includes the distinctive ways of carrying on life processes such as values, childrearing, and traditions. This idea agrees with Carrasquillo’s (1991) finding. Because of their symbolic and expressive functions, these elements have a particular meaning to the Multilanguage family members in SA. For Lufo, language represents their culture, and for Fatou (the TG), the use of ethnic languages in SA is a mark of national belongingness and a sign of distinctiveness. This view coincides with Makoni (1996) that ‘language is a crucial aspect in ascribing identity’ (p. 261).

There are also manifestations of non-material ethnic culture that cannot be observed, though they are equally important for understanding people’s way of life. These include beliefs, values, ideas, customs of a particular time and place, and means for regulating interactions with others (Interviews: Appendix G). Within the DRC community in SA, religion seems to be an important factor in childrearing.

Res: Are you a member of a DRC association?
Lufo: Oui, surtout religieuse: l’Église Congolaise où je suis.
   (Yes, mainly religious: the DRC Church where I am.) (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G)

Ethnic church patterns become an integral part of their day-to-day life and the development of ethnic networks in the new nation. Mafo once more underlines the foreign parenting dilemma as a consequence of immigration.

   (The old daughters go to church, save Alpha. She does not want to pray. Even the old son refuses to go to church. He plays soccer on Sundays, instead of worshipping with us. I am trying to encourage them but it does not work yet) (Field notes: Appendix F)
Most DRC families in Johannesburg believe in religion as the appropriate means of bringing up their children in South Africa. Very closely related to this is the parents’ feeling that true worship happens in ethnic languages.

7.4.3 Ethnic and linguistic maintenance and hybridisation in SA

It is recognised that immigrant parents’ own ethnic identity plays a crucial role in inculcating ethnic sense into their children. Parents’ attitudes towards maintaining homeland languages in SA are undoubtedly positive. In Section 7.3.3.2 (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G) Mafo encourages the use of DRC indigenous languages in SA. This view is compatible with Pawels’ (1997) findings in Australia. Parents still believe in the childrearing value of their languages in SA (Interviews 4.3-4: Appendix G).

Res: Do you think that DRC languages still have value in the family in SA?
Lufo: Même si les parents parlent anglais avec les enfants, nos langues ont encore de la valeur, principalement si une personne est étrangère. (Even if parents speak English with children, our languages still have value, mainly when a person is a foreigner.)
Mafo: Oui. Bana il faut bayeba bawuti wapi. Eza pe po na réadaptation na Congo. Et quand je voudrais les blâmer, je le fais souvent en lingala. J’utilise lingala pour leur donner des conseils et leur enseigner nos normes et valeurs. Ils sont toujours à l’église. (When I want to blame them, I often do it in Lingala. I use Lingala to give them advice and teach them our values and norms. They are always in church.)
Res: If you have something secret to say, what language do you use?
Mafo: Ça dépend. Tokoki koloba monoko ya biso oyo motu moko akoki koyoka te. Papa souvent alobelaka ngai na Kipende. (It depends. We can use a DRC language that no one can understand. Papa often speaks to me in Kipende.)

Obviously, ethnic and linguistic identities are maintained for a number of reasons. DRC languages such as Lingala and Kikongo, or French embody power control over the children and are used by the mother to encourage them to understand and/or speak to them while providing advice and thus conveying ethnic values. On the other hand, Kipende (the parents’ mother language) creates situations of intimacy in the diaspora. In SA the immigrant children may prefer English to DRC languages. This can engender fear in parents. In view of this, the father insists that the idea of origin is linked to an ethnic language (Interviews 4.4: Appendix G):

Res: How would you feel if a child gives up DRC languages?
Lufo: Ils perdront leur origine et seront perdus quand ils rentrent au Congo. Nos langues ont toujours de la valeur. [French]
(They would lose their origin and be lost once back in the DRC. They always have value.)

This family experiences total ethnic enclosure as it lives within the DRC community. Maintaining one’s own ethnic identity in the new land may be seen as a way to struggle to define and defend one’s own social spaces, cultural boundaries and positions. Proficiency in many languages enables flexibility in thinking and performing in different linguistic systems, offering an advantage over English or French monolingual children (Cummins 1996). On the other hand, using ethnic languages allows parents to impart useful information and convey ethnic values, perceived as essential to the future behaviours of the children and to the perpetuation of the family’s values. By doing so, they recognize the vitality of DRC languages in South Africa in domestic communication and intimacy (Section 7.4.1) and for the children’s future. Retaining home languages also compensates for the insecurity felt when using English with a different accent and for the lack of knowledge of local African languages.

Hybridization

As discussed in Sections 7.3.2 and 7.4.1, the Multilanguage policy in the family clearly seeks to give the members hybrid identities, in that they are likely to navigate easily in diverse situations, although Mafo claims that her family members do not share local ways of life.

Res: Does living in South Africa make you feel more South African than Congolese?
Mafo: Non. Nous sommes encore congolais. Ils ne nous acceptent pas pour nous intégrer dans leurs réseaux. Nous sommes traités comme congolais ou étrangers. Si notre pays devient pacifique demain, ils nous demanderont de rentrer. Nous devrons retourner. Mais si nous nous sentons sud-africains ou demi-congolais, que ferons nous ou deviendrons-nous? (No. We are still Congolese. They do not accept us to be integrated into their networks. We are treated as Congolese or foreigners. If our country becomes peaceful tomorrow, they will instruct us to go back home. We will have to go back. But if we feel South Africans or half Congolese, what will we do or become?) (Interviews 4.3: Appendix G)

Mafo’s account finds support in both Lufo’s and Firo’s statements (Interviews 4.2 & 4.4: Appendix G):

Lufo (father): Nous ne pouvons pas abandonner notre culture pour être assimilés et perdre notre origine. Nous disons toujours aux enfants que la bonne éducation est ici en anglais mais le futur est dans notre pays. Nous serons plus à l’aise dans notre propre pays. (We cannot give it up in order to be assimilated and lose our origin. We always tell them that better education is here in English but the future is in our country. We will
I still feel Congolese. I am not used to sound South African. At the beginning they (i.e. South Africans) act fine for a while. But in the end they make you feel that you are not one of them.

In these accounts, the participants overlook the principles of cultural exchange and social integration/lived space when two cultures enter into contact and when people live in a multilingual milieu, or when foreigners have to share the same space with the host society. As with the other families using DRC languages, the family justifies the maintenance of homeland languages in SA by attributing their self-isolation to the South African society. However, Welsh (1999: 14) notes that different ways of life and cultures interpenetrate, or emerge from one another. This process is ‘endemic to all migrations of people which in history have involved the travel, contact, transmutations, hybridization of ideas, values and behaviour norms’ (Ahmad 1995: 18). In this globalising world ‘all forms of culture are continually in the process of hybridity’ (Bhabha 1990: 211). But the research participants resist this (Interviews 4.1: Appendix G).

Fatou ignores the fact that her mother cannot communicate in English (Interviews: Appendix G; Field notes: Appendix F). In SA children live and learn in two cultures: the family or homeland language and cultures and those of the host land as the result of contact and exposure. This field notes extract speaks for itself (Field notes: Appendix F):

Mafo:  *Papa, ici il faut être dur avec les filles. Les valeurs morales ici sont différentes de chez nous.*  
[French] (Papa, we have to be tough with girls. Moral values here are different from ours.)
Kele:  *Pourquoi?*  
[French]
Mafo:  *Fille moko sud-africaine ayaki kotala Alpha. Il semble que c’est sa collègue de classe. A la sortie, elle voulait qu’elle l’accompagne au coin de la rue. Ma fille dit ‘je dois demander la permission à Maman avant de sortir’. Son amie lui dira: Pourquoi? Chez nous, on sort comme on veut. Pas besoin de permission de ma mère. Je suis libre n’importe quand.*  
(A certain girl came to visit Alpha. It seems that she is her classmate. At the end, she wanted her to see her off at the corner of the street. My daughter said ‘I must ask for permission from Mum’. Her friend responded: Why? In our home, we are free. No need of permission. I am free to go out anytime)  
[Lingala & French]
Kele: *Ah bon. Elle a dit cela? (Is it? Did she say that?)* [French]

Mafo: *Oui. Ma fille a insisté que “dans notre coutume, on doit demander la permission aux parents avant de sortir pance qu’on est encore jeune fille”.* [French]

(Yes. My daughter insisted that ‘in our culture, we must ask for permission from parents before going out because we are still young girls’) [French]

Kele: *Elle a quand même demandé la permission? Mais je ne crois pas que toutes les familles ici tolèrent le laisser-faire malgré la démocratie.* [French]

(Did she ask for permission? But I don’t believe that all families here encourage laisser-faire despite democracy) [French]

Mafo: *J’ai appelé la fille et lui a dit que chez nous, on demande la permission ou conseil aux parents avant de faire quelque chose. C’est comme cela que nous étions élevés. Vos coutumes ne sont pas les nôtres. Si tu ne veux pas, ne viens plus chez moi.* [French]

(I called the girl and told her that in our culture, we ask for permission or advice from parents before doing something. This is the way we were reared/educated. Our cultural values are not yours. If you don’t accept this, stop coming to my house)

In the diaspora, immigrant mothers have to learn new childrearing practices that often conflict with their homeland values. In their daily life in SA the immigrant children have to incorporate some sociocultural aspects of the receiving society. This mixing thus leads to ‘new blended cultural patterns’ (Carrasquillo 1991: 56) that are conveyed through or emerge from familiarity with English and other South African languages. That is the factual experience of the host land’s worldview. Depending on the length of stay in the host land, immigrant children’s behaviours are likely to reflect aspects of South African culture. This process may be called *Southafricanisation*, i.e. conformity to the South African way of life.

### 7.5 Conclusion

In this last chapter on the research families, I focused on this Multilanguage family to examine their language practices and other selected issues. The push and pull factors that prompted the design of the FLP are the same as those of the French-only and to some extent, of the French-Tshiluba family. The policy of multiple languages in the DRC family in SA aims to create hybrid identities for the family members, particularly their children and may be the result of their unsuccessful experience in the host land.

As with the French-only and French-Tshiluba families, the Multilanguage family appears to be unhappy with their decision to migrate to SA because they have not obtained the expected material resources they came for. Consequently, the parents in contrast to the children (except one) think of returning to their homeland.
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION

8.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I summarise the findings involving the four research families, focusing on the patterns and differences. Thereafter, I discuss the implications of DRC immigrant family language policies and practices in South Africa and suggest directions for further research.

8.2 Summary of findings

This section discusses the findings in relation to the research questions, showing how the research fits within the literature on language maintenance in the diaspora across the generations. To facilitate understanding of this section, the research questions are given as headings.

8.2.1 What are the DRC parents’ assumptions that underpin the language policies in their homes in SA?

The data analysis indicated that three out of the four families (French-only, French-Tshiluba, and Multilanguage) designed the language policies for communication within the family and the DRC community. The use of homeland languages in these households serves to recreate the nation in the diaspora (see Anderson 1983). But the English-only family designed its policy to support the children’s schooling and academic success as well as their integration in the host country. This contributes to the creation of new identities for the children. It has also been shown that it is mostly fathers (traditionally seen as breadwinners) who decided on the language policy in the family. They were more educated than the mothers, except in the French-Tshiluba family. Despite the fact that the mother in the French-Tshiluba family is more qualified (a lawyer) than the father and the main breadwinner, she still has no sole decision-making power in relation to language choice. These unequal relations of power are the
expression of patriarchal gender relations which are rooted in particular gender ascriptions in traditional African families.

8.2.2 What are the current language practices in DRC immigrant families in SA?

In response to the above question, it was found that the effects of age and generational differences, as well as patriarchal gender relations and time lived in the DRC greatly influence language practices and shape the identities of individual members within a family, creating a divide between different generations of immigrants. My data analysis indicates that each research family has at least one language that facilitates communication at home. Notwithstanding the difference in language policies across the research families, in three out of the four immigrant families (English-only, French-only and French-Tshiluba) several other languages are spoken or heard, in addition to the language(s) stated in the policy. The fourth family has a multi-language policy that allows the use of any language. However, no local languages other than English are spoken in all the research homes. My data suggests that fathers have larger networks than mothers because they go out and have the opportunity to learn to speak English, while in order to take care of their children, most mothers stay home. This finding confirms similar findings by Norton (2000).

In two out of the four research families there are moves by members of the families to ignore the language policy (LP) but in different ways. This language behaviour is enacted by the less powerful or less educated parents, the women in the French-only and English-only households. Practically, a woman’s traditional role as a carrier-conveyor of ethnic values, including languages (confirming the finding by McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas 2001), leads to their breaking the stated policy. In addition, the mothers’ inability to speak the stated language fluently also influences them to break the agreement. In all the four research families children also disregard language policy when they communicate among themselves in English (French-only, French-Tshiluba), or because they just want to speak the ethnic language with the mother or learn it from her (Swahili and French in the English-only family, and Lingala in the French-only family) (Interviews: Appendix G). The breaking of the family language policy often
happens in the presence of the father as well as when he is not at home. The fathers in the English-only and French-only households also break the FLPs that they initiated, particularly when communicating with their wives in the home. In my experience they often use French and Swahili (English-only family), and Lingala (French-only family) with their wives (Interviews: Appendix G).

Regardless of the FLP, immigrant children in the research families engaged in inter-ethnic friendships and, some, in language exchange, thus creating opportunities for inter-ethnic penetration and the breaking down of social barriers. Similarly, by preferring non-ethnic friendships in schools, they have a sense of who they really are and confirm their identity within the wider South African society.

I now discuss practices in relation to specific languages in the research site such as English, French and DRC African languages, and Afrikaans and SA African languages. I start with English.

**English.** Most families use English to access local networks and for schooling. They also see English as a means to get better socio-economic opportunities in South Africa. The fathers speak English better than the mothers. As to the children, all but one of the research immigrant children are orally fluent in English. They came to South Africa very young (as young G1 or TG) and started schooling and thus socialising in the English language in SA. In contrast, Firo, the oldest child in the Multi-language family and the oldest of all the selected children (13 years old when she arrived), has difficulty speaking English. This explains her desire to return to the DRC. The lack of desire to extend her own boundaries limits her oral use of the language.

**French and DRC African languages:** It was found that for the English-only and Multilanguage families, French is the language of interaction between the parents and the lingua franca needed for communication with the ethnic community. But for the French-only and French-Tshiluba families, French serves to maintain their DRC élite identity in the diaspora. However, within the DRC community in South Africa, there is
mixing between the 'je-le-connais’ and the ‘less educated’ because they share the same geographic locations and ethnic organizations. My analysis shows that French is an ethnic language, not a colonial language in the Diaspora; consequently, it does not necessarily make one a ‘je-le-connais’. Because everyone (or almost everybody) speaks it in the diaspora, French loses its elitism in South Africa; it is a leveler. French in DRC families is totally naturalised and encouraged even in less educated families sharing the same life space as the élites. In South Africa, an African language marks you as a black South African (de Klerk & Gough 2002; Ndebele 1986) while in the DRC, French is enough to mark you as Congolese (Brausch 1961).

It was also found that, apart from the English-only and French-only families which prohibit the use of DRC African languages, the children in the French-Tshiluba and Multilanguage families are encouraged to speak DRC African languages. This is to enhance ethnic integration in the diaspora and establish links with the homeland and possibly facilitate the children’s re-integration if they were to return to the DRC.

_Afrikaans and SA African languages._ It was found that Afrikaans and SA African languages are not used at home. Despite the fact that several languages are encouraged in the Multilanguage family, it appears that no local African language is used within the household. Such behaviour reflects the family’s lack of interest in and knowledge of these languages. Similarly, most of the children and the parents cannot speak Afrikaans and local African languages beyond common greetings. In contrast, young G1 Peja in the French-only family speaks Afrikaans fluently and is competent in isiZulu and speaks some seSotho (School Report: Appendix H). Peja’s proficiency emerges as a rejection of a marginalised foreigner status and his desire to integrate into the host society.

8.2.3 What are the implications of language practices for relations within the research families and the DRC community?

Most children across the selected families respond to the parents in policy-appropriate languages, most of the time. This is a mark of politeness or distance between the DRC
immigrant parents and their children. The use of same DRC languages among family members and within the DRC community results in some kind of intimacy or closeness, a sense of common belongingness and has led to the formation of ethnic identity in the diaspora. However, within the families, it was also found that code-switching was sometimes used at home to contest existing relations and to allocate specific identities to the speakers (see Sections 4.3.2.3; 5.3.2.3; 7.3.2.3). However, such language behaviours do not mean that family members have assimilated, although there is identity re-orientation in Peja (young G1, French-only family).

8.2.4 What are the implications of language practices for relations within the wider SA society?

The analysis of data revealed that the use of DRC languages by the DRC immigrant families in SA leads to stereotyping and xenophobia. But these negative feelings, which I discuss below, are experienced differently by the immigrant parents and their children.

Parents. Evidence shows that there are negative attitudes on the side of the families and on that of the local population. The families’ ethnic isolation results in little access to local indigenous African languages, and this in turn continues the cycle of xenophobia. Despite having a better education in SA for their children, parents in the French-only family, French-Tshiluba family and Multilanguage family feel that they made a bad decision in choosing South Africa as their adopted land, because of xenophobia; thus, they are disappointed at not having achieved the social and/or material conditions they aimed at. These families are nostalgic and plan a possible return to the DRC. Conversely, the English-only family seems to be satisfied. The reason is that, considering the socio-economic situation of all four immigrant families, the English-only family enjoys the material conditions for which they migrated and shows no interest in returning to their homeland.

Children. Of all 8 research focal children one child was born in South Africa (1 G2: second generation) and 7 children in the DRC. Among these 7 DRC-born children, three are young G1 (first generation) whose age ranges from 7 to 13, 4 TG (transitional generation) aged between 1 and 5 at the time of arrival in South Africa (Sections 4.1,
5.1, 6.1, 7.1; Interviews: Appendix G). Despite stereotyping and xenophobia, all but one of the children in the immigrant families do not intend to return to the DRC. They have no mental image of the DRC and thus are not emotionally attached to their country. These children have been able to integrate into the host society and inter-ethnic conflicts are rationalised. Only, Firo, the oldest child of the Multilanguage family, intends to go back to the DRC. Because she was born in the DRC, she is old enough to remember it; she was 13 years old when the family left the DRC for South Africa (Section 7.1). She was the oldest of the research immigrant children at the time of arrival and had difficulty adjusting to the new education system in South Africa, partly because of her lack of fluency in English.

8.2.5 What are the children’s attitudes towards their parents’ home languages and language policies?

Across the research families, most immigrant children, especially young G1, have positive attitudes to their DRC identities and their DRC languages. These attitudes show a symbolic attachment to their parents’ homeland. But, in reality, they see themselves more as South Africans than as DRC nationals. For example, the young G1, Peja, dissociates from DRC culture and considers ethnic language a mere means of interaction within the family (Interviews 2.2: Appendix G).

8.2.6 What is the motivation for ethnic language maintenance/learning in SA?

In this section, I discuss immigrant families’ reasons for perpetuating their DRC languages in the diaspora, and how these are maintained.

Data analysis reveals both language shift and language maintenance in the selected families. There is language shift in the English-only household, in that DRC (indigenous) languages are replaced by English as the primary means of communication and socialization within the family. This finding echoes Mesthrie et al, (2000: 253). Members of this English-only family, as Akhtar (1999: 64) says, ‘comfortably locate themselves in their current realities and envision their future’.
There is evidence in this family that language maintenance is associated with the family language policies in the French-only, French-Tshiluba and Multilanguage families and their links to their DRC community in SA. Members in these families (particularly parents) hope to return to their native land one day. Most parents (including Anaka, English-only mother), in contrast to Finku (English-only father), believe that DRC African languages still have childrearing or cultural value in South Africa and, consequently, encourage their learning in the diaspora. This consideration causes Anaka to break the stated language policy. As indicated earlier, all immigrant mothers, except the mother in the French-Tshiluba family, are overtly carriers of DRC African languages. In the French-Tshiluba family, however, the tribal language is taught by the father because the mother cannot speak Tshiluba well.

Furthermore, in three out of the four research families DRC languages are maintained only through speech, i.e. speaking and listening to the parents or siblings. Such a strategy perpetuates orality: the (traditional) African way of transmitting ethnic values or languages from parents’ mouths to the ears of the younger generation. An exception is the French-Tshiluba household that uses tribal stories and history of the DRC, prayers written and said in Tshiluba and the DRC national anthem in French to convey Tshiluba to the children (Interviews 3: Appendix G). These tribal stories, prayers and national anthem are believed to enhance patriotism and arouse love of and interest in the homeland, thus creating a mental and emotional connection with the DRC. The FLP is also seen as an appropriate way to perpetuate the ethnic languages (i.e. French and Tshiluba) in the diaspora. However, my data analysis indicates that most immigrant children have insufficient exposure to the ancestral or DRC languages (see Interviews: Appendix G). Consequently, these languages are already disappearing in immigrant children’s repertoires. Additionally, if the immigrant children (in particular 2nd and 3rd generations) marry outside the DRC community, the DRC languages are likely to disappear completely. In this situation there will be language shift.
8.3 Findings in relation to Spolsky’s categories

The development of a framework based on the work of Bernard Spolsky (2004) proved to be a useful analytical tool. This section deals with the findings across families in relation to Spolsky’s categories.

8.3.1 External forces/context

My data show that such factors as the geographic location of immigrant families, xenophobia, and the instrumentality of English in SA had an impact on decision-making concerning family language policy. All families living in ethnic areas designed policies in relation to DRC languages in order to facilitate communication and have access to the ethnic networks within their community. One family, the English-only family, lives away from the ethnicised area and uses English as the sole medium of interaction in the family.

8.3.2 Power, choice and regulation

It emerges that patriarchal gender relations governed the establishment of the FLPs in the selected families. The fathers, conceived of traditionally as breadwinners, are more educated than the mothers who are considered caregivers. One exception is the mother in the French-Tshiulu family who is more qualified than the father and the main breadwinner. Despite this, she still has no sole decision-making power in relation to language choice. The FLP is not highly regulated in three households and is ‘laissez-faire’ in the Multilanguage family. Similarly, in two out of four families the choice of language policy in the home is imposed by the fathers.

8.3.3 Identity

Family members’ identities are multiple or hybridized. My data indicate that immigrant children live in South Africa and undoubtedly feel closer to the local culture. Additionally, all research children, except Firo (young G1: Multilanguage family), are disconnected from the DRC. They have a symbolic attachment to the parents’
homeland. In contrast, the nostalgic parents’ life space is more ethnicised. Such a divide exercises a crucial influence on each generation’s individual identities and language practices.

8.4 Implications for FLPs

In my interviews, three out of the four families contend that their FLPs have no crucial impact on their children’s schooling. They relate the good academic performance of their children to the children’s natural ability. However, the English-only parents believe that their stated FLP does have an impact on their children’s academic performance. They think that the use of the language facilitates deep learning or, higher order skills. Yet Shaady (English-only TG) who started schooling in SA failed Grade 2 (2001 School Report: Appendix H) and was moved to another school. Similarly, young G1 Tevora (Shaady’s oldest brother and first-born) got poor marks in many subjects, including English (Grade 9, 2002 School Report: Appendix H). This poor performance is probably a result of a range of factors such as the subtractive character of the FLP, individual uprooting (Heugh 1995; Nann 1982), motivation and intelligence (Norton 2000, 1997). Additionally, social factors conducive to school success such as adaptation to the new milieu (Nann 1982) and the internal conflict due to de-ethnicisation (Akhtar 1999) may affect children’s schooling.

The data analysis of family language policies (FLPs) in three out of the four of DRC immigrant families shows a mismatch between language policy and language practice. In other words, setting up a policy does not mean that it is implemented as intended by the initiator. It has been shown that the imposition of a language policy does not always work because of the identity and power issues that are at stake. That is, what people say or think is not what they actually do. There are differences between espoused practices and enacted practices. In practice, family language policies are unstable. Even within a more confined and intimate domain like a family, language policies do not operate as planned. Factors such as identity, reality on the ground (e.g. education), and language as a carrier of identity influence the practices. Identity, or a sense of
ourselves, is what makes us distinct from others. However, identity is fluid, hybrid and generational. Members operate across multiple or hybrid identities. In practice, many DRC immigrants use French as a major carrier of identity in South Africa, as a result of ethnic enclosure. This enclosure, more than any other factor, seems to be responsible for DRC identity maintenance in the diaspora. It results in informal ethnic networks emerging from DRC public meeting places. All these elements tend to preserve DRC identity in SA. But in order to understand shifts in ethnic identity over time, further research is needed.

8.5 Limitations of the research

Although the research provides useful insights into language and ethnic identity in the context of South African immigration, generalisations cannot be made from the limited number of research families. Ethnicity and cultural differences among the research families and other DRC families and/or other ethnic groups and in schools are likely to vary in relation to the length of stay and the host country’s politics of integration. This thesis is limited by the following points:

Firstly, the research was conducted on only elite families because they understood the project and also gave me access to their homes and members. Secondly, the research families came to South Africa as voluntary immigrants and not as refugees or workers. As ‘je-le-connais’ or elites, they were the only people who could afford to migrate in the early 1990s. Later on, three out of the four research families became ‘accidental refugees’ (see Sections 5.1.1, 6.1.1, 7.1.1; Interviews: Appendix G). It should also be noted there was no full access to children in their rooms or their peers in schools, and there was limited access to school reports. Despite this gap, the research managed to gather the data needed to answer the research questions discussed in Section 1.4 of Chapter 1.
8.6 Directions for further research

A wide range of further research topics is suggested by this research. The following are suggested:

- *The exploration of the kinds of linguistic discrimination* that the children face in their geographic locations, while interacting with local friends (e.g. on the playground, or in the street/park), neighbours and the wider South African society. Acceptance by one’s peer group is central to children’s sense of belonging in a new country.

- *An exploration of the importance of ethnicity in the diaspora*. In the context of immigration, there is some importance attached to ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. To understand this importance, there is a need to undertake a longitudinal study of these immigrant family members. Since each generation understands ethnicity or ethnic culture and language differently, it is worth investigating what ‘ethnicity’ comes to mean to each generation of the generations studied. In addition, links to the DRC are likely to diminish with each new generation of their descendants.

- *Investigation of the effect of a school’s ethos on the performance of immigrant children*. The school policy and ethos inculcated into the learners, the peer relationships and teachers’ construction of immigrants’ children and their attitudes towards these are likely to impact on immigrant children’s academic performance. Research is needed to explore whether inter-ethnic relationships in schools affect foreign learners’ academic progress.

- *An investigation of immigrant children’s language difficulties at school*. Immigrant learners enter a new school system and language policy and will face difficulties. It is important to understand in depth the kind of (academic and social) assistance the school offers and the students' response to this support.
8.7 Final note on the research

This research has developed alongside my own experience of immigration to South Africa. I came alone in 2000 as a DRC immigrant, a father (without his family), as a Masters student and a researcher. I began this PhD research in early 2002, while my family was still in the DRC. By the time they joined me in South Africa in 2003 (mother and youngest daughter) and mid-2004 (three other children), all the data had been collected and some even analysed. This was the point at which we had to decide on a language policy for our own family. Parameters such as schooling, ethnicity, and freedom of language use were of crucial consideration in the decision-making. We decided on a Multilanguage policy. In practice, the research findings changed my own positions and practices. When I started this study, I had essentialist views of language and culture. As a result of completing this work, I believe that a multilanguage family allows multiple identities to interact flexibly in the diaspora maintaining ties to the homeland. It gives family members freedom to interact in all the languages they know, and thus offers the immigrant children a sense of true ethnic identity while enabling integration into South African society.

Five languages are spoken within my family in South Africa: French, English, Lingala, Kikongo, Kipende; these form the basis of daily interaction and inter-action among family members. My youngest (Grade 3) 8 year-old daughter, Bénédicte, started schooling in the DRC in French (pre-school, and five months of grade 1 primary education in French) before she immigrated (with my wife) to South Africa just under the age of six years in early January 2003. She arrived in SA with fluent spoken French and poor Lingala, and no English, while my wife came with a little spoken English learned at secondary school and at tertiary level. Currently, Bénédicte speaks English (her medium of learning in SA), French and Lingala fluently, and Kipende fairly well. She has learned to speak Kipende (my native language) in the family, and Lingala while interacting with her parents, and also with ethnic friends at school and in the DRC community in SA. Yet she performs well at school (2003 School Report: Appendix H) and always feels proud of her DRC and Pende identities, although she has no accurate
mental image of her native land. Ethnically and socially, she is apprenticed into the parents’ culture, and at the same time she is learning to adapt to the South African mainstream way of life at school. I believe that children should not be strangers in their own homes but should also have the opportunity to display multiple selves in a multilingual and multi-cultural country such as South Africa. Like my children, I navigate through hybrid selves, but my children are (and will be) more hybridized than me because of their early socialisation in SA and the number of years they will spend here at a young impressionable age.

To conclude, this research makes a distinctive contribution to an understanding of language practices in the context of migration to South Africa. The enabling character of my own subjectivity also allowed me to understand immigrant families. In the course of attempting to understand distinct ethnic and linguistic behaviours of DRC immigrant families in South Africa, I became at times confused, confronted as I was within my own multiple identities, and, at times, conflicting locations as: a student, a researcher, an immigrant father, a member of the marginalised (DRC) community in South Africa, an ethnic member, and an ‘Other’, a ‘stranger’, a ‘person-not-like-us’, a foreign African. This striking reality, however, had the potential to lead me deeper into the interpretation of the facts, language attitudes and changing behaviours.
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