PROOF COVER SHEET

Author(s): A. Parmegiani
Article title: The (dis)ownership of English: language and identity construction among Zulu students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal
Article no: RBEB 953775
Enclosures: 1) Query sheet
2) Article proofs

Dear Author,

1. Please check these proofs carefully. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication.

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window:
http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp

Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp

2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution. This check is to ensure that your name will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Andrea	Parmegiani	

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below.

AUTHOR QUERIES

General points:

1. **Permissions:** You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. Please see http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/permissions/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp.
2. **Third-party content:** If there is third-party content in your article, please check that the rightsholder details for re-use are shown correctly.
3. **Affiliation:** The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. Please see http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp.
4. **Funding:** Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert ' This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>', followed by the grant number in square brackets '[grant number xxxx]'.
5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials:** Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: ' The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/description of location [author to complete]'. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.
6. The **CrossRef database** (www.crossref.org/) has been used to validate the references. Mismatches will have resulted in a query.

AQ1 Please provide missing history dates for this article.

AQ2 Please provide 3–6 keywords for this article.

AQ3 The reference "Bourdieu, 1997" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ4 The reference "Bourdieu, 1997" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ5 The reference "Alexander, 2000" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ6 The reference "Kawangamalu, 2001" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ7 The 2002 for "Heugh, 2000" has been changed to match the entry in the references list. Please provide revisions if this is incorrect.

AQ8 The reference "Alexander, 1993" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ9 The reference "Moodley, 2009" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ10 Benesch 2008 has been changed to match the entry in the reference list, please confirm this is correct or provide missing reference details

AQ11 The 1988 for "Widdowson, 1994" has been changed to match the entry in the references list. Please provide revisions if this is incorrect.

AQ12 The reference "Balfour, 2010" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ13 Rudwick and Parmegiani 2013 has been changed to match the entry in the reference list, please confirm this is correct or provide missing reference details

AQ14 Paxton 2009 has been changed to match the entry in the reference list, please confirm this is correct or provide missing reference details

AQ15 The reference "Vincent, 2008" is cited in the text but is not listed in the references list. Please either delete the in-text citation or provide full reference details following journal style.

AQ16 Please check the sentence: Given the extent to which English functions as a … process of democratic transformation. for clarity.

AQ17 Paxton 2009 has been changed to match the entry in the reference list, please confirm this is correct or provide missing reference details

AQ18 The reference "Alexander, 2002" is listed in the references list but is not cited in the text. Please either cite the reference or remove it from the references list.

AQ19 Please provide complete details for "Constitution of South Africa, 1996" entry.

AQ20 Please provide complete details for "Department of Education, 1997" entry.

AQ21 Please provide page range for the reference "Deumert 2010".

AQ22 Please provide page range for the reference "Parmegiani 2008".

AQ23 Parkinson and Crouch, 2011, the pages has been replaced using data from CrossRef. Please provide the correct version if these are incorrect.

AQ24 Parmegiani, 2010, the pages has been replaced using data from CrossRef. Please provide the correct version if this is incorrect.

AQ25 Parmegiani, 2012, the pages has been replaced using data from CrossRef. Please provide the correct version if these are incorrect.

AQ26 PaPaxton, 2009, the pages has been replaced using data from CrossRef. Please provide the correct version if these are incorrect.

AQ27 Pennycook, 2004, the journal title has been replaced using data from CrossRef. Please provide the correct version if this is incorrect.

AQ28 Probyn, 2009, the pages has been replaced using data from CrossRef. Please provide the correct version if this is incorrect.

AQ29 Rampton, 1990, the pages has been replaced using data from CrossRef. Please provide the correct version if these are incorrect.

AQ30 Please provide page range for the reference "Webb 2009".

How to make corrections to your proofs using Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Taylor & Francis offers you a choice of options to help you make corrections to your proofs. Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can edit the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat/Reader. This is the simplest and best way for you to ensure that your corrections will be incorporated. If you wish to do this, please follow these instructions:

1. Save the file to your hard disk.

2. Check which version of Adobe Acrobat/Reader you have on your computer. You can do this by clicking on the "Help" tab, and then "About".

If Adobe Reader is not installed, you can get the latest version free from http://get.adobe.com/reader/.

3. If you have Adobe Acrobat/Reader 10 or a later version, click on the "Comment" link at the right-hand side to view the Comments pane.

4. You can then select any text and mark it up for deletion or replacement, or insert new text as needed. Please note that these will clearly be displayed in the Comments pane and secondary annotation is not needed to draw attention to your corrections. If you need to include new sections of text, it is also possible to add a comment to the proofs. To do this, use the Sticky Note tool in the task bar. Please also see our FAQs here: http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/index.asp.

5. Make sure that you save the file when you close the document before uploading it to CATS using the "Upload File" button on the online correction form. If you have more than one file, please zip them together and then upload the zip file.

If you prefer, you can make your corrections using the CATS online correction form.

Troubleshooting

Acrobat help: http://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html
Reader help: http://helpx.adobe.com/reader.html

Please note that full user guides for earlier versions of these programs are available from the Adobe Help pages by clicking on the link "Previous versions" under the "Help and tutorials" heading from the relevant link above. Commenting functionality is available from Adobe Reader 8.0 onwards and from Adobe Acrobat 7.0 onwards.

Firefox users: Firefox's inbuilt PDF Viewer is set to the default; please see the following for instructions on how to use this and download the PDF to your hard drive: http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin

International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2014
Vol. 00, No. 00, 1–12, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.953775

The (dis)ownership of English: language and identity construction among Zulu students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal

Andrea Parmegiani*

English Department, Bronx Community College, City University of New York (CUNY), New York, NY, USA

(*Received XX XXX XXXX; accepted XX XXX XXXX*) AQ1

This paper explores the role English and isiZulu play in the identity construction of a group of black South African university students from disadvantaged backgrounds enrolled in a bridge programme at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. I will discuss how, in post-apartheid South Africa, language practices continue to foster inequality, despite a constitution that grants official status to 11 languages. Attitudes towards language in South Africa are extremely complex. While native speakers of African languages tend to be highly invested in their mother tongues as markers of identities and carriers of traditional culture, they often oppose policies aimed at promoting a greater use of their mother tongue in domains of power, especially in education. I will unravel some of these complexities by adopting a theoretical framework that draws on post-modern, feminist and post-colonial conceptions of identity to examine students' discourses about the ownership of English. These discourses reveal that while there is consensus among students that their mother tongue is a fundamental part of who they are, positions vary greatly with respect to the role English can play in the identity construction of a native isiZulu speaker. Nevertheless, even the students who strongly reject the possibility of ever owning any other language besides their mother tongue, stake a collective claim to English as 'everybody's language' and as agents in the nation-building process that characterises post-apartheid South Africa.

Keywords: xxxx; xxxx; xxxx; xxxx; xxxx AQ2

Introduction

This paper explores how identities are perceived and constructed among a group of Zulu-speaking South African university students from a socio-economically disadvantaged background. Using a reconceptualised notion of language ownership (Parmegiani 2008, 2010) which is largely indebted to the work of Rampton (1990), I will examine how the identity constructions of these students intersect with their bilingual repertoires, paying particular attention to the discourses they deploy to claim or reject ownership of English. These conflicting and sometimes contradictory discourses show that while some students are open to hybrid and fluid bi/multilingual identities, other students strongly reject them by holding on to essentialised conceptions of identity based on a one-to-one correlation with their mother tongue. It is important to explore the tensions and contradictions that arise as students claim and reject the ownership of English because of the implications

*Email: andrea.parmegiani@bcc.cuny.edu

claiming and rejecting it holds for power relations and for the nation-building process in post-apartheid South Africa.

Among critical linguists and language rights activists, there has been growing consensus that language is not merely a politically neutral means of communication, but a social mechanism that shapes identity constructions and power relations. According to Bourdieu (1997, 43), within any sociolinguistic community, certain ways of using language are considered 'proper', 'educated', 'standard' or 'legitimate', while others are not. Legitimacy is determined not so much by intrinsically superior linguistic features but by power relations: the language that the elite uses and identifies with is imposed as the 'norm' and functions as a gatekeeper (Bourdieu 1997, 43). AQ3 AQ4

The struggle over language, power and identity has been a constant presence in the history of South Africa. Language has played a fundamental part in the battle for hegemony between white Afrikaans-speaking and white English-speaking South Africans (Mesthrie 2002; Kamwangamalu 2001). More importantly for the purpose of this paper, language had been used to create essentialised ethnolinguistic identities that have allowed the white minority to keep its power by balkanising the black majority with divide-and-rule tactics. According to De Klerk (2002, 30), the engineering of ethnolinguistic identities was 'a process started in earlier colonial times by Christian missionaries', but it became 'central to the ideology of apartheid'. The notion of 'mother tongue was a virtually sacred tool in the construction of ethnicities', and notions of language, culture and ethnic identity became 'virtually coterminous' (de Klerk 2002, 30).

In reality, most of the indigenous languages spoken in South Africa form two continua of communication systems that are characterised by varying levels of mutual intelligibility: the Nguni group and the Sotho group. These language continua were standardised into discrete languages by English missionaries to facilitate proselytising among the indigenous population with the translation of the Bible and other religious texts (Mesthrie 2002, 16; Kamwangamalu 2001, 385). The apartheid government used these questionable linguistic boundaries to ascribe different ethnic identities and to relegate each ethnicity to a different homeland. Homelands, or Bantustans, were land reservations for black people which were given a veneer of autonomy as an attempt to legitimise the exclusion of black South Africans from civil society. De facto, these entities were puppet states of the white government (de Klerk 2002, 32).

Essentialised identities based on a rigid correlation with language were reinforced with the Bantu Education Act, which the apartheid government passed in 1954 with the explicit intent to close down English-medium schools run by missionaries because they were creating a class of educated black South Africans that could pose a threat to white supremacy (Rose and Tumner 1975, 261). These schools were replaced with government-controlled institutions which relied heavily on students' mother tongues as instruments of ideological subjugation while restricting access to English, a language which played a key role in the liberation struggle of the black nation (de Klerk 2002, 33). Among the dire legacy of Bantu Education is a pervasive scepticism towards the use of indigenous languages in education, which persists even among their native speakers (Alexander 2000, 17; Kawangamalu 2001, 394; Heugh 2000). AQ5 AQ6 AQ7

Since the transition to democracy in 1994, South Africa has engaged in a new nation-building process that has put a lot of emphasis on language policy as a means to undo the inequitable social order of the past. The new constitution acknowledges 'the link between language, culture, and development' and the need to redress a status differential among the various languages spoken in the country (Mesthrie 2006, 152). Nine indigenous languages were made official (isiZulu, isiXhosa, siSwati, isiNdebele, Sepedi, Sesotho,

Setswana, Venda and Tonga) alongside English and Afrikaans, the two former colonial languages. As for education, the new constitution proscribes that 'every person shall be entitled to instruction in the language of his or her choice where this is reasonably practicable' (Constitution of South Africa, Chapter I, Section 6, Article 5). Building on these principles, the Department of Education articulated a language policy in education that aims to 'promote additive multilingualism', and 'to develop programs for the redress of previously disadvantaged languages' (Department of Education, Government Gazette, no. 18546, 19 December 1997).

The gap between language policy and practice in South Africa is well known (Heugh 2000; Alexander 2003; Mesthrie 2006; Paxton 2009; Webb 2009; Parmegiani 2012). Contrary to what the constitution proscribes, official languages are far from enjoying 'parity of esteem' and equal treatment. While there is no doubt that inroads have been made in the promotion of African languages since 1994 (Mesthrie 2006; Deumert 2010, 15; Ndhlovu 2008, Webb et al. 2010), the gatekeeping effects of the dominance of English in South Africa are well known. The mastery of English remains a precondition for professional employment (~~Alexander 1993;~~ Heugh 2000; Paxton 2009), access to higher education (Lafon 2009) and political participation (McLaughlin 2006). AQ8

Language attitudes among black South Africans are equally complex. On the one hand, indigenous languages are highly valued as markers of identity, which remain quite essentialised (Rudwick 2008). On the other hand, they are mistrusted as languages of teaching and learning due to the hegemony of English and the legacy of Bantu Education (Moodley 2009; Parmegiani and Rudwick forthcoming). AQ9

Theoretical framework

In order to unravel the complexity of the relationship between language, power and identity in post-apartheid South Africa, I have found it useful to start from Weedon's post-structural, feminist perspective on identity construction. Weedon (1987) argues that identity is 'fluid', 'contested' and 'decentered'. It is 'fluid' in the sense that people project themselves differently as they move across time and social domains. It is 'contested' because it is inextricably related to power relations: Who we are and the way we are perceived determines what we can and what we cannot do in life. It is 'decentered' because human beings' sense of self is shaped by a multitude of factors that can pull them in different directions in different situations. In Pavlenko and Blackledge's words:

> Identities are constructed at the interstices of multiple axes, such as age, race, class, ethnicity, gender, generation, sexual orientation, geopolitical locale, institutional affiliation, and social status, whereby each aspect of identity redefines and modifies all others. Since individuals often shift and adjust ways in which they position themselves in distinct contexts, identities are best understood when approached in their entirety, rather than through consideration of a single aspect or subject position. (2004, 16)

Bhabha's (1994) post-colonial notion of 'hybridity' is a healthy reminder that it is 'theoretically innovative and politically crucial' to 'think beyond narratives of originary and initial subjectivities' defined by monolithic and deterministic conceptions of identity markers such as race, class, gender, culture and mother tongue (Benesch 2008, 1) that were taken as axiomatic during apartheid. Heller's (2007) application of hybridity to language and its relationship with identity is also useful in avoiding essentialising and deterministic theoretical traps. She argues against 'the notion that languages are, objectively speaking, whole bounded systems' that can be associated with 'whole AQ10

bounded communities'. She reminds us that 'the constant emergence of traces of different languages in the speech of individual bilinguals […] illustrate the permeability of boundaries between languages and socio-linguistic domains' and 'the impossibility of direct association between language and identity' (1–13). Indeed, there is a plethora of evidence that, especially in urban areas, the language practices of black South Africans are characterised by a great use of contact languages (Mesthrie 2002, 12) and a great use of code-switching and code-mixing (Probyn 2009), rather than by a set of discrete languages that can be identified as 'whole bounded systems'.

To explore language, power and identity in multilingual contexts such as South Africa, it is important to pay close attention to discourses about language ownership, since it is often through this concept that languages are used as identity markers. As the data will show, phrases such as 'I am Zulu' and 'Zulu is my language' can be used almost synonymously.

It is beyond a doubt that whether or not a certain language is a speaker's mother tongue plays a key role in whether or not he/she will claim ownership of the language in question. Nevertheless, it is theoretically limiting to reduce the notion of language ownership to the notion of mother tongue, or, in Faez's words, to the 'native/non-native dichotomy' (2011, 231). Numerous studies conducted in a wide range of multilingual settings have shown that this dichotomy 'falls short in capturing the complex and multifaceted nature of individuals' linguistic backgrounds and tends to misrepresent them' (Faez 2011, 232; see also Bensch 2008). A perfect case in point is the following statement made by a young black South African about his linguistic repertoire:

> My father's home language was Swazi, and my mother's home language was Tswana. But as I grew up in a Zulu-speaking area we used mainly Zulu and Swazi at home. But from my mother's side I also learnt Tswana well. In my high school I came into contact with lots of Sotho and Tswana students, so I can speak these two languages well. And of course, I know English and Afrikaans. With my friends I also use Tsotsitaal. (in Mesthrie 2002, 13)

Evidently, when looking at the relationship between language and identity among multilingual speakers, we need to adopt a notion of language ownership that is much more open, fluid and decentred than what I have termed 'the birthright paradigm' (Parmegiani 2010) or the idea that speakers can only be considered legitimate owners of *only one* language that is established once and for all at birth. According to Pennycook (2004, 2), this 'overdetermined sense of linguistic fixity' can be traced to colonialism. We have already seen the extent to which apartheid South Africa relied on static and axiomatic identity categories based on a monolithic notion of mother tongue to build its inequitable social order. It must be emphasised, though, that even today, 'the dichotomy of native vs. non-native is power driven and political', more than a meaningful 'linguistic distinction' (Faez 2011, 233). Indeed, several scholars have pointed out that this dichotomy makes less and less sense in a world where English has been appropriated by individuals and entire sociolinguistic communities outside the 'inner circle' (Kachru 1986) of countries which traditionally have been associated with native English speakers (Widdowson 1994; Canagarajah 1999; Brutt-Griffler 2002; Higgins 2003).

The work of Rampton (1990) has been particularly useful in reconceptualising language ownership (Parmegiani 2008, 2010) in a way that can do justice to the complexities of linguistic repertories in South Africa and their interplay with bi/multilingual identity constructions. Rampton (1990) does not discard notions such as 'mother tongue' and 'native language' altogether, but he argues that several factors need

to be taken into account when thinking about language ownership. 'Expertise' (Rampton 1990, 99) is indicative of the extent to which a speaker is able to exercise command of a language (in other words, how well he/she can speak the language in question). 'Loyalty' refers to the extent to which a speaker identifies with a language, and it is in turn determined by the interplay of two subfactors: 'inheritance' and 'affiliation' (Rampton 1990, 99). 'Inheritance' has to do with whether or not a speaker is born into the social group traditionally associated with the language, and it is therefore closely related to notions such as 'mother tongue' and 'native language'. 'Affiliation' (Rampton 1990, 99) refers to a speaker's desire to be associated with a language, unlike inheritance, which is a structural factor imposed by society, affiliation is agentive or the result of a speaker's choice. In the data analysis section of this paper, I will pay particular attention to how notions of 'expertise', 'inheritance', and 'affiliation' emerge implicitly in students' discourses as they claim and reject the ownership of English in their identity constructions.

Exploring language and identity at the university of Kwazulu-Natal: context and methodology

The University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) is a particularly interesting setting for exploring language and identity in the new South Africa. UKZN went from being 'for whites only' during apartheid to a racially diverse learning institution whose vision is to become 'the premier University of African scholarship' and whose mission is to achieve academic excellence while 'addressing the disadvantages, inequalities and imbalances of the past'. To fulfil its vision and mission, UKZN has been in the forefront in promoting the use of isiZulu as a medium of instruction by implementing a language policy that seeks to give isiZulu 'the same institutional and academic status of English' (LP-UKZN, 2006: 1). While there is no doubt that progress has been made on this front (Balfour 2010; Rudwick and Parmegiani 2012), the mastery of academic literacy in English remains a precondition for academic success at UKZN. The pressure to attain high levels of English proficiency on a multilingual and multiracial campus opens up interesting questions for identity constructions. These questions are particularly interesting for black students from disadvantaged backgrounds, who, in most cases, did not have the opportunity to develop the same levels of English proficiency of more privileged black students, who were able to attend much better resourced multiracial schools that used to be reserved for 'whites only' during apartheid.

The data discussed in the following section was part of a larger study (Parmegiani 2009) aimed at investigating language attitudes and practices among UKZN students through the use of a survey, ethnographic observations and interviews. This paper focuses on a section of the interview data in order to explore the discourses students deployed to claim and reject identities based on language. The data analysis is driven by the following questions: How do students use the notion of language ownership to claim and reject identities based on the languages they speak? What discourses do they use to position themselves vis-à-vis the ownership of English and their mother tongue (isiZulu)? What role do Rampton's notions of expertise, 'loyalty', 'inheritance' and 'affiliation' play in these discourses, even if these concepts are not explicitly mentioned? What tensions and contradictions emerge as bi/multilingual speakers question their identity constructions on the basis of language? What are the implications of these tensions and contradictions for power relations and the process of democratic transformation in post-apartheid South Africa?

All the participants of this study were recruited from the Access Programme, a bridge programme designed to increase the presence of students from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds. Access students do not have the necessary requirements to enter UKZN through the regular admission procedures; however, they have shown the potential for academic success by receiving scores on their high school exit examination that are well above average in the secondary schools where they graduated.

The data discussed in this study was collected with the approval of UKZN's ethical clearance committee. It began with a five-month period of ethnographic observations during which I interacted as a participant observer with a group of 25 Access students while they took English Language and Academic Literacy development classes. At the end of this observation period, there was a process of individual interviews with five students who were selected according to the following criteria. First of all, I chose students who seemed eager to participate in conversations about language and identity. As Seidman points out, when looking for respondents, 'the major criteria for appropriateness is whether the subject of the researcher's study is central to the participant's experience' (2005, 39). Among these students, I looked for a group who would represent the broadest possible spectrum of positions on the issue of the ownership of English: students who strongly rejected it, students who embraced it enthusiastically and students who fell somewhere in the middle. All the students interviewed are native isiZulu speakers. To protect their anonymity, they will be referred to through the use of pseudonyms.

There were two rounds of interviews. In the first round, I drew on life history (Atkinson 2002) and in-depth (Johnson 2002) techniques in order to allow discourses about language and identity to emerge from students' recollection of their life vicissitudes. My interview schedule was flexible to accommodate the narrative flow that students produced in response to my questions. In the second round of interviews, I drew on simulated recall techniques (Nuan, 1992) by asking students to delve into some of the statements they had made in the previous round.

Data analysis

All the students I interviewed saw an inextricable link between their identity and their mother tongue that was established at birth. This foregrounds Rampton's notion of 'inheritance' as a determinant of language ownership. In some cases, students describe this link by resorting to biological metaphors. A male student, whom I will refer to with the pseudonym of A.W., describes isiZulu as 'the language that my mother breastfeeded [*sic*] me'; for April, a female student, it is a language that is 'in your genes' and for Bongani, a male student, 'it is a language that I have in me since I was born'. It is interesting how these metaphoric references to a biological link between language and identity resemble Ngugi's premises for rejecting English as a means for literary expression: 'no man or woman can chose their biological identity' (1981, 1) and 'the choice of language and the use to which language is being put is central to people's definition of themselves' (1981, 3). According to his theory of 'colonisation of the mind', the extensive use of English on the part of Africans creates a mismatch between a speakers' natural language and their 'biological identity' that results in 'colonial alienation', and ultimately, subjugation (Ngugi 1981, 18).

While none of the students I interviewed made explicit reference to Ngugi, two of them used a rhetoric that was very similar to Ngugi's theory to reject the possibility that a black South African might claim the ownership of English or any other language besides the one that is associated with his/her tribal identity. A.W. explains the impossibility of owning an additional language with the following claim:

> I am a Zulu; I am a Zulu speaker. The Zulu language is mine because I learned it from the day I started speaking. That was the language I was open [*sic*] to. It will be impossible to say I own another language, like English, for example.

When I pointed out to him that he had mentioned that he finds it easier to carry out certain tasks in English, such as reading a book, and therefore it could be argued that in terms of 'expertise' he might own English, his response was that it does not matter how well you know or do not know a language because:

> your language defines where you come from and your culture. So if I can say English is my own language, it means I am living my life according to the English culture. Your language separates you from other cultures and other races. It defines who you are.

For A.W., constructing identities outside the parameters of the ethnolinguistic community into which a speaker is born results in an identity loss, rather than a redefinition of it. A.W. believes that if you do not want to separate yourself from other cultures or races, or if you do not want to be defined by just one language, 'then you lost [*sic*] your identity: you don't know who you are anymore'. According to his vision, it is a person's accent that polices the borders of this inherited one-to-one relationship between language and identity:

> You can learn a language and be fluent in it, but you can't gain an accent. The accent it links with the mother tongue. I can't gain an English accent because I am not an English.

When I asked A.W. to consider the possibility that he could have spoken English without a black Southern African accent, if, for example, his parents had sent him to a white school from an early age, his response was:

> I would hate myself. Seriously, I would hate myself. And I will probably question my parents for it once I'm grown up […]. If your parents are Zulu, you have to be Zulu. There is no way out.

Bongani constructs a relationship between his Zulu identity and his ownership of isiZulu that is very similar to A.W.'s. Bongani sees claiming ownership of an additional language as:

> a mistake, because if you give up your language, you give up your identity […]. You can't give away your heritage, no matter how educated you are. You can have your doctorate in English, but your mother tongue is more than your doctorate.

Like A.W. and Bongani, April sees her mother tongue, isiZulu, as a fundamental marker of identity, but unlike them, she does not go out of her way to exclude English from her identity construction. On the contrary, she is just as vocal in staking her claim to English as she is in staking her claim to isiZulu. Her claim is based on the 'expertise' she acquired:

> No one can come to me and say something in English that I wouldn't understand. I know most of the things in English, and I am able to understand people whenever they speak, in the news and everywhere. I can write it. I can speak it. It's part of me now. Even though I know my Zulu, but I know my English as well. So it's like, my English and my Zulu.

Ingenious and Prosperity (respectively, a male and a female student) also see English as playing an important part in their identity construction. Ingenious believes that a

speaker's own language is 'the language you use the most, the language you like, the language that you see as very, very useful'. His construction foregrounds language practices, 'loyalty' ('the language you like') and Peirce's (1995) notion of investment ('the language you see as very, very useful'). To stake his claim to the ownership of English, he juxtaposes his language practices, his investment and his loyalty to the notion that languages can only be owned through 'inheritance':

> As I said to you, I use both languages, and English is very, very useful to me. It's the language that I communicate with most of the people. The language I am able to make friends with many people. That's why I use it as my own language […]. It's not because my mother spoke to me in both languages. I believe that your own language is a language that you like the most and that dominates many things for you. It makes things possible for you, so English is one of those languages.

Prosperity goes even further in questioning exclusive claims on language ownership based on birthright by pointing out that 'people sound very possessive' when they refer to a language as their own. While acknowledging that people do inherit languages from their parents, she stresses that ownership can be the result of a successful process of appropriation that happens later in life:

> A language has its own indigenous speakers, but what about the other people that are learning that language and wanting to use that language? I think you can say a language is yours when you are an indigenous speaker, but you can also say that a language is yours when you have mastered the language, when you are able to speak the language.

As a second-language speaker, like April, she highlights the 'expertise' she gained as the result of her struggle to appropriate English: 'English has become a part of me because I strived hard in mastering it, with the help of teachers, who were teaching it from primary until varsity. And my family have contributed a lot'.

It is important to point out that neither Prosperity nor Ingenious have any intention of supplanting Zulu with English. In fact, these students also see their mother tongue as an important marker of identity. For Prosperity your mother tongue 'determines where you come from, it determines who you are', but she also believes that 'any language is a valuable part of you'. Hence, her language 'loyalties' are not mutually exclusive. The way she describes her language practices reflects her identity construction as a bilingual speaker who has appropriated an additional language without disowning her mother tongue:

> I have a huge background of Zulu. I speak Zulu at home with my parents. I speak Zulu with people who don't understand English. I use Zulu on a daily basis *and* I use English on a daily basis. I don't think I can lose my Zulu. I use both equally.

Ingenious is even more passionate in defending his ownership of isiZulu. As an aspiring multilingual, he sees a contradiction in losing one language to acquire another:

> I would love to use my Zulu wherever I go because I would like to know many languages, so if I lose my Zulu that will mean I am losing another language. In fact I am trying to learn other languages as well [.]. You have to know as many languages as possible. You don't have to lose some languages.

He thinks it is 'stupid' that some speakers do not take pride in their mother tongues, and he gets 'very, very angry' when Zulu speakers refuse to speak isiZulu with each other.

He does not see his love for English as being detrimental to the love for his mother tongue, and he sees the need to maintain the vitality of isiZulu as his personal responsibility:

> I love English, but I also have to do my best to preserve my own language. I don't love English only. It's not like loving a person. There are many people who speak even more than ten languages. There are many people who speak all eleven South African languages. So how can you fail to speak two or three?

A very interesting contradiction emerges in the discourses of A.W. and Bongani, the two students who strongly reject the possibility of owning any language other than the one associated with a speaker's ethnic identity, when they are asked to consider the language shift to English that the Indian community went through in South Africa.[1] For Bongani:

> English as a native language of Indians, it is questionable. According to my knowledge, they have their own language and they gave up their language many years ago. Their language has died. I will not consider them native English speakers because even if you listen to their accent of English you can understand that they are visitors in this language. Even if it's the only language they know, because the way they speak it is different to the way white people speak the language.

Similarly, A.W. excludes South African native English speakers of Indian descent from the legitimate ownership of English because their language variety deviates from his conception of 'white English' standards:

> With Indians, what I have seen from high school and even here, they speak English, but they are not best speakers. Their accent is not English. There is an Indian language influence, so they use words incorrectly, like 'come quickly quickly'. White people don't do this.

Conversely, when I asked both of these students if they would like to use English less, if they could live in a sociolinguistic environment in which they could empower themselves using exclusively their mother tongue, they rejected this idea in no uncertain terms with discourses about the ownership of English in South Africa that are antithetical to the ones they used to hold on to their essentialised conceptions of language and ethnic identity. Bongani's answer is resounding:

> No, we should keep English. English is our official language. This is an African language because we have English speakers in Africa. It is Indian. Nowadays, English is their mother tongue. English is an African language. It's everybody's language.

A.W. makes a similar claim by reflecting on the language practices of fellow South Africans. After he spent a period of time living in a racially integrated suburb, he stopped seeing English as a white man's language: 'I took English as everybody's language because most of the time, most people, even me, are using it'. He also expressed a concern about what would happen to the native speakers of the other official African languages if he could have unlimited opportunities for socio-economic empowerment in his mother tongue: 'What about the other languages? What about Xhosa? What about Sotho? No, South Africa is a very diverse country'.

Conclusion

The data that emerged from the interviews confirmed the importance of isiZulu as a marker of identity found in other studies (Rudwick 2004; Paxton 2009). Some students AQ14

include English in their identity constructions by claiming it as their own language on the basis of their 'expertise', their language practices and/or their 'affiliation' with this language. For this group of students, language ownership does not have to be restricted to one language, and claiming English as part of who they are does not pose a threat to their sense of themselves as Zulu and African. Other students reject the possibility of owning any language besides their mother tongue on the basis of discourses that posit an essentialised relationship between language and identity that is established at birth once and for all. According to these discourses, claiming the ownership of additional languages would disrupt this relationship and result in an 'identity loss', rather than a redefinition of identity.

Students who essentialise the relationship between language and identity also bring a disquieting racial element into the equation when asked to consider the language shift to English which has made the Indian community of South Africa mainly native-English speaking. This racial element was used by these students to deny the legitimacy of the ownership of English of the Indian community because their language variety differs from the white variety, which is unquestionably taken as the standard. The same students resort to antithetical discourses when asked to contemplate a sociolinguistic scenario where they could empower themselves by using exclusively their mother tongue. They reject this possibility by constructing English as a pan-African language of national unity that is playing a crucial role in the post-apartheid nation-building process. As a language that is helping bridge racial and ethnic divisions from the past, even for these students, English becomes 'everybody's language'.

It would be untoward to suggest that students like A.W. and Bongani are wrong because their conception of language and identity does not conform to the theoretical framework adopted in this paper. Individuals ought to have maximum freedom in their processes of identity construction, and it would be problematic to draw on feminist, post-colonial and post-structural theory to restrict this freedom. Nevertheless, there is cause for concern when, in their discourses, students mention notions of 'identity loss' and 'self-hatred' as consequences of blurring the boundaries of ethnolinguistic identities that the apartheid government relied on so heavily to keep South Africa's population separate and unequal. First of all, self-hatred is always a cause for concern, but when there is the possibility that this hatred might be rooted in the process of stigmatisation that many black students face for allegedly sounding 'white' (Rudwick 2008; McKinney 2007) or for forming friendships with students of other racial groups ~~(Vincent 2008)~~, it is disconcerting. AQ15

The idea that English can only be legitimately owned by the racial group that benefited from centuries of white supremacy is also a cause for great concern. Given the extent to which English functions as a gatekeeper in South Africa, it is easy to see how restricting the ownership of the language of power to the racial group that has been in power puts a brake on the process of democratic transformation. Making English 'everybody's language' so that more and more people can harness its power is an essential part of this process. Transferring some of that power to African languages is no less important and their ownership should also be opened up to members of other racial groups. AQ16

Note

1. While heritage languages from India have not completely disappeared and still function as markers of identity, the Indian community of South Africa generally uses mainly English as a home language (Paxton 2009, 85; Mesthrie 2002, 161–17 AQ17

References

Alexander, N. 2002. "Linguistic Rights, Language Planning and Democracy in Post-apartheid South Africa." In *Language Policy: Lessons From Global Models*, edited by S. Baker, 116–129. Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute of International Studies.

Alexander, N. 2003. "The African Renaissance and the Use of African Languages in Tertiary Education." University of Cape Town, *PRAESA Occasional Papers*, 13.

Atkinson, R. 2002. "The Life History Interview." In *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, edited by J. Gubrium and J. Holstein, 121–139. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Benesch, S. 2008. "'Generation 1.5'" and Its Discourses of Partiality: A Critical Analysis." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 7 (3–4): 294–311. doi:10.1080/15348450802237954.

Bhabha, H. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Brutt-Griffler, J. 2002. *World English. A study of its Development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. 1999. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Constitution of South Africa. 1996.

DeKlerk, G. 2002. "Mother Tongue Education in South Africa: The Weight of History." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 154: 29–46.

Department of Education, *Government* Gazette, no. 18546, 19 December 1997.

Deumert, A. 2010. "Tracking the Demographics of (Urban) Language Shift – an Analysis of South African Census Data." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31 (1). doi:10.1080/01434630903215125.

Faez, F. 2011. "Reconceptualizing the Native/Nonnative Speaker Dichotomy." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 10 (4): 231–249. doi:10.1080/15348458.2011.598127.

Heller, M. 2007. "Bilingualism as Ideology and Practice." In *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*, edited by M. Heller, 1–22. New York: Macmillan.

Heugh, K. 2000. "The Case Against Bilingual and Multilingual Education." University of Cape Town, *PRAESA Occasional Papers*, 6.

Higgins, C. 2003. "Ownership" of English in the Outer Circle: An Alternative to the NS-NNS Dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly* 37 (4): 615–645. doi:10.2307/3588215.

Johnson, J. 2002. "In-depth Interviewing." In *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, edited by J. Gubrium, and J. Holstein, 103–119. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kachru, B. 1986. *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions, Models of Non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. 2001. "The language planning situation in South Africa." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 2 (4): 361–445. doi:10.1080/14664200108668031.

Lafon, M. 2009. "The Impact of Language on Educational Access in South Africa." The Educational Policy Unit at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa. *Create Pathways Research Monographs* 24.

McKinney, C. 2007. "'If I speak English, does it make me less black anyway?' Race and English in South African desegregated schools." *English Academy Review* 24 (2): 6–24. doi:10.1080/10131750701452253.

McLaughlin, E. 2006. Language, Democracy, and Governance in South Africa. In *The Politics of Language in South Africa*, edited by V. Webb and T. Du Plessis, 119–137. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mesthrie, R. 2002. "South Africa: A Socioliguistic Overview." In *Language in South Africa*, edited by R. Mesthrie, 11–25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mesthrie, R. 2006. "Language, Transformation and Development: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of Post-apartheid South African Language Policy and Practice." *Southern African Linguistic and Applied Linguistics Studies* 24 (2): 151–163. doi:10.2989/16073610609486414.

Ndhlovu, F. 2008. "The Conundrums of Language Policy and Politics in South Africa and Zimbabwe." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 28 (1): 59–80. doi:10.1080/07268600701877499.

Ngugi, W. 1981. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House.

Nuan, D. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parmegiani, A. 2008. "Language Ownership in Multilingual Settings: Exploring Attitudes at the University of KwaZulu-Natal." Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics 38.

Parmegiani, A. 2009. "The Power of English and Academic Literacy: Students' Perceptions and Theoretical, Political, and Pedagogical Implications. A Case Study of Students at the University

of KwaZulu-Natal." Unpublished dissertation, The Graduate Center of the City University of New York.
Parkinson, J., and A. Crouch. 2011. "Education, Language and Identity Amongst Students at a South African University." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 10 (2): 83–98. doi:10.1080/15348458.2011.563644.
Parmegiani, A. 2010. "Reconceptualizing Language Ownership: A Case Study of Language Practices and Attitudes at the University of KwaZulu-Natal." *Language Learning Journal* 38 (3): 359–378. doi:10.1080/09571736.2010.511771.
Parmegiani, A. 2012. "Language, Power and Transformation in South Africa: A Critique of Language Rights Discourse." *Transformation* 78 (1): 74–97. doi:10.1353/trn.2012.0042.
Parmegiani, A., and S. Rudwick. forthcoming. "An Exploration of Students' Attitudes." In *Multilingual Teaching and Learning Innovations in Higher Education in South Africa*, edited by L. Hibbert and C. Van der Walt. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Pavlenko, A., and A. Blackledge. 2004. "Introduction: New Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts." In *Negotiation of Identity in Multilingual Contexts*, edited by A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge, 1–33. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Paxton, M. I. J. 2009. "'It's easy to learn when you using your home language but with English you need to start learning language before you get to the concept': bilingual concept development in an English medium university in South Africa." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30 (4): 345–359. doi:10.1080/01434630902780731.
Pennycook, A. 2004. "Performativity and Language Studies." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 1 (1): 1–19. doi:10.1207/s15427595cils0101_1.
Probyn, M. 2009. " 'Smuggling the Vernacular into the Classroom': Conflicts and Tensions in Classroom Codeswitching in Township/Rural Schools in South Africa." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12 (2): 123–136. doi:10.1080/13670050802153137.
Rampton, M. B. H. 1990. Displacing the Native Speaker: Expertise, Affiliation, and Inheritance. *ELT Journal* 44 (2): 97–101. doi:10.1093/elt/44.2.97.
Rose, B., and R. Tumner. 1975. *Documents in South African Education*. Johannesburg: Donker.
Rudwick, S. 2004. "Zulu, We Need It for Our Culture: Umlazi Adolescents in the Post-apartheid State." *Southern African Applied Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 22: 159–152.
Rudwick, S. 2008. "Coconuts and Oreos: English-speaking Zulu People in a South African Township." *World Englishes* 27 (1): 101–116. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2008.00538.x.
Rudwick, S., and A. Parmegiani. 2013. "Divided loyalties: Zulu vis-à-vis English at the University of KwaZulu-Natal." *Language Matters* 44 (3): 89–107. doi:10.1080/10228195.2013.840012.
Seidman, I. 2005. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Webb, V. 2009. "Multilingualism in South Africa: The Change to Below." *Language Matters* 40 (2).
Webb, V., M. Lafon, and P. Pare. 2010. "Bantu Languages in Education in South Africa: The Absent Owner." *Language Learning Journal* 38 (3): 273–292. doi:10.1080/09571730903208389.
Weedon, C. 1987. *Feminist Practice and Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Widdowson, H. 1994. The Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 28 (2): 377–389. doi:10.2307/3587438.