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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the causes behind the differences in proficiency in the North Indian language Gujarati among heritage learners of Gujarati in three diaspora locations. In particular, I focus on whether there is a relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic and cultural identity. Previous studies have reported divergent findings. Some have found a positive relationship (e.g., Cho, 2000; Kang & Kim, 2011; Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang, 2001; Soto, 2002), whereas others found no correlation (e.g., C. L. Brown, 2009; Jo, 2001; Smolicz, 1992), or identified only a partial relationship (e.g., Mah, 2005). Only a few studies have addressed this question by studying one community in different transnational locations (see, for example, Canagarajah, 2008, 2012a, 2012b). The current study addresses this matter by examining data from members of the same ethnic group in similar educational settings in three multi-ethnic and multilingual cities.

The results of this study are based on a survey consisting of questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and proficiency tests with 135 participants. Participants are Gujarati heritage language learners from the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa, who are either current students or recent graduates of a Gujarati School. Despite similar amounts of instruction in the Gujarati language, Gujarati proficiency varied drastically, with some participants performing at near native-like levels, and others at beginner levels. To understand these differences, I apply a mixed methods approach by quantitatively examining the extent to which the differences in Gujarati proficiency can be explained by identity and demographic factors, as well as linguistic experiences/history, and by qualitatively analyzing participants’ personal insights on these topics.

Findings show that strength of identification with Gujarati ethnicity and culture is partially significant in explaining variations in language proficiency. In addition, three factors were significantly associated with language proficiency among the participants: amount of language use, language input/exposure, and knowledge of other North Indian languages.

The current study has important implications for understanding heritage language learning as well as ethnic identity formation and maintenance. Furthermore, it provides an original contribution to the field by performing a multi-site study to investigate the varying proficiencies among heritage language learners.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Why do we speak in Gujarati? Is it because our grandparents can’t understand English very well? Is it because when at home our parents insist we speak in Gujarati to them? Or do you feel as though it’s part of who we are?

(K. Shah, 2011)

Does speaking one’s heritage language Gujarati make someone automatically Gujarati? Can someone still be considered Gujarati even if he/she does not speak Gujarati well or not at all? My own experiences have led me to ask these very questions. As a British Gujarati born in the U.K., I hold a British passport and I am a British citizen. I have been educated in the English language, I have many British friends, and I am continually exposed to British culture and the British way of life. Like many of my British friends in their late twenties, but unlike the majority of my Indian friends, I am not yet married. At the same time, I also speak Gujarati at home and attended a community-run weekend Gujarati School for ten years during my childhood to become literate in the Gujarati language. I occasionally celebrate ethnic festivals and religious holidays at home or at the temple and wear a sari (a garment traditionally worn by Indian women) when attending community gatherings. I drink home-made chai (Indian tea) several times a day and eat Gujarati food on a daily basis. From a young age, I have been educated about the importance of adhering to ethnic morals and values, such as using respectful address when communicating with elders. So who am I? Am I British or Gujarati? Or am I some sort of mixture of the two? How do others view me? How do I define and label myself? British? Indian? British Asian? British Indian? Indobrit1?

1Indobrit is a term coined by Mukadam in 1999 (http://www.indobrit.com/index.htm), and is used to describe “individuals of Indian cultural background and British nationality” (Mukadam, 2003, p. 45). According to Mukadam (2003), “this term is merely a means of identifying individuals who have a common trajectory and should not be viewed as being a fixed category that is imposed on individuals” (p. 45).
With many striking differences between the immigrant and host communities and with exposure to British and Gujarati societies, it is not surprising that second generation “British Gujaratis” like myself may have difficulties in knowing who we really are and how to label ourselves. Furthermore, identity more generally speaking is not a fixed category, but it is rather fluid and multifaceted (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Bucholtz, 1995; De Fina, Schiffrin, & Bamberg, 2006).

This dissertation is centered on the Gujarati diaspora community. Gujarati is a language of the Indo-European family, spoken originally in the state of Gujarat which is located on the west coast of India. There are currently about 47 million Gujarati speakers worldwide (V. Edwards, 2007), the majority of whom (approximately 46 million) are located in India (“Statement 1: Abstract of speakers’ strength of languages and mother tongues”, 2001). However, there are a number of longstanding Gujarati communities in various locations around the world. This dissertation focuses on identity formation and development among second and subsequent generations of Gujaratis living in three continents. I define second generation as those who were born and have citizenship in the host country, and who have at least one parent who was born elsewhere and was an immigrant to the host country. In this dissertation, I take a multi-pronged approach to examine how second and subsequent generations of Gujarati people living outside of India identify themselves and how this relates to their proficiency in their heritage language. In particular, my study investigates connections between language proficiency and identity among heritage learners of Gujarati who have received similar amounts and types of Gujarati language instruction in Gujarati language programs in the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa. Having attended a Gujarati language program in the U.K. myself, my own experience of studying my heritage language through this type of program has led me to pursue the theme of this dissertation. As a second generation Gujarati in London, I have grown up being completely immersed in Gujarati, which is the first language of my parents. Until the age of three, the only language I knew and spoke was Gujarati, despite living in a country where the official language is English. Once I began attending school, I increasingly heard and used English. At around this time, my parents sent me to a Saturday Gujarati School to formally learn Gujarati. There I learnt to read and write in my home language, Gujarati, while simultaneously improving my spoken Gujarati at a time when English was slowly becoming more and more dominant in my life. Attending a Saturday Gujarati School not only helped to reinforce my linguistic skills in Gujarati, it also provided me with an opportunity to socialize with other Gujarati children of my age, to take part in Indian cultural activities, and to learn about my religion. Since completing Gujarati School and especially after leaving London and moving to Washington DC for graduate school, the opportunities I had to use Gujarati diminished and my proficiency in Gujarati consequently decreased. I consider my current proficiency in Gujarati to
be high intermediate, but English is undoubtedly the language in which I am most proficient. I have found that narratives like these are told by many heritage learners of Gujarati, “who 1) were exposed to a family language in childhood, 2) switched to another language that became dominant, but 3) still have some competency in the home language” (Kagan, 2009, p. 2, based on Polinsky & Kagan, 2007).

The present study is intended to contribute to the literature on heritage learners of Gujarati. Two community-run Gujarati schools in the U.K. have been studied in depth in two influential projects funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (Creese et al., 2007; Martin, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Creese, 2004). The present study adds to the literature on heritage learners attending Gujarati schools by focusing on the variation in language proficiency of such learners. Among my peers alone, I have noticed that less than ten years after they completed the program, their proficiency in Gujarati varied dramatically, with some performing at near native-like levels and others at beginner levels. This is the case despite each of them having received similar amounts and types of Gujarati language instruction and despite having had similar opportunities to hear and use the Gujarati language in their daily lives during the period of instruction. To understand these vast differences in language ability, the relationships among ethnic and cultural identity and proficiency with current students and recent graduates of a Gujarati School in each of the three sites are considered. Furthermore, the relationship between language proficiency and other variables are explored to determine the variables that are most influential in explaining variations in language proficiency. A pilot study of graduate students of a Gujarati School in the U.K. found a clear trend for speakers who associated key aspects of their identities with Indian cultural norms and values rather than British ones to have higher proficiency in Gujarati. The converse is also true: those whose overall profiles suggested they identified as British rather than Indian had lower proficiency (S. Shah, 2010). Although the educational structure for Gujarati is similar in all three countries, the sociocultural contexts of Singapore and South Africa are quite different from that of the U.K. Therefore, gathering data on Singaporean and South African Gujarati heritage learners will enable comparisons to be made with the U.K. results and will hopefully highlight how differences in identity formation might impact language proficiency.

1.2 Background to the Problem

The Gujarati community has its origins in the state of Gujarat, which is located on the west coast of India and has a size of 121,803 square miles (Jha, 2011, p. 290). Gujarati is the official language of Gujarat. While the majority of Gujarati speakers are located in India, large Gujarati diaspora
communities have developed outside of India due to long-standing traditions of migration that Gujaratis, renowned as traders and businesspeople, have to destinations around the world. Despite long-standing traditions of migration, Gujarati is generally well-maintained in diaspora settings (e.g., U. K. Desai, 1997 [South Africa]; Mugler & Mamtora, 2004 [Fiji]; M. L. Roberts, 1999 [New Zealand]; Sridhar, 1993 [U.S.]). Various factors have enabled the Gujarati diaspora communities to maintain their language and culture outside of their homeland. These include Gujarati households in the diaspora traditionally being composed of three generations, which often includes monolingual Gujarati grandparents, and Gujaratis generally marrying within their community and sometimes even within their sub-caste (Oonk, 2007, p. 157; K. Shah, 2007, p. 118). However, the newer generations of Gujaratis in the diaspora seem to be gradually shifting away from their heritage language and sometimes even their heritage culture (Oonk, 2004, 2007). This situation is not unique to the Gujarati community and has been reported for many migrant communities, such as the Chinese in Britain (Wei, 1994), the Dutch in New Zealand (Folmer, 1992), and the Hungarian in Australia (Clyne & Kipp, 1997).

Factors that have been found to greatly contribute to language maintenance or shift among the Gujarati community in the diaspora include language use (Lieberson & McCabe, 1982; Stubbs, 1985; Wilding, 1981), attitudes of the community (Mercer, Mercer, & Mears, 1979), attitudes of the host society (e.g., Swann, 1985), and heritage language education (Creese, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Martin, 2006; Kenner, Creese, & Francis, 2008; Martin et al., 2004). Studies on different linguistic communities in the diaspora have highlighted heritage language schools as one important way in which ethnic language and culture can be preserved (Otcu, 2010 on Turkish language schools in New York City; Chinen & Tucker, 2005 on Japanese language schools in Los Angeles; Oriyama, 2010 on Japanese language schools in Australia). See Section 2.2 for a more in-depth discussion on heritage language schools.

To date, comprehensive studies on Gujarati heritage language education appear to have been conducted only in the U.K. Two important ESRC-funded projects on heritage language schools (Creese et al., 2007; Martin et al., 2004) examined in depth two Gujarati Schools in Leicester and showed the significance of heritage language education for developing and maintaining ethnic languages and identities in the diaspora. See Section 2.2 for a discussion of some of the key findings from these two projects. However, no study to date has explored the variation in proficiency that exists among Gujarati heritage learners who attend heritage language schools.

Previous studies that have attempted to explain variation in proficiency levels among heritage learners of other languages in terms of strength of identification with heritage ethnicity have reported divergent findings. Many studies identified a positive relationship between heritage ethnic
identity and heritage language ability and/or fluency (e.g., Cho, 2000; Kang & Kim, 2011; Phinney et al., 2001; Soto, 2002), but others have not found a correlation between ethnic identity and heritage language proficiency (e.g., C. L. Brown, 2009; Jo, 2001; Smolick, 1992) or found only a partial relationship (e.g., Mah, 2005). Similarly, studies which have addressed this issue with heritage learner groups in heritage school settings have also reported conflicting findings with regard to strength of ethnic identification (see, for example, Chinen & Tucker, 2005 vs. Oriyama, 2010). In addition, the ways in which strength of ethnic identification and heritage language ability have been evaluated also vary from study to study. From these divergent findings on the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity, it can be said that the ability to speak the heritage language may be aided by having meaningful connections and identifying with one’s ethnic group. However, it is not certain whether a positive orientation to one’s heritage ethnic identity is sufficient to ensure high levels of heritage language proficiency for all ethnic groups. Given the unresolved issues and the conflicting findings from previous studies, there is a need for further studies that examine the relationship between language proficiency and ethnic identity among heritage learners who learn their ancestral language in a heritage language program.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

As mentioned in Section 1.1, proficiency in Gujarati varies significantly among my peers who are recent graduates of a Gujarati School in London. Some of us possess native-like skills in the language, whereas others are at beginner levels. This is puzzling given the similar amount and type of Gujarati language instruction and exposure we all had. The causes behind such differences in Gujarati proficiency are not well understood in spite of a number of studies having been conducted with Gujarati speakers in the diaspora (see, for example, Creese et al., 2007, 2006; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; U. K. Desai, 1992, 1997; Kenner, 2000; Lieberson & McCabe, 1982; Martin et al., 2004; Martin, Bhatt, Bhujani, & Creese, 2006; Mercer et al., 1979; Mugler & Mamotora, 2004; Oonk, 2007; M. L. Roberts, 1999; Sridhar, 1993; Wilding, 1981).

While the younger generations of Gujaratis are generally shifting to the more dominant languages of the society they live in (Lieberson & McCabe, 1982; Oonk, 2007; Wilding, 1981), Gujarati is nonetheless still well maintained in some diaspora settings (U. K. Desai, 1992, 1997; Mugler & Mamotora, 2004; M. L. Roberts, 1999; Sridhar, 1993). One important means by which Gujarati is being maintained outside of India is through language instruction in heritage language schools. Such schools provide a space for heritage learners to develop language skills and ethnic cultural identity (Creese et al., 2007, 2006; Martin et al., 2004).
With most research on heritage language acquisition having thus far been conducted in the U.S., and with few studies on Gujarati heritage language learning, the most comprehensive ones having been conducted with Gujarati heritage learners in England (Creese et al., 2007, 2006; Martin et al., 2004), there is a need to expand and conduct studies with other Gujarati diaspora communities. In addition, most studies that have typically examined variation in heritage language proficiency have tended to focus on one community in one location (e.g., C. L. Brown, 2009; Chinen & Tucker, 2005; Kang & Kim, 2011) or several communities in one location (e.g., Mah, 2005; Phinney et al., 2001; Smolicz, 1992). Other studies have focused on speakers in one location who speak different dialects of the same heritage language (e.g., Albirini, 2013). But few studies have focused on the same ethnic community in different locations (see, for example, Canagarajah, 2008, 2012a, 2012b on the new identities in English for Tamil diaspora communities in London, Toronto, and California). My study will address these gaps by comparing Gujarati heritage learners in different countries and continents. More specifically, through a multi-site analysis with the same ethnic minority group in similar educational settings, I will aim to ascertain how differences in identity formation and degree of assimilation into the dominant culture might impact proficiency.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the causes behind the variation in Gujarati proficiency among heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents, with a particular emphasis on whether there is a relationship among heritage language ability and ethnic and cultural identity. With only a few studies having addressed this question by studying one community in different transnational locations (see, for example, Canagarajah, 2008, 2012a, 2012b), my study aims to address this matter by performing a fine-grained analysis and focusing on one ethnic group in three different multi-ethnic and multilingual cities around the world. Such a study can, I believe, achieve a number of goals. It can help to explain the differences in speaker proficiency, add to our general understanding and knowledge of heritage language learning and ethnic identity formation, and illustrate how differences in identity formation, acculturation, and assimilation into the host society may impact proficiency. I address these issues through a mixed methods approach by quantitatively examining the extent to which the proportion of variation in proficiency among Gujarati heritage learners can be explained by selected identity and demographic factors, as well as linguistic experiences/history, and by qualitatively analyzing participants’ personal insights on these topics.
1.5 Research Questions

With the above issues in mind, the present investigation was guided by the following research questions:

**RQ1.** What role does identity play in determining heritage language ability? More specifically:

**RQ1a.** Is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

**RQ1b.** Is the local context a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

**RQ1c.** Does current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school influence the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

**RQ2.** Besides identity, what quantitative evidence exists for a relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and demographic factors and linguistic experiences/history? More specifically, is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and the following factors:

- Country
- School status
- Age
- Gender
- Parents’ birthplace
- Living in a three-generational household
- Parents’ L1
- Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends, and vice versa)
- Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)
- Knowledge of other languages
- Gujarati School experiences (i.e., number of years at Gujarati School, feelings about going to Gujarati School, reasons for going to Gujarati School, additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School)

**RQ3.** Based on qualitative evidence, what factors underlie the relationship between language proficiency and the factors mentioned in RQs 1 and 2? What other factors might affect language proficiency?
1.6 Significance of the Study

Growing up in a multicultural and multilingual environment enriches an individual’s life and makes acquiring native-like language skills in other languages generally easier and quicker. At the same time, individuals who grow up with two or more languages bridge different cultures, languages, and histories. The personal, cognitive, academic, and societal benefits of knowing a second language have been highlighted by a number of researchers (e.g., King & Mackey, 2007; Marcos, 1998). Heritage language learners are in a unique position in having a distinctive linguistic and cultural advantage compared to traditional foreign language learners (Gambhir, 2008). However, the dominant mainstream languages of society, English being one of them, overshadow heritage languages and shift the focus in everyday life to these dominant languages. This makes the task of preserving heritage languages among heritage speaker populations difficult. Furthermore, parents may be misinformed about issues related to bilingualism and hold beliefs that are not supported by existing research (De Houwer, 1999; King & Fogle, 2006), for example, parents believing that children would experience delays in language learning as a result of a bilingual environment. In addition, linguistic minorities often face pressure to abandon their cultural heritage, including their family language, for a number of external reasons, such as the need to overcome discrimination and be accepted by the majority culture. As a relatively ‘new’ field of study (Polinsky & Kagan, 2007, cited in Montrul, 2012, p. 1), the investigation of heritage language acquisition promises to deepen our knowledge and allow various stakeholders in society to make the most of the unique position of heritage language learners and ensure that they reach high levels of proficiency in their heritage language. This in turn can aid in enriching the dominant society and can contribute to an increasingly multilingual world.

One aim of this study is to determine the key factors in how to successfully transmit and maintain the Gujarati heritage language and culture. This study performs a fine-grained analysis of one ethnic group in different locations and demonstrates which components influence identity formation and heritage language fluency. In addition, it investigates the role of various stakeholders and institutions in heritage language development and maintenance (governments, language educators, community members, family members, peers, and individuals themselves), for example, the role of the government in implementing language policies and the role of family members in using the heritage language in the home. Furthermore, the evidence gathered from this study is intended as support and guidance for parents, heritage language instructors, and policy makers to allow them to better assess methodologies in maintaining heritage languages in general. More
specifically, this study will illustrate whether a strong sense of ethnic identity is related to success in heritage language ability.

1.7 Organization of the Chapters

This dissertation is structured around 7 chapters. Chapter 2 contextualizes the present study by reviewing the relevant existing literature on the topic. It provides important background information on the Gujarati community, and more specifically on the sociolinguistic and linguistic situation of the Gujarati community in the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa. It also explores the ways in which heritage language learners differ from other groups of language learners (i.e., foreign language learners and native speakers), both from a linguistic and a socio-cultural perspective, and considers the factors that have been shown to impact their language proficiency. Some approaches to and frameworks for the study of identity are discussed. Findings from previous studies that examine the relationship between language proficiency and ethnic identity among heritage language learners conclude this chapter.

Chapter 3 states the research questions guiding the study and presents a detailed description of the employed methodology. It outlines the chosen mixed methods approach, which incorporates sociolinguistic and applied linguistic methodologies, and combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Furthermore, it provides a description of the three research sites and the participants, and gives details on the data collection materials used (questionnaires, sociolinguistic interviews, and proficiency tests). It ends by presenting and discussing the data analysis procedures that were applied.

Chapter 4 presents the quantitative findings. It is divided into two parts. The first part reports the results of the statistical analyses which were carried out using SPSS. This includes a summary of the descriptive statistics for this study, as well as a presentation of the significant Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression results. The second part of this chapter discusses the validity of using a scoring rubric to evaluate heritage language proficiency by exploring two other ways of measuring language proficiency, namely a) type-token coding and b) word-per-minute output (“speech rate”), and comparing the results from the aforementioned analyses with the scores obtained when evaluating heritage language proficiency through the use of a rubric.

Chapter 5 discusses how ethnic identity has changed and is changing for second and subsequent generation Gujarati adolescents and young adults from the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa. The impact of migration on personal identity and group cohesion has meant that some identity markers traditionally used in definitions of identity (e.g., language, culture, religion) are becoming weakened
or lost among individuals and communities in the diaspora. Using the participants’ own words and insights, this chapter explores the factors which contribute to their ethnic identity (i.e., “being Indian”) and to their local identity (i.e., “being British”, “being Singaporean”, or “being South African”), and the ways in which their ethnic or local identity may be heightened or weakened. Through detailing the intricacies of identity, this chapter portrays the difficulties of being able to accurately and reliably measure ethnic identity and emphasizes the importance of conducting mixed methods studies in order to obtain a more balanced overview of identity formation among individuals and communities in the diaspora.

Integrating both quantitative and qualitative findings, Chapter 6 explores a number of other factors, besides identity, that play a role in language maintenance and in language proficiency among young Gujaratis in the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa. These include speaker generation, the home environment, language use with various family members and with Gujarati friends, language use in different domains, age, birth order, area of residence, trips and ties to India, language attitudes, and attending a heritage language school. This chapter highlights that factors affecting language proficiency are not always independent of one another but rather often intersect. In addition, any discrepancies which arise between qualitative and quantitative findings are also examined. Furthermore, this chapter seeks to explain the reasons for the differences in average language proficiencies between the three locations. This chapter ends with a discussion on the future of Gujarati in the three diaspora contexts.

The last chapter, Chapter 7, restates the purpose of the study, and summarizes the methods and procedures that were applied in order to answer the research questions. It provides a summary of the main research findings, and the answers to the research questions, while also briefly considering some limitations of the study and providing recommendations for change and suggestions of future research directions. In addition, this chapter considers how the findings of this study can allow parents, heritage language schools, and policy makers to successfully support heritage language maintenance and ensure high proficiency levels. This chapter concludes by highlighting some major generalizations and conclusions that can be drawn from the study.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 The Gujarati Community

2.1.1 Gujarati Immigration and Settlement Patterns

The Gujarati community has its origins in the state of Gujarat, which is located on the west coast of India and has a size of 121,803 square miles (Jha, 2011, p. 290). Gujarati is the official language of Gujarat. According to the 2001 Census of India (“Statement 1: Abstract of speakers’ strength of languages and mother tongues”, 2001), the total number of Gujarati speakers in India is 46,091,617. While the majority of Gujarati speakers in India reside in the state of Gujarat (42,768,386 speakers), there is also a sizeable Gujarati community in the state of Maharashtra, which is located south of Gujarat (2,315,409 speakers). Outside of India, large Gujarati diaspora communities have developed due to long-standing traditions of migration that Gujaratis, renowned as traders and businesspeople, have to destinations around the world. Significant migration and settlement of Indians abroad can be divided into two major periods (Clarke, Peach, & Vertovec, 1990, p. 3). The first involved migration in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. During this period, Indians travelled to various colonial territories around the world. Many worked as indentured laborers and others followed to work freely as traders and administrators. Gujaratis generally fell in the latter category. The second period involved migration during the post-colonial period. During this period, Indians travelled to western countries and the Middle East to embark on various occupations, ranging from unskilled to highly skilled and professional.

While the Gujarati community is often considered as one linguistic community whose members have a tie to the state of Gujarat, some relevant dimensions of distinction exist among Gujarati speakers, a few of which are mentioned here. The first is religion. Many faith groups are represented
within the Gujarati community, including Hinduism, Islam, Zoroastrianism, Jainism, and Christianity (Mawani & Mukadam, 2007, p. 2). Religious faith has implications on many aspects of life, for example, diet. Vegetarianism is mandatory under Jainism, it is encouraged under Hinduism, and under Islam only Halal foods are permitted.

The second distinction is caste/sect. The caste system is a means of social stratification among Hindus. It is estimated that there are 3,000 castes and 25,000 sub-castes (Christensen & Levinson, 2003, p. 120). One is born into a particular caste, whose members are bound together by common occupations. The different castes fall under four basic varnas ('social divisions'; literal translation from Sanskrit: ‘color’), listed in order of hierarchy: Brahmins (teachers, scholars, and priests), Kshatriyas (kings, warriors, and military personnel), Vaisyas (merchants, traders, and agriculturalists), and Sudras (artisans and servants) (Poros, 2011, p. 183). People not belonging to the caste system are called Untouchables (also known as Dalits). One’s caste has implications on various aspects of life, including marriage partner and food restrictions (e.g., orthodox Brahmins in Gujarat do not generally accept water or cooked food from any caste other than their own [Pruthi, 2004, p. 209]). Muslims are divided according to the sect they belong to, for example, the Shi’a sect and the Sunni sect. While all Muslims regardless of sect believe in the most fundamental Islamic beliefs and articles of faith (“faith in the unity of God”, “faith in Angels”, “faith in the Prophets”, “faith in the Book of Revelation”, “faith in the afterlife”, and “faith in destiny and divine decree” [Balogun, 2012, p. 64]), differences exist between the sects. The two main sects (the Shi’a sect and Sunni sect) differ, for example, on matters related to the successor of Mohammed and on Quranic belief. Other religions, e.g., Jainism and Buddhism, have traditionally rejected the caste system. However, in the case of Jainism, the Hindu caste system was later absorbed into Jainism, but in a less rigid form (Jain, 2009, p. 25).

The third distinction is language. The Gujarati community speaks Gujarati, which is an Indo-European language. The standard variety of Gujarati is based on the educated speech of Ahmedabad, the largest city and financial capital of Gujarat (Bright, 1992, p. 96-99). In addition, several regional dialects of Gujarati exist, namely Pattani (a Northern dialect, named after the city Patan), Surati (a Southern dialect, named after the city Surat), Charotari (a dialect spoken in Charotar [Anand], Kheda area), and Kathiawadi (a dialect spoken in Kathiawad, Saurashtra; some of the major cities of Kathiawad include Rajkot, Jamnagar, Bhavnagar, and Porbandar) (Bright, 1992; Dave, 1995). The maps in Figure 1 display the location of Gujarat in India (left) and the location of the various cities in Gujarat mentioned above (right).

Little descriptive work exists on the linguistic properties of the various Gujarati dialects. According to numerous conversations which I had with native speakers of Gujarati, these dialects
Manohar’s (2006) study revealed how her respondents believed that the various Gujarati dialects varied primarily in terms of pronunciation. Examples of pronunciation differences include rural communities around Surat and Charotar using \( h [\text{hə}] \) instead of Standard Gujarati \( s [\text{sə}], s [\text{ʃə}], \) or \( s [\text{ʃə}], \) and Kathiavadis saying \( \text{आयवो} \) \( [\text{ajvo}] \) ‘came’ and \( \text{बोयो} \) \( [\text{bojlo}] \) ‘spoke’ instead of Standard Gujarati \( \text{आयो} \) \( [\text{avjo}] \) ‘came’ and \( \text{बोलो} \) \( [\text{boljo}] \) ‘spoke’ (p.c. with Kusum Shah, 8th March 2013).

According to Mugler and Mamtora (2004), religion, caste, and social and occupational background also impact the way in which Gujaratis speak. The idea of socioeconomic background being an important factor in dialectal differences in Gujarati has also been stated by Grierson: “The only true dialectic [sic] variation of Gujarati consists in the difference between the speech of the uneducated and that of the educated” (cited in G. P. Taylor, 1908, p. 177). There are also slight variations between Indian varieties of Gujarati and some diaspora varieties of Gujarati, e.g., the East African variety of Gujarati. The differences that exist here are mainly lexical, where East African Gujarati speakers tend to use certain Swahili words in their vocabulary, e.g., \( \text{dhizi} \) for ‘banana’ and \( \text{jugu} \) for ‘peanuts’ (Dave, 1995, p. 93).

The following three sub-sections focus on Gujarati immigration and settlement patterns in the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa, and discuss how the distinctions among Gujarati speakers mentioned above play out in these three sites.

2.1.2 Gujarati Immigration and Settlement Patterns in the U.K.

The Gujarati community in the U.K. consists of two main groups. The first group arrived directly from Gujarat (India), especially from the central and southern parts of Gujarat (Dave, 1991, p. 90), and the second group arrived via East Africa. As a result of labor shortages in certain
industries (e.g., health, transport, service, and manufacturing) at a time when Britain’s industry was expanding, the U.K. actively pursued labor migration. Indian men came directly from India between 1955 and 1970 as unskilled migrant workers and provided cheap labor. The majority of the Indian men recruited in this way were Gujaratis and Punjabis (Poros, 2011, p. 57). The men were then followed by their wives and families in the 1960s and 1970s when the unrestricted right of entry for Commonwealth citizens was established by the immigration legislation. However, the majority of the Gujaratis in the U.K. (approx. 70%) did not come directly from India, but via East Africa (Price, 2000, p. 92). Almost 38,000 South Asians, mainly Punjabis, were sent to East Africa between 1890 and 1914 by British and German colonial powers to work as indentured laborers and construct the Kenya-Uganda railway line (Lal, Reeves, & Rai, 2006, p. 255). Gujaratis initially arrived to East Africa as merchants and to set up businesses after towns developed as a result of the railway line, creating opportunities for trade and settlement. However, after several African states gained their independence, many Gujaratis living in the newly independent East African states of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda found that they were no longer wanted in these countries. During the colonial period, there had been a three-tiered hierarchical system, with Europeans occupying the top, Indians in the middle, and Africans at the bottom. The latter had envied and resented the economic prosperity of the Indians during colonial rule, believing the Indians to occupy all the positions to which they aspired. As a result of Africanization policies which the governments in East Africa implemented, the livelihood of Indians was threatened and life became increasingly difficult for them. This led many Indians, including Gujaratis, to leave East Africa. East African Indians had received the right to possess a British passport, which the British had succeeded in securing for them during the negotiations for independence, and as a result, many of the Gujaratis migrated to the U.K. Gujarati immigration to the U.K. was boosted in particular by the decision of Idi Amin, former president of Uganda (1971-1979), to expel South Asians, including Gujaratis, from Uganda. In 1968, there were 345,000 Indians in East Africa. By 1984, according to the Minority Rights Group (1990), their numbers had fallen to about 85,000. Those who moved to the U.K. via East Africa are often referred to as ‘twice migrants’, a term coined by Bhachu (1985).

Indians are the largest non-White ethnic group in both England and the U.K.1 Of the approximately 52 million inhabitants of England, about 1.5 million are Indians (i.e., just under 3% of the total population), of which a third (i.e., 1% of the total population) are based in London (Office for

---

1England is part of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom (or ‘U.K.’ for short) consists of Great Britain (i.e., England, Scotland, and Wales) and Northern Ireland. Both the terms ‘England’ and the ‘U.K.’ are used in this dissertation for varying reasons. For example, in discussions on national examinations, the term ‘England’ is employed, since the school systems and national examinations differ in each of the countries which belong to the U.K. (e.g., GCSE in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland vs. Standard Grade in Scotland). In discussions on identity (see Chapter 5), the identity labels ‘British’ (i.e., those from the U.K.) and ‘English’ (i.e., those from England) had different associations for participants and were used accordingly by them.
National Statistics U.K. (2009b). While the Office for National Statistics U.K. does not collect data on specific sub-groups within the Indian community, more than 700,000 Gujaratis are estimated to reside in the U.K. (Mawani & Mukadam, 2007, p. 2), making them one of the larger Indian subgroups within the Indian community (Poros, 2011, p. 62). The community is found throughout the country, but the majority of the Gujarati community is concentrated in Greater London and the Midlands (Dave, 1991). Many of them follow Hinduism (Akinwale, 2005, p. 9), but there is also a sizeable Gujarati Muslim and Jain community in the U.K.

2.1.3 Gujarati Immigration and Settlement Patterns in Singapore

Indians began arriving to Singapore in the early nineteenth century as workers, soldiers, and convicts. Gujaratis began arriving to Singapore much later, in the late nineteenth century. They originated primarily from areas in and around urban centers of Gujarat, such as Ahmedabad and Surat, and came to Singapore either directly from their home provinces or via Bombay (Sandhu, 1969, p. 119). They came to Singapore as traders, with the intention of returning to their homeland, India, after they had made their fortune in Singapore.

Indians constitute about 8.4% of the Singaporean population, according to a 2004 estimate (Lal et al., 2006, p. 176). The majority of Indians in Singapore are of Tamil origin (about 64%). Gujaratis form a very small minority community. According to the 2000 Singapore Census, there are 3,260 Gujaratis in Singapore (Leow, 2001, cited in Mehta, 2009, p. 303), which means that they form less than half a percent of the Singaporean population. Although Gujaratis in Singapore are found in all parts of the city, they generally tend to dominate the East side of the island, along with other Indian groups. Gujaratis in Singapore may be followers of Hinduism, Islam, or Jainism (Bhattacharya, 2011, p. 43).

2.1.4 Gujarati Immigration and Settlement Patterns in South Africa

The first Indians in South Africa came as indentured laborers to Natal between 1860 and 1911 to work on sugar plantations. Entrepreneurs from Gujarat began arriving to South Africa from the early 1870s. Gujaratis came at their own expense as traders and were known as “passenger Indians” (as they paid for their own passage). They settled first in Natal, with many then later migrating to the Transvaal. By contrast to the indentured laborers, who worked under fixed contracts, the “passenger Indians” had the status of free, rather than bonded, people. Ninety five percent of the “passenger Indians” were Gujaratis (Klein, 1986, p. 2). Among this percentage, the majority were Muslim Gujaratis, though there were also some Hindu Gujaratis. The “passenger Indians”
traded in goods, such as Indian spices and clothing, mostly to their fellow Indians who worked as indentured laborers.

The number of people of Indian origin in South Africa approximates 1.2 million (Lal et al., 2006) and constitutes about 3 percent of the total South African population (U. K. Desai, 1997, p. 1; Klein, 1986, p. 2). The majority are of Tamil origin. Gujaratis are “a minority within a minority” (U. K. Desai, 1997, p. 1). The Gujarati population constitutes about 3 percent of the minority Indian population (U. K. Desai, 1997) and thus totals about 36,000 members. Klein refers to the Gujaratis in South Africa as “a middleman [sic] minority” (Klein, 1986). Klein explains that “middleman” minorities are minority groups in the country in which they currently inhabit, a country which they themselves migrated to or which their descendants migrated to. They hold middle-ranked roles, concentrate on entrepreneurial business, and maintain strong ties with their ethnic group and ancestral country.

2.2 Gujarati Language and Cultural Maintenance and Shift in the Diaspora

Despite long-standing traditions of migration, various factors have enabled the Gujarati diaspora communities to maintain their language and culture outside of their homeland. One important factor is that many Gujarati households in the diaspora are traditionally composed of three generations, which often includes monolingual Gujarati grandparents. This practice stems from an established strong sense of responsibility toward both parents and children (Elliott & Gray, 2000). Another is that Gujaratis generally marry within their community and sometimes even within their sub-caste (Oonk, 2007, p. 157; K. Shah, 2007, p. 118), which is another way in which “ethnic boundaries” (Oonk, 2007, p. 157) are maintained. Factors such as the ones highlighted above have enabled the Gujarati community to remain a tight-knit community and maintain their Gujarati identity outside of their homeland. However, the newer generations of Gujaratis in the diaspora seem to be gradually shifting away from their heritage language and sometimes even their heritage culture. Oonk’s (2007) study investigated the shift from Gujarati to English among three generations of the Hindu Lohana community in East Africa. While the first generation of East African Hindu Lohana participants in his study were still able to speak, write, and read Gujarati fluently, the second generation already displayed signs of difficulty in writing Gujarati and the third generation may have spoken Gujarati at home with their (grand)parents, but were mostly unable to read or write it. One of the factors cited in his study to explain this shift was that the Gujaratis in the third generation had “a more international outlook” (Oonk, 2007, p. 82), which encompassed
a need to become fully proficient in English. An earlier study by Oonk (2004) illustrated how the cultural practices among the same community in East Africa were shifting. The changing cultural practices included altering food habits and marriage policies. The men in his study went from marrying Hindu women from the same sub-caste (i.e., Lohana) who were raised in India to marrying Hindu women outside of the Lohana sub-caste who were raised in East Africa. In addition, they went from being strict vegetarians and non-drinkers to eating meat and drinking alcohol. The gradual loss of language and the shift to more dominant language(s) of society have been reported for many migrant communities, such as the Chinese in Britain (Wei, 1994), the Dutch in New Zealand (Folmer, 1992), and the Hungarian in Australia (Clyne & Kipp, 1997). Language shift tends to precede cultural shift, so in some cases, although ethnic minority communities may no longer be able to express their ethnic identity through linguistic means, they may instead resort to expressing their ethnic identity predominantly or solely through cultural means (see, for example, Canagarajah, 2008; Khemlani-David, 1998). In such instances, they would be moving from the “hard linguistic – hard non-linguistic” quadrant to the “soft linguistic – hard non-linguistic” quadrant in Giles’ (1979) ethnic boundary model.

One factor that can greatly contribute to language maintenance/shift is how often the language is spoken. The diaspora community may feel the need to speak the dominant language of the society they are living in, be it for professional, communicative, or other reasons, and this can happen at the expense of their home language. Wilding’s (1981) study investigated how English, the dominant language in British society, has greatly altered the speech of second and subsequent generations of Gujaratis living in Leicester. He found that the parents, mostly L1 speakers of Gujarati, were bilingual in English and Gujarati, but this was not always the case with their children, who tended to shift to speaking only English. The findings from his study are confirmed by the findings of the Linguistic Minorities Project for Coventry and London, which reports on the prevalence, use, and teaching of community languages (Stubbs, 1985). The Adult Language Use Survey in the Linguistic Minorities Project shows that adults have a higher level of Gujarati than their British-born children, based on parental estimates of children’s language use. About a third of parents in both Coventry and in London claimed that their children used mostly or only English when talking among themselves (Stubbs, 1985). The use of both English and Gujarati by parents when addressing their children can accelerate the language shift to English, as was found in Lieberson and McCabe’s (1982) study, which examined the Gujarati community in Nairobi in 1964. This idea has been cited by other scholars, such as Fishman (1966), and is a finding reported in many studies on language maintenance and shift (see, for example, Sirèn, 1991, p. 160).
In addition to language use patterns, positive attitudes toward the minority language and culture can play an important role in ethnic language and cultural maintenance. However, even if the community has positive attitudes toward language and cultural maintenance (see, for example, Mercer et al., 1979), language shift to the dominant language of society may begin or be accelerated as a result of the attitudes of the host society (Blackledge, 2005; Rassool, 2008). The emphasis on a monolingual curriculum in primary schools in the U.K. (see, for example, the Swann Report: Swann, 1985) has meant that the teaching and studying of community languages, including Gujarati, have been strongly discouraged in schools for many years. Kenner’s (2000) study of a 4-year-old Gujarati-English girl in the U.K. shows how the guidelines of the Swann Report are having an effect on multilingual children. Despite actively using both Gujarati and English to enhance her literacy learning and constructing texts which synthesized home and school experience, this child’s biliteracy development was restricted by institutional constraints, as languages other than English are neglected by the educational system (see also Seals, 2013). These studies claim that ethnic languages can be successfully maintained when there is a positive attitude toward the language and culture from individuals, the community, and also the host society. See Section 2.2.1 for more information related to the impact of language policy on heritage language maintenance.

Despite this seemingly inevitable shift to the dominant language of society for diaspora communities, Gujarati tends to be one of the better-maintained languages among Indian languages. This is the case even when there is an inevitable need to acquire the dominant language of society for political, economic, and social survival. In South Africa, U. K. Desai (1992, 1997) demonstrates how the Gujarati community, a minority community in South Africa, has relied on its own resources to maintain its ethnic identity and language. These have included setting up linguistic, cultural, and religious organizations. Through such community efforts, Gujarati is cited as proportionally being the most spoken Indian language in South Africa (U. K. Desai, 1992, p. 4). Mesthrie (2007) agrees with U. K. Desai (1992) and claims that Gujarati is “the best maintained Indian language [in South Africa] in the twentieth century” (p. 11). According to Mesthrie (2007), class plays a key role: Gujaratis in South Africa belong to the middle-class, whereas other Indian languages in South Africa (e.g., Hindi, Tamil, and Telugu) often historically became associated with indenture (see Section 2.1.4). As such, language shift to English was a means to escape the world of indenture and poverty for speakers of these other Indian languages. The successful maintenance of Gujarati among migrants is not exclusive to South Africa (see, for example, Mugler & Mantora, 2004, about Fiji; M. L. Roberts, 1999, about New Zealand; Sridhar, 1993, about the U.S.).

Setting up heritage language schools is one important way in which ethnic language and culture can be preserved (Creese et al., 2006 and Kenner et al., 2008 on Gujarati language schools in the
U.K.; Otcu, 2010 on Turkish language schools in New York City; Chinen & Tucker, 2005 on Japanese language schools in the US; Oriyama, 2010 on Japanese language schools in Australia) and can be a particularly effective way to transmit the heritage language to children in areas where ethnolinguistic vitality is low (Shibata, 2000). The vitality of language communities is defined as “that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup settings” (Giles, Bourhis, & Taylor, 1977, p. 308). If a group’s ethnolinguistic vitality is low, they are likely to go through assimilation. Heritage language schools also provide an opportunity for bolstering feelings of ethnic group membership and foster ethnic identity among students (Chinen & Tucker, 2005). Heritage language schools are often community-run voluntary schools designed to teach heritage language and culture. They may also include a religious component. Heritage schools are usually established and run by the local community and classes generally take place over the weekends or in the evenings. They are also known as “complementary schools” (term adopted by Creese et al., 2007) or “supplementary schools” in the U.K., and as “community language schools” or “ethnic schools” in Australia (Blackledge, 2010, p. 309).

To date, comprehensive studies on Gujarati heritage language education appear to have only been conducted in the U.K. Two important ESRC-funded projects on heritage language schools (Creese et al., 2007; Martin et al., 2004) examined in depth two Gujarati schools in Leicester and showed the importance of heritage language education for Gujarati children in the U.K. The projects found that learning Gujarati, and thus becoming more proficient in the parents’ L1, allowed the students to have hybrid identities, such as a learner identity, a multicultural identity, and a heritage identity (Creese et al., 2006). They also demonstrated the importance of providing an institutional context in which to develop ethnic identities (Creese et al., 2006), a point which has been mentioned by other researchers, such as Hornberger (2001), who, along with others, notes that having bilingual spaces for language learning in dominant monolingual environments provides an arena for identity negotiation to take place. The ESRC-funded projects examining Gujarati heritage language schools also demonstrated the ways in which both languages, English and Gujarati, are used to support and enhance ethnic language learning (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Martin et al., 2006). These studies have demonstrated how heritage language schools can provide a positive atmosphere for ethnic minority children to develop and maintain ethnic languages and identities.

2.2.1 Language Policy

Heritage language maintenance is influenced by language policies. Advocates of minority languages have repeatedly stressed that a language policy which favors and supports minority languages
may play a key role in helping these languages to survive and thrive outside of their homeland (see, for example, Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Strubell, 1999). Favorable language policies may, for example, provide heritage language study in schools. On the other hand, language policies such as Namibia’s English-Only Language Policy in Education, which obligates all Namibians, regardless of their mother tongue, to only use English in classrooms, can dramatically affect heritage language maintenance and contribute greatly to heritage language loss. This section discusses language policy in England, Singapore, and South Africa, and focuses in particular on language policy as it relates to community languages, such as Gujarati.

2.2.1.1 Language Policy in England

While English is the official language of England, many children growing up in England speak a language other than or in addition to English. According to the CILT Community Languages Report (CILT, 2005), more than 700,000 children between 5-18 years old in English schools speak one of 360 languages. Despite multilingualism being prevalent in the U.K., the development of the home language in the U.K. has largely been seen as the responsibility of the home or the community (Swann, 1985), and not of mainstream education. For example, the ‘Education for All’ Report (a report produced by the U.K. Government’s Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups; also known as the ‘Swann Report’ after its Chairman, Lord Swann), notes that mother tongue teaching should take place outside of main school education:

> If a language is truly the mother tongue of a community and is the language needed for parent/child interaction ... for access to the religious and cultural heritage of the community, then we believe it will survive and flourish regardless of the provision made for it ... within mainstream schools ... Mainstream schools should not seek to assume the role of community providers for maintaining ethnic minority community languages. (Swann, 1985, p. 408, 771, cited in Ager, 1996, p. 92)

Community languages began to become increasingly relevant in England in the 1960s, a period which is marked by a strong influx of immigrants from Asia and the Caribbean to England (McPake & Sachdev, 2008, p. 5). Through “subtractive bilingualism” (cf. W. E. Lambert, 1975), many bilingual children in the U.K. have throughout the years become monolingual as few opportunities to use and develop their first language have existed in their host country. While some students in the U.K. have been educated through a bilingual approach, this approach has primarily been carried out to support young children until they are sufficiently proficient in English and can leave their home language behind. Emphasis has been placed on teaching English to minority language communities.
In recent years, several high-profile cases involving ethnic minorities (e.g., the racial riots in the northern cities of England in 2001 and the London bombings in 2005) have led politicians and others to question multiculturalism in England; language features prominently in such debates. Those speaking out against multiculturalism have argued that the use of minority languages of immigrants and their descendants in schools constitute a threat, not only to children’s educational attainment, but also to society in general (see, for example, Cantle, 2001, which documents the 2001 racial riots in England’s northern cities and stresses the importance of immigrants learning English to prevent ethnic divisions). As stated in Blackledge (2010), senior national politicians in the U.K. argued that the use and visibility of minority languages other than English represented a threat to social cohesion, security, and national identity. The English language came to represent the idea of a shared national identity (Ritchie, 2001, p. 9), which according to David Cameron, current Prime Minister of the U.K., needs to be strengthened: “...we have allowed the weakening of our collective identity. Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream” (Cameron, 2011). The English language also became a defining element of what it meant to be a British citizen (Denham, 2001, p. 20). Senior national politicians thus advocated for the use of English not only in schools in England, but also in homes, as noted most notoriously in David Blunkett’s comment, when Home Secretary in the U.K.: “[Speaking English] helps overcome the schizophrenia which bedevils generational relationships” (Blunkett, 2002). In more recent years, the situation has changed somewhat. Minority languages are nowadays more often referred to as a “resource” rather than a “threat” (Sneddon, 2011, p. 7); however the responsibility to teach and maintain these languages still lies predominantly on the communities themselves.

Gujarati in England is currently offered as a GCSE, AS Level and A Level subject, and most recently as an Asset Level subject. See Appendix O for a brief explanation of the educational system in England and the various examinations. Gujarati is assessed as a modern foreign language by examination boards in the U.K. (e.g., Edexcel, OCR, etc.). This seems contradictory, since students studying a community language like Gujarati generally have some prior knowledge of the language (Roderio, 2009), which tends not to be the case for those studying foreign languages such as French and German (McPake & Sachdev, 2008). However, despite being assessed as a modern foreign language, its status is still not equal to European foreign languages. One reason for this is that Gujarati is predominantly taught in community-run weekend or evening schools and only to those who already have some knowledge of the language (i.e., heritage speakers). By contrast, European languages are offered in main schools to all students, regardless of whether they have prior knowledge of the language or not. However, a few main schools have recently introduced
Gujarati as a modern foreign language in the school curriculum, though this seems to only be the case if the school is located in an area with a high concentration of Gujaratis. An example of such a school is Manor High School in Leicester, which offers Gujarati as a GCSE subject. This shows that the U.K. has progressed somewhat in its regard to community languages since the Swann Report (Swann, 1985).

2.2.1.2 Language Policy in Singapore

Singapore has four official languages: Chinese, English, Malay, and Tamil. Chinese is the dominant language in Singapore, with English the second most common, but there is an on-going language shift with English becoming more commonly used at home, especially among the younger generation (Department of Statistics Singapore, 2010). These four languages were chosen as official languages to represent the multiracial composition of Singapore’s population. In order to ensure respect for each of the different cultures present in Singapore, the country’s emphasis on National Education includes constant teaching about a set of national values including respect for other cultures (C. J. W.-L. Wee, 2000). So, unlike the U.K., Singapore has explicit public policies about racial integration, which it carries out in educational policy as well as other policies.

Singapore has a ‘bilingual’ education policy, which is centered on the four official languages. According to this policy, all children in government-funded schools take national examinations (i.e., Primary School Leaving Examination, GCE N-Level, GCE O-Level, and GCE A-Level examinations – see Appendix O for a brief explanation of the educational system in Singapore and the various examinations) in English plus one other official language, locally referred to as their ‘Mother Tongue’ (MT). The Ministry of Education in Singapore defines ‘Mother Tongue’ based on paternal ethnicity and not based on the language used at home or on the first language used by the student. This bilingual language policy ensures that Singaporeans can advance professionally and globally through their proficiency in English, but enables them to still maintain a link to their traditional cultures and values through their knowledge of their mother tongue and thus ensures that they do not become too Westernized (L. Wee, 2003, p. 214).

Pre-1990, Indians who were not of Tamil origin were granted the choice by the state to study any of the three second languages (i.e., Chinese, Malay, or Tamil) as their ‘Mother Tongue’ (Rai, 2009). Most North Indians, including Gujaratis, whose mother tongue was linguistically distinct from Tamil, decided to study Malay as their second language, based on their view that Malay was easier than both Tamil or Mandarin (Ramakanthan, 1989, p. 43) and more useful than Tamil for interethnic communication (Altehenger-Smith, 1987, p. 87). The need to study two languages, neither of which were their mother tongue, meant a decline in proficiency in North Indian languages,
such as Gujarati. Statistics show that the percentage of Indians proficient in non-Tamil Indian languages had declined from 5.2% in 1970 to 1.7% in 1980 (Lal et al., 2006, p. 186). An important change in school language policy was the decision that minority Indian groups would be able to establish classes in five Non-Tamil Indian Languages (NTILs), these being Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Punjabi, and Urdu, starting in 1989. This decision was made to counter the distress of non-Tamil Indian students who were having difficulty fulfilling their mother tongue requirement with Chinese, Malay, or Tamil.

These five NTIL languages were included in the Primary School Leaving Examinations (PSLEs) beginning in 1995. Currently students can opt to take Gujarati in place of one of the ‘Mother Tongues’. These five NTIL languages are offered as a ‘Mother Tongue’ subject in “community-run weekend ... classes” (Saravanan, 1999, p. 174). If there are enough students at the school learning the language (e.g., Hindi in a few cases), classes can be offered on site. However, this is not the case with Gujarati. Students attend school on Saturdays, gaining a free period for self-study or some other work during the week (Singapore Gujarati School interview, 29th November 2010). In addition to the local Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE), these students can take the GCE N-Level, O-Level, and A-Level in Gujarati, and these results count in place of their ‘Mother Tongue’.

There are seven South Asian community groups that organize the teaching of these NTILs:

1. Bangla Language and Literary Society (Bengali)
2. Bangladesh Language and Cultural Foundation (Bengali)
3. Singapore Gujarati School (Gujarati)
4. D.A.V. Hindi School Ltd (Hindi)
5. Hindi Society Singapore (Hindi)
6. Singapore Sikh Education Foundation (Punjabi)
7. Urdu Development Society (Urdu)

In order to oversee the delivery of NTIL instruction by these community groups and standardize the examinations across the various communities, the Board for the Teaching and Testing of South Asian Languages (BTTSAL) was created. The community is responsible for holding its own classes, employing its own teachers, designing its curriculum, and setting its own assessments with the exception of the final national examinations (Rai, 2009, p. 151). Since 2008, the Ministry of Education (MOE) has provided financial support for the teaching and learning of NTILs through a total grant of about 1.5 million SGD (approx. 1.2 million USD) each year. In addition, the MOE has worked closely with BTTSAL to ensure that NTIL grades for students’ level-to-level progression
within school, before the students take the national examinations, are recognized. Furthermore, the MOE and BTTSAL have worked closely together to ensure that students' NTIL grades count toward their eligibility for various funding and scholarship programs (e.g., Edusave, Good Progress Award).

2.2.1.3 Language Policy in South Africa

During the period of Apartheid (1948-1994), English and Afrikaans were the only two languages with an officially recognized nationwide status. Other languages were either suppressed, as in the case of some of the indigenous African languages, or marginalized, as in the case of the Indian languages. Since 1990, there has been considerable debate over language policy in South Africa. The new constitution recognizes eleven languages as official languages of South Africa. These are the two former official languages (English and Afrikaans) and nine regional African languages (Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, isiNdebele, isiXhosa, and isiZulu). The constitution also calls on the government to “promote respect for all community languages (including German, Greek, Gujarati, Hindi, Portuguese, Tamil, Telugu and Urdu)” (Section 6 [5] [b] of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996).

As in the U.K. and Singapore, the teaching of Gujarati in South Africa is largely seen as the responsibility of the community itself and not of mainstream education. According to a report of the Dyson commission, a commission of Inquiry instituted in 1928 under the leadership of a Mr. J. Dyson, who had found facilities for Indians to be inadequate, especially at state-aided schools (U. K. Desai, 1997, p. 111), “if the Indian community desires to teach the children Indian vernaculars, they should be permitted to do so outside the school hours, and by separate teachers paid for by the Indian community” (Naidoo, 1989, p. 108). Indian languages were soon after discontinued in government schools. As a result of the government policy, the Gujarati community took responsibility to build its own schools for mother tongue education.

Since the end of Apartheid, South Africans have been entitled to education in the language of their choice, provided it is reasonably practicable (Section 29 [2] of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996). However, South African classrooms are often composed of students with many different mother tongues and most education in South Africa is carried out in English. There have been several attempts in recent years to have Indian languages be recognized as official languages in the school curriculum. While attempts to have Indian languages feature as a ‘First Additional Language’ (i.e., as a second language, after the ‘Home Language’) for South African citizens were in vain, with the Education Ministry Director, Duncan Hindle, stating that “Indian languages were not a viable second language option because they were not recognized by the
Constitution” (“South African Indian students reject Afrikaans as second language”, 2009), there has been success in getting Gujarati (along with other Indian languages) included in the school curriculum as a ‘Second Additional Language’ (i.e., in addition to taking two official languages as part of the school curriculum, one as ‘Home Language’ and the other as ‘First Additional Language’). For Vishnu Naidoo, the principal of Buffelsdale Secondary School and convener of the Southern African Eastern Languages Association, this is a big step: “This is the first time in the history of the country that Eastern languages are in the curriculum” (Govender, 2013). According to him, this will ensure that Indian languages and cultures are not lost: “In the next 50 years or so we could lose it [our culture] completely, but by introducing the subjects in formal studies at schools, we could preserve our culture” (Govender, 2013).

Currently, it is possible for students to take Gujarati at the Matriculation level (Department of Basic Education SA, 2011, p. 10). Matriculation is the qualification received on graduating from high school and the minimum university entrance requirement for South African students. While Gujarati has been cited as being the best maintained among the Indian languages spoken in South Africa (U. K. Desai, 1997), meetings that I had with several community-run schools in 2011 indicate a decline over the years in the number of students studying and proficient in Gujarati. In an informal meeting with a community education leader in Pretoria, it was highlighted to me that it is becoming increasingly difficult for community-run Gujarati Schools in South Africa to attract students and as a result, many schools cover the first few basic years of Gujarati language teaching and do not go beyond this stage. There is only one school in South Africa that prepares students for the Matriculation examination, this being the Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir (SBSM) in Lenasia, Johannesburg. SBSM offers optional after-school Gujarati classes from Grades 1 to 12 (ages 6-18). Students at this school take Zulu or Afrikaans as a ‘First Additional Language’ and can opt to take Gujarati as a ‘Second Additional Language’. Gujarati as a ‘Second Additional Language’ is considered an additional school subject, which does not form part of the six core subjects that students take for the Matriculation qualification. As such, the grades obtained for Gujarati are generally not considered to form part of the points system for university admission. However, if students do badly in one of their six core subjects, the grade for Gujarati may replace the grade obtained in one of their weaker subjects.

2.3 Heritage Languages and Heritage Speakers

Various definitions of the term “heritage language learner” have been proposed, with some researchers highlighting the linguistic abilities of the learner and others highlighting the cultural,
familial, and ancestral ties of the individual to a particular ethnomlinguistic group. The difficulty in agreeing to one particular definition of the term is due to the heritage language learner population being large and heterogeneous. Valdés' (2001) definition of a heritage language learner as someone who “is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken and who speaks or at least understands the language and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English” (p. 38) is a narrower definition of the term, which highlights the level of language proficiency required to belong to this group. On the other hand, Fishman’s and Van Deusen-Scholl’s broader definitions of the term which emphasize heritage languages having “a particular family relevance to the learners” (Fishman, 2001, p. 81) and heritage language learners as those who “have been raised with a strong cultural connection to a particular language through family interaction” (Van Deusen-Scholl, 2003, p. 222) identify the cultural and ancestral links that heritage speakers have with a given language, but do not presuppose that they are linguistically competent in the language. In this dissertation, I take both the linguistic and the familial/cultural elements and refer to a Gujarati heritage language learner as someone who has an emotional attachment to Gujarati through family ties and who has some proficiency in the Gujarati language (based on Polinsky & Kagan, 2007).

2.3.1 Heritage Language Learners compared to Foreign Language Learners and Native Speakers

Some notable differences between heritage language learners and foreign language learners (i.e., late L2 learners) exist. First, the timing of language input, the setting, and the modality of language input differ for the two groups (Montrul, 2012, p. 10-11). Heritage language learners are generally exposed to a language from a young age through the home environment, whereas foreign language learners customarily learn a language at a later age in a classroom setting. In addition, heritage language learners typically receive aural input, whereas foreign language learners obtain aural and written input. Given these differences, it is not surprising that heritage speakers have been described to possess native-like fluency in listening comprehension (Renganathan, 2008) and have been found to typically have an advantage in terms of oral production, but late L2 learners have tended to outperform heritage language learners in written production (Montrul, Foote, & Perpiñán, 2008). Second, heritage language learners and foreign language learners usually have different reasons for learning the language, as well as a different motivation and attitude toward the language (Cho, Cho, & Tse, 1997). Some studies maintain that heritage language learners have a distinctive linguistic and cultural advantage compared to foreign language learners (e.g.,
Gambhir, 2008), though not in all domains of language, whereas others do not (e.g., O’Grady, Lee, & Choo, 2003).

In the remainder of this section, I examine how the linguistic abilities of heritage language learners compare with those of foreign language learners on the one hand, and of native speakers on the other. However, it is important to note that comparing studies on this topic can also be problematic and some caution should therefore be taken when interpreting the findings, since different researchers may have used different definitions of heritage language learners.

Studies have shown that heritage language learners have advantages in phonology, both in terms of production and perception, but not in morphosyntax. Au, Knightly, Jun, and Oh (2002) and Knightly, Jun, Oh, and Au (2003) found that adults who overheard Spanish during childhood (‘childhood overhearers’) had more native-like Spanish pronunciations than adult learners of Spanish who had no childhood experience with Spanish (‘typical late L2 learners’). In terms of morphosyntactic measures, however, the two groups performed in a similar fashion, thus indicating that childhood hearing had no measurable benefits in terms of morphosyntax for heritage speakers. The native-like pronunciation of heritage learners has been confirmed by other researchers, such as Saddah (2011) for Arabic, and Chang, Haynes, Rhodes, and Yao (2008) for Mandarin, but not all researchers agree (e.g., Godson, 2003). Godson’s (2003) study of Western Armenian heritage speakers in the U.S. found that the Armenian vowels of heritage speakers were influenced by English. While this highlights the differences in production between native speakers of Western Armenian and heritage speakers, her findings illustrate that this is only the case for Armenian vowels which are close to English vowels. In addition to production, heritage language learners have been shown to be on par with native speakers in terms of perception, as measured experimentally, while foreign language learners do not display native-like skills in this area (Lukyanchenko & Gor, 2011; Oh, Jun, Knightly, & Au, 2003).

In a later study, Au, Oh, Knightly, Jun, and Romo (2008) compared those who spoke a language during early childhood (‘childhood speakers’) with childhood overhearers and found that speaking a language regularly during childhood had benefits not only in the phonological domain, but also in the morphosyntax domain. Specifically, they found that childhood speakers performed better than childhood overhearers and typical late L2 learners in terms of producing grammatically well-formed narratives and making grammaticality judgments. Furthermore, childhood speakers made fewer morphosyntactic errors in repeating simple sentences presented without noise than typical late L2 learners and outperformed them in sentence perception in noisy contexts. By contrast, the childhood overhearers only outperformed the typical late L2 learners on one of the morphosyntactic measures, namely sentence perception in noise.
Studies on morphosyntax have shown that foreign language learners may outperform heritage language learners in some tasks. Montrul and Perpiñán (2011) found that foreign language learners and heritage language learners differed from native speakers with regard to tense-aspect and mood morphology. On closer examination of the two groups, it was found that heritage language learners were more accurate than foreign language learners on grammatical aspect (i.e., a feature of language acquired during early language development), but were not necessarily more accurate with mood (i.e., a feature of language acquired during later language development). Their study also found that foreign language learners were seen to outperform heritage language learners in some cases (e.g., in two morphology recognition tasks).

Similar findings have been reported for lexical retrieval. Studies have shown that heritage learners of Indian languages embed more English in their speech than foreign language learners. Ilieva (2012) found that heritage language learners of Hindi often made extensive use of English within their Hindi utterances (including intrasentential code-mixing), much more so than native speakers who also at times tend to insert English into their Hindi sentences and unlike foreign language learners who made conscious efforts to avoid using English in their speech.

In sum, the majority of studies show that heritage speakers have an advantage over foreign language learners in the phonological domain, and generally possess native-like skills in both production and perception. However, they may not always be at an advantage to foreign language learners in terms of other domains of language, e.g., morphosyntax and lexical retrieval.

2.3.2 Difficulties for Heritage Learners of Gujarati

No studies exist on the linguistic difficulties which heritage learners of Gujarati experience. I therefore contacted Mrs. Kusum Shah MBE, a leading promoter of the Gujarati language and culture in England and a former headmistress of the Oshwal Gujarati School in South London, on this matter. Through over forty years of working with heritage speakers of Gujarati in the U.K. and Kenya, Mrs. Kusum Shah has found that heritage learners of Gujarati manifest a wide range of linguistic deficiencies in the areas of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar, some of which are discussed in the sections below. These linguistic deficiencies do not necessarily impede comprehension, but are indicative of one having non-native speaker ability in the language.

2.3.2.1 Pronunciation Difficulties for Heritage Learners of Gujarati

Heritage learners of Gujarati who wish to approximate L1 pronunciations face some challenges. There are some sounds which exist in Gujarati, but are absent from English. These are the alveolar tap/flap [ɾ], the retroflex sounds ([ɽ], [ɖ], [ʈʰ], [ɳ], [ɭ]), and the palatal sounds ([ç], [j], [ɕ], [p], [pʰ], [t], [tʰ], [k], [kʰ], [ŋ], [n], [l]).
According to the aforementioned Mrs. Kusum Shah, some of these non-English sounds are more problematic for heritage learners of Gujarati than other sounds. In particular, the retroflex nasal [n] and the retroflex lateral approximant [l] are difficult for heritage learners of the language. These sounds are often interchanged by heritage learners of Gujarati, e.g., in words like ‘our’ (the target pronunciation is આપણા, [apəɳa] but instead it is often said as આપળા [apəɭa]). With heritage learners of Gujarati, both sounds are often even pronounced with the [ɾ] sound, as in આપરા [apəɾa]. In many words, the [ɭ] may also be changed to [ɭ] [ɭə], e.g., in words like ‘rangoli’ (the target pronunciation is રંગોળી [ɾəmgoɭi], but instead it is often pronounced રંગોલી [ɾəmgoli]). Just as the [ɭə] is often changed to [ɭ] [lə], the [ɳə] is sometimes changed to [n] [ne]. This, however, does not cause much difficulty in speaking but does produce spelling errors, e.g., in a word like ‘water’ (the target pronunciation is પાણી [paɳi], but instead it is often written [and sometimes said] as પાની [pani]). As English does not have retroflex consonants in its sound inventory, heritage learners of Gujarati may be more likely to replace retroflex consonants with a similar sounding consonant which is found in the English inventory. Further pronunciation difficulties include the retroflex sounds often being confused with the dental sounds – [ʈ] [ʈə], [ʈʰ] [ʈʰə], [ɖ] [ɖə], [ɖʰ] [ɖʰə] for [t] [ʈə], [θ] [ʈʰə], [d] [ɖə], [dʰ] [ɖʰə]. Sounds with voicing (vocal fold vibrations) and VOT differences may also pose problems for heritage speakers of Gujarati, e.g., [ɹ] [ɾ] may be pronounced as [s] [ʂ].

2.3.2.2 Grammar Difficulties for Heritage Learners of Gujarati

Heritage learners of Gujarati have difficulties with gender agreements and case endings. Gujarati marks gender on many parts of speech (e.g., the verb, some adjectives, and the possessive). These parts of speech agree with the gender of the noun that one uses in a sentence. This is in marked contrast with English. As heritage speakers of Gujarati may not know the gender of nouns in Gujarati, they often choose the middle path and use the neuter gender. Some examples of what they may choose are given in Table 2.1.

Another difficulty for heritage learners of Gujarati lies in the fact that Gujarati is a split ergative language (DeLancey, 1981), meaning that the subject of a transitive clause receives ergative case in the perfective, but the subject appears in the nominative case in all other aspects (e.g., imperfect and progressive). Using the example cited in MacWhinney (1999, p. 228), this means that a sentence in the imperfect tense (e.g., The farmer was growing the corn) is nominative-accusative, but a sentence in the perfective (e.g., The farmer grew the corn) shifts into ergative-absolutive.

Table 2.2 illustrates a typical error that heritage learners of Gujarati may make. In perfective tenses, the subject of a transitive clause receives ergative case. Ergativity does not exist in English.
Table 2.1: Gender agreement and case endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage speakers of Gujarati</th>
<th>Native speakers of Gujarati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>શાક  અધ્ય,  રોટલી  પણ  અધ્ય</td>
<td>શાક  અધ્ય,  રોટલી  પણ  અધ્ય</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>અને  રોટલી  ખાધુ</td>
<td>અને  રોટલી  ખાધુ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry (n) ate (n), chapatti (f) ate (n) and bread (m) also ate (n)</td>
<td>Curry (n) ate (n), chapatti (f) ate (f) and bread (m) also ate (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ate curry, I ate chapatti and I also ate bread.</td>
<td>I ate curry, I ate chapatti and I also ate bread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>મોટું  ઘર,  મોટી  ગાડી  અને  મોટ્યો  બંગલો</td>
<td>મોટું  ઘર,  મોટી  ગાડી  અને  મોટી  બંગલો</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big (n) house (n), big (n) car (f) and big (n) bungalow (m)</td>
<td>Big (n) house (n), big (f) car (f) and big (m) bungalow (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big house, big car and big bungalow.</td>
<td>Big house, big car and big bungalow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>બહેનનું  પુસ્તક,  બહેનની  કોટ</td>
<td>બહેનની  પુસ્તક,  બહેનની  કોટ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister’s (n) textbook (n), sister’s (n) exercise book (f) and sister’s (m) coat (m)</td>
<td>Sister’s (n) textbook (n), sister’s (f) exercise book (f) and sister’s (m) coat (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister’s textbook, sister’s exercise book and sister’s coat.</td>
<td>Sister’s textbook, sister’s exercise book and sister’s coat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Examples provided by Mrs. Kusum Shah)

Heritage learners may mistakenly give the subject of a transitive clause the nominative case, instead of the ergative, as illustrated in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Ergativity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage speakers of Gujarati</th>
<th>Native speakers of Gujarati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>હું  ખાવાનું  ખાઇ  લીધું</td>
<td>મેં  ખાવાનું  ખાઇ  લીધું</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (NOM) meal eat take</td>
<td>I (ERG) meal eat take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ate the food.</td>
<td>I ate the food.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Example provided by Mrs. Kusum Shah)

However, the ergative is not unknown to them, as illustrated in the example in Table 2.3 below, where the ergative case is erroneously used in a sentence containing a non-perfective tense. As illustrated in the right-hand column, the correct case for the subject is nominative. Examples like the one below could be explained as an overextension of the ergative rule, where heritage learners of Gujarati are seen to apply the rule in more cases than is actually necessary.

These data agree with the findings in Mahajan (2009) and Montrul, Bhatt, and Benmamoun (2010). According to Mahajan (2009), cited in Benmamoun, Montrul, and Polinsky (2010), heritage speakers of Hindi use the “ergative marking very randomly - omit it when [it is] needed with [the] subject of [a] transitive perfect verb but insert it when [they] cannot have it” (p. 64). Similarly, Montrul et al. (2010) show that heritage speakers of Hindi overgeneralized the ergative case in about 11% of cases and left it out in the other 33% of cases.
Table 2.3: Ergativity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage speakers of Gujarati</th>
<th>Native speakers of Gujarati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>મે કાગળ લખીને પોસ્ટમાં નાખવા</td>
<td>હું કાગળ લખીને પોસ્ટમાં નાખવા</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ERG) letter write post-box put</td>
<td>(NOM) letter write post-box put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go is After I write the letter, I am going to put it in the post box.</td>
<td>go is After I write the letter, I am going to put it in the post box.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Example provided by Mrs. Kusum Shah)

One last difficulty that heritage speakers of Gujarati often face is related to inclusive and exclusive ‘we’. Gujarati makes a distinction in grammatical person between inclusive ‘we’, which includes the addressee, and exclusive ‘we’, which excludes the addressee (Tisdall, 1892). In English, this distinction is not made through grammatically different forms of ‘we’, but rather indirectly, e.g., through explicitly inclusive phrasing, such as ‘we all’, or through inclusive ‘let’s’. Heritage speakers of Gujarati are known to use the two forms of ‘we’ interchangeably, saying અમે [əme] (‘we’) in the place of આપણે [apəɳe] (‘we all’), and vice versa.

2.4 Language Proficiency

2.4.1 Factors affecting Language Proficiency

In this section, I discuss some of the factors that a) impact language proficiency and b) are significant predictors of language proficiency. These include language use, the home environment, and especially the role of parents and grandparents, speaker generation, birth order, heritage language education, gender, and motivation. While this list is not exhaustive, it indicates the wide range of factors that play a role in heritage language proficiency.

2.4.1.1 Language Use

The importance of language use in predicting language retention or attrition has been cited by a number of researchers (e.g., Schmid, 2007). Using the language more frequently and in a greater number of contexts increases the possibility of retaining various aspects of the language and being able to retrieve them quickly in conversation. A number of studies have highlighted this factor as the most important factor in predicting language proficiency. For example, Albirini (2013) assessed the relationship between Arabic proficiency among heritage speakers in the U.S. and linguistic, socio-affective, socio-contextual, and demographic factors. While a number of variables correlated
positively with language proficiency, language use (in terms of frequency, range, and contexts) was the only significant predictor of heritage language proficiency.

### 2.4.1.2 Home Environment

Family plays a critical role in ensuring whether a heritage language is preserved in the diaspora (see, for example, Canagarajah, 2008, whose study highlights the fact that many community members consider the decline in Tamil proficiency among the youngest generation in the diaspora to be a result of the negligence of the family to transmit the language). In particular, the family composition influences language use patterns in the home and whether minority languages will get transmitted. Living in large families means a greater likelihood of heritage language maintenance (Oropesa & Landale, 1997). The presence of non-English speaking household members increases the likelihood that a child will learn and speak a non-English language (Ishizawa, 2004; Stevens, 1985). Children living with one or two foreign-born parents, and in particular parents with the same non-English mother tongue, are more likely to speak a non-English language (Ishizawa, 2004; Stevens, 1985). Non-English speaking grandparents co-residing in three generation households also contribute to their grandchildren’s minority language maintenance (Ishizawa, 2004).

### 2.4.1.3 Grandparents

The important role that extended family members, such as grandparents, play in providing exposure to the heritage language and in heritage language maintenance has been cited by a number of researchers (see, for example, Ishizawa, 2004; Liu, 2008; Yi, 2009; Zhang, 2009). For example, Liu’s (2008) study which examines 28 Chinese heritage language learners in the U.S. found that 71% reported learning Chinese through instruction from parents or grandparents. Obregon’s (2010) study found that Spanish-usage with non-peer family members (i.e., parents and grandparents) was a significant predictor of grammatical competence. In particular, grandparents are cited as playing an instrumental role in helping their grandchildren acquire oral and initial literacy skills (Zhang, 2009) and in helping their grandchildren prepare for national examinations, such as their SAT II (Yi, 2009). According to Ishizawa (2004), living with non-English-speaking grandparent influences grandchildren’s minority language use in multigenerational households and prevents three-generational language shift (Fishman, 1972) from taking place. While her findings indicate that the grandmother is more effective than the grandfather at heritage language transmission, a finding which she explains “by the fact that women are more likely to be caregivers and be involved in grandparenthood” (p. 478), the presence of any non-English speaking parents, grandparents, or other adults in the household increases the likelihood of children’s heritage language use. The
importance of females in language transmission and maintenance is also highlighted by Mukadam (2003), who found that mothers were most influential, followed by grandmothers at maintaining the use of Gujarati within the family among second-generation British Gujarati schoolchildren.

### 2.4.1.4 Parents

Parents’ decisions about their own language use in the home affects their child’s language acquisition (Pauwels, 2008). Various scholars have found parental language use to be a major contributing factor in language maintenance (De Houwer, 2007; Hakuta & D’Andrea, 1992; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Veltman, 1981). While the presence of any non-English speaking member in the household (parents, grandparents, other adults) increases the likelihood of a child speaking a non-English language, it is the parents who have the strongest effect (Mukadam, 2003; Stevens, 1985). Furthermore, research has shown that the sole use of the minority language in the home is more effective in language maintenance efforts than using two languages: “If a mother or a father chooses to use both languages with the child ... the chances of the child becoming actively bilingual are not great” (Sirèn, 1991, p. 160). However, others believe in the ‘one parent, one language approach’ (Dopke, 1992), in which one parent speaks one language (e.g., the heritage language) to the child and the other parent speaks another language (e.g., the language of the dominant society) to the child, believing this to be effective in promoting bilingualism. Albirini (2013) found that language input was closely related to language use, but was not a significant predictor of language proficiency, which suggests that language exposure is not always enough to ensure high proficiency levels (see also the discussion on the acquisition of morphosyntactic errors by ‘childhood hearers’ vs. ‘childhood speakers’ in Section 2.3.1).

### 2.4.1.5 Speaker Generation

Intergenerational language transmission to children in the home is key to language maintenance, and it is maintained that “the ultimate survival of a language depends on intergenerational transfer” (Pauwels, 2008, p. 730-731; cf. Fishman, 1991; UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages, 2003). If a language is not passed on to the next generation, there is a high likelihood of language shift taking place. The three generation model of language shift, originally proposed by Fishman (1972), summarizes the stages of language shift among immigrant populations, i.e., from the native language of immigrants (their L1) to the dominant language of the host society (their L2). For the purposes of this study, the various generations of immigrants are defined as follows: First generation immigrants are those who left their home country and immigrated into a host country. Second generation refers to those who are born in the host country and have at least
one foreign-born parent. Third generation immigrants represent locally-born children of locally-
born parents, who have at least one foreign-born grandparent. According to Fishman’s model of
language shift, first generation immigrants continue to speak their native language while learning
the language of their host country, second generation immigrants grow up bilingually but become
more fluent in the language of the host country, and third generation immigrants are monolingual
in the host country’s language and have little or no ability in the language of their grandparents.
While the three generation model of language shift was originally designed to describe language
use patterns among immigrant groups in North America, a similar trend of language shift has also
been found among immigrant groups outside of North America (see, for example, Oonk, 2007, who
describes the shift from Gujarati to English among three generations of the Hindu Lohana
community in East Africa). Speaker generation has been found to be an important variable in
explaining the variation in linguistic proficiency. Researchers have found that heritage speakers
of earlier generations generally possess a higher degree of proficiency in the heritage language
than those of later generations, i.e., second generation speakers generally possess a higher degree
of proficiency in the heritage language than the third generation (Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Zentella,
1997). While the three generation model of language shift seems applicable for a number of
communities in the diaspora, a few studies have reported a slower shift to the dominant language.
Paulston (1994) found a four generation shift among Greeks in Pittsburgh. This slower shift was
attributed to a number of factors, such as marriage patterns (marriages with monolingual Greek
speakers from Greece) and access to language instruction through the Greek Orthodox Church.
Batibo (2005) proposed a five generation shift as being appropriate in many African contexts.

2.4.1.6 Birth Order

Birth order has been described as playing a role in home language ability. Studies have shown
that younger children of immigrants generally have a lower proficiency in the home language than
their older siblings (W. Lambert & Taylor, 1996; Wong Fillmore, 1991; Zentella, 1997). Shin
spoke Korean with their parents before beginning school, compared with a smaller percentage
of second-born, and an even smaller number of third-born children. Similar findings are found
investigate language maintenance among various immigrant communities in the U.S. found that
Persian siblings considered those who were older as being more fluent in Persian than those who
were younger. These findings are not surprising. In households where the heritage language is
actively spoken by parents, the ancestral language would have been passed on by parents to the
first child. Subsequent children in the family would have a higher likelihood of more exposure to
the dominant language of society, given that the first-born child may be attending school at this
stage and hence be exposed to more of the dominant language of the society they are living in,
which they may then bring into the home domain.

2.4.1.7 Heritage Language School

Language schools play an important role in language maintenance within an ethnolinguistic com-

munity, and are an especially effective way of teaching children a heritage language in locations
where ethnolinguistic vitality is low (Shibata, 2000). Heritage language schools are considered sites
where valuable linguistic and cultural input is provided to children (Carreira & Rodriguez, 2011)
and where heritage language proficiency is developed (Chinen & Tucker, 2005). Chinen (2004)
found that the heritage learners of Japanese in his sample felt that the Japanese heritage language
school was a place to develop proficiency in Japanese, and specifically literacy skills. Such schools
have been described as introducing students to “cultivated speech” (Fishman, 1991, p. 372) and
“honorary language” (Chinen, 2004, p. 128). Formal instruction facilitates language learning, at
least in the short term, as demonstrated in Montrul and Bowles’ (2010) study on Spanish heritage
learners in the U.S. However, not all researchers agree. Albirini (2013) empirically measured fac-
tors related to the variability in language proficiency among Arabic heritage speakers in the U.S.
and found that school experience was not related to L1 proficiency, use, or input. He suggests that
this may be linked to the fact that the language that they are exposed to at home is often different
from the Standard Arabic taught in the classroom.

2.4.1.8 Gender

A number of studies have reported that females are more likely to have higher proficiency in the
heritage language (Portes & Hao, 1998; Zentella, 1997). This is also supported by SLA research
(e.g., Ellis, 1994). However, not all researchers agree (Klee, 1987; Solé, 1978). The contradictory
findings seem to be explained by other variables, some related to gender (not female sex per se),
e.g., socioeconomic class, social networks, etc. In Zentella’s (1997) study on Puerto Ricans in New
York, females had higher proficiency in Spanish than males, which she explained through social
networks: “Girls were more likely than their brothers to be expected to do things and be with
people that resulted in greater involvement with Spanish. Boys, on the other hand, could spend
much more time outside of the house and off the block, away from Spanish” (Zentella, 1997, p. 51,
cited in Lynch, 2003, p. 8). In Klee’s (1987) study on Spanish in Texas, one proposed explanation
as to why men were seen to use more Spanish than women was related to socioeconomic factors;
the majority of the men tended to have jobs that did not require them to speak English, whereas women tended to have jobs which required the use of English (e.g., service and professional jobs).

2.4.1.9 Motivation

Motivation may be instrumental (i.e., to obtain something practical or concrete from the study of another language [Hudson, 2000], e.g., an economic reward) or integrative (i.e., a favorable attitude toward the target language; this may include a wish to integrate into a new culture through the language [R. C. Gardner, 1985, p. 54]). The importance of motivation in second language learning and proficiency has been highlighted by a number of researchers, e.g., R. Gardner (2001):

“Motivation is an important factor in determining success in learning another language in the classroom setting” (p. 2). The same seems to be true for heritage language learners (e.g., Cho et al., 1997; E. Kim, 2006; Yang, 2003). Yang (2003) investigated the motivation of heritage language learners and how their performance in classroom settings was affected by their motivation. Her study which focused on heritage learners and non-heritage language learners enrolled in East Asian language classes found that the motivational orientations for the two groups differed to a great extent. She found that heritage learners had significantly more motivation and higher proficiency in East Asian languages than non-heritage learners.

2.4.2 Measuring Proficiency

This section discusses some of the ways in which heritage language proficiency has been evaluated in previous studies. Commonly used heritage language assessment measures include both subjective and objective measures. The advantages and disadvantages of both measures are outlined.

2.4.2.1 Self-Evaluations

Heritage language competence is often measured through obtaining participants’ self-perception of their linguistic competence in areas such as speaking, reading, writing, and listening. Studies on heritage language learners that have employed self-reported proficiency measures include Chinen and Tucker (2005), S. Y. Kim and Chao (2009), J. Lee (2002), Mah (2005), Noels, Pon, and Clement (1996). Self-reported proficiency measures vary, from the use of assessments where participants are asked to simply rate their own levels of heritage language ability in the various skills (i.e., reading, writing, listening, speaking, and overall language skills) using a Likert scale (Cho, 2000) to the use of “can do” questionnaires, where participants are required to rate how well they can perform various tasks that involve reading, writing, listening, or speaking in the heritage language (Chinen & Tucker, 2005). Furthermore, the number of points on a Likert scale
for self-assessed heritage language proficiency vary, e.g., 6 points (Chinen & Tucker, 2005), 5 points (Cho, 2000; J. S. Lee, 2005), and 4 points (Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Tallon, 2006). Self-reports are the most frequently used method of assessing heritage language ability, and are especially useful for large-scale studies. While self-reports of language ability are considered reliable (Portes & Hao, 2002; Portes & Schauffler, 1994; Smith & Baldauf, 1982), previous studies have shown that self-assessed proficiency assessments are not always consistent with objective proficiency assessments (Gibbons & Ramirez, 2004; MacIntyre, Noels, & Clement, 1997). Self-assessed proficiency levels may be influenced by a range of factors, such as learner anxiety and beliefs (MacIntyre et al., 1997), attitudinal orientation (Hakuta & D’Andrea, 1992), the status of the language and the speakers concerned (Gibbons & Ramirez, 2004), and ethnic orientation (Kang & Kim, 2011). Surface, DuVernet, Nelson, McDaniel, and Thornhill (2011) and Surface, Nelson, DuVernet, and Thornhill (2012) indicate that self-ratings may be used as a proxy for actual proficiency scores, but recommend caution in interpreting self-rated proficiency scores from younger students or from those in non-immersed language settings.

2.4.2.2 ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI)

The oral proficiency interview (OPI) offered by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) is widely used to objectively evaluate spoken proficiency in a language. OPI testing is currently available in 37 languages, including three Indian languages: Hindi, Punjabi, and Urdu. It was developed to test students of foreign languages whose learning experience takes place in the classroom, and was not designed with heritage language learners in mind (Valdés, 1989). Valdés (1989) argues that the OPI does not accurately measure the spoken proficiency of those who speak nonstandard varieties of a language, citing the nonstandard varieties of Spanish as an example, since the OPI guidelines use the standard variety of a language as the norm and compare students against that. The validity of using the OPI to assess heritage language speakers has also been questioned by a number of other researchers (e.g., Kagan & Friedman, 2003; Lowe, 1998). However, despite being developed for second language learners, the OPI is frequently used by institutions to place heritage speakers in university language classes. Kagan and Friedman (2003), who used the OPI to assess the spoken proficiency of heritage language speakers of Russian in order to place them in Russian language classes, found that the heritage speakers of Russian in their sample could be assessed using the ACTFL Guidelines, since the authors maintain that “Russian has few dialectal features” (Kagan & Friedman, 2003, p. 543) and as such “using educated Russian as a basis for measuring proficiency would not only be appropriate but desirable” (Kagan & Friedman, 2003, p. 543). However, they partly agree with Valdés (1989) and suggest using the
OPI in addition to other placement measures. The above studies highlight that the appropriateness of the OPI for evaluating heritage language learners seems language-dependent and it would thus be beneficial if the guidelines could be tailored appropriately. Said-Mohand (2011) encourages educators to move beyond the ACTFL and find other ways to measure the language proficiency of heritage learners, and recommends the use of both direct and indirect measures (e.g., language background questionnaires, self-rating scales, and language samples). Ilieva’s (2012) study, which assesses Hindi heritage language learners through the use of the OPI, compares their performance with that of foreign language learners who are rated at similar levels on the proficiency scale. Her study highlights some challenges of using the OPI guidelines to assess heritage language learners. While acknowledging the current unsuitability of the OPI for the assessment of all heritage language learners, it is hoped that the expanded set of OPI descriptors which ACTFL is currently working on and which will take heritage speakers’ proficiency and knowledge into account may provide a more suitable means to measure heritage language ability (Swender, 2008).

2.4.2.3 OCR Guidelines for Evaluating the GCSE Gujarati Examination in England

The OCR (Oxford, Cambridge, and Royal Society of Arts [RSA] Examinations) is one of the main examination boards in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland. The OCR guidelines for the GCSE Gujarati examination allocates points ranging from novice to native-like proficiency in three areas: content and communication (maximum 10 points), quality and range of structures used (maximum 10 points), and pronunciation and intonation (maximum 5 points), allowing participants to obtain a maximum of 25 points. The more points the students receive, the higher their proficiency in the language.

The OCR guidelines for Gujarati have been developed with “non-target language speakers” in mind, i.e., foreign and heritage learners. The majority taking the Gujarati GCSE examination fall in the latter category, i.e., they do not have English as their mother tongue and have some previous knowledge of Gujarati (Roderio, 2009). For each of the three sections (i.e., content and communication, quality and range, and pronunciation and intonation), a rubric explaining what a student should be able to demonstrate to obtain a certain number of points is provided. The lowest score on the rubric for each of the three sections is obtained when students display no or limited language ability and the highest score is reserved for those who show extremely high language ability, though slight deviations are permitted. The rubric provided by the OCR board for Gujarati, while somewhat similar to the rubrics for other languages assessed by the examination board (e.g., French, Persian, etc.), is not identical, suggesting that the rubrics for the various
languages (community vs. foreign language) may have been developed with the learner group typical for that language in mind, i.e., heritage learner of Gujarati vs. foreign learner of French.

2.4.2.4 Speech Rate

Speech rate is measured by the word-per-minute (WPM) output in spontaneous speech and has been cited as another means to assess heritage language proficiency and fluency (Albirini, 2013; Kagan & Friedman, 2003; Polinsky, 2008; Polinsky & Kagan, 2007). The higher the speech rate, the higher the proficiency of the individual in the heritage language. Speech rate has been found to correlate significantly with grammatical proficiency (Polinsky, 2008; Polinsky & Kagan, 2007) and lexical access (Polinsky & Kagan, 2007). Polinsky and Kagan (2007) and Polinsky (2008) showed that gender restructuring in Russian among heritage learners correlated with speech rate. In their study, those who had completely reanalyzed the baseline by absorbing the neuter class into the feminine class, thereby producing an incorrect two-gender system in Russian, had a lower speech rate, whereas those who maintained a reduced neuter class, and therefore a three-gender system, had a higher speech rate. Polinsky and Kagan (2007) showed that those with low proficiency in a heritage language had problems with lexical access, which may lead to difficulties in constructing sentences and speech which often contains numerous pauses, repetitions, and false starts. While the use of speech rate as a means to classify the different range of linguistic fluency found among heritage language learners seems to be an accurate proxy for heritage language proficiency, Polinsky and Kagan (2007) caution that this measure may not be suitable to use among those who have extremely low proficiency in the language, as they may be hesitant about producing any language whatsoever.

2.4.2.5 Type-Token Coding

Measuring grammatical accuracy and syntactic complexity is another means by which proficiency in L1 and L2 research has been assessed. For example, Iwashita (2006) examined how syntactic complexity measures related to oral proficiency in Japanese as a foreign language. She found that the length of T-units\(^2\) and the number of clauses per T-unit was the best way to predict learner proficiency. In addition, this measure had a significant linear relation with independent oral proficiency measures. Other researchers have noted similar findings (e.g., Housen & Kuiken, 2009; Larsen-Freeman, 2006). Such measures have also been successfully used to assess heritage language proficiency (e.g., Albirini, 2013).

\(^2\) A t-unit is “a main clause plus all subordinate clauses and non-clausal structures attached to or embedded in it” (Hunt, 1979, p. 4)
In this dissertation, proficiency assessments consisted of subjective evaluations of proficiency, an oral proficiency test, and national examinations in Gujarati. Oral proficiency tests were administered via a phone interview (discussed in more detail in Section 3.11.3) and the OCR guidelines (see Section 2.4.2.3) were used to evaluate the tests.

2.5 Identity

2.5.1 “Being Indian” in Singapore, South Africa, and the U.K.

In a study on heritage learners of Hindi, Gambhir (2008) found that second generation Indian-Americans mostly identified as “Indian-American” rather than as “Punjabi-American” or “South-Indian American”, i.e., they identified themselves through a pan-Indian identity label rather than through regional identity labels (e.g., Gujarati, Punjabi, etc.) like their parents had. However, the term “Indian” has varying connotations, depending on which diaspora context is being referred to. It may denote everyone originating from the Indian subcontinent (i.e., including those from modern-day Sri-Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nepal), or simply those originating from present-day India. On a related note, this has meant that Indians have been labeled with various different terms in each of the three countries which this thesis focuses on, ranging from broad terms such as “South Asian” to narrower terms such as “Gujarati Lohana”. This section defines what the term “Indian” means in the Singaporean, South African, and the U.K. context.

In Singapore, as a result of the way in which ‘races’ have been classified, the term “Indian” is used as a broad term to refer to all people who originate from the Indian subcontinent. This means that those from modern-day Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nepal have also been grouped under the category “Indian” (Lal et al., 2006, p. 176). Census categories in Singapore recognize three main races, these being Chinese, Malay, and Indian, together with a fourth known as ‘Others’, and so all individuals of South Asian descent are grouped together under the category “Indian” (Lal et al., 2006, p. 176). However, such census categories may be problematic, as illustrated by Purushotam (2000):

My son tried to argue that he was “multicultural” and that all humans were only of one race anyhow. But the teacher, who thought his arguments to be misunderstandings that arose from the complexities of his background, took pains to make him understand that he was “Indian”, even if different from most other “standard Indians”, as she put it. (p. 53)

There is a North-South divide among the Indians in Singapore. They often identify as either “North Indian” or “South Indian” rather than using the collective term “Indian” (Rai, 2004). While this identity distinction has its origins in the homeland, it has over time come to be internalized
by Indians in Singapore, with those of original North Indian heritage maintaining a North Indian identity in Singapore and those of original South Indian heritage maintaining a South Indian identity in Singapore. Interestingly, in the three sites, it is only in Singapore that discourses of “North Indian” versus “South Indian” exist, highlighting how “identities and boundaries of diasporas were not finally determined at the point of departure, but were refashioned by the local situation ‘in accordance with the continually changing political and economic imperatives of colonial rule’ (M. Sinha, 1995, p. 1) in the ‘hostland’” (Rai, 2004, p. 249) and also by the immigrants themselves.

A somewhat different situation emerges in South Africa. Throughout South African history, and especially during Apartheid, Indians in South Africa have been labeled in various ways, including “Non-White”, “Black”, “Asian”, as well as “Indian”. Under the Group Areas Act of 1950, individuals in South Africa were separated geographically based on their race, which heightened a sense of ethnic separateness (Mesthrie, 2007, p. 8). Skin color continues to be salient in post-Apartheid South Africa, where people are classified as “White”, “Colored”, “Indian or Asian”, “Black African”, and “Other” for official purposes (Lal et al., 2006, p. 252). Unlike in Singapore, where there is a divide between the North and South Indians, Indian identities in South Africa are increasingly revolving around specific Tamil, Muslim, or Hindu heritage (Lal et al., 2006, p. 252).

In the U.K., the generic term ‘British Asian’ is used to label all people of South Asian origin (i.e., anyone of Indian, Pakistani, or Bangladeshi descent). This generic term is seen as problematic by some groups. A survey published in the British Parliament illustrates how Britain’s Hindus do not want to be described as “Asians” and be identified alongside Pakistanis and Bangladeshis. Instead, 80% would prefer to be called British Indian or British Hindu, rather than British Asian (Berkeley, 2006), as they believe that their interests are different from other South Asian communities. Indeed, such sentiment is so strong that it led to the creation of a popular BBC program called “Don’t call me Asian”, whose commentators, according to a 2005 article in the Times of India “agree that the overwhelmingly well-educated, prosperous and well-integrated Indian community’s needs are deeply divergent from the comparatively provincial, poor, insular and failing Pakistani and Bangladeshi” (Ahmed, 2005).

In all three sites, a tendency among diaspora Indians can be observed to distinguish themselves from Indians from India (Kamdar, 2000, p. 253; Sharma, 2005, p. 15). In Singapore, there is a tendency to use the hyphenated identity (Chinese-Singaporean, Malay-Singaporean, Indian-Singaporean, and vice-versa). This is also the case in the U.K. and seems to be the case in South Africa; however there is evidence that South African Indians are increasingly using a more national and inclusive South African identity label rather than an ethnic identity label (Goldschmidt, 2003, p. 210), though not all researchers agree (Stinson, 2009, p. 5). Derogatory terms such as FOB
(“Fresh off the Boat”) may be used by more long-established diaspora Indians to categorize Indians from India who have very recently left their country of birth for a new country. Furthermore, a diaspora Indian may also be called FOB if they do something that is indicative of what FOBs do, e.g., if he/she uses his/her hands to eat a rice dish. Similarly, FOBs may use certain terms to categorize the diaspora Indians, e.g., ABCD (“American Born and Confused Desi”), a term which is used to refer to Indians who were born in the United States.

2.5.2 Definitions of Ethnic Identity

Despite “widely discrepant definitions and measures of ethnic identity” (Phinney, 2003, p. 500), certain common variables are found in most definitions and descriptions of “ethnicity” and “ethnic identity”. A powerful marker of ethnic identity is a shared language. This makes studies attempting to correlate the two somewhat problematic, since each co-constitutes the other. Nonetheless, the idea of language being an important marker of ethnic identity has been presented by many, including Fishman (1989), who notes that “language is more likely than most symbols of ethnicity to become the symbol of ethnicity” (p. 27), De Vos (1995), who states that “language undoubtedly constitutes the single most characteristic feature of ethnic identity” (p. 23), and Clyne (2005), who asserts that “language is a vital part of the development and expression of identity” (p. 1). The ethnolinguistic identity theory developed by Giles and Byrne (1982) highlights the central role of language in ethnic identity and group membership. Their theory aims to explain the conditions under which a group is likely to acquire the language of the dominant group. According to the researchers, members of the ethnic group are likely to acquire the dominant language of society when their “in-group identification is weak, in-group vitality low, in-group boundaries open, and identification with other groups strong” (cited in Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004, p. 4). Similarly, they are likely to achieve low proficiency in the dominant language when their vitality as a language community is high. The vitality of language communities is defined as “that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup settings” (Giles et al., 1977, p. 308). If their ethnolinguistic vitality is high, they are likely to maintain their ethnic group’s linguistic and cultural characteristics in multilingual settings, whereas if their ethnolinguistic vitality is low, they are likely to go through assimilation. According to the researchers, ethnolinguistic vitality is affected by sociostructural factors, such as status, demographic, and institutional support factors (Giles et al., 1977). While language is an important marker of ethnic identity, other fundamental markers of ethnicity, in addition to language, include shared culture, shared traditions, shared ancestry, shared religion, shared food, and shared aesthetics. In this

---

3 Desi refers to a person from the Indian subcontinent and its diaspora.
According to Phinney (2003), ethnicity is “a dynamic, multidimensional construct that refers to one’s identity, or sense of self as a member of an ethnic group” (p. 63). For Phinney, being a member of an ethnic group means having a common ancestry and sharing at least a similar culture, race, religion, language, kinship, or place of origin. At the same time, Phinney (2003) notes that, “ethnic identity is not a fixed categorization, but it is rather a fluid and dynamic understanding of self and ethnic background. Ethnic identity is constructed and modified as individuals become aware of their ethnicity, within the large (sociocultural) setting” (p. 63). This idea is shared by others, including Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001), Bucholtz (1995), Clifford (1988), De Fina et al. (2006), Giddens (1991), and Wolf (1997). De Vos and Romanucci-Ross (1982) define ethnicity as “the attribute of membership in a group set off by racial, territorial, economic, religious, cultural, aesthetic, or linguistic uniqueness” (p. 3). They share Phinney’s idea that certain similar traits are necessary to belong to an ethnic group. For Collier and Thomas (1988), “ethnic identity is identification with and perceived acceptance into a group with shared heritage and culture” (p. 115). They emphasize the importance of self-identifying and being accepted by a group.

It has been suggested that ethnic identity is closely related to cultural identity. Some researchers, such as Fong (2004) have argued that cultural identity has become an umbrella term that includes ethnic identity, an idea which can be seen to hold true when exploring definitions of cultural identity. Jackson and Garner (1998) define culture as “a set of patterns, beliefs, behaviours, institutions, symbols, and practices shared and perpetuated by a consolidated group of individuals connected by an ancestral heritage and a concomitant geographical reference location” (p. 44). Lustig and Koester (1999) define cultural identity as a “sense of belonging to a particular culture or ethnic group. It is formed in a process that results from membership in a particular culture, and it involves learning about and accepting the traditions, heritage, language, religion, ancestry, aesthetics, thinking patterns, and social structures of culture” (p. 138). While the above definitions demonstrate that the elements which make up the term “ethnic identity” are found in “cultural identity”, definitions of “cultural identity” seem to place more importance on behaviors, practices, and traditions.

Despite there being “widely discrepant definitions and measures of ethnic identity, which makes generalizations and comparisons across studies difficult and ambiguous” (Phinney, 2003, p. 500), the above definitions of ethnic identity incorporate certain common ideas, including shared language, shared culture, shared ancestry, shared religion, and shared history.
2.5.3 Measuring Ethnic Identity

The difficulty of reliably measuring ethnic identity has been expressed by many. This difficulty arises for several reasons. One reason is that ethnic identities are subjective. Tempting as it may be to infer a person’s ethnic identity from concrete traits, such as the language that we hear them speak or their physical features, these signs may in fact be quite deceptive. Another reason is that individuals possess multiple ethnic identities and the prominence of each is likely to vary with context. For example, a British Indian friend once told me that she sees herself as British Indian in the U.K., but as British abroad. However, when sporting events take place, she supports and feels patriotic toward India. She sees herself as Gujarati when among other Indians, and as Gujarati Jain when among Gujarati Hindus and Muslims. Context plays a role in defining one’s identity, whether it is one’s location, who one is speaking to, or what events are taking place at a particular moment. Issues such as these make it difficult to quantify ethnic identity. Person-internal factors of course play a vital role as well; see Section 2.6 below and Section 6.8 in Chapter 6 for more on this.

Ethnic identity has been measured in various ways, from the use of a single, monolithic factor (Richman, Gaviria, Flaherty, Birz, & Wintrob, 1987) to scales containing several dimensions, e.g., Phinney’s (1992) “Multigroup Identity Measure”, which comprises two factors, namely ‘ethnic identity search’ (a developmental and cognitive component) and ‘affirmation, belonging, and commitment’ (an affective component). Similarly, some identity scales were created to be used across diverse ethnic groups (e.g., Phinney, 1992), whereas others were designed for specific ethnic groups in mind (e.g., Suinn, Ahuna, & Khoo, 1992, which measures the level of acculturation among Asian populations; Felix-Ortiz, Newcomb, & Myers, 1994, which measures the level of acculturation among Latino/a populations). According to Trimble (2005, p. 331), regardless of which technique is used or developed, the following four domains of inquiry must be factored in when measuring ethnic identity:

1. “natality”, including the ancestral genealogy of others in the family, including siblings, parents and grandparents.
2. “subjective identifications”, where the respondent declares what his or her own ethnic identity is.
3. “behavioral expressions of identity”, where the respondent indicates his or her preference for activities connected to his or her ethnic group, e.g. food, music, etc.
4. “situational or contextual influences”, where the respondent indicates the situations in which he or she deliberately expresses his or her ethnic affiliation, e.g., during traditional ceremonies.
2.6 Relationship between Ethnic Identity and Language Proficiency

This section presents and discusses studies that investigate the relations between language and ethnic identity. According to Gudykunst and Schmidt (1988), a reciprocal relationship between ethnic identity and language exists: “Language usage influences the formation of ethnic identity, but ethnic identity also influences language attitudes and language usage” (p. 1). This makes studying the interrelation between language and ethnicity tricky, since each co-constitutes the other. Previous studies that explored the link between ethnic identity and language for heritage speakers have reported divergent findings. Some studies identified a positive relationship between ethnic identity and heritage language ability and/or fluency (e.g., Cho, 2000; Kang & Kim, 2011; Phinney et al., 2001; Soto, 2002), but others did not (e.g., C. L. Brown, 2009; Jo, 2001; Smolicz, 1992), or found only a partial relationship (e.g., Mah, 2005). In this section, I present and discuss the findings from several of these studies.

Ethnic identity has been shown to influence heritage language fluency, with many studies revealing that higher proficiency in a heritage language is linked to stronger ethnic identification (e.g., Cho, 2000; Kang & Kim, 2011; Phinney et al., 2001; Soto, 2002). For example, Tse (1998) studied American-born Asian American adults and concluded that having positive attitudes toward the heritage language and feeling positively about one’s ethnic group aided with language acquisition. Phinney et al. (2001) found that language proficiency predicted ethnic identity for all three groups that they worked with (Vietnamese, Armenian, and Mexican heritage learners in the U.S.). Similarly, Chinen and Tucker’s (2005) study examined Japanese-American adolescents enrolled in a Saturday Japanese heritage school in Los Angeles and found that those who had a stronger sense of being Japanese had a higher proficiency in Japanese.

Other studies report that there is only a partial correlation or none at all between ethnic identity and heritage language proficiency (e.g., C. L. Brown, 2009; Jo, 2001; Mah, 2005; Oriyama, 2010; Smolicz, 1992). C. L. Brown’s (2009) study focused on four Korean-American college students who had high levels of proficiency in Korean. Through in-depth interviews, she found that there was a close relationship between ethnic identity and heritage language for some of her participants. However, her findings illustrate that the ability to speak Korean did not contribute to a positive outlook on ethnic identity for all of her participants, highlighting that high proficiency in Korean did not necessarily mean that heritage learners had a higher sense of Korean identity. Similarly, Smolicz’s (1992) study on Polish, Welsh, and Chinese Australians found that the Polish felt that maintaining their heritage language was important for their ethnic identity, but the Welsh and the
Chinese did not hold the same views. Mah (2005) looked at a sample of ethnically diverse second generation Canadians in Toronto, focusing on individuals with Chinese heritage, and examined the relationship between their heritage language ability and ethnic identity. Mah divided ethnic identity into external and internal aspects. External aspects of ethnic identity involve observable behaviors, such as speaking an ethnic language (i.e., the language use factors mentioned in, e.g., Sections 2.2 and 2.4.1.1) and practicing ethnic traditions (e.g., factors related to social networks, cf. gender effects on proficiency in the heritage language discussed in Section 2.4.1.8). Internal aspects involve attitudes, feelings, ideas, and images. While her findings demonstrate that external expressions of ethnic identity are related to oral language ability (but not literacy), there is no clear link between internal aspects of identity and language ability, highlighting that she only partially supports the statement that there is a link between ethnic identity and heritage language proficiency. Finally, Oriyama’s (2010) study which examined Japanese heritage learners in heritage school settings in Australia found that the level of Japanese heritage language proficiency is not always relative to one’s degree of identification with Japanese people.

In sum, the findings seem to vary from one community to another (Smolicz, 1992), from one location to another (Chinen & Tucker, 2005 vs. Oriyama, 2010), and from one speaker to another (C. L. Brown, 2009). The ways in which strength of ethnic identification and heritage language ability have been evaluated also vary from study to study (see Sections 2.4.2 and 2.5.3). From these divergent findings on the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity, it can be said that the ability to speak the heritage language may be aided by having meaningful connections and identifying with one’s ethnic group. However, it is not certain whether one’s ethnic identity orientation is sufficient to ensure high levels of heritage language proficiency for all ethnic groups. Mah’s (2005) findings encourage us to look deeper into the idea of internal versus external aspects of ethnic identity.

2.7 Summary

In this chapter, I provided important background information on the Gujarati community, and more specifically on the sociolinguistic and linguistic situation of the Gujarati community in the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa. I also explored the ways in which heritage language learners differ from other groups of language learners (i.e., foreign language learners and native speakers), and the wide range of factors that may impact their language proficiency. Some of the ways in which ethnic identity and proficiency have been measured in previous studies have been presented,
as well as findings from previous studies that explored the relationship between language proficiency and ethnic identity.

In Chapter 3 to follow, I present the research questions guiding the study and a detailed description of the employed methodology, which incorporates sociolinguistic and applied linguistic methodologies, and combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Furthermore, I provide a description of the three research sites and the participants, and give details on the data collection materials used (questionnaires, sociolinguistic interviews, and proficiency tests). I end by presenting and discussing the data analysis procedures that were applied.
Chapter 3

Data and Methodology

This chapter addresses the research approach, a characterization of the research sites and the participants, details about data collection, and the data analysis procedures that were applied. The data for this study come from 135 participants who were a) heritage speakers of Gujarati based in England, Singapore, and South Africa, and b) current students or recent graduates of a Gujarati School in their country. Participants completed a questionnaire, took part in a follow-up interview with me, and participated in an oral proficiency test with a native speaker of Gujarati. This chapter provides a detailed overview of the data and methodology used in this study.

3.1 Objectives

Among my peers who are recent graduates of a Gujarati School in London, our proficiency in Gujarati varies significantly, with some of us performing at near native-like levels, and others at beginner levels. This is the case despite similarities in amount and type of Gujarati language instruction and exposure. The causes behind such differences in Gujarati proficiency are not well understood in spite of a number of studies having been conducted with Gujarati speakers outside of India (see, for example, Creese et al., 2007, 2006; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; U. K. Desai, 1992, 1997; Kenner, 2000; Lieberson & McCabe, 1982; Martin et al., 2004, 2006; Mercer et al., 1979; Mugler & Mamtora, 2004; Oonk, 2007; M. L. Roberts, 1999; Sridhar, 1993; Wilding, 1981).

Studies on Gujarati speakers have shown that even if the younger generations are generally shifting to the more dominant languages of the society they live in (Lieberson & McCabe, 1982; Oonk, 2007; Wilding, 1981), Gujarati is still being well maintained in some diaspora settings (U. K. Desai, 1992, 1997; Mugler & Mamtora, 2004; M. L. Roberts, 1999; Sridhar, 1993). Language instruction in community-run language schools plays a major role in maintaining Gujarati in diaspora com-
munities. As well as providing a space to develop language skills, such schools are also important sites for heritage learners to develop ethnic cultural identity (Creese et al., 2007, 2006; Martin et al., 2004).

The variation in proficiency that exists among Gujarati heritage learners who attend these heritage language schools has not yet been explored. Studies which have addressed this issue with other heritage learner groups in heritage school settings have shown conflicting results. Some studies found a relationship between heritage language proficiency and ethnic identity (e.g., Chinen & Tucker, 2005), whereas others did not (e.g., Oriyama, 2010). The conflicting findings from previous studies highlight the need for further studies that examine the relationship between language proficiency and ethnic identity among those who learn their heritage language in a heritage language program.

With the most comprehensive studies on Gujarati heritage language learning being conducted with Gujarati heritage learners in England (Creese et al., 2007, 2006; Martin et al., 2004), there is a need to expand and conduct studies with other Gujarati diaspora communities. My study will address this matter by comparing Gujarati heritage learners in different countries and continents. I believe that a multi-site analysis with the same ethnic minority group in similar educational settings will enable researchers to ascertain how differences in identity formation and degree of assimilation into the dominant culture might impact proficiency.

In this dissertation, I am looking for common patterns and experiences of successful or unsuccessful efforts by local communities to maintain the Gujarati cultural heritage among the youngest generation through a Gujarati School. At the same time I am also very interested in how the differences between the countries and local settings influence the ethnic identity formation of people. By choosing to conduct a multi-site analysis with the same ethnic minority group, I hope to be able to illustrate differences in identity formation, acculturation, and assimilation into the host society and highlight how such differences impact language proficiency. I believe that my study will also contribute to the general understanding of ethnic identity formation and heritage language learning and enable ethnic language communities to better assess methodologies that work in transmitting the heritage language to their target population. Furthermore, I believe that the methodology used in this study can be extended to other heritage learning situations, thereby creating possibilities for replicating this study with other heritage learner communities.
3.2 Research Questions and Hypotheses

With the above issues in mind, the present investigation was guided by the following research questions:

RQ1. What role does identity play in determining heritage language ability? More specifically:

   RQ1a. Is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

   RQ1b. Is the local context a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

   RQ1c. Does current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school influence the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

Hypothesis 1. There is a positive relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati. This relationship does not change depending on local context, but current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school does influence this relationship.

RQ2. Besides identity, what quantitative evidence exists for a relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and demographic factors and linguistic experiences/history? More specifically, is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and the following factors:

- Country
- School status
- Age
- Gender
- Parents’ birthplace
- Living in a three-generational household
- Parents’ L1
- Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends, and vice versa)
- Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)
- Knowledge of other languages
- Gujarati School experiences (i.e., number of years at Gujarati School, feelings about going to Gujarati School, reasons for going to Gujarati School, additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School)
Hypothesis 2. All of the above-mentioned demographic and language acquisition factors influence Gujarati language proficiency. Heritage language proficiency is significantly improved by:

- Being from Singapore or the U.K.
- Being a current student
- Being young
- Being female
- Having parents from India
- Living in a three-generational household
- Having parents whose L1 is Gujarati
- Using Gujarati with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends, and vice versa
- Using Gujarati before the start of primary school
- Knowing other North Indian languages
- Being a student at Gujarati School for many years
- Having positive feelings about going to Gujarati School
- Choosing to go to Gujarati School as a result of intrinsic reasons
- Undertaking additional work in Gujarati outside of Gujarati School

RQ3. Based on qualitative evidence, what factors underlie the relationship between language proficiency and the factors mentioned in RQs 1 and 2? What other factors might affect language proficiency?

Hypothesis 3. Other factors that significantly improve heritage language proficiency exist.

3.3 Research Approach

The success of any study is driven by the appropriateness of the research approach. Quantitative studies are deductive and confirmatory in nature, whereas qualitative studies are inductive and exploratory. As a relatively new research approach in the social sciences, mixed methods research, also known as multi-methods (Brannen, 1992), multi-strategy (Bryman, 2004), or mixed methodology (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), combines both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Researchers may choose to employ a mixed methods design for a variety of reasons. For example, one of the two approaches, qualitative or quantitative, may be used to better understand, explain, or build on the results obtained from the other approach.

Incorporating both sociolinguistic and applied linguistic methodologies, this study is a mixed methods study, which combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The mixed methods
design used in this study is the *triangulation design* (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003). In the triangulation design, qualitative and quantitative data are collected and analyzed separately but concomitantly, with each approach being given equal weight. The mixing of the data takes place when the qualitative and quantitative data are merged, or when the results of two or more approaches are integrated or compared side by side in a discussion.

In this study, I conducted surveys with 135 participants, whereby I obtained quantifiable data related to demography, linguistic experiences/history, ethnic identification, subjective evaluations of language ability and national examination scores through detailed questionnaires, and triangulated these data with quantitative data from oral proficiency tests\(^1\), which provided an objective evaluation of the participants’ spoken abilities in Gujarati. At the same time, I also conducted and analyzed semi-structured follow-up interviews of about 60 minutes long with each survey participant, which enabled participants to discuss their views about speaking a heritage language and growing up as second and subsequent generations of Gujaratis in their respective countries. The quantitative statistical results were enriched by information gleaned from the semi-structured follow-up interviews. In this way, the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were used to either support and confirm the patterns in the quantitative results or illustrate contradictions using participants’ own words and insights.

Briefly, the participants from whom I collected data were 135 male and female participants ranging in ages from 13-29. They were heritage speakers of Gujarati who were born and grew up in England, Singapore, or South Africa. In this dissertation, I take both the linguistic and the familial/cultural elements and refer to a Gujarati heritage language learner as someone who has an emotional attachment to Gujarati through family ties and who has some proficiency in the Gujarati language (based on Polinsky & Kagan, 2007). The participants were either current students or recent graduates of a Gujarati School in their respective countries. Current students were above the age of 13, were in their last years of Gujarati School, and were preparing for the respective nationally recognized final exit examination(s) in Gujarati (see Appendix O for a brief description of the various examinations):

- GCSE examination, AS Level examination and/or A Level examination in England
- GCE O-Level examination and/or GCE A-Level examination in Singapore
- Matriculation examination in South Africa

Graduates were below the age of 30 (i.e., they were recent graduates of Gujarati School). In total, 135 heritage learners of Gujarati participated in this study: 48 from England, 50 from Singapore, 52

\(^1\)The holistic ratings yielded by the oral proficiency tests were further compared with two other measures (type-token coding, speech rate). In this way, an even broader perspective was gained.
and 37 from South Africa. Of the 135 participants, 62 participants were current students and 73 participants were recent graduates.

More detail regarding the study participants is given in Section 3.9 below.

3.4 Research Design

Research questions 1 and 2 from Section 3.2 are repeated below. In this section, I present the dependent, independent, and moderator variables for these two research questions, as well as information on coding categories and measures used.

RQ1. What role does identity play in determining heritage language ability? More specifically:

RQ1a. Is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

In order to determine whether there is a positive relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati (RQ1a), the dependent and independent variables used were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language ability</td>
<td>Ethnic identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent variable, language ability, was assessed as follows:

- Subjective evaluation of proficiency (i.e., self-reported proficiency), measured from 0 (not good) to 3 (very good) for each of the four skills: reading, writing, listening, speaking, resulting in a total value from 0 to 12. 0 indicates no language knowledge and 12 indicates fluency in the language.
- Objective evaluation of spoken proficiency (i.e., externally assessed spoken proficiency) involves the assessment of the oral proficiency test (measured from 0 to 25 by two evaluators). The higher the score given by the two evaluators, the higher the proficiency.
- National examination scores, obtained by the participants in any of the following national examinations they had taken (measured from 0 to 3): GCSE/AS/A-Level in England, GCE O-Level/GCE A-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa. The higher the score

---

2For graduates, this includes both their subjective evaluation of proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School and their subjective evaluation of proficiency at the time when the study was conducted (i.e., current evaluation of proficiency). For current students, only the latter applies.
obtained in the national examinations, the higher the proficiency. In order to obtain comparable measures of national examination scores across the three countries, a standardized variable with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 was used in calculations (Z-score).

Details of the way in which the four aforementioned proficiency measures are related to one another are given in Chapter 4.

The independent variable, ethnic identity, can be separated into the nine identity variables as follows: Nine identity variables, namely films, social events, music, food, clothes, entertainment, friends, wedding, and ethnic self-identification, each assigned a code from 1 (non-Indian) to 5 (Indian), resulting in a total value from 1 to 45. The higher the score, the more Indian one feels.

RQ1b. Is the local context a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

In order to determine whether the local context is a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati (RQ1b), the dependent, independent, and moderator variables used were as follows:

Table 3.2: Dependent, independent, and moderator variables for RQ1b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderator Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language ability</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent and independent variables were coded as described above. The moderator variable, country, was measured from 0 to 2 (0 = England; 1 = Singapore; 2 = South Africa).

RQ1c. Does current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school influence the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

In order to determine whether current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school influences the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati (RQ1c), the dependent, independent, and moderator variables used were as follows:

Table 3.3: Dependent, independent, and moderator variables for RQ1c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderator Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language ability</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>School status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent and independent variables were coded as described in RQ1a. The moderator variable, school status, was measured from 0 to 1 (0 = current student; 1 = graduate).
RQ2. Besides identity, what quantitative evidence exists for a relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and demographic factors and linguistic experiences/history? More specifically, is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and the following factors:

- Country
- School status
- Age
- Gender
- Parents’ birthplace
- Living in a three-generational household
- Parents’ L1
- Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends, and vice versa)
- Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)
- Knowledge of other languages
- Gujarati School experiences (i.e., number of years at Gujarati School, feelings about going to Gujarati School, reasons for going to Gujarati School, additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School)

In order to determine the factors that impact proficiency for heritage speakers of Gujarati (RQ2), the dependent and independent variables used were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language ability</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents’ birthplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living in a three-generational household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents’ L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language spoken in the early years of one’s life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gujarati School experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent variable, language ability, was separated and measured as indicated in RQ1a. The independent variables were coded as follows:

- Country was coded from 0 to 2 (0 = England; 1 = Singapore; 2 = South Africa).
• School status includes both current students (coded as 0) and graduates (coded as 1).
• Age was coded from 0 to 3 (0 = 13-16; 1 = 17-20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25+).
• For gender, males were assigned the code 0 and females were assigned the code 1.
• Parents’ birthplace was coded from 0 to 1 (0 = not India; 1 = India).
• Living in a three-generational household includes currently living at home with parents (coded as 0 if negative and as 1 if positive) and grandparents (coded as 0 if negative and as 1 if positive).
• Parents’ L1 includes: English (coded as 0); both English and Gujarati (coded as 1); Gujarati (coded as 2); Other (coded as 3).
• Language use is separated into:
  – Language which the mother uses to speak to the child (i.e., the participant)
  – Language which the father uses to speak to the child (i.e., the participant)
  – Language which the child (i.e., the participant) uses to speak to the mother
  – Language which the child (i.e., the participant) uses to speak to the father
  – Language which the participant uses to speak to siblings in
  – Language which the siblings use to speak to the participant in
  – Language which the participant uses to speak to Gujarati friends in
  – Language which the participant spoke before starting primary school
Each of the above were coded as follows: 0 = English; 1 = both English and Gujarati; 2 = Gujarati; 3 = Other. A blank indicates N/A (i.e., a parent had passed away or the participant has no brothers and sisters).
• Language spoken in the early years of one’s life was coded as follows: 0 = English; 1 = both English and Gujarati; 2 = Gujarati. A blank indicates that no answer was provided.
• Knowledge of other languages was separated as follows:
  – Knowledge of languages other than English and Gujarati (coded as 0 if negative and as 1 if positive)
  – Knowledge of other North Indian languages (coded as 0 if negative and as 1 if positive; a blank indicates N/A)
  – Knowledge of official languages\(^3\) (coded as 0 if negative and as 1 if positive; a blank indicates N/A)
• Gujarati School experiences were separated as follows:
  – Number of years at Gujarati School was measured in years (e.g., 1 year, 2 years, etc.)

\(^3\)This variable is applicable in Singapore and South Africa only.
Feelings about going to Gujarati School were measured from 0 to 2 (0 indicates negative feelings about going to Gujarati School, 1 indicates neutral feelings about going to Gujarati School, and 2 indicates positive feelings about going to Gujarati School).

Participants were presented with 8 possible reasons as to why they might have gone to Gujarati School (listed below), as well as a ninth category, known as ‘other’.

* Reason 1: Parents’ wish that their child studies Gujarati
* Reason 2: To aid in communication with grandparents
* Reason 3: Part of being Indian means that one should be able to speak, read, and write in Gujarati well
* Reason 4: To have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati (e.g., GCSE in England, GCE O-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa)
* Reason 5: To understand one’s roots/origins
* Reason 6: To make new friends
* Reason 7: To organize and take part in cultural and religious events
* Reason 8: To have Gujarati on one’s C.V.

Participants were asked to select a maximum of three reasons from the above reasons. Each of the reasons for going to Gujarati School were coded as follows: 0 if participants did not choose that reason and 1 if participants chose that reason.

Additional work in Gujarati during the time of Gujarati instruction was coded as 0 if negative and as 1 if positive.

As is standard in the social sciences, a $p$ value of less than 0.05 is the significance factor by which I intend to accept the hypothesis (Field, 2009). Obtaining a value of less than 0.05 thus indicates that results are statistically significant, i.e., that there is a less than 20% probability that the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is due to chance (a single asterisk [*] is used to indicate results where $p < 0.05$ [95% confidence] and double asterisks [**] are used to indicate results where $p < 0.01$ [99% confidence]).

### 3.5 Background of the Researcher

As a second generation Gujarati, born in London to parents who emigrated from Kenya, the issue of identity and belonging among the diaspora Gujarati community is one that is close to my heart.

I was born and raised in Croydon, a suburb in South London where 40% of the residents are from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups (Croydon Council, 2009) and where a large
Gujarati community resides (Dave, 1991, p. 90). Both my parents grew up in Kenya. My family’s ties to Kenya began with my great-grandparents. The family of both my paternal grandmother and my maternal grandfather had moved to Kenya for economic reasons and consequently my paternal grandmother and my maternal grandfather were born in Kenya. My parents immigrated to England at the age of 16 to complete the last years of high school and to receive higher education. My father continued to live in England after he completed his university degree, but my mother returned to Kenya and stayed there for a few more years, until she married my father through an arranged marriage, at which point she moved back to England.

I grew up in a Gujarati-speaking household, which developed into a bilingual household throughout the years. My parents spoke to me and my younger siblings in Gujarati only. My first language was Gujarati and I only began to be exposed to English at the age of 3 when I attended playgroup several times a week. From this point on and especially once I began school at the age of 5, I increasingly heard and used English. At around the time I began school, my parents sent me to a Saturday Gujarati School to formally learn Gujarati. At Gujarati School, I learnt to read and write in my home language, Gujarati, while simultaneously improving my spoken Gujarati at a time when English was slowly becoming more and more dominant in my life. Attending a Saturday Gujarati School not only helped to reinforce my linguistic skills in Gujarati, it also provided me with an opportunity to socialize with other Gujarati children of my age, to take part in Indian cultural activities, and to learn about the Jainism religion.

I attended Gujarati School for 10 years, from the age of 5 to 15, and completed the school with a GCSE qualification in Gujarati. My experiences at Gujarati School were generally positive. I enjoyed seeing my Gujarati School friends every Saturday, I did well in the annual examinations, I liked the teachers and I actively took part in cultural and religious activities. However, I remember that I occasionally envied my non-Gujarati friends who had the possibility to lie-in on Saturday mornings or watch Saturday morning television while I had to attend three hours of Gujarati classes.

After completing Gujarati School and especially after leaving Croydon to go to Germany during my Gap Year and then to university, the opportunities I had to socialize with other Gujaratis (and Indians) were minimal and consequently my use of Gujarati gradually began to decrease. During this time away from home, I became increasingly conscious of cultural differences between mainstream cultural groups and ethnic minorities, the latter to which I belonged. It was through interactions with and questions from my new friends at university, who showed great interest in my background and culture, that I became even more interested in the topic of identity and belonging among second generation British-born Gujaratis.
3.6 Role of the Researcher

As a member of the community that I am conducting research on, I had to be mindful of the advantages and also the disadvantages that came with this. Based on my perceptions during fieldwork, I was usually regarded and also considered myself an “insider”, but the degree to which I was an “insider” varied with each of the three research locations: the Oshwal Gujarati School in Croydon (England), the Singapore Gujarati School (Singapore), and the Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir in Lenasia (South Africa).

In England, being a former resident of Croydon and a former student of the local Gujarati School there, I was well known to the participants, their parents, and the community. My position as a young, second-generation British Indian, who was personally known to the participants, and my status as a student encouraged participation, as well as genuine responses (cf. Harris, 2006, p. 28, who identified the age and status divide between the researcher [adult/teacher] and the participants [child/student] as a possible methodological limitation in research among young British South Asians). Furthermore, my insider knowledge and command of Gujarati meant that participants could freely code-switch and/or use Gujarati terminology during the interview without having to explicitly translate or explain such terms to me (cf. Harris, 2006, p. 28, on the shortcomings associated with not knowing the home language of the ethnic group under investigation). On the other hand, my “insider” status might have also prevented the participants from always being open and honest with me, the researcher, as they may have felt that they had to observe expected group norms and values when interacting with an in-group member, especially with regards to certain taboo topics in Indian (or more specifically, Gujarati) culture (e.g., non-Indian boyfriends and alcohol) which were brought up during the interviews. However, it appeared to me that participants gave frank and detailed responses in most cases. In fact, the picture that emerged from the interviews was that participants were eager rather than afraid to talk and open up to someone they knew, someone they felt comfortable with, and someone who could relate to them and their experiences.

At the other two research sites, my position was somewhat different. In Singapore and South Africa, I felt that I was considered both an “insider” and an “outsider”. I was an “insider” in terms of ethnicity, language, and age range, but an “outsider” in terms of nationality and sometimes religion. As I was recruiting participants at the Singapore Gujarati School, one of the teachers at the school encouraged her students to take part in my study by saying that “we should help our own people”, referring to me here as an “insider” through the ethnic and linguistic affiliation which I shared with them. Despite being an insider, my status of being an outsider in terms of
nationality also had its advantages. A graduate of the Singapore Gujarati School, who did not so readily identify with the Singaporean Gujarati community, said to me during the interview that he probably would not have taken part in this study if I had been a Singaporean Gujarati:

Actually, at first, I was a bit skeptical. Why would a Gujarati be doing surveys on Gujaratis? Then my mum said it is a lady from the U.K. So, ok, I thought cool, interesting. Why would a U.K. citizen be interested in me, so I was more curious. Why interested in me? So, I didn’t mind. But if you were Singaporean, I would say maybe not. Because the thing is, Singaporean Gujaratis know each other already, so I’d see you every year at functions, so to do something like this is a bit awkward, to fill out a form and everything. (Amit, Singapore)

While my position as both an insider and an outsider was advantageous in these sites, one main disadvantage of holding such a position was that it took a longer period of time to gain access to the Gujarati community in Singapore and South Africa than it did in England, as I first had to establish contact with and trust among members of the Gujarati community and potential participants. What greatly facilitated the process in both of these countries was having a teacher at the school who volunteered to help me with the recruitment process. In both cases, this was a teacher who was personally known to the participants, either by currently being their Gujarati teacher or having been so at some earlier stage during their time at the Gujarati School. Using this ‘friend of a friend’ approach (Milroy, 1987) meant that it was easier to obtain ties with the community through someone who was already well known in their community, which greatly facilitated and sped up the participant recruitment process, as well as reduced the number of potential participants who declined to participate (Milroy & Gordon, 2003, p. 32).

3.7 Pilot Study

A pilot study for my project was conducted for two main reasons: 1) to evaluate the self-designed survey questions (see Appendices E-J and Section 3.11.1 for further information about the survey) and 2) to determine the appropriate age range of the population to be considered. The pilot study was initially carried out with ten British Gujarati participants, and then at a later stage with three Singaporean Indian participants and two South African Gujarati participants. A larger number of British Gujarati pilot study participants were recruited to help shape the project during its early stages.

The demographics of the British Gujarati pilot study participants were as follows: one person in the 5-8 age range, three people aged 9-12, two people aged 13-16, and four people aged 18+. All were either current students of the Oshwal Gujarati School in Croydon or had been at an earlier stage. The participants were asked to complete the questionnaire and then indicate what they
liked about the questionnaire, what they didn’t liked, as well as any changes or modifications that they would like to see be made.

Based on their feedback, one important modification was made to the questions concerning identity. Participants originally provided one of two possible answers: “Indian” or “Western”. For example, when asked which films they generally preferred, they could answer either “Indian film” or “Western film”. Based on the feedback received, a Likert scale from 1 to 5 was introduced, giving participants more scope to choose a value that better reflected what they identified with. This meant that participants did not necessarily have to choose a point on the extreme end of the continuum, but rather could choose a value that fell in between the minimum and maximum values on the scale. A 5-point scale was chosen to provide participants with the possibility to pick the middle, neutral value, 3, which indicated that they liked both the Indian and Western option equally and did not have a preference of one over the other. Some participants also indicated that they would have liked to explain their answers to the identity questions and in particular, why they picked one answer over another. In view of the change made, which now provided participants with more scope to choose an answer that better reflected what they identified with, and in order not to increase the length of the questionnaire and the time taken to complete it, it was decided that such discussions would be reserved for the follow-up interview.

Given the relevance of responses received from the various age groups, it was decided to only consider participants aged 13+ in the actual study. Those younger than 13 were excluded for two reasons: 1) they had not yet reached the more advanced levels of instruction at Gujarati School, and 2) they had often not explored their ethnic identity and had less of a clear and committed sense of their ethnicity than the older participants and as such had less to say on the identity questions (cf. R. E. Roberts et al., 1999, p. 303).

A pilot study was also conducted with three Singaporean participants. They were Tamil-speaking and not Gujarati-speaking. Given the smaller Gujarati population in Singapore, it was decided not to include the already few eligible Gujarati participants in Singapore in the pilot study. The Tamil pilot study participants thus substituted ‘Mother Tongue’ (which meant Tamil in this context) for Gujarati when answering the questions.

Based on their feedback, it was decided to include a rubric explaining what the values 1 to 5 for the identity questions represented. Related to the identity questions, there was also some discussion about liking to wear Indian clothes but actually wearing Western clothes. It was decided not to capture this emotion vs. actual distinction in the questionnaire (thus keeping the wording to ‘liking’ to wear), but to allow participants to comment and follow-up on this in the interview that would take place on completion of the survey. Lastly, it was decided to include a question
about one’s citizenship status in Singapore (‘Singapore Citizen’ or ‘Permanent Resident (PR)’ or ‘Other’). As noted by one of the pilot study participants, one’s citizenship status may have an effect on how they view their identity.

Finally, in South Africa, the survey was pilot tested with two South African Gujarati participants. Apart from a few additional questions or slight alterations which were incorporated to fit the South African context, no major changes were noted by them.

3.8 Research Sites

Research was conducted in the following three locations:

- Croydon (England)
- Eastern and Central Singapore (Singapore)
- Lenasia (South Africa)

These locations were selected based on similarities in:

- The size and strength of the Gujarati community
- The existence of a Gujarati School

Croydon in England is a suburb of London with a large Gujarati population (Dave, 1991, p. 90). Lenasia in South Africa is an Indian (and predominantly Gujarati) suburb of Johannesburg (Bhatt, 2002, p. 79). The eastern and central parts of Singapore are historically areas with a large Gujarati (and Indian) population. However, through the Ethnic Integration Policy which was introduced in Singapore in 1989, the Government now attempts to prevent the formation of racial enclaves by integrating its multi-ethnic population through housing. As a result of this policy, a quota system is now in place to ensure that a representative number of each of Singapore’s ethnic communities are living in a particular housing block or neighborhood (Sim, Yu, & Han, 2003). Despite this policy, during my field trip to Singapore, I witnessed that many of the Singaporean Gujarati participants generally still live in the eastern and central parts of the island. Those who did not live there nevertheless spent a lot of time there, as this area is home to “Little India” and as a result, Indian shops, Indian places of worship, etc., are located there.

In addition to a strong and large Gujarati community in each of the locations, another important criterion when selecting the research locations was the presence of a Gujarati School. This criterion ensured that all participants in the study, regardless of the country they lived in, had similar and abundant opportunities to learn and use their heritage language, both in an informal context (at home) and in a formal context (at school). The chosen Gujarati Schools are the Oshwal Gujarati
School (England), the Singapore Gujarati School (Singapore), and the Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir School (South Africa). Each of these schools teaches heritage learners of Gujarati their ancestral language and offers them the possibility to take a nationally recognized final exit examination. While this is an examination set by the national examination board of the particular country they live in, the examinations in each of these countries are essentially of equivalent level and the diplomas obtained can be used in university applications. I report more details about these three schools in Sections 3.8.1-3.8.3.

In the remaining part of this section, I discuss some differences in the three countries in which these sites are located, namely differences in:

- the overall size of the Gujarati population compared to other ethnic communities in the country
- the number of generations of Gujaratis present in the country
- the public discourse about identity and ethnicity
- national policies on heritage language education
- the teaching philosophy of the three Gujarati Schools

The size of the Gujarati and Indian communities in these countries varies. Indians are the largest non-White ethnic group in England. Of the 51,809,700 inhabitants of England, 1,414,100 are Indians. 480,000 Indians (i.e., a third of the Indian community) are based in London and 20,200 in Croydon (Office for National Statistics U.K., 2009a). While the Office for National Statistics U.K. does not collect data on specific sub-groups within the Indian community, Gujaratis are cited as being one of the larger Indian subgroups within this large Indian community (Mobbs, 1985; Poros, 2011, p. 62) and more than 700,000 Gujaratis are estimated to reside in the U.K. (Mawani & Mukadam, 2007, p. 2). By contrast, in Singapore and South Africa, both the Gujarati and Indian communities are minority communities. Indians constitute about 8.4% of the Singaporean population, according to a 2004 estimate (Rai, 2006, p. 176), with the majority of the Indians in Singapore being of Tamil origin (64%). Indians account for approximately 3% of the total population of South Africa (U. K. Desai, 1997, p. 1; Klein, 1986, p. 2). The majority of South African Indians are also of Tamil origin. In both Singapore and South Africa, Gujaratis are cited as being a small ethnic minority group within a minority Indian community (U. K. Desai, 1997, p. 1; Leow, 2001, cited in Mehta, 2009).

The migration history of Gujaratis in each of these three countries is different. Gujaratis started settling in Singapore and South Africa in the late nineteenth century. Consequently, the Gujarati population has, by and large, been in residence for three or more generations, with up to
five generations being present in these two countries. By contrast, Gujaratis arrived in England much later (from 1955 onwards). They are therefore more recent immigrants in this country, with up to three generations of British Gujaratis currently present in England (Frübing, 2008, p. 32).

The public discourse about ethnicity is also markedly different in each of these countries. In Singapore, in an attempt to build and foster national identity and unity after the new post-colonial nation-state was established in 1965, but at the same time ensure that ethnic ties were not destroyed, the hyphenated identity was adopted, i.e., national – ethnic, e.g., Singaporean-Indian (Rai, 2006, p. 185). In England (and more generally, the U.K.), the term ‘British Asian’ is frequently used to refer to individuals of Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi descent. These individuals may employ the term ‘British Asian’ to describe themselves, though they tend to prefer using specific ethnic categories, e.g., ‘Indian’, ‘Pakistani’ or ‘Bangladeshi’ (Berkeley, 2006; Jaspal, 2011).

In South Africa, during Apartheid and as a result of the Population Registration Act of 1950, South Africans were classified based on one of four racial classifications: Black, White, Colored, and Indian. However, now, in the post-apartheid period, there seems to be a shift among certain South African groups, including the South African Indians, from employing an ethnic identity label to using a more national and inclusive South African identity label (Goldschmidt, 2003, p. 210), though not all researchers agree (cf. Stinson, 2009, p. 5).

The three countries adopt different national policies on language education. Singapore’s bilingual education policy means that all students in the government-funded schools must take English plus one other official language (i.e., Chinese, Malay, and Tamil), which are locally referred to as ‘Mother Tongues’, as part of their school curriculum (Dixon, 2005, p. 1). Currently students can opt to take Gujarati in place of their ‘Mother Tongue’ and their results from the Gujarati examinations count as fulfilling their ‘Mother Tongue’ requirement (Rai, 2009, p. 151). This is not the case in England and South Africa, where Gujarati is taken as an additional (voluntary) subject.

In terms of the actual heritage language schools chosen for this study, the teaching philosophy differs in relation to the amount of time dedicated to other activities, specifically religious and cultural activities. In Singapore, the Gujarati School is solely a site where students are taught the Gujarati language. The school is not affiliated with any religion, and in fact, the topic of religion is not even mentioned at the school to prevent tensions arising from the different religious groups (Muslims, Hindus, and Jains) represented at the school (Singapore Gujarati School interview, 29th November 2010). Religion and culture are dealt with separately, e.g., through the Singapore Gujarati Society, the Jain Society of Singapore, etc. In England and South Africa, by contrast, the schools are affiliated with the Jainism and Hinduism religion, respectively. In terms of enrollment,
the Gujarati School in England gives priority to Oshwals (a subcaste within the Jainism religion) and admits other subcastes only if space allows. Religion is addressed and taught during school assemblies in both of these schools, and in the case of the South African Gujarati School, Hinduism is also taught in some depth during classroom hours. Therefore, even though the number of hours of classroom teaching at the Gujarati School in South Africa (8.5 hours a week in Grades 1-9 and 1.5 hours a week in Grades 10-12) is higher than in England (2 hours and 45 minutes a week) and Singapore (4 hours a week, including a 30 minute recess), the number of hours of actual Gujarati instruction is quite similar in all three countries.

The similarities discussed above make these sites suitable for the study. Participants receive similar amounts and types of Gujarati language instruction and ethnic cultural exposure by growing up in close-knit Gujarati communities in their respective countries and by attending a Gujarati heritage language school throughout their childhood. However, the differences highlighted above add an interesting dimension to the study. In this dissertation, I am interested to see how the differences between the countries and local settings influence the ethnic identity formation of people. Through a multi-site analysis with the same ethnic minority group in similar educational settings, I hope to be able to illustrate differences in identity formation, acculturation, and assimilation into the host society and highlight how such differences impact language proficiency.

In the following three sections, I discuss each of the heritage language schools in more detail.

### 3.8.1 Oshwal Gujarati School

The Oshwal Gujarati School in Croydon (South Area) is one of many Gujarati Schools in the U.K. This is unlike the Singaporean and South African Gujarati Schools, which are unique in their countries. The Oshwal Gujarati School (South Area) was established in the spring of 1974 by members of the Gujarati community in Croydon, with their objective being to teach the youngest generation of Gujaratis their mother tongue in order to preserve one’s culture and heritage. In its early years, teaching took place in several different locations. From 1982 onwards, the teaching of Gujarati has taken place in a building owned by the Oshwal community. Currently, the school runs for 2 hours and 45 minutes every Saturday morning, which begins with a morning assembly where all children recite prayers and which is then followed by classes. Classes follow the main (i.e., national) school schedule and take place on 32 Saturdays a year. There are currently 11 classes at the school, including GCSE, AS, and A Level classes.

The Oshwal Gujarati School in Croydon belongs to the Oshwal Association of the U.K. The Oshwal Association of the U.K. was founded in 1968 by some of the first Halari Visa Oshwals who came to settle in the U.K. The Association comprises of nine geographically defined branches,
referred to as Areas. The South Area, where my research took place, is one of the Areas of the Oshwal Association of the U.K. Each Area has its own committee, which organizes various activities, such as the running of Gujarati Schools, Youth Clubs, Ladies Clubs, sporting activities, religious and cultural programs, workshops, etc.

The Oshwal Gujarati School in Croydon caters to all ages ranging from 5 to 17. At its opening in 1974, 22 students were enrolled in the school. The school reached a peak enrollment of 268 students in the late 1980/early 1990s, but in recent years, the number of students has remained steady at around 175 students. According to the deputy headmistress of the school, the decline in the number of students from the 1980s/1990s to the present day is a result of various factors. Other extra-curricular activities are being scheduled on Saturdays which children may prefer to take part in, and the newer generation of Oshwal parents are not always encouraging their children to attend the school (as discussed in more detail in Chapter 6). Furthermore, knowledge of the school is predominantly through word of mouth. This was a successful method of becoming aware of the school in the past when the majority of the students attending the school were from the same community, i.e., the Oshwal community. However, nowadays there are fewer Oshwals attending the school and no active advertisement of the school takes place outside the Oshwal community.

The 160 students currently attending the school are taught by 12 teachers. Teachers at the Oshwal Gujarati School are required to have good knowledge of Gujarati, as well as previous teaching experience (especially for the higher level classes). Prior to recruitment, all potential teachers are interviewed, and for the higher classes, they are required to give a mock class. Teachers are paid 40 GBP (approx. 65 USD) per Saturday teaching session. In addition to the 12 teachers currently teaching at the school, there are 3 assistant teachers, 1 administrator, and 2 office helpers. Along with the regular staff, some of the former students of the school occasionally act as assistants to the teachers or in the school office.

School fees vary depending on whether the parents of the individual attending the school are Oshwal members, i.e., belong to the Halari Visa Oshwal community, or non-Oshwal members. There are approximately 25,000 Oshwals in the U.K. Priority in enrollment and lower school fees are given to Oshwal children. The school fees for 2011-12 were 100 GBP (approx. 162 USD) for Oshwals and 155 GBP (approx. 252 USD) for non-Oshwals. Oshwals currently consist of about a third of the student body, which is in stark contrast to the period up to the 1990s when the school

---

4This situation is changing. As of 2012, the school has started advertising in the local newspapers and the Gujarati Samachar (a Gujarati newspaper sold worldwide), and there is now also a notice board by the school which informs passers-by about the school.

5Average household income per head in the South London area in 2010 was 22,458 GBP/year, i.e., 1,871.50 GBP/month (Office for National Statistics U.K., 2012).

6According to http://www.oshwal.co.uk/
was composed of Oshwals only. As of the start of the academic year 2012-13, enrollment is free if both parents of the student are life members of the Oshwal Association of the U.K.

A universal syllabus for all Oshwal schools in the U.K. was introduced by the Oshwal Association of the U.K. at the start of the academic year 2012-13, and all Oshwal schools in the U.K. are now required to follow this syllabus. In previous years, not all of the Oshwal schools were following the same syllabus and some schools were using different methods of teaching, e.g., teaching Gujarati through “fun and music” (the sansaar method), or having a different emphasis, e.g., more cultural education than language learning.

The Oshwal Gujarati School started the Gujarati O Level examination in 1976 (it later became known as the GCSE examination). AS/A level classes started in 2000. Reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills are tested at the GCSE level. At the AS/A level, there is no speaking component. The GCSE and AS/A qualifications in Gujarati are recognized by universities and assist in UCAS applications. Currently, the Oshwal Gujarati School is the only school in the Croydon area that offers children the opportunity to take the AS/A Level in Gujarati. Asset examinations, a new assessment scheme recently introduced in the U.K., started at the Oshwal Gujarati School (South Area) in 2009 with the Breakthrough level (A1 on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, hereafter CEF). As of 2010, 3 levels of Asset examinations have been offered at the school (breakthrough [A1 on the CEF], preliminary [A2 on the CEF], and intermediate [B1 on the CEF]). In addition to the external examinations, students also take internal school examinations annually in June. The school has a 100% pass rate with the majority achieving the highest grades.

In addition to the language teaching, various cultural, religious and extra-curricular activities also take place at the school. In previous years, when the school was predominantly composed of Oshwals, Jainism was taught in the morning assemblies. Nowadays, it is not taught in as much detail, as a result of the more mixed religious composition of the students. However, certain Jain religious festivals are nonetheless discussed in the assemblies or celebrated, e.g., Paryushan (known as the “festival of forgiveness”). During Diwali (a five-day Hindu and Jain festival, popularly known as the “festival of lights”), the school organizes a Chopda Pujan (a ritual of the account books), where all the children are taken through the different steps of the Puja (a ritual in honor of the Gods) in Gujarati and English.

---

7UCAS stands for the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service and is the British admissions service for students applying to university and college.

8The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF) was developed by the Council of Europe to standardize the various levels of language examinations in different regions. There are six levels in the CEF: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2, with A1 being the lowest level (beginner) and C2 being the highest level (native speaker). See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1_en.asp for more information about the CEF and the various levels.
3.8.2 Singapore Gujarati School

The Gujarati community in Singapore opened the Singapore Gujarati School on the 2nd of October 1947 (this date was specifically chosen as it is Gandhi Jayanti, the birthday of Mohandas Gandhi, which is a national holiday in India). Mr. R. Jumabhoy, a philanthropist and the first Indian to be made Justice of the Peace in the time prior to the 1940s, was invited to officiate the opening of the school at 79 Waterloo Street. Due to poor attendance, the school was closed in 1954 but reopened again in 1958, as the absence of Gujarati education was very badly felt in the community. In 1960, the school was registered with the Ministry of Education.

The Singapore Gujarati School is the only institution in Singapore which provides Gujarati language instruction. Throughout the years, Gujarati classes have taken place at various locations. Currently, they are held at the Haig Girls’ Primary School on Joo Chiat Road for 4 hours every Saturday morning. School fees are 350 SGD (approx. 286 USD) per annum. Teachers receive 80 SGD (approx. 65 USD) per Saturday teaching session. At present, the 150 students enrolled at the school are instructed by 17 teachers. The student enrollment has decreased in recent years. The school believes that the reason behind this is because Indians, primarily expatriate Indians, prefer to send their children to the Hindi language schools. Not only is Hindi the national language in India, but it is also a compulsory school subject for students in India. Therefore many of the Indian parents consider Hindi to be more beneficial for their children (as discussed in more detail in Chapter 6), especially the temporary Indian sojourners residing in Singapore, whose children can then easily continue their Hindi language education on their return to India.

Teachers at the Singapore Gujarati School are required to be native speakers of Gujarati. While teachers with a university degree from India are preferred, at present only two teachers have a bachelor’s degree with a major in Gujarati. None of the current 17 teachers at the school are locally born; they are all originally from India and the majority moved to Singapore at the time of marriage. The school has advertised for Gujarati teachers in India. However, recruiting directly from India was found to be financially unviable, and so potential teachers who are already residing locally have instead been sought by word of mouth and through announcements at various Gujarati events.

The first Gujarati PSLE, GCE O-Level, and GCE A-Level candidates were in 1994 and the first Gujarati GCE N-Level candidates were in 1996. See Appendix O for a brief explanation of the various examinations. For the GCE N-Level, GCE O-Level, and GCE A-Level examinations in Gujarati, students sit two papers: 1) an essay writing paper and 2) a language usage and comprehension paper. There is no oral and listening comprehension examination at these levels.

---

9The median household income in 2012 was 7,570 SGD/month (Department of Statistics Singapore, 2012).
These skills are only tested at the PSLE level, along with reading and writing skills. Throughout the years, examination scores for these nationally recognized examinations in Gujarati have been consistently high. PSLE scores have largely been in the $A^{10}$-A-B range, GCE N-Level scores have been in the A1-A2-B3 range, GCE O-Level scores have generally been in the A1-A2-B3 range, and GCE A-Level scores have typically been in the A1-A2 range$^{11}$. There was a general increase over the years in the number of students taking the GCE O-Level and GCE A-Level examination in Gujarati, with a peak having been reached in 2003/2004, which was then followed by a decline in the number of students sitting these examinations in recent years.

The examining body for Gujarati examinations in Singapore is the Singapore Examination and Assessment Board. They collaborate with the University of Cambridge and the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES) to prepare the GCE N-Level, GCE O-Level, and GCE A-Level papers. The PSLE papers were initially set in India but due to the poor quality of the papers, they are now set at Cambridge as well. All the national examination papers (PSLE, GCE N-Level, GCE O-Level, and GCE A-Level papers) are marked externally in Cambridge, whereas the internal mid-year and final year examination papers are marked by the Gujarati School teachers.

The Singapore Examination and Assessment Board informs the school on the design of the PSLE, GCE N-Level, GCE O-Level, and GCE A-Level papers. In the past, the individual Non-Tamil Indian Language (NTIL) schools designed their own syllabi. However, in 2004, the Board for the Teaching and Testing of South Asian Languages (BTTSAL) was created and now the different NTIL groups work together to prepare the syllabus for the NTILs and the two examination papers every year (the mid-year paper, taken at the end of semester 1, and the final year paper, taken at the end of semester 2). BTTSAL and the different NTIL groups also work together to locally prepare the textbooks. Initially, the books used to teach Gujarati came from India. However, the students felt that they could not relate to the topics discussed in the books and as a result, the teachers created their own materials. As of 2008, books were conceptualized in English and then translated into the target languages of Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Punjabi, and Urdu.

$^{10}$A$^*$ stands for ‘A star’ and is similar to A+ in the U.S. This grade is awarded to mark out the top students who have scored an A grade.

$^{11}$The approximate percentage values of the letter grades are as follows: $A1 = 75\%+$, $A2 = 70-74\%$, $B3 = 65-69\%$. Grades in the A category are deemed ‘excellent’ (also known as ‘quality pass grade’), grades in the B category are considered ‘good’, grades in the C category are regarded to be ‘fair’, and grades in the D category are judged to be ‘poor’.
3.8.3 Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir School

The Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir School in Lenasia (SBSM) was first established in 1936 as a Gujarati vernacular school, as a means to maintain Indian culture and to educate children in Indian languages such as Gujarati, Hindi, and Sanskrit. Today, it is a private educational institution in the Gauteng province that runs a main school in the mornings and a Gujarati School in the afternoons. The main school offers three Eastern languages as part of its curriculum: Gujarati, Hindi, and Tamil. These languages are taught for 1.5 hours per week. Students take one of these languages from grades 1 to 9 at either higher level or standard level. According to the school director, taking any of these languages at standard level is particularly useful for those who do not come from households where one of these languages is actively spoken and for those who start the school in later years and therefore miss out on learning some of the basics of the language.

Attending Gujarati School is an optional after-school activity open to all Gujarati children living in the Gauteng province. From Grades 1 to 9 (ages 6-15), Gujarati School is held for 8.5 hours during the week (1.5 hours on Mondays to Thursdays and 2.5 hours on Fridays), which includes at least 30 minutes per day on religious and cultural education. Hindi is also taught at Gujarati School from grade 5 onwards. Those who complete the afternoon Gujarati School up to Grade 9 (i.e., Shishuvarga to Sanskrutz varga 2) are said to have “graduated from Gujarati School”.

Students are offered the option to take Gujarati as a Second Additional Language at the Matriculation level in Grade 12 (age 18). Matriculation in South Africa is the qualification received on graduating from high school and the qualification required to enter university. Other languages that are recognized at the Matriculation level in South Africa include the 11 social languages of the country, as well as numerous other languages, including several South Asian languages. The South Asian languages assessed at Matriculation level are Gujarati, Hindi, Tamil, Telugu, and Urdu. Currently no other Gujarati School exists in the Lenasia area, and SBSM is the only school in the entire country that offers students the opportunity to take the Matriculation qualification in Gujarati (available since September 2000).

Students preparing to take Gujarati as a Second Additional Language at the Matriculation level complete either the daily after-school Gujarati classes up to grade 9 (age 15) and/or the weekly 1.5 hours of Gujarati instruction which is part of the SBSM curriculum. The conversion of SBSM in 1996 to a morning Independent School and an afternoon Gujarati School, as well as the introduction of Gujarati as part of the curriculum at the SBSM Independent School have resulted in fewer students attending the optional afternoon Gujarati classes, which consist of 1.5 hours of after-school Gujarati instruction every week from grades 10 to 12 (ages 16-18). Gujarati classes from
grades 10-12 are not held during the morning school hours, as Gujarati is considered an additional subject at the Matriculation level, which does not replace the compulsory six subjects that students have to take at Matriculation\textsuperscript{12}. The compulsory subjects include two languages chosen from the eleven official languages of the country, one of which is assessed as a Home Language (which is English at SBSM) and the other of which is assessed as a First Language (which is either Afrikaans or Zulu at SBSM). In general, those who choose to take the Matriculation in Gujarati are current students of SBSM; very few students outside SBSM take the Matriculation in Gujarati. According to the school director, there are two reasons why students would choose to take the Matriculation in Gujarati. The stronger students may take it to have an extra subject at the Matriculation level and the weaker students may take it to help them pass the Matriculation qualification, as the marks obtained in Gujarati can be used in university applications to replace their marks for one of their compulsory Matriculation subjects that they may do poorly in.

Since 2008, the Independent Examinations Board (IEB) has been externally assessing Gujarati at the Matriculation level for SBSM students. While only a few students have been taking the Matriculation qualification in Gujarati in recent years (5 students maximum each year in the last 4 years), those who are taking it are passing with very high scores.

There are currently 122 students (101 students in grades 1-9 and 21 students in grades 10-12) and 10 Gujarati teachers at the afternoon Gujarati School. Teachers are required to be native speakers of Gujarati and to have some prior teaching experience. Also required in recent years is that they have some sort of qualification or university degree, preferably from India. Current teachers at the Gujarati School are both from South Africa and from India. The syllabus for Gujarati, which was created by the teachers, is based on the requirements of the Matriculation examination. Books used by the teachers to teach the language come from India.

School fees for the afternoon Gujarati School are 120 ZAR per month (14 USD). The Transvaal United Patidar Society (TUPS) (a society responsible for maintaining the social, cultural, educational, and religious activities of the Patidar community, a large Hindu ethnic group which originates from the state of Gujarat) subsidizes the teachers’ salaries. Salaries for the Gujarati School teachers begin at 2000 ZAR (235 USD) per month, with teachers earning up to 5000 ZAR (590 USD) per month\textsuperscript{13}. Teachers’ salaries are dependent on the number of years of teaching experience they have.

\textsuperscript{12}An exception exists for foreigners who have been residing in South Africa for less than 5 years. They may appeal to the Department of Education and request to have Gujarati count as one of their compulsory subjects.

\textsuperscript{13}The average household income for South African Indians in 2010/2011 was 252,724 ZAR/year, i.e., 21,060 ZAR/month (Statistics South Africa, 2012).
Enrollment numbers for the afternoon Gujarati School have dropped significantly in recent years. Enrollment was at its highest prior to 1996. Enrollment dropped by 20 students between 2007 and 2008. Since 2008, enrollment numbers have been between 110 and 122 students. As noted above, the drop in enrollment is due to the conversion of SBSM in 1996 to a morning Independent School and an afternoon Gujarati School, as well as the introduction of Gujarati as part of the curriculum at the SBSM Independent School, developments which mean that students can now receive Gujarati instruction as part of their regular school day rather than having to attend optional afternoon Gujarati classes. According to the School Director at SBSM, students are becoming too lazy to go to school in the afternoon and complain that they have too much homework to do from their main school; however, the School Director also blames parents for not pushing students hard enough to take optional afternoon Gujarati classes.

In sum, there are some similarities and differences among the three Gujarati Schools; a few of the main ones will be summarized here. First, all three schools teach Gujarati from beginner to advanced level to heritage learners of Gujarati. In the U.K., the chosen Gujarati School for this study is one of many Gujarati Schools that teaches Gujarati to an advanced level. In contrast, the Singaporean and South African Gujarati Schools are each the only Gujarati School in their respective country. Second, the study of Gujarati is an additional extra-curricular activity for students; the only partial exception to this is in South Africa, where students also have the possibility to study Gujarati in their main school. Third, the U.K. and South African Gujarati Schools also incorporate cultural and religious activities into the school day, which is not the case with the Singapore Gujarati School, since state policy dictates that language education should be secular; as such, cultural and religious events are organized by separate associations.

3.9 Participants

As mentioned in Section 3.3, the participants in this study were heritage speakers of Gujarati who were born and grew up in England, Singapore, or South Africa. In line with Polinsky and Kagan’s (2007) definition of the term ‘heritage language learner’, I take both the linguistic and the familial/cultural elements and refer to a Gujarati heritage language learner as someone who has an emotional attachment to Gujarati through family ties and who has some proficiency in the Gujarati language. The participants in this study were either current students or recent graduates of a Gujarati School in their respective countries. Current students were above the age of 13, were in their last years of Gujarati School, and were preparing for the respective nationally
recognized final exit examination(s) in Gujarati (see Appendix O for a brief description of the various examinations):

- GCSE examination, AS Level examination, and/or A Level examination in England
- GCE O-Level examination and/or GCE A-Level examination in Singapore
- Matriculation examination in South Africa

Graduates were below the age of 30 (i.e., they were recent graduates of Gujarati School). In total, 135 heritage learners of Gujarati participated in this study: 48 from England, 50 from Singapore, and 37 from South Africa.

3.10 Participant Selection and Recruitment

Several months before the start of my data collection, I began establishing contact with the heritage language schools that had been selected in each of the countries. Letters of cooperation were obtained from the three schools, granting me permission to recruit participants from each of these schools (see Appendix A). Once on site, the snowball sampling technique was primarily adopted. At the end of each interview, participants were asked to provide the names of friends or relations who would be appropriate for the study and who might be willing to participate. Using this ‘friend of a friend’ method (Milroy, 1987) through the snowball sampling technique proved to be highly successful in obtaining contact with participants in the two communities where I was not known, the Singaporean and South African Gujarati communities, and also greatly reduced the number of potential participants who declined to participate in my study (Milroy & Gordon, 2003, p. 32).

Specific details about participant selection and recruitment in each of the three sites are given in the next sections.

3.10.1 Participant Selection and Recruitment in England

The British Gujarati participants were recruited from the Oshwal Gujarati School in Croydon (a suburb of London). As a former student of the Oshwal Gujarati School from 1990 to 2000 and a past resident of Croydon, I had many contacts with the Gujarati School and the Gujarati community there. The graduate participants were selected from a pool of contacts personally known to me, and/or to my family. I collected data from 26 recent graduates of this school in March/April 2010. Current students of the school were recruited through contacts I have with the school and the community. I collected data from 22 current students of this school in May and August 2012.
3.10.2 Participant Selection and Recruitment in Singapore

The Singaporean Gujarati participants were recruited from the Singaporean Gujarati School. Contact with current students was established through announcements sent out by Dr. Rita Silver (National Institute of Education, Singapore) via the Singapore Gujarati School list server. A pilot study was conducted remotely via telephone with some of the current students of the school in early 2011. Further data were collected on site during a 6 week field trip in Singapore (June – July 2011). Working through people’s social networks (Milroy, 1987), I reached out to the participants who had participated in the pilot study and also to teachers at the school, and approached new participants (both current students and graduates) as a ‘friend of a friend’ (Milroy, 1987). Data were collected from 23 current students and 27 graduates of this school during my field trip in Singapore.

3.10.3 Participant Selection and Recruitment in South Africa

The South African Gujarati participants were recruited from the Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir School (SBSM) in Lenasia (a suburb of Johannesburg). Contact with current students and graduates was established through the Head of Eastern Languages at the school, Mrs. Bhagwati Paima. I collected data from 17 current students and 20 graduates of this school during a 6 week field trip in South Africa (July – August 2011).

3.11 Study Protocols and Procedure

My study used a mixed methods design. The participants were given a brief overview of the study to determine initial interest. Then they were given an assent and/or consent form which discussed the confidential nature of the project and the fact that participation was voluntary. Once consent was obtained, participants a) completed a survey, b) took part in a follow-up interview with me, and c) participated in an oral proficiency test in Gujarati. Each of these data collection procedures are discussed in more detail below. In addition, several interviews were conducted with important stakeholders in each of the three countries. These included interviews with various Gujarati School personnel (school director, head/deputy head teacher, and school teachers), experts on the Gujarati language, and academics.

Data collection was conducted in a variety of settings, such as a room in the participants’ home, in my home, or at the Gujarati School. Preference was given to the location that best suited the
participant, however it was emphasized to the participant that the location they choose should have as little background noise as possible and no other family members present during the data collection. The former was especially important for the data collection components which were being recorded, for which the aim was to obtain the best acoustic environment possible under the circumstances and to reduce background noise.

3.11.1 Survey

Current students completed a 44-question online survey\(^{15}\) which was sent to them via email and the graduates completed a 50-question online survey\(^{16}\). Participants also had the option to have a hard copy of the survey if they wished to complete the survey by hand. A copy of the survey which was administered to the current students based in England can be found in Appendix E and a copy of the survey which was administered to the graduate participants based in England can be found in Appendix F. The survey consisted of four sections: 1) demographic information, 2) language information, 3) questions related to issues of identity, and 4) Gujarati School experience.

The first section of the survey included questions on age, gender, country of birth of the participants and their parents, occupation of parents, schooling, and current living situation.

The second section of the survey contained 11 questions in total, and included items about language use with various members of the family (the language usually used by the mother, father, and siblings when conversing with the participant, and vice versa), language use with British/Singaporean/South African Gujarati friends, the language spoken in the first few years of the participants’ life, and their knowledge of other languages.

The third section of the survey consisted of 10 questions. Nine of the questions focused on the strength of identification with the ethnic group. As indicated in Section 2.5.3, ethnic identity has been measured in various ways, from the use of a single item (Richman et al., 1987) to scales containing several dimensions (Phinney, 1992). Although measures of ethnic identity such as the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) were examined (Phinney, 1992; R. E. Roberts et al., 1999), a new set of questions was designed for the participants in this study. The questions that were created captured characteristics that I and other members of the Gujarati community whom I consulted on this issue considered to be salient in the life of the participants. These included eight external markers of identity (related to films, social events, music, food, clothes, entertainment, friends, wedding). I also asked for a self-evaluation of their strength of ethnic identification. The

\(^{15}\)The survey was created using the online tool www.esurveyspro.com

\(^{16}\)The number of questions on the survey varied slightly with each location, as certain country-specific questions were included, if deemed necessary. The numbers presented here apply to the surveys given to the participants in England.
participants were asked to rate their choice for each question, choosing from (1) 100% non-Indian (i.e., British/Singaporean/South African) to (5) 100% Indian for the above topics. A description of each of the five values on the scale was provided to the participants:

- 1 indicates “completely non-Indian”
- 2 indicates “more non-Indian than Indian, but not completely non-Indian”
- 3 indicates “50% non-Indian and 50% Indian”
- 4 indicates “more Indian than non-Indian, but not completely Indian”
- 5 indicates “completely Indian”

A Likert-scale with an even number of responses and no middle neutral choice was not chosen. My wish was not to force the participants to have to decide whether they lean more toward the Indian or non-Indian end of the scale for each item, as there may be times when their response is neutral or impartial and they fall in the middle category. The last question was open-ended and allowed the participant to explain their answer to the question “Do you consider yourself British/Singaporean/South African or Indian?”

Finally, the fourth section consisted of closed and open-ended questions about the participants’ Gujarati School experience. Examples of closed-ended questions included their feelings about going to Gujarati School (on a three-point Likert scale: I like/liked going, I don’t/didn’t mind going; I don’t/didn’t like going) and subjective evaluations of language ability (on a four-point Likert scale: very good, good, ok, not good). Various measures for subjectively evaluated language proficiency exist. Some ask participants to simply rate their own levels of heritage language ability in the various skills (i.e., reading, writing, listening, speaking, and overall language skills) using a Likert scale (Cho, 2000). Others use “can do” questionnaires, where participants are required to rate how well they can perform various tasks that involve reading, writing, listening, or speaking in the heritage language (Chinen & Tucker, 2005). Furthermore, the number of points on a Likert scale for subjectively evaluated heritage language proficiency vary, e.g., 6 points (Chinen & Tucker, 2005), 5 points (Cho, 2000; J. S. Lee, 2005), and 4 points (Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Tallon, 2006).

A four-point scale was chosen, as opposed to a five-point scale, as many of the five-point scales had a category for “not at all”, which was inapplicable to the heritage language population I was working with, since all participants had received heritage language education for an average of 10 years. Examples of open-ended questions in this section of the questionnaire included opportunities for the participants to elaborate on their Gujarati School experience and their feelings about the Gujarati language.
Note that two slightly different questionnaires were used for current students and for graduates (see Appendices E and F). Lexical changes were made to ensure that the language employed was accessible to the age group in question (current students vs. graduates). Grammatical changes in terms of the tenses used were made for some of the questions to reflect present or past ideas, where appropriate (e.g., length of time at Gujarati School).

I produced slightly different versions of the questionnaire for each country to reflect country-specific details (e.g., school types). Occasionally additional country-specific questions were inserted. The questionnaires for current students and graduates from the Gujarati Schools in Singapore and South Africa can be found in Appendices G, H, I, and J, respectively.

3.11.2 Interview

After completing the survey, the participants took part in an informal, semi-structured follow-up interview. This was conducted via phone and/or in person, depending on the preference and availability of participants. Firstly, their answers to the questions from the questionnaire were discussed. Secondly, I asked the participants some additional questions tailored to their site and age group. Although at first glance asking different questions of different participants may seem to render the interviews less than truly comparable across individuals and research sites, in reality, researchers have questioned whether different interviewees of different cultures, or indeed individuals of the same cultural background ever truly understand even the most formulaic of interviews in the ‘same’ way, and have argued that tailored, ethnographically appropriate interviews will yield more valid understandings than administering a single ‘one-size-fits-all’ interview across all participants, communities, and cultures (see Briggs, 1986; Schilling, 2013). Thirdly, this interview was also an opportunity for some more open-ended discussions (e.g., on teaching style, class structure, ways of improving the school, etc.). Each interview lasted approximately an hour and was digitally-recorded with the permission of the participant. The recording device used was a high-quality digital voice recorder to record MP3 files, which yielded adequate sound quality for my basic acoustic analyses and for my content/discourse analyses, while at the same time ensured that audio file sizes would not be too large as to become unwieldy, especially when conducting long-distance interviews across continents. A list of some of the questions for the British graduate participants is provided in Appendix K. Similar questions were used when interviewing the other participants in this study, adding where appropriate questions tailored to each site and age group.
3.11.3 Oral Proficiency Test in Gujarati

Even though subjective evaluations of language ability were obtained from the survey and are considered reliable\textsuperscript{17}, an objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency, supplemented by information on participants' proficiency as objectively assessed in the national examination scores (obtained from survey responses), was deemed necessary for this study. Immediately after the interview in English, an oral proficiency test in Gujarati (a 5 minute phone conversation) was conducted with a native speaker of Gujarati. The phone conversation was not conducted by me, since I am a heritage speaker of Gujarati; a native speaker of Gujarati was therefore chosen to carry out this second interview. This conversation was recorded with the permission of the participant using the same high-quality digital voice recorder mentioned in Section 3.11.2. In cases where it was not possible to conduct the conversation via phone (e.g., due to a bad phone connection, time difference, etc.), the questions were pre-recorded and then played to the participants by me.

Instructions were given to the native speaker of Gujarati. The native speaker of Gujarati was asked to open each conversation with the same greeting. She then proceeded by asking the participants seven questions. Questions for this phone conversation were designed to elicit certain words and phrases that are known to be particularly challenging for heritage learners of Gujarati. I discussed challenges that heritage learners of Gujarati face with Mrs. Kusum Shah MBE, a leading promoter of the Gujarati language and culture in England and a former headmistress of the Oshwal Gujarati School in South London. Through over thirty years of working with heritage speakers of Gujarati, she has found that heritage learners of Gujarati manifest a wide range of linguistic deficiencies in the areas of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. Some of these linguistic deficiencies were discussed in detail in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.2) and are summarized in the sections below. These linguistic deficiencies do not necessarily impede comprehension, but are indicative of one having non-native speaker ability in the language.

3.11.3.1 Pronunciation Difficulties for Heritage Learners of Gujarati.

Heritage learners who wish to approximate L1 pronunciations face some challenges. As discussed in detail in 2.3.2.1 above, the retroflex nasal \([ŋ]\) and the retroflex lateral approximant \([ɭ]\) are especially difficult for heritage learners of Gujarati. They often substitute these sounds with other sounds. For example, the retroflex nasal \([ŋ]\) (Gujarati symbol: \(ણ\)) may be pronounced as the retroflex lateral approximant \([ɭ]\) (Gujarati symbol: \(ળ\)), the alveolar tap/flap \([ɾ]\) (Gujarati symbol: \(ર\)), or the

\textsuperscript{17}Portes & Hao, 1998; Portes & Schauffler, 1994; although cf. Surface et al., 2011, 2012 who indicate that subjective evaluations may be used as a proxy for objectively evaluated proficiency scores, but recommend caution in interpreting subjectively evaluated proficiency scores from younger students or from those in non-immersed language settings.
dental nasal [n] (Gujarati symbol: ન). Similarly, the retroflex lateral approximant [ɭ] (Gujarati symbol: લ) may be pronounced as the alveolar lateral approximant [l] (Gujarati symbol: લ) or the alveolar tap/flap [ɾ] (Gujarati symbol: ર). See Section 2.3.2.1 for a detailed overview of the pronunciation difficulties faced by heritage learners of Gujarati.

3.11.3.2 Grammar Difficulties for Heritage Learners of Gujarati

Major grammatical difficulties faced by Gujarati heritage learners include: 1) incorrect use of inclusive ‘we’ vs. exclusive ‘we’, 2) difficulties in gender agreement and case endings, and 3) incorrect use of ergative-absolutive marking vs. nominative-accusative marking. See Section 2.3.2.2 for a detailed overview of the grammatical difficulties faced by heritage learners of Gujarati.

3.11.3.3 Questions for the Oral Proficiency Test

The questions for the oral proficiency test were designed to elicit certain words and phrases to test for some of the pronunciation and grammar points summarized above and discussed in detail in Section 2.3.2.1 and 2.3.2.2 which are known to typically pose problems to non-native speakers of Gujarati. Each of the questions asked in the phone conversation allowed for the grammar points mentioned above to be tested. Four of the seven questions tested for the way that certain words were pronounced. The questions asked in this informal phone conversation and the forms targeted are given in Table 3.5.

The questions were modified slightly when appropriate. For example, if the questions were asked early in the morning, the first question was modified to “What did you do yesterday?” Similarly, if the participant was not Hindu or Jain and hence did not celebrate Diwali, the question was asked about one of the festivals that they celebrate, e.g., Eid for Muslim Gujarati participants.
Table 3.5: Questions for the phone conversation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question asked</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Target form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What have you done today since waking up?</td>
<td>To test for general fluency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you make Indian chai?</td>
<td>To elicit retroflex sounds</td>
<td>‘water’ (पाणी [paṇi])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘strain’ (गाळीये [gaɭiye])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What fruits do you like?</td>
<td>To test their knowledge of vocabulary in a specific domain and to elicit retroflex sounds</td>
<td>‘banana’ (केळ [keɭ])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you celebrate Diwali?</td>
<td>To test for general fluency, to test the participants’ knowledge of Indian festivals, and to elicit retroflex sounds</td>
<td>‘rangoli’ (રંગોળી [ɾəmgoɭi]) ‘diwali’ (િદવાળી [divaɭi])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What colors do you typically use in a rangoli?</td>
<td>To test their knowledge of vocabulary in a specific domain and to elicit retroflex sounds</td>
<td>‘yellow’ (પીળો [piɭo]) ‘white’ (ઘોળો [dʰoɭo]) ‘black’ (કાળો [kaɭo])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please can you translate the following sentence into Gujarati: “Shall we all go to the temple now?”</td>
<td>To test for exclusive (‘we’) vs. inclusive (‘we all’)</td>
<td>અમે [əme] ‘we’ refers to the speaker and his group, but does not include the listener.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you prefer to go to India or America during your vacation? Why?</td>
<td>To determine whether they would lean toward going to a more Western destination or an Indian one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12 Data Processing and Analysis

This section discusses the precise method of how the data obtained were processed, analyzed, and then triangulated.

Survey responses were gathered and transferred into Excel spreadsheets, and the quantitative data were then coded (see Section 3.4). Coded responses were entered and analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software. Pearson’s correlation coefficient and bivariate linear regression were used to determine the relationships between variables. The significance level was set at 0.05. Significant findings from these analyses are presented in Chapter 4.

The semi-structured interviews were partially transcribed and then coded into general thematic categories. Examples of coding categories include: differences between Gujaratis from India and British/Singaporean/South African Gujaratis, challenges faced by being and acting Gujarati in their respective countries, exposure to Indian culture, Gujarati language use in the participants’
respective countries, etc. For a full list of coding categories used, see Appendix L. In addition, given the dissertation’s focus on identity, I looked out for identity markers during the interviews (e.g., language, culture, and religion). These were used to determine which variables were considered important by participants in the construction of a) their Indian identity and b) their local identity. See Chapter 5 for a detailed description of the analysis.

Results of the oral proficiency test in Gujarati were evaluated in three ways: (1) using a holistic rubric, (2) using type/token coding, and (3) using word-per-minute output (“speech rate”). Using these three methods enabled the proficiency and speech of the students to be evaluated as a whole (through the holistic method and the word-per-minute output), as well as in more depth (through type-token coding). More details about each of these three methods of evaluation are given below.

Two native speakers of Gujarati evaluated the participants’ spoken proficiency during the phone conversation using a holistic proficiency scale. The evaluators used the grading scheme provided by the OCR examination board for the GCSE Gujarati examination in England. This grading scheme allocates points for content and communication (maximum 10 points), quality and range of structures used (maximum 10 points), and pronunciation and intonation (maximum 5 points), allowing participants to obtain a maximum of 25 points. The more points the participants received, the higher the evaluators rated their spoken proficiency in the language. The grading scheme can be found in Appendix M.

Two evaluators had been chosen to assure reliability in the results. The evaluators were both native speakers of Gujarati residing in the U.K. The evaluators each separately graded the participants and then their individual assessments of the participants’ oral proficiency were compared. If there was a wide discrepancy among the scores, the evaluators met to discuss why they gave certain ratings. In such cases, an attempt was made to settle any discrepancy by reaching an agreement in the ratings. This process, sometimes referred to as coding socialization (Philp, Oliver, & Mackey, 2006), was performed on the entire data set.

In addition to using a holistic proficiency scale, type/token coding was also carried out. All possible occurrences of problematic linguistic features in Gujarati were noted (see Sections 3.11.3.1 and 3.11.3.2) and coded on the basis of being: (1) correctly used, (2) incorrectly used, or (3) avoided every time a potential context arose which enabled a particular linguistic feature to be used. Undertaking type-token coding ensures that the proficiency ratings given by the evaluators are further confirmed.

Furthermore, the word-per-minute (WPM) output was also calculated. According to a number of scholars, the faster the rate of speech in the heritage language, the more proficient an individual
is in the heritage language. WPM output has been cited as an effective means by which to assess heritage language proficiency (Kagan & Friedman, 2003; Polinsky, 2008; Polinsky & Kagan, 2007).

Type-token coding and WPM output were carried out for certain participants only. Participants were selected from the lower, mid, and high ends of Gujarati proficiency (which had been determined by the holistic proficiency ratings given by the two evaluators) and type-token coding and WPM output were carried out for them only. In total, type-token coding and WPM output were carried out for 20% of the participants (27 participants out of 135, 9 in each of the three proficiency groups). The results obtained for the type-token coding analyses and WPM output were compared with the participants’ rank on the holistic proficiency scale, and the former were used to help evaluate the effectiveness and accuracy of the holistic ratings given by the two assessors. See Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion on type-token coding and WPM output.

Once the data from the individual components of the study (i.e., survey, interview, and oral proficiency test) had been processed and analyzed, the triangulation design was applied. Numerical data related to demography, linguistic experiences/history, ethnic identification, subjective evaluations of language ability, and national examination scores were obtained through the questionnaire, and these data were triangulated with data from oral proficiency tests. The precise details of the analysis and how they are linked together is presented in Chapter 4. The quantitative statistical results were then enriched with qualitative discussion from the semi-structured follow-up interviews. The qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were used to either support and confirm the patterns in the quantitative results or illustrate any contradictions using participants’ own words and insights.

3.13 Ethical Considerations

Several measures were taken in this study to protect participants. Care was taken to ensure that the participants fully understood the nature of the study and that participation was voluntary. They were also made aware that they would not be penalized if they chose to quit at any stage in the study, nor would it harm their relationship with the Gujarati School or anyone in the Gujarati community. In addition, the study was non-invasive/non-intrusive and I took care to ensure that the questions did not cause participants discomfort. Participation may have even been enjoyable and/or interesting and have been a positive experience rather than a potentially harmful one. In order to ensure that participant confidentiality was maintained at all times, study data were kept in a password-protected file. Any data obtained on paper (e.g., data obtained from the survey) were destroyed once they had been scanned. All data were thus kept in digital form only, which
only I as the researcher had access to. Names of participants were not available to anyone, either
during or after the study. In addition, no participant names have been reported in publications,
presentations, or in this dissertation.

3.14 Internal and External Validity

The way in which the study is carried out and reported determines the validity and reliability of
the design and the results. Certain steps were taken to ensure internal and external validity.

Internal validity was assured through pilot testing the proposed survey instrument with repre-
sentatives from each of the three chosen countries. Based on the feedback and results obtained from
the pilot testing of the survey, necessary modifications were made to the survey before the actual
study was carried out. This was an essential step to take in order to confirm that the self-designed
instrument used in this study was clear and unambiguous to participants.

External validity was assured in my study through the triangulation of the results, which
enabled the results to be examined from both a qualitative and a quantitative lens. Examining
the results from different perspectives such as these allows the validity and reliability of the results
to be enhanced. In addition, obtaining comparable ratings of proficiency by both participants and
outside raters (as discussed in detail in Chapter 4) is another measure of reliability. Furthermore,
the multi-sited nature of the study demonstrates that the study is not specific to one location only,
but that it can be replicated in other sites.

3.15 Summary

In this chapter, I have presented the research approach, a characterization of the research sites
and the participants, details about data collection, and the data analysis procedures that were
applied. The research questions outlined at the beginning of this chapter centered on the issue
of understanding the factors leading to the varying proficiency levels among Gujarati heritage
learners. Motivated by the conflicting findings on the role that ethnic identity plays in heritage
language proficiency, my study in particular focuses on the extent to which ethnic identity is
positively correlated with heritage language proficiency, and whether such a relationship, if one
exists, is specific to one’s country of residence or one’s school status.

In Chapter 4 to follow, I present the results of the quantitative analyses that have been con-
ducted to answer the research questions. The quantitative data presented in Chapter 4 numerically
illustrate the role of identity in heritage language proficiency, as well as other variables that have
an impact on language proficiency among Gujarati heritage learners from the U.K., Singapore and South Africa who learn their ancestral heritage language in a heritage language program.
Chapter 4

Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the quantitative findings of this dissertation. It is divided into two parts.

The first part focuses on survey data collected by means of a questionnaire and an oral proficiency test. The questionnaire contained questions related to demography, linguistic experiences/history, ethnic identification, subjective evaluations of language ability, and national examination scores, and the oral proficiency test provided an objective evaluation of the participants’ spoken abilities in Gujarati (see Chapter 3 for more details). In the first part of this chapter, I present the results of the statistical analyses which were carried out on survey results in order to answer the research questions (Section 3.2, see also Section 1.5). The analyses were conducted using the IBM SPSS Statistics 21 software package. As is standard in the social sciences, the significance level was set to 0.05 for all tests (Field, 2009), meaning that there is a less than 20% probability that the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is due to chance. Section 4.2 presents the descriptive statistics for this study. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 present the Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression results. A correlation indicates whether or not there is an association between two variables, more specifically if the variables are independent. It does not indicate causal links. A regression, on the other hand, is usually considered to show a causal link, i.e., from a significant regression, an increase in one unit in the independent variable (e.g., age) can predict the amount of change in the dependent variable (e.g., language proficiency). In Section 4.5, I provide a summary of the significant findings from the Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analyses.

The second part of this chapter discusses the validity of using a scoring rubric to evaluate language proficiency (Section 4.6). In Section 4.7, I present the main linguistic difficulties faced
by heritage learners of Gujarati. In Sections 4.8 and 4.9, I describe and present the proficiency outcomes from two other ways of measuring language proficiency, namely a) type-token coding and b) word-per-minute output (“speech rate”). Finally, I end this chapter by comparing the results from these analyses with the scores obtained when evaluating language proficiency through the use of a rubric to determine the validity of using the latter to evaluate heritage language proficiency (Section 4.10).

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

The quantitative analyses have been carried out on data obtained by means of a survey questionnaire and an oral proficiency test. A summary of survey participants and the dependent and independent variables used in this study is provided below.

Table 4.1 presents demographic information of the participants. The study involved 135 Gujarati heritage learners (53 male and 82 female, aged between 13 and 29). 48 of the participants were from England, 50 were from Singapore, and 37 were from South Africa. Just under half of the participants in this study (46%) were current students of a Gujarati School in their respective countries; the remaining 54% were recent graduates of the school. The vast majority of participants were born in England, Singapore, or South Africa (96%) and held British, Singaporean, or South African citizenship (97%); the few who were not born in their respective countries moved there before the age of 6. All of the parents of the British Gujarati participants were born in Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, or Madagascar) or India with the exception of one who was born in England. This is in contrast to the situation in Singapore and South Africa, where many more of the parents were locally born. The vast majority of the participants (90%) lived at home with their parents at the time of completing the survey and just over a third of the households were three-generational households (i.e., households in which grandparents were living in the family home).
Table 4.1: Demographic information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (Percentage)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>48 (35.6%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>50 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>37 (27.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School status (current student)</td>
<td>62 (45.9%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>42 (31.1%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>37 (27.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>26 (19.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>30 (22.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>47 (34.8%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>45 (33.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>37 (27.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Citizen</td>
<td>48 (35.6%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaporean Citizen</td>
<td>46 (34.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Citizen</td>
<td>37 (27.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (2.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s birthplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>26 (19.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>39 (28.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>59 (43.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s birthplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>30 (22.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>31 (23%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>41 (30.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>30 (22.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living at home with parents</td>
<td>122 (90.4%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in family home with grandparent(s)</td>
<td>43 (35.2%)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 presents information on language use. Although 81% of mothers and 64% of fathers had Gujarati as their L1, only 53% of mothers and 15% of fathers used Gujarati when speaking with their children. Similarly, while 43% of participants spoke Gujarati before the start of primary school (age 5), only 26% spoke Gujarati with their mother and 6% spoke Gujarati with their father at the time of completing the survey. English was overwhelmingly the dominant language used in conversation with Gujarati friends and siblings.
Table 4.2: Language use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable Frequency Sample Size (Percentage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s L1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>23 (17%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>109 (80.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s L1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>44 (32.6%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>87 (64.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language which mother uses to address par-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>49 (36.6%)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>14 (10.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>71 (53%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language which the father uses to address par-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>102 (76.7%)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>11 (8.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language which the participant uses to ad-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>83 (61.9%)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>16 (11.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>35 (26.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language which the participant uses to ad-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>116 (87.2%)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>9 (6.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>8 (6.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language which the participant uses to ad-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>117 (94.4%)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language which the sibling(s) use to address participant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>119 (96%)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>3 (2.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language participant uses to address Gujarati friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>126 (93.3%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>9 (6.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 One participant did not answer this question, since her mother had passed away.
2 Two participants did not answer this question, since their fathers had passed away.
3 Eleven participants did not have any siblings.
Table 4.2 – Continued from previous page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (Percentage)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken before primary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>68 (50.7%)</td>
<td>134⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and Gujarati</td>
<td>9 (6.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>57 (42.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to English and Gujarati, the majority of the participants (94%) claimed to have some knowledge of at least one other language. Just under half of these participants (48%) had some knowledge of another North Indian language, e.g., Hindi. In Singapore and South Africa, countries with several official languages⁵, a large majority (86%) knew at least one other official language of their country besides English, e.g., Malay in Singapore and Afrikaans in South Africa.

All participants were either current students or recent graduates of a Gujarati School. On average, participants had studied Gujarati for 10 years at Gujarati School (Table N.1⁶). Table 4.3 presents information about the participants’ Gujarati School experiences. About a third of the participants enjoyed going to Gujarati School, half of the participants had neutral feelings about going there, and the remaining 16% did not enjoy going to Gujarati School. Reasons for going to Gujarati School varied, with the two most cited reasons being that parents wanted their child to study Gujarati and participants wanted to have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati. Most participants had completed or were planning to complete a national qualification in Gujarati⁷. In addition to their time spent at Gujarati School, just over a third reported doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School (e.g., writing letters to grandparents who were overseas).

⁴One participant failed to give an answer for this question.
⁵The official languages of Singapore are English, Malay, Chinese, and Tamil. The official languages of South Africa are Afrikaans, English, Ndebele, Northern Sotho, Sotho, Swazi, Tswana, Tsonga, Venda, Xhosa, and Zulu.
⁶This table appears in Appendix N.
⁷In Singapore, all were planning to complete or had already completed the GCE O-Level in Gujarati, due to the national requirement of having a Mother Tongue (‘MT’) language at the GCE O-Level stage. See Appendix O for more details about the education system in Singapore.
⁸For information about the amount of time spent in each of the Gujarati Schools, including hours per week and number of years, see Section 3.8.
Table 4.3: Gujarati School experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (Percentage)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about going to Gujarati School:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t/didn’t like going</td>
<td>22 (16.3%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t/didn’t mind going</td>
<td>67 (49.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like/liked going</td>
<td>46 (34.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for going to Gujarati School:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ wish that their child studies Gujarati</td>
<td>78 (57.8%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To aid in communication with grandparents</td>
<td>33 (24.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of being Indian means that one should be able to speak, read and write in Gujarati well</td>
<td>56 (41.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati (e.g., GCSE in England, GCE O-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa)</td>
<td>61 (45.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To understand one’s roots and origins</td>
<td>43 (31.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make new friends</td>
<td>36 (26.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To organize and take part in cultural and religious events</td>
<td>40 (29.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have Gujarati on one’s C.V.</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11 (8.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National examinations (completed or planning to complete):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE</td>
<td>45 (93.8%)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level</td>
<td>19 (39.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE O-Level</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE A-Level</td>
<td>28 (56%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>27 (73%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School(^8)</td>
<td>49 (36.3%)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above variables which were obtained from survey data, the participants’ language ability was also assessed, both subjectively (from survey data) and objectively (from oral proficiency tests/participants’ reported scores for Gujarati proficiency on national examinations). Language proficiency was assessed through:

a) subjective evaluations after completing Gujarati School, i.e., those who had already completed Gujarati School (i.e., graduates) were asked to recall how they thought their Gujarati was when they completed Gujarati School (on a four-point Likert scale: very good, good, ok, not good)

b) subjective evaluations at the time of completing the survey (on a four-point Likert scale: very good, good, ok, not good)

c) objective evaluations of their spoken Gujarati, as assessed by two raters (on a 25-point scale; see Appendix M)
d) participants’ reported scores obtained in national examinations (e.g., A, B, etc.)

Information related to a), b), and d) was obtained from participants’ questionnaire responses. Data for c) were obtained by an oral proficiency test. Graduates’ language ability was assessed through a), b), c), and d), whereas current students’ language ability was assessed through b), c), and d).

Participants evaluated their proficiency in Gujarati at the time of completing Gujarati School to be higher than their proficiency in the language at the time of completing the survey (see Table N.2); this was the case for all four skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). Participants evaluated their listening skills in Gujarati as their strongest skill, followed by speaking.

In the oral proficiency test, participants generally scored highest for pronunciation, followed by quality and range of clause types, vocabulary, idioms, and structures used, and the lowest for content and communication (Table N.3). See Section 3.11.3 for more information about the oral proficiency test and Appendix M for the assessment criteria used to evaluate proficiency. The minimum number of points that participants could obtain in the oral proficiency test was 0 and the maximum was 25. Both raters had a very similar mean score for the participants (15.38 units out of 25 for rater 1 and 15.58 units out of 25 for rater 2).

Participants who had already taken national examinations in Gujarati obtained scores which were typically very high (Table N.4). More than half of the participants in England and Singapore achieved scores in the A range. The most variation in the scores is found in South Africa, where scores ranged from A to D.

To quantitatively assess the participants’ ethnic identity orientation, participants were asked to choose a value from 1 to 5 on a Likert scale for selected identity variables, where ‘1’ represented ‘non-Indian’ and ‘5’ represented ‘Indian’. Table 4.4 displays the means and standard deviations for each of the identity variables. Participants on average leaned more toward the non-Indian side of the identity scale for their liking of films, music, desserts, clothes, comedies, and how they self-identified, and inclined more to the Indian side of the identity scale for their preference of events, friends, and type of wedding.

---

9While national examination scores can be considered to be an objective evaluation of proficiency, given that the examinations are externally assessed, they are for the purposes of this study considered separately from ‘objective evaluation of spoken proficiency’ (point c).

10Comedies are a separate category from ‘film’, since comedies come in various forms, for example, a movie, play, or television program, and may be performed live in the theater or pre-recorded and later broadcasted, e.g., via television.
Table 4.4: Identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.424</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies(^{10})</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all identity markers</td>
<td>1-45</td>
<td>26.39</td>
<td>6.148</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Correlations

This section examines the strength of correlations (linear dependence) between variables and discusses its relevance in reference to the research questions. As discussed in Section 4.1, a correlation quantifies the degree to which two variables are related. It does not indicate causal links.

Language proficiency was subdivided as follows:

- subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School (in reading, writing, listening, and speaking) – henceforth subjective evaluation then
- subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency at the time of completing the survey (in reading, writing, listening, and speaking) – henceforth subjective evaluation now
- objective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency, i.e., average rating by the two evaluators (for spoken proficiency only) – henceforth objective evaluation now
- national examination scores – henceforth examination scores

In order to ensure inter-rater reliability for the coding of language proficiency (objective evaluation now), two raters individually evaluated the language proficiency of the participants and later met to discuss their individual ratings in an attempt to reach consensus on any disagreements in their individual ratings (as discussed in more detail in Section 3.12). This process, sometimes referred to as coding socialization (Philp et al., 2006), was performed on the entire data set. The two raters evaluated proficiency both before and after coding socialization with high correlation, \(r^{11} = 0.686, p < 0.01\) and \(r = 0.920, p < 0.01\), respectively (Table N.5). There is also a strong Pearson correlation between the participants’ subjective evaluation of current proficiency in speaking and their objectively evaluated spoken proficiency, \(r = 0.485, p < 0.01\).

\(^{11}\text{r is the correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient ranges from -1 to 1. A value of 0 means that there is no correlation between x and y, a value of 1 means that there is perfect correlation between x and y, and a value of -1 means that there is perfect anti-correlation between x and y.}\)
In the remainder of this section, I present the results from correlation analyses conducted between the various variables related to demographics, linguistic history/experience, and ethnic identity and four measures of language proficiency. While the four language proficiency variables remain constant throughout, the other variables vary, according to the research question. Significant correlations between variables are indicated in red throughout this section.

The first research question motivating the present investigation, which was introduced in Section 3.2, is repeated below:

RQ1. What role does identity play in determining heritage language ability? More specifically:

RQ1a. Is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

RQ1b. Is the local context a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

RQ1c. Does current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school influence the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

The first sub-question of RQ1 focuses on the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati. Table 4.5 presents the correlations between language ability and the nine identity variables. The numbers in the table represent the r values. Asterisks mark statistically significant findings. The variables that individually correlated with perceiving current proficiency in Gujarati as being high were: having a preference for Indian films ($r = 0.202, p < 0.05$), having a preference for Indian music ($r = 0.176, p < 0.05$), having a preference for Indian clothes ($r = 0.176, p < 0.05$), and self-identifying as Indian ($r = 0.351, p < 0.01$). Pearson correlations yielded no significant relationships between current subjective evaluation and the other five identity variables. Furthermore, there were no significant correlations between the nine identity variables and a) subjective evaluation of language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School, b) objective evaluation of spoken Gujarati proficiency, and c) national examination scores.

The second sub-question of RQ1 explores whether local context is a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati. Table 4.6, Table 4.7, and Table 4.8 present the relationships between the identity-related variables and proficiency scores for each country. More significant relationships between the variables existed for the British participants than the Singaporean and South African participants. Each of the significant relationships is discussed below.
Table 4.5: Correlations between heritage language ability and ethnic identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Then</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.176*</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.176*</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.351**</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all identity markers</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.243**</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in the table above represent the $r$ values. Asterisks mark statistically significant findings.

In both England and Singapore, self-identifying as Indian is significantly correlated with perceiving current proficiency in Gujarati as being high, i.e., subjective evaluation now ($r = 0.536$, $p < 0.01$ and $r = 0.392$, $p < 0.01$, respectively). For the British participants, the other identity variables that individually correlated with perceiving current proficiency in Gujarati as being high were:

- having a preference for Indian films ($r = 0.337$, $p < 0.05$)
- having a preference for Indian events ($r = 0.360$, $p < 0.05$)
- having a preference for Indian music ($r = 0.431$, $p < 0.01$)
- having a preference for Indian weddings ($r = 0.297$, $p < 0.05$)

For the South African participants, the only identity variable that individually correlated with perceiving current proficiency in Gujarati as being high was having a preference for Indian clothes ($r = 0.412$, $p < 0.05$).

The identity variables that individually correlated with perceiving proficiency in Gujarati at the time of completing Gujarati School (i.e., subjective evaluation then) as being high were: self-identifying as Indian for the British participants ($r = 0.554$, $p < 0.01$), not having a preference for Indian events for the Singaporean participants ($r = -0.499$, $p < 0.01$), and not having a preference for Indian friends for the South African participants ($r = -0.543$, $p < 0.05$).

For British participants, having a preference for Indian music and Indian clothes is significantly correlated with a high objective spoken proficiency in Gujarati ($r = 0.475$, $p < 0.01$ and $r = 0.291$ and $p < 0.05$, respectively). Pearson correlations yielded no significant relationships be-
tween objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati and any of the identity variables for the Singaporean and South African participants. Furthermore, there were no significant relationships between national examination scores and any of the identity variables for participants in any of the countries.

Table 4.6: Correlations between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati in England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Then</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.337*</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.360*</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.431**</td>
<td>0.475**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.291*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.297*</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>0.554**</td>
<td>0.536**</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all identity markers</td>
<td>0.389*</td>
<td>0.454**</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Correlations between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati in Singapore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Then</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>-0.499**</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>-0.324</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.392**</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all identity markers</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third sub-question of RQ1 explores whether current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school influences the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity
Table 4.8: Correlations between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati in South Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Then</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td><strong>0.412</strong></td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td><strong>-0.543</strong></td>
<td>-0.240</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all identity markers</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for heritage speakers of Gujarati. The correlation between identity variables and proficiency ratings are presented for current students in Table 4.9 and for graduates in Table 4.10. There were more significant relationships between the variables for the current students than the graduates. Each of the significant relationships is discussed in turn below.

For the current students, the identity variables that individually correlated with current subjectively evaluated high proficiency in Gujarati were:

- having a preference for Indian films ($r = 0.295, p < 0.05$)
- having a preference for Indian music ($r = 0.308, p < 0.05$)
- having a preference for Indian comedies ($r = 0.336, p < 0.01$)
- self-identifying as Indian ($r = 0.440, p < 0.01$).

For the graduates, the only identity variable that individually correlated with subjectively evaluating current proficiency in Gujarati as being high was self-identifying as Indian ($r = 0.304, p < 0.01$).

Pearson correlations yielded no significant relationships between any of the nine identity variables and subjective evaluation of language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School for the graduates. Furthermore, for both the graduates and the current students, there were no significant correlations between any of the nine identity variables and a) objective evaluation of spoken Gujarati proficiency and b) national examination scores.
Table 4.9: Correlations between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for current students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Evaluation</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>0.295*</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.308*</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>0.336**</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>0.440**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all identity markers</td>
<td>0.380**</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Correlations between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for recent graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Then</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.304**</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all identity markers</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having presented the correlations that exist between heritage language proficiency and ethnic identity (reasons for the various correlations and/or lack thereof are explored in subsequent chapters), I now turn to RQ2, which examines the quantitative evidence that exists for a relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and variables other than identity.

RQ2. Besides identity, what quantitative evidence exists for a relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and demographic factors and linguistic experiences/history? More specifically, is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and the following factors:

- Country
- School status
- Age
- Gender
- Parents’ birthplace(s)
- Living in a three-generational household
- Parents’ L1(s)
- Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends, and vice versa)
- Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)
- Knowledge of other languages
- Gujarati School experiences (i.e., number of years at Gujarati School, feelings about going to Gujarati School, reasons for going to Gujarati School, additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School)

Table 4.11 presents the correlations between proficiency and demographic variables. Participants’ national examination scores are significantly but negatively correlated with their school status ($r = -0.236$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that current students had better national examination scores in Gujarati than graduates had. Participants’ spoken proficiency as evaluated by the two raters and their national examination scores are significantly correlated with age ($r = -0.179$, $p < 0.05$ and $r = -0.353$, $p < 0.01$, respectively), indicating that younger participants had better objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati and better national examination scores. Participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency is significantly correlated with their mother’s and father’s birthplace ($r = 0.302$, $p < 0.01$ and $r = 0.303$, $p < 0.01$, respectively), indicating that those participants whose parents were born in India had better objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati. Lastly, participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency is significantly correlated with two of the country variables, Singapore and South Africa, meaning that those who came from Singapore had high objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati ($r = 0.390$, $p < 0.01$) and those who came from South Africa had low objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati ($r = -0.339$, $p < 0.01$).

Pearson correlations yielded no significant relationships between any of the demographic variables and a) subjective evaluation of language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School and b) current subjective evaluation of language proficiency.

Table 4.12 presents the correlations between heritage language proficiency and language use factors. The language use variables that individually correlated with participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati are:

- the language that their mothers speak to them in ($r = 0.367$, $p < 0.01$)
Table 4.11: Correlations between proficiency and demographic information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Then</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country: UK</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country: Singapore</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.390**</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country: SA</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.339**</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>-0.236*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.179*</td>
<td>-0.353**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.302**</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living at home with parents</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in family home with grandparent(s)</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- the language that they speak to their mother in \( r = 0.403, p < 0.01 \)
- the language that they speak to their father in \( r = 0.233, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they use with Gujarati friends \( r = 0.178, p < 0.05 \)
- the language they spoke before beginning primary school \( r = 0.232, p < 0.01 \).

The language use variables that individually correlated with participants’ subjectively evaluated proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School are:

- the language their father addresses them in \( r = 0.248, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they speak with their mother \( r = 0.263, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they speak with their father \( r = 0.346, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they speak with Gujarati friends \( r = 0.274, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they spoke before beginning primary school \( r = 0.228, p < 0.01 \).

The language use variables that individually correlated with their current subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati are:

- the language their father addresses them in \( r = 0.248, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they speak with their mother \( r = 0.263, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they speak with their father \( r = 0.346, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they speak with Gujarati friends \( r = 0.274, p < 0.01 \)
- the language they spoke before beginning primary school \( r = 0.228, p < 0.01 \).

Pearson correlations yielded no significant relationships between any of the language use variables and national examination scores.
Table 4.12: Correlations between proficiency and language use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjective Eval. Then</th>
<th>Subjective Eval. Now</th>
<th>Objective Eval. Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s L1</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s L1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which mother uses to address participant</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.367**</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which father uses to address participant</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.248**</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address mother</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
<td>0.263**</td>
<td>0.403**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address father</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.346**</td>
<td>0.233**</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address sibling(s)</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the sibling(s) use to address participant</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language participant uses to address Gujarati friends</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.274**</td>
<td>0.178*</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken before primary school</td>
<td>0.259*</td>
<td>0.228**</td>
<td>0.232**</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 presents the correlations between language proficiency and language knowledge variables. There is significant correlation between participants’ current subjective evaluation of their Gujarati proficiency and their knowledge of other North Indian languages \( (r = 0.260, p < 0.01) \). Furthermore, there is significant positive correlation between their objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati and their knowledge of other Indian languages \( (r = 0.417, p < 0.01) \) and significant negative correlation between their objectively evaluated spoken proficiency and their knowledge of other official languages (besides English) of the country they are living in \( (r = -0.336, p < 0.01) \). Pearson correlations yielded no significant relationships between any of the language knowledge variables and a) subjective evaluation of language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School and b) national examination scores.

Table 4.14 presents the correlations between language proficiency and Gujarati School experiences. Gujarati School experiences include the following factors: number of years at Gujarati School, feelings about going to Gujarati School, reasons for going to Gujarati School, and additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School. The reasons for going to Gujarati School, which are identified through the use of a number in Table 4.14, are indicated in full below:

- Reason 1: Parents’ wish that their child studies Gujarati
Table 4.13: Correlations between proficiency and language knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of other languages other than England and Gujarati</th>
<th>Subjective Eval. Then</th>
<th>Subjective Eval. Now</th>
<th>Objective Eval. Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of other North Indian languages</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.260**</td>
<td>0.417**</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.336**</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reason 2: To aid in communication with grandparents
- Reason 3: Part of being Indian means that one should be able to speak, read, and write in Gujarati well
- Reason 4: To have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati (e.g., GCSE in England, GCE O-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa)
- Reason 5: To understand one’s roots/origins
- Reason 6: To make new friends
- Reason 7: To organize and take part in cultural and religious events
- Reason 8: To have Gujarati on one’s C.V.
- Reason 9: Other

Heritage language proficiency is significantly and positively correlated with the number of years that participants spent at Gujarati School ($r = 0.255$, $p < 0.05$ for subjective evaluation of language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School; $r = 0.206$, $p < 0.05$ for current subjective evaluation of language proficiency; $r = 0.227$, $p < 0.01$ for objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency; $r = 0.267$, $p < 0.01$ for national examination scores). Proficiency is also significantly and positively correlated with additional work done outside of Gujarati School ($r = 0.439$, $p < 0.01$ for subjective evaluation of language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School; $r = 0.303$, $p < 0.01$ for current subjective evaluation of language proficiency; $r = 0.263$, $p < 0.01$ for objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency; $r = 0.228$, $p < 0.05$ for national examination scores). Participants’ feelings about going to Gujarati School is significantly correlated with their subjective evaluations of their Gujarati spoken proficiency, both then ($r = 0.468$, $p < 0.01$) and now ($r = 0.353$, $p < 0.01$), as well as with their national examination scores ($r = 0.225$, $p < 0.05$). Their objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati is significantly and positively correlated with studying Gujarati to have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati ($r = 0.275$, $p < 0.01$) and to make new friends ($r = 0.280$, $p < 0.01$), and is negatively correlated with studying...
Gujarati for cultural and religious reasons, e.g., studying Gujarati to take part in cultural and religious events organized through Gujarati School \( (r = -0.186, p < 0.05) \). There is significant and negative correlation between their subjective evaluations of Gujarati proficiency, both then and now, and their parents’ wish that they attend Gujarati School \( (r = -0.302, p < 0.01 \text{ and } r = -0.273, p < 0.01, \text{ respectively}) \). There is significant and positive correlation between their current subjective evaluation of their Gujarati proficiency and learning Gujarati as part of their ethnic identity \( (r = 0.246, p < 0.01) \).

### Table 4.14: Correlations between proficiency and Gujarati School experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjective Eval. Then</th>
<th>Subjective Eval. Now</th>
<th>Objective Eval. Now</th>
<th>Examination Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.255*</td>
<td>0.206*</td>
<td>0.227***</td>
<td>0.276**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about going to Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.468**</td>
<td>0.353**</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.225*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 1</td>
<td>-0.302**</td>
<td>-0.273**</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 2</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 3</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.246**</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 4</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.275**</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 5</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 6</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.280**</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 7</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>-0.186*</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 8</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 9</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.439**</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>0.263**</td>
<td>0.228*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Linear Regression Analyses

The following section presents the results from the multiple linear regression model analyses. Unlike a correlation, which does not indicate causal links, a regression is usually considered to show a causal link. From a significant regression, an increase in one unit in the independent variable can predict the amount of change in the dependent variable. In this study, the dependent variables are the four language proficiency variables, presented in Section 4.3 above and repeated below:

- subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School (in reading, writing, listening, and speaking) - henceforth *subjective evaluation then*
• subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency at the time of completing the survey (in reading, writing, listening, and speaking) - henceforth subjective evaluation now
• objective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency, i.e., average rating by the two evaluators (for spoken proficiency only) - henceforth objective evaluation now
• national examination scores - henceforth examination scores

While the four dependent variables remain constant throughout, the independent variables vary, according to the research question. Significant predictors of language proficiency are indicated in red throughout this section.

The first sub-question of RQ1 examines whether the variance in heritage speakers’ language proficiency can be explained by strength of ethnic identification. Table 4.15 presents the significant findings from the multiple linear regressions. It can be seen from Table 4.15 that self-identity is a significant predictor of participants’ current subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati with $p < 0.01$. The unstandardized estimate of self-identity is 0.869, indicating that an increase in one unit in self-identity is related to an increase of 0.869 units in their current subjective evaluation of proficiency, holding other variables constant. The other identity markers were not significant predictors of participants’ current subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati. Furthermore, none of the identity markers were significant predictors of participants’ subjective evaluation of language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School (Table N.613), participants’ objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency (Table N.7), and participants’ national examination scores (Table N.8).

The second sub-question of RQ1 examines whether local context is a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati. Table 4.16 and Table 4.17 present the significant findings from the multiple linear regressions. It can be seen from these tables that there is a relationship between ethnic identity and subjectively evaluated language proficiency both at the time of completing Gujarati School and currently for participants in England, indicating that local context is a moderator variable in these contexts. Table 4.16 shows that the unstandardized estimate of total identity for British participants is 0.222, indicating that an increase in one unit in total identity for the British Gujarati participants is related to an increase of 0.222 units in their subjective evaluation of proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School. 

---

12 In this dissertation, I report the $B$ values, i.e., the unstandardized regression coefficients. $B$ values indicate the amount of change that one unit of the independent variable (e.g., identity) brings about in the dependent variable (i.e., language proficiency). By reporting unstandardized coefficients, the slope of the regression line, which the $B$ coefficient refers to, can be interpreted directly in terms of the raw values of the dependent and independent variables.

13 The tables from in this section which have been relegated to an appendix contain insignificant results, while those in the main text contain significant results.
Table 4.15: Results from linear regression model for predicting current subjectively evaluated language proficiency through strength of ethnic identification. B is the unstandardized regression coefficient value. Std. Error refers to the standard error of the regression coefficient. t is the unstandardized regression coefficient (B) divided by its standard error. p refers to the degree of significance, that is, whether the independent variable has statistically significant predictive capability (as is standard in the social sciences, a p value of less than 0.05 indicates that results are statistically significant; see Section 3.4 for more information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.474</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>-0.324</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-1.361</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>-0.405</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identification</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of completing Gujarati School, holding other variables constant. Similarly, Table 4.17 shows that the unstandardized estimate of total identity for British participants is 0.234, indicating that an increase in one unit in total identity for the British Gujarati participants is related to an increase of 0.234 units in their current subjective evaluation of proficiency, holding other variables constant. Local context was not a moderator variable for predicting the relationship between ethnic identity and a) participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency (Table N.9) and b) participants’ national examination scores (Table N.10).

Table 4.16: Results from linear regression model for predicting the relationship between subjectively evaluated language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School and ethnic identity through country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Identity</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (UK)</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (Singapore)</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-1.614</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (SA)</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17: Results from linear regression model for predicting the relationship between subjectively evaluated current language proficiency and ethnic identity through country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Identity</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (UK)</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (Singapore)</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (SA)</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third sub-question of RQ1 examines whether school status is a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati. Table 4.18 presents the significant findings from the multiple linear regressions. It can be seen from Table 4.18 that there is a relationship between ethnic identity and current subjective evaluation of language proficiency for current students, indicating that school status is a moderator variable in this context. Table 4.18 shows that the unstandardized estimate of total identity for current students is 0.131, indicating that an increase in one unit in total identity for the current students is related to an increase of 0.131 units in their current subjective evaluation of Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. School status was not a moderator variable for predicting the relationship between ethnic identity and a) participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency (Table N.11) and c) participants’ national examination scores (Table N.12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Identity</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (current)</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>3.180</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (graduate)</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ2 examines the relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and independent variables besides identity. In particular, it questions whether the variation in heritage speakers’ language proficiency can be explained by demographic factors and linguistic experiences/history. Table 4.19 and Table 4.20 present the significant findings from the multiple linear regressions. It can be seen that age is a significant predictor of current subjectively evaluated language proficiency and national examination results. Table 4.19 shows that the unstandardized estimate of age for heritage learners is -1.545, indicating that an increase in one unit in age (i.e., from 13-16 to 17-20, from 17-20 to 21-24, from 21-24 to 25+) is related to a decrease of 1.545 units in participants’ current subjective evaluation of Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. Table 4.20 shows that the unstandardized estimate of age for heritage learners is -0.581, indicating that an increase in one unit in age (i.e., from 13-16 to 17-20, from 17-20 to 21-24, from 21-24 to 25+) is related to a decrease of 0.581 units in their national examination scores, holding other variables constant. Furthermore, it can be seen in Table 4.20 that gender is a significant predictor of national examination scores. The unstandardized estimate of gender for heritage learners, as seen in Table 4.20, is 0.640, indicating that an increase in one unit in gender (i.e., from male to female) is related to an increase of 0.640 units in their national examination scores. None of the demographic variables were significant predictors of a) participants’ subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati...
at the time of completing Gujarati School (Table N.13) and b) participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency (Table N.14).

Table 4.19: Results from linear regression model for predicting current subjectively evaluated language proficiency through demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demography</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country: Singapore</td>
<td>-2.042</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>-1.574</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country: SA</td>
<td>-0.802</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>-0.711</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.545</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>-2.687</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>1.791</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in family home with grandparents</td>
<td>-1.061</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>-1.142</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20: Results from linear regression model for predicting national examination scores through demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demography</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country: UK</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country: SA</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>-0.241</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.581</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>-3.232</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>2.251</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in family home with grandparents</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>-0.424</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ2 also explores the relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and language use. Table 4.21 and Table 4.22 present the findings from the multiple linear regressions. It can be seen from Table 4.21 that the language spoken with Gujarati friends is a significant predictor of current subjectively evaluated language proficiency for Gujarati heritage learners. Table 4.21 shows that the unstandardized estimate of language spoken with Gujarati friends is 2.276, indicating that an increase in one unit in language spoken with Gujarati friends (i.e., from primarily English to both English and Gujarati, or from both English and Gujarati to primarily Gujarati) is related to an increase of 2.276 units in participants’ current subjective evaluation of Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. Furthermore, it can be seen from Table 4.22 that the language which the participant uses with his/her mother is a significant predictor of participants’ objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency. Table 4.22 shows that the unstandardized estimate of language spoken with mother is 1.256, indicating that an increase in one unit in language spoken with mother (i.e., from primarily English to both English and Gujarati, or from both English
and Gujarati to primarily Gujarati) is related to an increase of 1.256 units in their objective evaluation of their spoken Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. None of the language use variables were significant predictors of a) participants’ subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati at the time of completing Gujarati School (Table N.15) and b) participants’ national examination scores (Table N.16).

Table 4.21: Results from linear regression model for predicting current subjectively evaluated language proficiency through language use variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s L1</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s L1</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>-1.035</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which mother uses to address participant</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which father uses to address participant</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address mother</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address father</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>0.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address sibling(s)</td>
<td>-3.372</td>
<td>1.905</td>
<td>-1.771</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the sibling(s) use to address participant</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>1.654</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language participant uses to address Gujarati friends</td>
<td>2.276</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken before primary school</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ2 also explores the relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and knowledge of other languages. Table 4.23 presents the significant findings from the multiple linear regressions. It can be seen from Table 4.23 that knowledge of other North Indian languages is a significant predictor of participants’ objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency. Table 4.23 shows that the unstandardized estimate of knowledge of other North Indian languages is 2.469, indicating that knowing other North Indian languages is related to an increase of 2.469 units in their objective evaluation of their spoken Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. Furthermore, it can be seen from Table 4.23 that knowledge of official languages of the country participants reside in is a significant predictor of objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency. Table 4.23 shows that the unstandardized estimate of knowledge of official languages of the country they reside in is -2.571, indicating that knowing official languages of the country they reside in is related to a decrease of 2.571 units in their objective evaluation of their spoken Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. None of the language knowledge variables
Table 4.22: Results from linear regression model for predicting objective evaluation of language proficiency through language use variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s L1</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s L1</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which mother uses to address participant</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which father uses to address participant</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address mother</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>2.204</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address father</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address sibling(s)</td>
<td>-4.741</td>
<td>2.858</td>
<td>-1.659</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the sibling(s) use to address participant</td>
<td>5.076</td>
<td>3.115</td>
<td>1.630</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language participant uses to address Gujarati friends</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken before primary school</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were significant predictors of a) participants’ subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati at the time of completing Gujarati School (Table N.17), b) participants’ current subjective evaluations in Gujarati (Table N.18), and c) participants’ national examination scores (Table N.19).

Table 4.23: Results from linear regression model for predicting objective evaluation of language proficiency through language knowledge variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Knowledge</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of other North Indian languages</td>
<td>2.469</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>2.863</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>-2.571</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>-2.101</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ2 also explores the relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and Gujarati School experiences. Gujarati School experiences include the following factors: number of years at Gujarati School, feelings about going to Gujarati School, reasons for going to Gujarati School, and additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School. The reasons, which are identified through the use of a number in the tables below, are indicated in full below:

- Reason 1: Parents’ wish that their child studies Gujarati
- Reason 2: To aid in communication with grandparents
- Reason 3: Part of being Indian means that one should be able to speak, read, and write in Gujarati well
- Reason 4: To have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati (e.g., GCSE in England, GCE O-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa)
- Reason 5: To understand one’s roots/origins
- Reason 6: To make new friends
- Reason 7: To organize and take part in cultural and religious events
- Reason 8: To have Gujarati on one’s C.V.
- Reason 9: Other

Table 4.24, Table 4.25, and Table 4.26 present the significant findings from the multiple linear regressions.

Table 4.24: Results from linear regression model for predicting current subjectively evaluated language proficiency through Gujarati School experience variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gujarati School</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about going to Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 1</td>
<td>-0.898</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>-1.480</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 2</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>-0.743</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 3</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>2.376</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 4</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 5</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>-0.603</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 6</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 7</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 8</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 9</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from Table 4.24 that holding the belief that Gujarati is part of one’s ethnic identity is a significant predictor of current subjective evaluation of language proficiency in Gujarati. The unstandardized estimate is 1.278, indicating that holding this belief is related to an increase of 1.278 units in their current subjective evaluation of Gujarati language proficiency, other variables being constant. Furthermore, it can be seen that doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School is also a significant predictor of current subjective evaluation of language proficiency. The unstandardized estimate of doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School is 1.127, indicating that doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School is related to an increase of 1.127 units in their current subjective evaluation of Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant.
Table 4.25: Results from linear regression model for predicting objective evaluation of language proficiency through Gujarati School experience variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gujarati School experience variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about going to Gujarati School</td>
<td>-0.916</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>-1.500</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 1</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 2</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 3</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 4</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 5</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 6</td>
<td>3.040</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>3.359</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 7</td>
<td>-0.535</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>-0.617</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 8</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 9</td>
<td>3.428</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.25, it can be seen that studying Gujarati to have the possibility to take nationally recognized examinations in the language is a significant predictor of objective evaluation of participants’ spoken proficiency in Gujarati. Table 4.25 shows that the unstandardized estimate of studying Gujarati to have the possibility to take nationally recognized examinations in the language is 2.837, indicating that studying Gujarati to have the possibility to take nationally recognized examinations in the language is related to an increase of 2.837 units in their objective evaluation of their spoken Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. Furthermore, it can be seen from Table 4.25 that studying Gujarati to make new friends is a significant predictor of objective evaluation of participants’ spoken proficiency in Gujarati. Table 4.25 shows that the unstandardized estimate of studying Gujarati to make new friends is 3.040, indicating that studying Gujarati to make new friends is related to an increase of 3.040 units in their objective evaluation of their spoken Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. In addition, it can be seen from Table 4.25 that studying Gujarati for other reasons (i.e., not already listed) is a significant predictor of objective evaluation of participants’ spoken proficiency in Gujarati. Table 4.25 shows that the unstandardized estimate of studying Gujarati for other reasons is 3.428, indicating that studying Gujarati for other reasons is related to an increase of 3.428 units in their objective evaluation of their spoken Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant. Finally, it can be seen from Table 4.25 that doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School is also a significant predictor of objective evaluation of participants’ spoken proficiency in Gujarati. Table 4.25 shows that the unstandardized estimate of doing additional work in Gujarati
outside Gujarati School is 2.512, indicating that doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School is related to an increase of 2.512 units in their objective evaluation of their spoken Gujarati language proficiency, holding other variables constant.

Table 4.26: Results from linear regression model for predicting national examination scores through Gujarati School experience variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gujarati School</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>2.330</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about going to Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 1</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 2</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 3</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 4</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 5</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>-0.281</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 6</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>-0.701</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 7</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>-0.558</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 8</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>-0.716</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 9</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from Table 4.26 that the number of years at Gujarati School is a significant predictor of national examination scores. Table 4.26 shows that the unstandardized estimate of number of years at Gujarati School is 0.099, indicating that an increase in one unit in number of years at Gujarati School is related to an increase of 0.099 units in participants’ national examination scores, holding other variables constant. None of the Gujarati School experience variables were significant predictors of participants’ subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati at the time of completing Gujarati School (Table N.20).

4.5 Summary of Findings

The main objective of this study is to determine the causes behind the variation in Gujarati proficiency among heritage learners of Gujarati, and specifically the role that identity plays in heritage language proficiency. Among my peers who are recent graduates of a Gujarati School in London, I was aware that our proficiency in Gujarati varied significantly, with some of us performing at near native-like levels, and others at beginner levels. This is the case despite similarities in amount and type of Gujarati language instruction and exposure. However, this situation is not unique to my peers, and can be found in other diaspora contexts. Gujarati heritage language
learners from England, Singapore, and South Africa display a considerable amount of variation in heritage language proficiency, as illustrated by the scores they received in an oral proficiency test conducted for the purposes of this study. With these issues in mind, I was interested to know why such variation exists. More specifically, I was interested to understand the extent to which the variation in proficiency among Gujarati heritage learners could be explained by selected identity and demographic variables, and linguistic experiences/history.

Sections 4.3 and 4.4 presented the Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analyses results. A summary of the key significant findings as they relate to participants’ subjective evaluation of Gujarati language proficiency (both at the time of completing Gujarati School and currently), their spoken objective language proficiency (as evaluated by the two raters), and their national examination scores are presented below.

Participants’ subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School is significantly correlated with the following variables (text in blue indicates significant negative correlation):

- The identity variable ‘self-identity’ in England
- All nine identity variables in England
- The identity variable ‘events’ in Singapore
- The identity variable ‘friends’ in SA
- The language which the mother uses to address the participant
- The language which the participant uses to address the mother
- The language spoken before primary school
- Number of years studying Gujarati at Gujarati School
- Feelings about Gujarati School
- Going to Gujarati School because of parents’ wish that the participant goes there
- Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

The following variable is a significant predictor of participants’ subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School:

- All nine identity variables in England

Participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency is significantly correlated with the following variables (text in blue indicates significant negative correlation):

- The total of all nine identity variables
• The total of all nine identity variables in England
• The identity variable ‘self-identity’ in Singapore
• The identity variable ‘clothes’ in SA
• The identity variables ‘films’, ‘music’, ‘comedies’, and ‘self-identity’ for current students
• The total of all nine identity variables for current students
• The identity variable ‘self-identity’ for recent graduates
• The language which the father uses to address the participant
• The language which the participant uses to address parents and Gujarati friends
• The language spoken before primary school
• Knowledge of other North Indian languages
• Number of years at Gujarati School
• Feelings about going to Gujarati School
• Going to Gujarati School because of parents’ wish that the participant goes there
• Studying Gujarati because it is important for ethnic identity
• Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

The following variables are significant predictors of participants’ current subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency (text in blue indicates significant negative correlation):

• The identity variable ‘self-identity’
• The total of all nine identity variables in England
• The total of all nine identity variables for current students
• Age
• Language which the participant uses to address Gujarati friends
• Studying Gujarati because it is important for ethnic identity
• Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

Participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency is significantly correlated with the following variables (text in blue indicates significant negative correlation):

• The identity variables ‘music’ and ‘clothes’ in England
• Country of origin (for Singapore and SA only)
• Age
• Parents’ birthplace
• Language which the mother uses to address the participant
• Language which the participant uses to address parents and Gujarati friends
• Language spoken before primary school
• Knowledge of other North Indian languages
• Knowledge of other official languages in the country that the participant resides in (for SA and Singapore only)
• Number of years studying Gujarati at Gujarati School
• Studying Gujarati to take nationally recognized examinations in the language
• Studying Gujarati to make friends
• Studying Gujarati to take part in cultural and religious activities
• Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

The following variables are significant predictors of participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency (text in blue indicates significant negative correlation):

• Language which the participant uses to address his/her mother
• Knowledge of other North Indian languages
• Knowledge of other official languages in the country that the participant resides in (for SA and Singapore only)
• Studying Gujarati because it is important for ethnic identity
• Studying Gujarati to take nationally recognized examinations in the language
• Studying Gujarati to make friends
• Studying Gujarati because it will look good on one’s C.V.
• Studying Gujarati for other reasons (reasons specified by participants)
• Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

Participants’ national examination scores in Gujarati are significantly correlated with the following variables (text in blue indicates significant negative correlation):

• School Status
• Age
• Number of years at Gujarati School
• Feelings about going to Gujarati School
• Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

The following variables are significant predictors of participants’ national examination scores (text in blue indicates significant negative correlation):

• Age
• Gender
4.6 Measuring Heritage Language Proficiency in Gujarati

Heritage language proficiency was objectively measured through proficiency ratings obtained from two native speakers of Gujarati. The evaluators used the grading scheme provided by the OCR examination board for the GCSE Gujarati examination in England (Appendix M). This grading scheme allocates points for content and communication (maximum 10 points), quality and range of structures used (maximum 10 points), and pronunciation and intonation (maximum 5 points), allowing participants to obtain a maximum of 25 points. The more points the participants received, the higher the evaluators rated their Gujarati proficiency. As seen in Table N.5, the two raters evaluated proficiency both before and after coding socialization with high correlation ($r = 0.686$, $p < 0.01$ and $r = 0.920$, $p < 0.01$, respectively). Furthermore, there is a strong correlation between the participants' subjectively evaluated current proficiency in speaking and their actual objectively evaluated spoken proficiency as assessed by the two raters ($r = 0.485$, $p < 0.01$).

In the following sections, I discuss the validity of using a scoring rubric to evaluate language proficiency. The subsequent sections are organized as follows: In Section 4.7, I present the main linguistic difficulties in Gujarati which the participants faced as they completed the phone interview in Gujarati. In Sections 4.8 and 4.9, I present and discuss the results of two other ways of measuring language proficiency, namely a) type-token coding analyses and b) word-per-minute output ("speech rate"), and compare these results with the scores obtained when evaluating language proficiency through the use of a rubric.

4.7 Linguistic Difficulties Faced by Heritage Speakers of Gujarati

Sections 2.3.2.1 – 2.3.2.2 presented the main linguistic deficiencies that heritage speakers of Gujarati manifest in the areas of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. The questions in the oral proficiency test were designed to elicit certain words and phrases to test for some of the pronunciation and grammar points mentioned in the aforementioned sections which are known to typically pose problems and be challenging for non-native speakers of Gujarati. Each of the questions in the phone conversation tested participants' grammatical knowledge. Four of the seven questions tested
for the way that certain words are pronounced. Two of the seven questions tested for vocabulary knowledge in a specific domain.

Sections 4.7.1, 4.7.2, and 4.7.3 present a summary of the main grammatical, pronunciation, and lexical errors that the participants made. Section 4.7.4 presents some of the gaps in cultural knowledge and understanding that participants displayed.

### 4.7.1 Grammar

Gujarati makes a distinction in grammatical person between *inclusive we*, which includes the addressee, and *exclusive we*, which excludes the addressee (Tisdall, 1892, p. 39-40). In English, this distinction is not made through grammatically different forms of *we*, but rather indirectly, e.g., through explicitly inclusive phrasing, such as *we all*, or through inclusive *let’s*. Participants used the two forms of *we* interchangeably, saying અમે [əme] (‘we’) in the place of આપણે [apəṇe] (‘we all’), and vice versa. An example of the former error is seen in the translation of “Shall we all go to the temple now?” (question 6 in the oral proficiency test), where many participants incorrectly used exclusive *we* અમે [əme] (‘we’) instead of inclusive *we* આપણે [apəṇe] (‘we all’). An example of the latter error was demonstrated when Kalpa (among others) used the phrase આપણા પરિવારો [apəṇa pəɾivaɾo] (‘our families’, where ‘our’ includes the addressee) in her description of how the Swaminarayan community in South Africa celebrates Diwali. However, the correct version is અમારા પરિવારો [əmaɾa pəɾivaɾo] (‘our families’, where ‘our’ excludes the addressee), since she did not intend to include me, the addressee, when she used the possessive determiner ‘our’.

Ergativity was another difficulty faced by the participants. Gujarati is a split ergative language (DeLancey, 1981), meaning that the subject of a transitive clause receives ergative case in the perfective, but the subject appears in the nominative case in all other aspects (e.g., progressive). Ergativity does not exist in English. Participants were seen to mistakenly give the nominative case to the subject of a transitive clause in the perfective, instead of the ergative, as illustrated in the examples in Table 4.27.

However, the ergative is not unknown to the participants, as illustrated in the examples in Table 4.28 below, where the ergative case is erroneously given to the subject of the sentence instead of the nominative case. Examples like the ones below could be explained as an overextension of the ergative rule.

---

14 A faith group which consists of a large percentage of Gujarati Hindus in which followers offer devotion to and worship Lord Swaminarayan.
Table 4.27: Erroneous use of the nominative case by Gujarati heritage language learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tejal (SA)</td>
<td>હું પૂજા કરી હતી.</td>
<td>મેં પૂજા કરી હતી.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (NOM) worship do(INF) AUX(SING FEM PERF)</td>
<td>I (ERG) worship do(INF) AUX(SING FEM PERF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I did worship.</td>
<td>I did worship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritul (SA)</td>
<td>હું કેરલ ખાધુ.</td>
<td>મેં કેરલ ખાધુ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (NOM) cereal eat(SING NEUT PERF)</td>
<td>I (ERG) cereal eat(SING NEUT PERF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I ate cereal.</td>
<td>I ate cereal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.28: Erroneous use of the ergative case by Gujarati heritage language learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rania (Singapore)</td>
<td>ગઈકાલે મેં દિરયાિકનારે ગઈ.</td>
<td>ગઈકાલે હું દિરયાિકનારે ગઈ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yesterday I (ERG) seaside (LOC) go(NON-PERF)</td>
<td>Yesterday I (NOM) seaside (LOC) go(NON-PERF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yesterday I went to the seaside.</td>
<td>Yesterday I went to the seaside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreya (SA)</td>
<td>મેં તી ઘરે હતી.</td>
<td>હું તી ઘરે હતી.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (ERG) indeed home (LOC) was(NON-PERF)</td>
<td>I (NOM) indeed home (LOC) was(NON-PERF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I indeed was at home.</td>
<td>I indeed was at home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heritage learners of Gujarati also have difficulties with gender agreement between a) the subject and the verb, b) an adjective and a noun, and c) a possessive and the noun signifying possession (see also Ilieva, 2012, p. 28, who notes similar difficulties among Hindi heritage language learners in the U.S.). Gujarati marks gender on many parts of speech (e.g., the verb, some adjectives, and the possessive). These parts of speech agree with the gender of the noun that one uses in a sentence. This is in marked contrast to English. As heritage speakers of Gujarati may not know the gender of nouns in Gujarati, they may choose the middle path and use the neuter gender. Some examples of gender mismatch between the subject and the verb are illustrated in Table 4.29. Note that pl indicates ‘plural’ and sg indicates ‘singular’.

However, the neuter gender was not the default incorrect gender used in all cases. There were also many instances where the participants used another gender incorrectly. A few examples are presented in Table 4.30 below.

There were also several cases of a gender mismatch between a personal pronoun and a verb. An example of this is when a female participant applies the masculine case ending on a verb which describes her actions, or vice versa. There were also several instances of number mismatch, e.g.,

15 Penda and laddoo are Indian sweets.
Table 4.29: Gender agreement and case endings in Noun – Verb constructions: Erroneous use of the neuter gender as the default gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vimal (Singapore)</td>
<td>થાક લાગતું હતુ</td>
<td>થાક લાગતી હતી</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tiredness (m) felt was (n)</td>
<td>tiredness (m) felt was (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was feeling tired.</td>
<td>I was feeling tired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay (Singapore)</td>
<td>ભારત જાયે તે રાજ</td>
<td>ભારત જાયે તે રાજ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>holidays (f)</td>
<td>holidays (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was (n)</td>
<td>was (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going to India is not a holiday.</td>
<td>Going to India is not a holiday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal (UK)</td>
<td>પેંડા ને લાડુ</td>
<td>પેંડા ને લાડુ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penda and laddoo (pl)</td>
<td>Penda and laddoo (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eat (n, sg)</td>
<td>eat (pl)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.30: Gender agreement and case endings in Noun – Verb constructions: Erroneous use of other genders besides the neuter gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aarti (Singapore)</td>
<td>રા પાણી પીધો</td>
<td>રા પાણી પીધા</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tea water (pl) drank (m, sg)</td>
<td>Tea water (pl) drank (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[I] drank tea and water.</td>
<td>[I] drank tea and water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay (Singapore)</td>
<td>આદું નાખવાની</td>
<td>આદું નાખવાનું</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ginger (n) put (f)</td>
<td>ginger (n) put (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika (Singapore)</td>
<td>જરૂર પકતા</td>
<td>જરૂર પકતા</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>need (f, sg) have (pl)</td>
<td>need (f, sg) have (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[They] were necessary</td>
<td>[It] was necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

when a person (singular) applies the plural number ending on a verb which describes his or her action. Some examples illustrating these cases are presented in Table 4.31.

While the majority of the gender mismatch examples came from Noun - Verb agreements, there were also cases of gender mismatch with an adjective and a noun. In Gujarati, some adjectives (“variable adjectives”) have to agree with the nouns they modify in gender and number, e.g., સારું (‘good’), whereas other adjectives (“invariable adjectives”) have a single form which does not change to reflect the gender or number of the noun, e.g., સુંદર (‘beautiful’). Some examples from my data of gender mismatch with an adjective and a noun are presented in Table 4.32.

There were also instances of gender mismatch between a possessive and the noun signifying possession in my data. In Gujarati, possessive nouns agree in number and gender with the nouns
signifying possession. Some examples of gender mismatch with a possessive noun and a noun are presented in Table 4.33.

Table 4.33: Gender agreement and case endings in Possessive Noun – Noun constructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal (UK)</td>
<td>મારું ઓરડો</td>
<td>મારો ઓરડો</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my (n) room (m)</td>
<td>my (m) room (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my room</td>
<td>my room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh (SA)</td>
<td>મારું મા</td>
<td>મારી મા</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my (n) mother (f)</td>
<td>my (f) mother (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my mother</td>
<td>my mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
less frequently. These include the incorrect conjugation of verbs for tense and person, and the incorrect case given to nouns.

### 4.7.2 Pronunciation

Some of the main pronunciation errors that emerged from the heritage speakers’ oral proficiency tests are noted below.

Heritage learners had difficulty with the retroflex sounds, and instead produced the non-retroflex counterpart. Table 4.34, Table 4.35, and Table 4.36 illustrate instances where heritage speakers of Gujarati replaced a retroflex sound with the corresponding non-retroflex sound.

**Table 4.34: Examples of cases where the retroflex lateral approximant is replaced with the alveolar lateral approximant, [ɭ] → [l] (ળ → લ)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ishaani (Singapore)</td>
<td>કાલો [kalo]</td>
<td>કાળો [kaɭo]</td>
<td>‘black’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi (Singapore)</td>
<td>શાલા [ʃala]</td>
<td>શાળા [ʃaɭa]</td>
<td>‘school’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.35: Examples of cases where the retroflex nasal is replaced with the dental nasal, [ɳ] → [n] (ણ → ન)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shakil (Singapore)</td>
<td>ઘણી વાર [gʰəni var]</td>
<td>ઘણી વાર [gʰəɳi var]</td>
<td>‘many times’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa (SA)</td>
<td>માણસો [manso]</td>
<td>માણસો [maɳso]</td>
<td>‘man’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.36: Examples of cases where the voiceless retroflex stop is replaced with the voiceless dental stop, [ʈ] → [t] (ટ → ટ)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chirag (Singapore)</td>
<td>કુટુંબ [kutumbo]</td>
<td>કુટુંબ [kutumbo]</td>
<td>‘family’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishal (SA)</td>
<td>પસ્તાક્દા [pʰastakdɑ]</td>
<td>પસ્તાક્દા [pʰastakdɑ]</td>
<td>‘fireworks’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My data also show instances where retroflex sounds were produced as the alveolar tap/flap [ɾ]. Table 4.37, Table 4.38, and Table 4.39 illustrate instances where heritage speakers of Gujarati replaced a retroflex sound with the alveolar tap/flap.
Table 4.37: Examples of cases where the retroflex lateral approximant is replaced with the alveolar tap/flap, [ɭ] → [ɾ] (ɭ → ɾ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vishal (SA)</td>
<td>કારા [kaɾa]</td>
<td>કાળા [kaɭa]</td>
<td>‘black’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipak (UK)</td>
<td>પીરું [piɾũ]</td>
<td>પીળું [piɭũ]</td>
<td>‘yellow’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.38: Examples of cases where the retroflex nasal is replaced with the alveolar tap/flap, [ɳ] → [ɾ] (ɳ → ɾ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashika (Singapore)</td>
<td>હમરાંજ [həmɾãɟ]</td>
<td>હમણાંજ [həmɳãɟ]</td>
<td>‘just now’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal (UK)</td>
<td>આપરે [apaɾai]</td>
<td>આપણે [apəɳai]</td>
<td>‘we all’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.39: Examples of cases where the voiced retroflex stop is replaced with the alveolar tap/flap, [ɖ] → [ɾ] (ɖ → ɾ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh (SA)</td>
<td>કપરા [kəpɾa]</td>
<td>કપડાં [kəpɖã]</td>
<td>‘clothing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keval (SA)</td>
<td>ફટાકરા [pʰəʈakɾa]</td>
<td>ફટાકડા [pʰəʈakɖa]</td>
<td>‘reworks’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the above examples illustrate the difficulties that heritage speakers of Gujarati had with producing the retroflex sound, the retroflex sound is not unknown to them. My data illustrate many cases where they produced a retroflex sound instead of the correct non-retroflex counterpart. Several cases are illustrated in Table 4.40, Table 4.41, and Table 4.42. This phenomenon has also been cited for Hindi heritage language learners (cf. Ilieva, 2012, p. 21, who mentions that the dental consonant group, e.g., in tum ‘you’, often sounded like a retroflex among heritage language learners of Hindi in the U.S.).

Table 4.40: Examples of cases where the voiced dental stop is replaced with the voiced retroflex stop, [d] → [ɾ] (d → ɾ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa (SA)</td>
<td>સફેડ [səpʰeɖ]</td>
<td>સફેદ [səpʰed]</td>
<td>‘white’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payal (SA)</td>
<td>િડવો [ɖivo]</td>
<td>િદવો [diɭo]</td>
<td>‘candle’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to contrasting dental and retroflex sounds, Gujarati also has contrastive aspiration on voiceless and voiced stops, as illustrated, for example, in word pairs like [kaːɳu] ‘hole’ vs. [khaːɳu],
Table 4.41: Examples of cases where the voiced aspirated dental stop is replaced with the voiced aspirated retroflex stop, [dʰ] → [ɖʰ] (_Do → _\&)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anushka (SA)</td>
<td>垸 água [kʰaɖʰu]</td>
<td>垸 água [kʰadʰu]</td>
<td>‘ate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh (SA)</td>
<td>垸 água [bəɖʰu]</td>
<td>垸 água [bədʰũ]</td>
<td>‘all’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.42: Examples of cases where the voiceless aspirated dental stop is replaced with the voiceless aspirated retroflex stop, [tʰ] → [ʈʰ] (� → _硚)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payal (SA)</td>
<td>垸 tide [saʈʰe]</td>
<td>垸 tide [satʰe]</td>
<td>‘together’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘meal’ and [maːg] ‘demand’ vs. [maːgʰ] ‘a name of a month of Gujarati calendar’ (examples taken from Vyas, 2010, p. 94). The study participants sometimes had difficulty with this contrast and at times produced aspirated stops without aspiration. A few cases where heritage speakers did not produce the required aspiration needed in a particular sound are presented in Table 4.43.

Table 4.43: Examples of cases where the voiceless aspirated velar stop is replaced with the voiceless unaspirated velar stop, [kʰ] → [k] (_|歩 → _歩)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gujarati heritage speaker</th>
<th>Gujarati native speaker</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh (SA)</td>
<td>垸 ave [kavanu]</td>
<td>垸 ave [kʰavanũ]</td>
<td>‘food’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh (SA)</td>
<td>垸 ave [kan]</td>
<td>垸 ave [kʰãɖ]</td>
<td>‘sugar’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.3 Vocabulary

Participants displayed some lexical gaps in their knowledge of Gujarati. For example, a number of participants had difficulty understanding the word 垸 (‘fruit’) used in question 3 (Question 3: “What fruits do you like?”). Lexical gaps also resulted in code-mixing. English words were often embedded within Gujarati sentences. This usually occurred at the level of words or phrases (i.e., code-mixing), rather than at the level of whole clauses and sentences (i.e., code-switching). Code-mixing was a phenomenon displayed in the speech of all participants, though to varying degrees. Some examples of code-mixing from my data are presented below:
(1) એક કલાક free હતું
one hour free was
There was one hour free. (Radhika, UK)

(2) Situation permit હું તો Australia જઉ
Situation permit do then I Australia go
If circumstances permit, I would go to Australia. (Bansi, Singapore)

(3) mango માજુ favorite છે.
mango my favorite is
Mango is my favorite [fruit]. (Vikesh, Singapore)

English discourse markers (e.g., ‘actually’, ‘basically’, ‘I mean’) were found in the participants’ speech. An example of ‘actually’ being used in an otherwise completely Gujarati sentence is presented below:

(4) લાલ, પીળા, ભૂરો, um actually any also nice colors
red yellow blue um actually, any nice colors. (Meera, Singapore)

Participants also used English nouns or adjectives which they conjoined with the Gujarati verb કરે ‘to do’ to form conjunct verbs (e.g., boil કરે, celebrate કરે). An example from my data is provided below:

(5) તેને boil કરી દેવાનું
That boil do need
You need to boil that. (Shakil, Singapore)

While the use of such constructions may also be present in the speech of native speakers of Gujarati, the heritage learners used them much more frequently. It is unclear if their use of English represented a lexical gap in all cases, since there were times when they interchangeably used an English word and then later the Gujarati equivalent, or vice versa.

(6) દિવાલી કરે તેવાં friends સાથે
Diwali celebrate ... all friends together
To celebrate Diwali ... We celebrate with all friends. (Sarika, Singapore)
English was not the only language used in the participants’ speech. Evidence of code-mixing into Hindi is also found in their speech. An example where the Hindi word ‘‘ફીર’’ (‘again’) is used instead of the Gujarati equivalent ‘‘પાછું’’ (‘again’) is provided below (note that ‘‘HS’’ and ‘‘NS’’ stand for ‘‘heritage speaker’’ and ‘‘native speaker’’, respectively):

(7)  

| HS: ફીર પાછું લાગુ છુ | NS: પાછું ફીર લાગુ છુ |
|------|----------------|-----------------|
| Again on my feet do           | I bow down again. |

(In Anshul, Singapore)

In addition, Swahili words were inserted by some of the British participants. This is a case of lexical borrowing, whereby individual words were adopted from Swahili by East African Gujaratis and subsequently passed down to the younger generations in the U.K. An example where the Swahili word ‘‘ઢીઝી’’ (Gujarati: ‘‘કેળું’’, ‘‘banana’’) was used is provided below:

(8)  

| HS: ઢીઝી બહુ ભાવે | NS: કેળા બહુ ભાવે |
|------|----------------|----------------|
| Bananas a lot like            | I like bananas a lot. |

(In Deepika, UK)

There were occurrences of lexical errors. Examples include the use of ‘‘ઉભરાવા દેવાનું’’ (‘‘to let it overflow’’) for ‘‘ઉકાળવા દેવાનું’’ (‘‘to let it simmer’’) (example 9) and the use of ‘‘કરવું’’ (‘‘to do’’) for ‘‘બનાવવા’’ (‘‘to make’’) (example 10).

(9)  

Use of ‘‘ઉભરાવા દેવાનું’’ (‘‘to let it overflow’’) for ‘‘ઉકાળવા દેવાનું’’ (‘‘to let it simmer’’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HL: એને ઉભરાવા દેવાનુ</th>
<th>NS: એને ઉકાળવા દેવાનુ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It overflow let</td>
<td>You need to let it [tea] overflow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS: એને ઉકાળવા દેવાનુ</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It simmer let</td>
<td>You need to let it [tea] simmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bansi, Singapore)
In some cases, the incorrect word had the same denotation as the target word but carried different connotations. Examples include the use of  ગમે (‘to like something’, as in an object) for  ભાવે (‘to like something’, as in food) (example 11) and the use of  આ (‘low’, as in speed) instead of  ધીમે (‘low’, as in heat of cooker) (example 12):

(11) Use of  ગમે (‘to like something’, as in an object) for  ભાવે (‘to like something’, as in food):
HL: pineapple  ગમે છે
NS: અનેનાસ  ભાવે છે
I also like pineapple. (Mitul, Singapore)

(12) Use of  આ (‘low’, as in speed) instead of  ધીમે (‘low’, as in heat of cooker):
HL:  આ છે I have the cooker on  આસ્થ્યિ
NS:  આ છે I have the cooker on low heat.
Then I have the cooker on low heat. (Seema, UK)

In other cases, participants made a slight modification to the word they wanted to use, which in fact represented a novel word. An example of this is provided by Meeta (SA). When naming colors for question 5 (Question 5: “What colors do you typically use in a rangoli?”), she used the word  ગુલાબ [gulab] (‘a rose flower’) instead of the word  ગુલાબી [gulabi] (‘pink color’).

4.7.4 Cultural Knowledge

Heritage speakers typically have an advantage over traditional foreign language learners in terms of their ethnic cultural knowledge and understanding. Nonetheless, they may demonstrate certain
gaps in their knowledge and understanding. In this study, some participants displayed gaps in their cultural heritage knowledge when asked questions 2, 4, and 5. These questions, which were originally stated in Chapter 3, are repeated below:

- Question 2: How do you make Indian *chai*?
- Question 4: How do you celebrate *Diwali*?
- Question 5: What colors do you typically use in a *rangoli*?

There were key details missing in some of their answers to questions 2 and 4. For question 4, some participants left out some of the main aspects of *Diwali*, for example, families cleaning and decorating their homes with lamps and candles. Similarly, in question 2, some participants left out key ingredients used in Indian tea, for example, tea leaves, sugar, water, or important procedures, for example, boiling the water, allowing the tea mixture to simmer, etc. Furthermore, some participants were unable to give any information about the Indian tea making process. A lack of cultural knowledge was also displayed by some participants when asked question 5. Some participants named the color ‘black’ as one of the colors used in *rangoli*. *Rangoli* is a folk art from India which symbolizes joy and happiness and is by its very essence colorful. The color black is therefore generally avoided in *rangoli* designs.

### 4.8 Type-Token Coding

In addition to using a holistic proficiency scale, type-token coding was carried out. All possible occurrences of problematic linguistic features in Gujarati were noted (see Sections 2.3.2.1 and 2.3.2.2) and coded on the basis of being: (1) correctly used, (2) incorrectly used, or (3) avoided every time a potential context arose which enabled a particular linguistic feature to be used / expressed in English. For some features (e.g., pronunciation features, grammar features other than ergativity), type-token analysis was performed in the typical way, and scores were reported in a standard manner (i.e., as the number of occurrences of the feature in question out of possible total occurrences). For ergativity, the type-token analysis was performed standardly, but index scores were instead reported, since it is not possible to determine possible instances of ergativity. In order to provide quantitative measures of vocabulary knowledge, I include the number of Gujarati vocabulary items elicited for each participant; however, type-token analysis was not strictly possible, since the vocabulary elicitations were open-ended (i.e., participants were simply asked to list all the fruits and colors they could think of).

Given the large number of participants in this study, it was not feasible to conduct type-token coding for all participants. Type-token coding was therefore carried out for a limited number of
participants. Participants from the lower, mid, and high ends of Gujarati proficiency were selected (which had been determined by the holistic proficiency ratings given by the two evaluators; i.e., objectively evaluated spoken proficiency). These participants were chosen to ensure that a range of proficiencies was considered when carrying out the type-token analyses. In total, type-token coding was carried out for 20% of the participants (27 participants out of 135, 9 in each of the three proficiency groups). The results obtained from the type-token coding analyses were compared with the participants’ rank on the holistic proficiency scale and the former found to corroborate the results of the latter.

4.8.1 Grammar

As noted above, several grammatical errors are commonly found in the speech of Gujarati heritage learners: 1) incorrect use of inclusive ‘we’ vs. exclusive ‘we’, 2) difficulties in gender agreement and case endings, and 3) incorrect use of ergative-absolutive marking vs. nominative-accusative marking. In this section, I present a brief overview of each of these errors in turn below and a description of the way in which these errors were coded. I then display the coded results and analyses for these errors.

4.8.1.1 Inclusive ‘we’ vs. Exclusive ‘we’

Gujarati makes a distinction in grammatical person between inclusive ‘we’, which includes the addressee, and exclusive ‘we’, which excludes the addressee (Tisdall, 1892, p. 39-40). As noted in Section 4.7.1, heritage speakers of Gujarati are known to use the two forms of ‘we’ interchangeably, saying અમે [əme] (‘we’) in the place of આપણે [apəɳe] (‘we all’), and vice versa. For question 6 in the oral proficiency test, which was initially presented in Chapter 3 and is repeated below, participants were required to make sole use of inclusive ‘we’.

Question 6: Please can you translate following sentence into Gujarati: “Shall we all go to the temple now?”

For this question, the use of inclusive ‘we’ was coded as follows:

1. correctly used and pronounced (આપણે) [apəɳe]
2. correctly used but incorrectly pronounced (e.g., આપરે [apəɾe] or આપને [apənə])
3. incorrectly used (e.g., exclusive ‘we’ અમે [əme]) or not used at all

Table 4.44 presents the coded results for inclusive ‘we’. This feature proved to be particularly problematic for heritage speakers. Only 5 of the 27 heritage speakers of Gujarati produced both the correct form and pronunciation of the target word (i.e., આપણે [apəɳe] [‘we all’]), of which the
majority (80%) were in the top proficiency category. Five participants chose the correct form of ‘we all’, but substituted the retroflex nasal [ɳ] with another sound, e.g., the alveolar tap/ flap [ɾ] or the dental nasal [n]. The remaining 17 heritage speakers of Gujarati used an incorrect form for ‘we all’, e.g., exclusive ‘we’ or no word at all. While this task proved to be quite challenging for most heritage speakers, the top proficiency group performed the best on this task. The middle and bottom proficiency groups performed equally poorly on this task, with only one participant in the middle proficiency group employing both the correct form and the correct pronunciation of inclusive ‘we’ in Gujarati, and one participant in the middle proficiency group and three participants in the bottom proficiency group using the correct form but the incorrect pronunciation of inclusive ‘we’.

Table 4.44: Coded results for inclusive ‘we’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (top proficiency group, per the holistic ratings)</th>
<th>‘we all’</th>
<th>Participant (middle proficiency group, per the holistic ratings)</th>
<th>‘we all’</th>
<th>Participant (low proficiency group, per the holistic ratings)</th>
<th>‘we all’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samir (SA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kirit (UK)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Soham (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika (Sing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rakhee (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mahavir (Sing)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimal (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ashika (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rakesh (SA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal (Sing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chandni (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bindiya (UK)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagar (UK)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Khilan (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chirag (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vishal (SA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keval (UK)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi (Sing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Payal (SA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adarsh (UK)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa (SA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sheetal (UK)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neil (UK)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshana (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anshul (Sing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ravi (UK)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.1.2 Gender Agreement and Case Endings

Gujarati marks gender on many parts of speech (e.g., the verb, some adjectives, and the possessive). These parts of speech agree with the gender of the noun that one uses in a sentence. As noted in Section 4.7.1, heritage learners of Gujarati have difficulties with gender agreement and case endings. As heritage speakers of Gujarati may not know the gender of nouns in Gujarati, they may choose the middle path and use the neuter gender, or use another gender altogether.
The following target categories were chosen (the words in bold determine the gender of the word that follows/precedes):

- **Noun** - Verb
- **Adjective** - **Noun**
- **Possessive Noun** - **Noun**

Phrases and sentences from question 1 (Question 1: “What have you done today since waking up?”) which contained the above target categories were coded on the basis of being: (1) correctly used, (2) incorrectly used, or (3) avoided every time a potential context arose which enabled a particular linguistic feature to be used or expressed in English. This question was chosen to encourage participants to tell a narrative about their day which provided many opportunities for them to use the forms in question. Table 4.45 summarizes the results for the 27 participants.

A summary of the findings from Table 4.45 is presented in Table 4.46. The highest variation between the groups can be observed in terms of the number of correctly used target forms. Participants in the top proficiency group had the highest number of correctly used target forms for the three target categories (both individually and collectively [226]), followed by the middle proficiency group (69), and then the bottom proficiency group (32), indicating that the top proficiency group not only used more N-V, Adj-N, and PossN-N constructions, but also used them correctly. While there are also differences between the groups in terms of a) the number of incorrectly used forms and b) the number of forms which were avoided or expressed in English, the variation between the groups for these two categories is not as striking. As seen in Table 4.46, participants in the middle proficiency group had the overall highest number of incorrectly used target forms (12), followed closely by the bottom proficiency group (11), and then the top proficiency group (6). The number of forms which were avoided or expressed in English is overall highest among the top proficiency group (12), followed by the bottom proficiency group (8), and then the middle proficiency group (6).
## Table 4.45: Coded results for gender agreement and case endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>N-V (1)</th>
<th>N-V (2)</th>
<th>N-V (3)</th>
<th>Adj-N (1)</th>
<th>Adj-N (2)</th>
<th>Adj-N (3)</th>
<th>PosN-N (1)</th>
<th>PosN-N (2)</th>
<th>PosN-N (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samir</td>
<td>14/15 (93%)</td>
<td>1/15 (7%)</td>
<td>0/15 (0%)</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>1/5 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika</td>
<td>13/13 (100%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>5/8 (62.5%)</td>
<td>0/8 (0%)</td>
<td>3/8 (37.5%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimal</td>
<td>25/26 (96%)</td>
<td>1/26 (4%)</td>
<td>0/26 (0%)</td>
<td>31/12 (25%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal</td>
<td>15/16 (94%)</td>
<td>1/16 (6%)</td>
<td>0/16 (0%)</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>1/5 (20%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagar</td>
<td>23/26 (88%)</td>
<td>0/26 (0%)</td>
<td>3/26 (12%)</td>
<td>10/12 (83%)</td>
<td>0/12 (0%)</td>
<td>2/12 (17%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>13/13 (100%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>4/4 (100%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>16/17 (94%)</td>
<td>1/17 (6%)</td>
<td>0/17 (0%)</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa</td>
<td>8/9 (89%)</td>
<td>1/9 (11%)</td>
<td>0/9 (0%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshana</td>
<td>27/27 (100%)</td>
<td>0/27 (0%)</td>
<td>0/27 (0%)</td>
<td>10/10 (100%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0%)</td>
<td>11/10 (100%)</td>
<td>0/11 (0%)</td>
<td>0/11 (0%)</td>
<td>0/11 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (top)</td>
<td>154/162 (95%)</td>
<td>5/162 (3%)</td>
<td>3/162 (2%)</td>
<td>51/59 (86%)</td>
<td>1/59 (2%)</td>
<td>7/59 (12%)</td>
<td>21/23 (91%)</td>
<td>0/23 (0%)</td>
<td>2/23 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krit</td>
<td>9/9 (100%)</td>
<td>0/9 (0%)</td>
<td>0/9 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhee</td>
<td>2/3 (67%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>1/3 (33%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashika</td>
<td>10/10 (100%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandni</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilna</td>
<td>3/4 (75%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vachal</td>
<td>4/9 (44.4%)</td>
<td>4/9 (44.4%)</td>
<td>0/9 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payal</td>
<td>12/13 (92%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>1/13 (8%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>4/6 (67%)</td>
<td>2/6 (33%)</td>
<td>0/6 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal</td>
<td>7/8 (87.5%)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0/8 (0%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aashul</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (mid- dle)</td>
<td>57/66 (86%)</td>
<td>6/66 (9%)</td>
<td>3/66 (5%)</td>
<td>5/8 (62.5%)</td>
<td>2/8 (25%)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7/13 (54%)</td>
<td>4/13 (31%)</td>
<td>2/13 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shom</td>
<td>6/6 (100%)</td>
<td>6/6 (100%)</td>
<td>0/6 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahvir</td>
<td>3/4 (75%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7/8 (87.5%)</td>
<td>0/8 (0%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
<td>1/3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1/3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1/3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindiya</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirag</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/5 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevval</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adarsh</td>
<td>6/9 (67%)</td>
<td>0/9 (0%)</td>
<td>3/9 (33%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neel</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (bot- tom)</td>
<td>25/40 (62.5%)</td>
<td>10/40 (25%)</td>
<td>5/40 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3/4 (75%)</td>
<td>0/4 (0%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>4/7 (57%)</td>
<td>1/7 (14%)</td>
<td>2/7 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.46: Summary of findings for gender agreement and case endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (correctly used)</td>
<td>226/244 (93%)</td>
<td>69/87 (79%)</td>
<td>32/51 (62.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (incorrectly used)</td>
<td>6/244 (2%)</td>
<td>12/87 (14%)</td>
<td>11/51 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (avoided / expressed in English)</td>
<td>12/244 (5%)</td>
<td>6/87 (7%)</td>
<td>8/51 (15.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.1.3 Ergativity

Another difficulty for heritage learners of Gujarati lies in the fact that Gujarati is a split ergative language (DeLancey, 1981), meaning that ergative-absolutive marking is used in the perfective tense, but not the imperfective. Heritage speakers may mistakenly give the subject of a transitive clause the nominative case, instead of the ergative, and give the subject of a sentence containing a non-perfective tense the ergative case, instead of the nominative.

The following target categories were chosen:

- Ergative - Absolute
- Nominative - Accusative

Sentences from question 1 were coded on the basis of being: (1) correctly used or (2) incorrectly used. The target categories were not coded on the basis of being avoided every time a potential context arose which enabled the particular linguistic feature to be used, since omitting a subject is permitted in conversation, though not in formal writing (p.c. with Kusum Shah, 8th March 2013). Table 4.47 summarizes the results for the 27 participants.

It can be seen from Table 4.47 that there were more total occurrences of the two forms being used correctly by the top proficiency group (33), followed by the middle proficiency group (17), and then the bottom proficiency group (3). A different pattern emerges with regard to the incorrectly used forms: there were more occurrences of the two forms being used incorrectly by the middle proficiency group (5) than the bottom proficiency group (3) and the top proficiency group (3).
Table 4.47: Coded results for ergativity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Erg - Abs (1)</th>
<th>Erg - Abs (2)</th>
<th>Nom - Acc (1)</th>
<th>Nom - Acc (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samir</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (top)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashika</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anshul</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (middle)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahavir</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindiya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirag</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adarsh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (bottom)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.2 Pronunciation

The retroflex nasal [ɳ] and the retroflex lateral approximant [ɭ] are especially difficult for heritage learners of Gujarati. They often substitute these sounds with other sounds. For example, the retroflex nasal [ɳ] (Gujarati symbol: ણ) may be pronounced as the retroflex lateral approximant [ɭ] (Gujarati symbol: લ), the alveolar tap/flap [ɾ] (Gujarati symbol: ર), or the dental nasal [n] (Gujarati symbol: ન). For example, a word like ‘our’ [ાપણા] (ાપણા) is often pronounced as
[apəɭa] (આપળા), [apəra] (આપરા), or [apəna] (આપના) by heritage speakers of Gujarati. Similarly, the retroflex lateral approximant [ɭ] (Gujarati symbol: ળ) may be pronounced as the alveolar lateral approximant [l] (Gujarati symbol: લ) or the alveolar tap/flap [ɾ] (Gujarati symbol: ર). For example, a word like ‘rangoli’ [ɾəmgoɭi] (રંગોળી) is often pronounced as [ɾəmgoli] (રંગોળી) or [ɾəmgori] (રંગોરી) by Gujarati heritage learners.

Given these pronunciation difficulties, type-token coding was carried out as follows. Several words which participants would need to use in their answers and which contained these problematic sounds were chosen. The following target words were chosen:

- पाणी [paɳi] (‘water’) for question 2
- उकालवू [ukaɭvũ] (‘to boil’) or variants thereof for question 2
- गलणी [gəɭəɳi] (‘a funnel’ or ‘a strainer’) or गलीये [gaɭiye] (‘to strain’ or ‘to filter’) or variants thereof for question 2
- केळा [keɭa] (‘banana’) for question 3
- रंगोली [ɾəmgoɭi] (‘rangoli’) for question 4
- दिवाळी [divaɭi] (‘Diwali’) for question 4
- पीलो [piɭo] (‘yellow’) for question 5

The word घोलो [dʰoɭo] (‘white’) was not chosen as one of the target words for question 5, since there are two words for ‘white’ in Gujarati, namely सफेद [səpʰed] and घोलो [dʰoɭo], and only one of these words contains the target sound. The word काळो [kaɭo] (‘black’) was also not chosen for question 5, since the color black is generally not used in rangoli designs.

The seven target sounds were coded on the basis of being: (1) correctly used; (2) incorrectly used; (3) avoided every time a potential context arose which enabled a particular linguistic feature to be used / expressed in English. Table 4.48 summarizes the type-token pronunciation error findings for the 27 participants.

A summary of the findings from Table 4.48 is presented in Table 4.49. The findings show that there were more instances of the target sounds in the chosen words being correctly pronounced by the top proficiency group, followed by the middle proficiency group, and then by the bottom proficiency group. The data also indicate that there were more instances of the target sounds being avoided or expressed in English by the bottom proficiency group and the fewest instances of this occurring with the top proficiency group. Similar results are seen in terms of the target sounds being used, but incorrectly pronounced: The bottom proficiency group most often incorrectly used a target sound (i.e., used a target sound but incorrectly pronounced it), and the top proficiency group least often did this.
Table 4.48: Table displaying type-token pronunciation error findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>‘water’</th>
<th>'to boil'</th>
<th>‘to strain’</th>
<th>‘banana’</th>
<th>‘rangoli’</th>
<th>‘diwali’</th>
<th>‘yellow’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(paɳi)</td>
<td>(ɾoŋgôli)</td>
<td>(ɡaɭiye)</td>
<td>(keɭa)</td>
<td>(ɾąŋɡoɭi)</td>
<td>(diwali)</td>
<td>(piɭo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Qu. 2)</td>
<td>(Qu. 2)</td>
<td>(Qu. 2)</td>
<td>(Qu. 3)</td>
<td>(Qu. 4)</td>
<td>(Qu. 4)</td>
<td>(Qu. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashika</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anshul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahavir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindiya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adarsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Participant is Muslim and therefore does not make rangoli designs.

<sup>b</sup> Participant is Muslim and therefore does not celebrate the festival Diwali.

Table 4.49: Summary of type-token pronunciation error findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (correctly used)</td>
<td>43/61 (70.5%)</td>
<td>26/63 (41.3%)</td>
<td>9/63 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (incorrectly used)</td>
<td>2/61 (3.3%)</td>
<td>9/63 (14.3%)</td>
<td>12/63 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (avoided / expressed in English)</td>
<td>16/61 (26.2%)</td>
<td>28/63 (44.4%)</td>
<td>42/63 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.8.3 Vocabulary

Questions 3 and 5 were designed to test the heritage speakers’ knowledge of vocabulary in a specific domain, namely their knowledge of fruit names and colors in Gujarati. Only items expressed in Gujarati were included in the total. Participants were not penalized if they pronounced the word incorrectly, as long as it was clear what item they were referring to. Table 4.50, Table 4.51, and Table 4.52 below display the number of fruit names and colors that participants were able to name in Gujarati.

Participants in all three groups were able to name more colors than fruits. Those in the top and middle proficiency groups were able to name similar numbers of fruits and colors. Those in the bottom proficiency group were able to name the least number of fruits and colors.

Table 4.50: Vocabulary knowledge in the fruit and color domain for the top proficiency group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of fruit names</th>
<th>Number of color names</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL top</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.51: Vocabulary knowledge in the fruit and color domain for the middle proficiency group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of fruit names</th>
<th>Number of color names</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashika</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandni</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anshul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL middle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.52: Vocabulary knowledge in the fruit and color domain for the bottom proficiency group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of fruit names</th>
<th>Number of color names</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahavir</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindiya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirag</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adarsh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 Speech Rate

Speech rate is the word-per-minute (WPM) output in spontaneous speech\(^{17}\) and has been cited as another means by which to assess heritage language proficiency (Kagan & Friedman, 2003; Polinsky, 2008; Polinsky & Kagan, 2007), with the basic premise being that the faster the rate of speech in the heritage language, the more proficient an individual is considered to be in the heritage language. Table 4.53 presents the WPM output for the aforementioned twenty-seven participants (i.e., the nine top, middle, and bottom participants). The number of words calculated in the word-per-minute output included Gujarati words only. Any filler words (e.g., uh, um), incomplete words, words in other languages (e.g., English, Swahili, Hindi), and stuttered words were excluded from the total. While these elements may have a bearing on whether participants sound fluent or not, they were not included in the total, since they do not constitute actual words. Using samples of fluent speech (i.e., without pauses and repairs) to calculate speech rate has been employed by other researchers, for example, Brook and Nagy (2012). In addition, time which the interviewer spent asking questions was not included in the time (i.e., number of seconds of speech) recorded.

As can be seen in Table 4.53, the top proficiency group generally had the greatest WPM output, followed by the middle proficiency group, and then by the bottom proficiency group, minus a few exceptions, which will be discussed in more detail below. The top proficiency group had participants ranging from 73.95 WPM to 133.65 WPM (average WPM of the top proficiency group: 99.19 WPM), the middle proficiency group had participants ranging from 28.86 WPM to 84.81 WPM (average WPM of the middle proficiency group: 58.23 WPM), and the bottom

\(^{17}\)Other measures of speech rate exist, for example syllables per second (De Jong & Wempe, 2009).
### Table 4.53: WPM Output (“Speech Rate”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number of seconds of speech</th>
<th>Number of minutes of speech</th>
<th>Number of words</th>
<th>Words per minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samir</td>
<td>189.00</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>123.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika</td>
<td>184.00</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>101.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimal</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>90.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal</td>
<td>231.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>92.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagar</td>
<td>356.00</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>133.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>181.00</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>348.00</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa</td>
<td>456.00</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>73.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshana</td>
<td>483.00</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>77.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirit</td>
<td>151.00</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>71.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhee</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>81.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashika</td>
<td>218.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandni</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>84.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilan</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishal</td>
<td>237.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payal</td>
<td>133.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>77.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal</td>
<td>204.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anshul</td>
<td>443.00</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>44.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham</td>
<td>237.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahavir</td>
<td>224.00</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh</td>
<td>452.00</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindiya</td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirag</td>
<td>343.00</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keval</td>
<td>264.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adarsh</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>113.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proficiency group had participants ranging from 6.37 WPM to 33.19 WPM (average WPM of the bottom proficiency group: 17.30 WPM).

A few outliers can be seen. Kirit, Rakhee, Chandni, and Payal from the middle proficiency group all had scores which were similar to the ones obtained by Kalpa and Eshana from the top proficiency group. However, there is a substantial difference in the length of their responses. Kalpa and Eshana gave more in-depth responses to the seven questions, which can be seen by the number of words that they spoke throughout the interview (562 and 621 words in total, respectively), compared to shorter responses by Kirit, Rakhee, Chandni, and Payal (179, 146, 147, and 171 words in total, respectively). In addition, Adarsh and Soham from the bottom proficiency group
had scores which were similar to the ones obtained by Ashika and Vishal from the middle proficiency group. The same reasoning as above applies to Adarsh’s case. Adarsh gave much less in-depth answers than those given by Ashika and Vishal. This is however not the case for Soham. A similar number of words are spoken in the same number of seconds by both Soham (bottom proficiency group) and Vishal (middle proficiency group). The difference here lies in the number of prompts which the interviewer had to give the two participants. In addition to the seven questions, the interviewer had to prompt Soham 18 times for extra information, as a result of extremely brief answers or no answers at all, in comparison to having to prompt Vishal 11 times only. Furthermore, Soham’s answers contained very long pauses, which negatively affected his rate of speech, and he was unable to provide an answer for questions 2 and 5. By contrast, although Vishal’s general speed in Gujarati was slower than Soham’s speed, Vishal was able to answer all the questions that he was asked.

4.10 Summary of Findings

In Sections 4.8 and 4.9, I presented the results from two additional ways of measuring language proficiency, namely a) type-token coding and b) word-per-minute output (“speech rate”). In this section, I compare the results obtained from these analyses with the scores obtained when evaluating language proficiency through the use of a rubric in order to reveal similarities and differences in the results. Through such comparisons, I determine the validity of using a scoring rubric to evaluate heritage language proficiency.

I begin by presenting the main findings for type-token coding analyses and WPM output analyses, and compare them alongside the proficiency scores obtained through the use of the rubric (Table 4.54).

A key to interpreting the results in Table 4.54 is presented below:

- For exclusive vs. inclusive ‘we’ (Section 4.8.1.1): scores range from 1 to 3; the lower the number, the closer to the target form and pronunciation (and to native speaker command of Gujarati).
- For grammar 1, 2, and 3: the higher the number, the higher the number of forms used. Grammar 1 refers to gender agreement and case endings (Section 4.8.1.2). Grammar 2 refers to ergative-absolutive and grammar 3 refers to nominative-accusative (Section 4.8.1.3)
  - For grammar 1: the higher the number, the closer to native speaker command of Gujarati.
Table 4.54: Table summarizing all type-token coding and word-per-minute findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Exclusive vs. inclusive 'we'</th>
<th>Grammar: 1 (correctly used)</th>
<th>Grammar: 2 (incorrectly used)</th>
<th>Grammar: 3 (avoided / expressed in English)</th>
<th>Pronunciation (total)</th>
<th>Vocabulary (total)</th>
<th>WPM</th>
<th>Objective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123.17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101.09</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.27</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92.99</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>133.65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73.95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71.13</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81.11</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashika</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.68</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandni</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84.81</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khilan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.86</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anshul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahavir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindiya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirag</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adarsh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For grammar 2 and 3: the higher the number, the closer to non-native speaker command of Gujarati.

- For pronunciation (Section 4.8.2): scores ranged from 1 to 3; the lower the number, the closer to the target form and pronunciation (and to native speaker command of Gujarati).
- For vocabulary (Section 4.8.3): the higher the number, the higher the number of forms used (and the closer to native speaker command of Gujarati).
- For word-per-minute output: the higher the number, the more words spoken per minute (and the closer to native speaker command of Gujarati).

It can be concluded that the findings from these analyses support the scores given by the two evaluators and justify the participants’ rank on the proficiency scale (top, middle, or bottom). While the analysis of each feature for each individual might not necessarily support the rank that they were given, examining each individual’s findings in totality supports the evaluators’ ranking of the participants’ proficiency. For example, one top-ranking participant, Rishi (top) incorrectly used the nominative form instead of the ergative form a lot more than other participants in the top proficiency group and some participants in the middle and bottom proficiency groups. Similarly, he had more non-nativelike pronunciations than others in the top proficiency group and some participants in the middle and bottom proficiency groups. However, from other analyses, his rank matches that of other participants who were placed in the top proficiency group (e.g., number of correct uses of N-V agreement, WPM output, etc.). However, an exception exists. Kalpa’s (top) scores for all categories are very similar to the scores obtained by Kirit, Chandni, and Payal (all middle), meaning that according to the type-token and WPM analyses, Kalpa should be in the middle proficiency group, but according to the raters, she was in the top proficiency group. It can thus be concluded that the use of a scoring rubric to assess language proficiency seems valid in most instances.

4.11 Summary of Chapter

In this chapter, I presented the results of the quantitative analyses that were conducted to answer the research questions. The quantitative data presented in this chapter illustrate the extent to which variation in proficiency among Gujarati heritage learners, as evaluated by four language proficiency measures (subjective evaluation then, subjective evaluation now, objective evaluation now, and national examination scores), can be explained by selected identity and demographic factors, and linguistic experiences/history. In this chapter, I also compared the holistic rankings provided by the raters with two other ways of measuring language proficiency, namely a) type-
token coding analyses and b) word-per-minute output (speech rate). On the whole, the findings from the comparative analysis corroborate the proficiency rankings given by the two evaluators (top, middle, or bottom).

The findings from this chapter influence the discussions presented in the remaining chapters. This chapter has highlighted that certain identity and demographic factors, and linguistic experiences/history are important in determining heritage language proficiency, whereas others are not (see Section 4.5). In particular, many variables were significant in explaining participants’ current subjective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency. Fewer were significant in explaining objective spoken proficiency. Strength of ethnic identification generally proved to be insignificant in explaining variations in objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency; instead objectively evaluated spoken proficiency seems largely associated with a) amount of language use and b) amount of language input/exposure, and somewhat with c) knowledge of other languages. In Chapter 5, I present a detailed discussion on the intricacies of identity where I attempt to determine why certain identity markers influence heritage language proficiency, whereas others do not. In Chapter 6, I merge quantitative findings with qualitative analyses to interpret the reasons why certain demographic factors and linguistic experiences/history impact heritage language proficiency, whereas others do not. In addition to the selected identity and demographic factors, and linguistic experiences/history that were quantitatively measured and found in this chapter to be significant in explaining variations in language proficiency, I discuss other factors that contribute to higher levels of language proficiency for Gujarati heritage speakers.
Chapter 5

Defining Identity

5.1 Introduction

Identity is really important. So the feeling of actually belonging is really important. As a human being, everyone wants to belong, or most people. I think it is human nature to want to belong. (Reena, UK)

For Reena and many of the participants in this study, defining identity was important for their sense of self. Reena’s ancestors migrated from India to the U.K. via Kenya. Migration from one’s native land to a new country may heavily impact personal identity and group cohesion; specific markers which may have been traditionally used in definitions of ethnic identity (e.g., language, culture, religion) may become weakened in the new country because of the influence of the local society. The ethnic identity which second and subsequent generations in the diaspora thus possess may not be of the same form or composition as that of the first generation (Isajiw, 1990). In this chapter, I am interested to find out how ethnic identity has changed and is changing for second and subsequent generation Gujarati adolescents and young adults from the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa.

It has been proven to be difficult to reliably define and measure ethnic identity and previous studies have measured ethnic identity in various ways, from the use of a single item (Richman et al., 1987) to scales containing several dimensions (Phinney, 1992). I apply a mixed methods analysis (outlined in Chapter 3) and my conclusions are drawn from 135 in-depth interviews. In this chapter, I consider the ways in which identity is perceived, defined, experienced, and expressed by the diaspora Gujaratis. Through such an analysis, it is possible to understand the intricacies of identity for diaspora communities, which will in turn provide a better understanding of the quantitative statistical results presented in Chapter 4. My analysis is carried out as follows.
Since identity is often defined through various “identity markers”, I identified common identity markers that emerged during the semi-structured interviews I conducted with study participants to determine which variables are considered important in the construction of their Indian identity. I describe how “being Indian” is associated with factors such as the strong sense of community, ethnic morals and values, and traditions such as the celebration of ethnic holidays and religious practices, and how some factors are perceived as more important in descriptions of ethnic identity than others. However, when ethnic cultural ideas and expectations contrast with the local mainstream mind-set, some traditional Indian ethnic identity markers or behaviors have become weakened in the diaspora context or are being rejected by the participants. These include choice of marriage partner and traditional gender roles. In addition to markers that define their ethnic identity, other identity markers, for example, birthplace and local English accent, define or heighten a sense of local identity (i.e., Britishness, Singaporeaness, and South Africanness). Based on the findings presented in this chapter, I discuss the ways in which ethnic identity can be fostered in diaspora contexts. I discuss the major role that heritage language schools and the home play in passing on aspects of ethnic identity, in particular, culture, religion, and language, in order to maintain traditional Indian identity. In addition, I illustrate that identity does not have to remain static and be preserved intact through generations in order to be considered as authentic identity (see, for example, Clifford, 1988; Giddens, 1991; Isajiw, 1990). Furthermore, I illustrate the way in which identity formation of Gujaratis in diaspora is influenced by historical events, such as Apartheid in South Africa, and childhood experiences, such as growing up in areas which contain a large concentration of Gujaratis and other Indians. I also discuss the country’s role and policies as they relate to and impact the maintenance and development of identity for the Gujarati diaspora community.

Using words and insights of the adolescent and young adult participants in my study, this chapter highlights how their identities are multiple, fluid, and at times contradictory, and illustrates how they navigate these various and variegated identities. While identities are complex for all people, not just ethnic groups in the diaspora, the identity of minority groups in the Gujarati diaspora may be complicated in different ways, or to different degrees. Certain rules, expectations, and behaviors that are typically associated with being traditionally Indian are being challenged by new generations of Gujaratis in the diaspora. I argue that such challenges represent an evolution of Gujarati ethnic identity rather than assimilation (i.e., shift toward a local identity) and that the ethnic identity of Gujaratis in the diaspora may be more accurately defined as “Indian in the diaspora”, rather than as strictly “Indian”. In addition, through detailing the intricacies of identity, this chapter portrays the difficulties of being able to accurately measure ethnic identity and reveals
that simple statements about identity in surveys are not enough to fully understand this complex concept. The qualitative analysis presented in this chapter therefore helps to better understand, explain, and expand on the survey findings. By undertaking a multi-site analysis with the same ethnic minority group in similar educational but different local settings, this chapter also serves to illustrate differences in acculturation and assimilation into the host society and highlights how such differences impact the formation of identity.

5.2 The Construction of Identity

As mentioned in Section 5.1, identity is often defined through various “identity markers”. In order to assess the way in which Gujarati adolescents and young adults identify themselves, I looked out for several identity markers during the interviews, for example, language, culture, and religion, to determine which variables are considered important in the construction of a) their Indian identity and b) their local identity. Despite “widely discrepant definitions and measures of ethnic identity” (Phinney, 2003, p. 500), certain common elements are found in most definitions and descriptions of ethnic identity. As discussed in Chapter 2, a powerful marker of ethnic identity is a shared language. This viewpoint is shared by many scholars (De Vos, 1995; J. Edwards, 1985; Fishman, 1989; Woolard, 1991). The vitality of language communities is defined as “that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup settings” (Giles et al., 1977, p. 308). Ethnolinguistic vitality is affected by sociostructural factors, such as status, demographic, and institutional support factors (Giles et al., 1977). For Phinney (2003), being a member of an ethnic group means having a common ancestry and sharing at least a similar culture, race, religion, language, kinship, or place of origin. Similarly, De Vos and Romanucci-Ross (1982) define ethnicity as “the attribute of membership in a group set off by racial, territorial, economic, religious, cultural, aesthetic, or linguistic uniqueness” (p. 3). Ethnicity is “a dynamic, multidimensional construct that refers to one’s identity, or sense of self as a member of an ethnic group” (Phinney, 2003, p. 63). Subjective identification is just as important in ethnic identity as is being accepted and acknowledged by “ingroup” and “outgroup” members (Collier & Thomas, 1988; Saharso, 1989). Isajiw (1990) divides ethnic identity into external and internal aspects. External aspects are expressed through observable behavior (e.g., speaking an ethnic language, participating in ethnic institutions, etc.). Internal aspects involve attitudes, feelings, ideas, and images and can be further subdivided into three elements: cognitive (knowledge of one’s group), moral (feelings of obligation to one’s group), and affective (feelings of attachment to one’s group). According to Phinney (2003), “ethnic identity is not a fixed categorization, but it is rather a fluid
and dynamic understanding of self and ethnic background. Ethnic identity is constructed and modified as individuals become aware of their ethnicity, within the large (sociocultural) setting” (p. 23). The view that ethnic identity is more of an ongoing process than a static product is shared by many scholars working in a social constructionist vein, including De Fina et al. (2006), Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001), Hall (1992), and Bucholtz (1995), and can be applied to all people, not just particular ethnic groups in diaspora, as indicated in Section 5.1 above.

5.3 “Being Indian”

This section discusses several factors that participants describe as contributing to their “Indian-ness”. In Chapter 3, I presented the identity markers that were used in the survey to quantitatively assess identity among the participants. In this section, I discuss the identity markers that were most often cited by participants in their interviews as being part of their definition of ethnic identity, some of which were similar to or identical to the markers in the survey and others of which were different. An interview was conducted with each participant at some point after they had completed the survey. In most cases, this was immediately afterwards; in a few cases, due to participants’ availability, the interview took place at a later point. The interview was informal and semi-structured in nature, and it appeared to me that participants gave frank and detailed responses in most cases. In fact, the picture that emerged from the interviews was that participants were eager rather than afraid to talk and open up to someone who could relate to them and their experiences, and they often described the interview process as a positive, enjoyable, and interesting experience. While all the interviewees in this study are Gujarati, I analyzed their narratives in terms of their Indianness and not their Gujaratiness (unless otherwise stated). I adopted this approach for two reasons: 1) most interviewees used the words “Gujarati” and “Indian” interchangeably; 2) all interviewees largely focused on their Indian identity in opposition to their British, Singaporean, or South African identity when discussing their ethnic identity formation in the diaspora.

5.3.1 Language

A powerful marker of ethnic identity is often a shared language. This was repeatedly mentioned by the young Gujaratis based in the U.K. and Singapore: “How can I be Gujarati if I have not learned to read or write or speak well in the language?” (Sonya, Singapore); “If you can’t speak your own language, you’ve kind of lost half your culture” (Minal, UK). Knowing Gujarati not only heightens a sense of Indian identity, but also helps in socializing with other Gujaratis, especially
monolingual elders, and in integrating into the Gujarati community. A different viewpoint is shared by the majority of young South African Gujaratis. The ability to speak Gujarati was not viewed as an important marker of their Indian identity: “As a Gujarati person, it’s important to know your culture, it’s important to know your religion, it’s nice to know your language, it’s not key ... The key language is English; it’s spoken throughout the world” (Rakesh, SA). While Minal made a connection between language and culture, Rakesh and other South African participants viewed the two as separate concepts: “Language is not that important for your identity, as long as you know your culture, that’s all that matters for Gujarati” (Asha, SA); “You should know about your religion and culture. All those values. But not knowing Gujarati is not going to make you less of an Indian” (Keval, SA). For most of the South African participants, English was their first language and they had grown up in households that were predominantly English speaking. Consequently, their Gujarati proficiency was also generally lower than that of the Singaporean and British participants. So, while South African participants generally identified strongly as Indian and in some cases more so than Singaporean and British participants, knowing Gujarati was generally not considered to be an important identity marker. According to one South African participant, “They [Indians in Lenasia (South Africa)] don’t take language to be something very important ... They don’t take language seriously” (Meeta, SA).

5.3.2 Sense of Community

The strong sense of community that exists among Gujaratis was unanimously cited by participants in all three sites as one of the most defining characteristics of Indian identity. In Indian culture, family includes not only immediate family, but also extended family. Participants compared this to the mainstream culture in which they were living. Participants from the U.K. described the typical white British family as being composed solely of the immediate family members, which was in stark contrast to their situation, where three generational households were common and close contact was maintained with extended family members and the community:

I know of like British white families who like- they have their own immediate family and then they are quite disjoint even perhaps, maybe not from their grandparents, but from other brothers or sisters of their parents and their children kind of thing and they’re very distant, whereas we- I think we have a strong sense of family and that reaches out to a sense of community even between families ... Just treating everyone like brothers and sisters ... and even say friends of parents or anything ... I think that’s very strong ... Everyone kind of sticks together, everyone is in contact with one another. (Anand, UK)

The idea of closeness within the community is also portrayed through naming terms, for example, bhai (brother) to refer to male cousins, ben (sister) to refer to female cousins, and aunty to
refer to any female figure (e.g., a Gujarati teacher). While the idea of a close-knit community was viewed in a positive light by most participants, some also highlighted the problematic aspects of this: “People are in your space all the time. In other cultures, if you’re family, it’s your immediate family and that’s it, whereas here, you have to worry about a hundred thousand people other than just yourself” (Hiral, SA). Other negative aspects included gossip, competitiveness, and concern about personal reputation in the community. These are discussed further in Section 5.4.5.

5.3.3 Family Values and Morals

Many participants associated being Indian with family values and morals such as respectful address (e.g., use of polite ‘you’, i.e., tame) and honor toward parents and other elders, which is expressed through the use of particular styles of speech and appropriate behavior in public. Upholding family honor and reputation in the community is also considered important. As a result of this family-oriented culture, it is expected that parents live in the homes of the child, rather than alone or in old age homes, since it is Indian tradition that parents look after children who, in turn, look after parents: “I enjoy staying at home with my parents and stuff. And they expect us to stay with them and look after them, even after we get married and stuff; that’s just the way they did it and we follow it” (Keval, SA). Sending parents to old age homes often draws criticism from the family network and the community as a whole, and was negatively viewed by most participants:

What really like pisses me off is that some Chinese families, actually a lot of Chinese families ... don’t really take care of their grandparents. They send them to old folks’ homes and all that. And Malays not so much, but some Indians are still doing it. There’s some Indians, yeh, they are actually doing it. I’ve actually taken part in some of the old folks’ homes, erm like help them out and all that. And whenever I see like an Indian old man or old woman there, it really pisses me off. (Chirag, Singapore)

Furthermore, an Indian is expected to maintain general moral values, such as telling the truth, and not taking the wrong path, which includes avoiding criminal activity, drugs, and for some, alcohol too.

5.3.4 Indian Cultural Activities

Taking part in Indian cultural activities was mentioned as an aspect of being Indian which distinguished participants from their non-Indian friends. Many reported that they spent a good amount of their free time in their childhood engaging in Indian cultural activities, such as Indian classical dancing (e.g., Kathak), playing Indian instruments (e.g., the harmonium), or learning to sing Indian devotional songs (bhajans). In the U.K. and South Africa, many of the cultural activities were incorporated into the Gujarati School day or were organized through the school. In Singapore, this
was not the case because the Gujarati School, whose vision is “preserving culture through language” (http://www.sgsl.org.sg/), is designed to promote language study only, but there were nonetheless countless opportunities for Singaporean Gujaratis to undertake Indian cultural activities through organizations which focused on such activities. The heavy focus on Indian linguistic, cultural, and religious activities during childhood years meant that participants often did not engage in many other types of activities. This resulted in gaps in local cultural knowledge for some participants, for example, in music, which was the most cited example among the participants:

My music taste is very, very Indian in fact ... My friend had an 18th [birthday party] at a club on Saturday and kind of all the music, I was just thinking that “My God, I don’t actually- I haven’t heard of these [English] songs before and it’s kind of like everyone else has.” (Sagar, UK)

I didn’t have a regular Singaporean upbringing. Sometimes there are things that my friends talk about that I don’t relate to or I don’t even know what they are talking about ... I learnt a lot about Singapore after I went to university ... Until I was 13, I didn’t listen to English music at all. (Sonal, Singapore)

For Sonal and many others, these gaps in local cultural knowledge were often filled as they grew older, for example, once they began university and had more contact with other races.

While many participants spent a considerable amount of time during their childhood engaging in Indian cultural activities, not all individuals held the opinion that being Indian meant participating in such activities:

Everyone was constantly telling me that I’m Indian and that I should behave more appropriately from where I am from. But I didn’t know what it meant to be Indian. The only experiences I had were at Gujarati School, and the dance and harmonium classes we did, you know all that Indian stuff we did as kids, but that doesn’t really mean you’re Indian. Everyone kept telling me this, but as I didn’t know what it meant to be Indian, I thought I’d go to India and find out what it means to be Indian. (Reena, UK)

This participant, Reena, did in fact go to India, and during her time there, she found that many young Indians were not involved in such activities. This trend was noted by other study participants too: “Even though we are British born, I think we embrace a lot of Indian culture, more so because I recently was in Mumbai and I felt like everything is trying to be so westernized” (Minal, UK).

5.3.5 Religion

For some participants, being Indian meant attending religious ceremonies, following religious customs and practices, and performing religious rituals. For example, for Jains, this included following <i>Ahimsa</i>, which means having ‘respect for others’, i.e., for human beings, but also for animals (through vegetarianism). Religious knowledge in the U.K. and Singapore was often acquired at
the Gujarati School (e.g., during morning assemblies). In addition, the two schools organize many religious activities (e.g., the celebration of religious days). In Singapore, due to the more mixed religious composition of the students at the Gujarati School (Hindus, Muslims, and Jains) and as a result of state policy which dictates that language schools are secular institutions which promote language study only, religious activities are not organized by the school (Singapore Gujarati School interview, 29th November 2010), but through separate associations, such as the Singapore Jain Society. Some participants specifically discussed the connections between and merging of their religious and ethnic identity. Interestingly, it was mostly the Muslim Gujarati participants, all based in Singapore, who preferred to identify as “Muslim” rather than “Gujarati” or “Indian”: “I’m more inclined towards the Malay side ... Actually I’m not a Gujarati. I’m an Indian Muslim ... and I follow the Islam culture much more compared to the Indian culture” (Nazia, Singapore).

5.3.6 Food

“Food plays quite a big part of culture” (Priya, UK). Every participant claimed to eat Indian food on a regular basis, if not daily. Even non-Indian food made at home is often given an Indian touch through Indian spices, a trend which has been noted by other researchers too (see, for example, Oonk, 2004 on the tendency of East African Gujaratis to ‘Indianize’ Western food). Many eat Indian sweetmeats at the same time they eat their main meal, and not as dessert at the end of a meal as in Western cultures. While food is one element of Indian culture that has been sustained in the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa, some of the participants mentioned changing food and drinking habits. This included some of the younger generation of Gujaratis eating non-vegetarian food and/or drinking alcohol, with many doing so without their parents’ knowledge. Similar changing dietary habits have been noted for other Gujarati diaspora communities, including the Hindu Lohana community in East Africa (Oonk, 2004). The changing food and drinking habits were deemed necessary for integration purposes:

I think it would make it easier if you did [assimilate], if you were more British ... For example, if you didn’t drink alcohol, it would be a bit difficult to hang out with somebody or a group of friends who did drink alcohol. A lot of English people and Black people do drink alcohol, so if you weren’t the type of person to drink alcohol, then obviously going out with them would be quite difficult, or if you didn’t eat meat, then you know, going to restaurants and stuff, that could be difficult. (Seema, UK)

However, some described how this led to the adoption of a contradictory identity, for example, through publically displaying a strong Indian identity (e.g., going to the temple every day), but then secretly engaging in activities traditionally deemed inappropriate for Indians (e.g., eating meat or drinking alcohol):
A lot of our people, especially in our society, have changed. It’s just they do it behind their parents’ back ... they’ll still hide eating whatever it is that they eat [i.e., meat] and it’s actually shocking. (Meeta, SA)

Especially in England, there’s this sort of whole cultural traditional aspect of everyone where-. On the one hand, they might do lots of naughty things like drink, and then on the other hand, they try and present themselves as- it’s very fake. And I just, I don’t really appreciate that sort of fakeness. (Pooja, UK)

Strict food and dietary habits prevented some participants from eating some of the traditional food dishes of their country (e.g., roast beef and Yorkshire pudding in the U.K.) and from participating in customs that were popular in their country (e.g., braais [barbeques] in South Africa): “A typical Singaporean breakfast apparently would be like kaya toast and eggs and whatever, so things that I never grew up eating, ‘cause my family’s vegetarian and Indian, so that’s not something that you would eat” (Sonal, Singapore). Having different dietary habits to others, especially to the dominant local groups, led some to feel embarrassed and also heightened their sense of being different and not belonging:

[You feel like you’re] causing inconvenience, ‘cause you’re vegetarian ... You’re like “Oh, you know, I can’t eat, ‘cause like I’m vegetarian”, so normally I would just like not say and probably just not like eat and maybe bring some food of my own sort of thing ... During recess and stuff, you can’t go and buy food like other people and like so it’s weird and people look at you funny and be like why you bringing food from home kind of thing ... When I was young, I didn’t used to bring like- I like used to get very embarrassed to bring like lunch boxes and stuff, so I would like not eat. ‘Cause my primary school was quite racist ... It was very difficult to make friends. (Jyoti, Singapore)

Others, however, embraced these culinary differences and highlighted how aspects of Indian culture, such as food, were very much appreciated by locals: “Western culture does appreciate ... the Indian culture ... I mean, what’s the main British informal dish? Curry, isn’t it?” (Dhruv, UK). Dhruv’s observation echoes the comment made by Robin Cook, former U.K. foreign secretary, in 2001: Chicken tikka masala is “a true British national dish, not only because it is the most popular, but because it is a perfect illustration of the way Britain absorbs and adapts external influences”.

5.3.7 Academic and Professional Success

Being Indian was associated with achieving work success, e.g., obtaining top grades at school and university, thriving professionally, and being financially stable. Participants compared the work ethic among Indians with the work ethic among other local groups and described Indians as having a stronger work ethic, as well as higher aspirations:

With personal statement, which is what you write to get in [to university], it’s kind of like try your best [among non-Asians] and if I can’t be bothered, then I won’t do
it. Whereas with kind of my Asian friend circle, they all do all-nighters, they all go to
whatever extent that they can to kind of make sure it’s perfect, ‘cause they- they look
forward a lot more, I think, they’re much more forward looking. They’re kind of not
living the present, again like pseudo kind of present future. (Sagar, UK)

Emphasis is put on education since good education is linked to a successful future. Indians
are often expected to do well in school, and generally do so, regularly outperforming other local
groups in their country (as noted, for example, in a 2010 online news article in the Times of India
titled (“Indians better than British students, even in English”, 2010). They are also expected to
continue onto higher education, and have careers that lead to secure (financial) futures, and so
certain university degrees in the humanities (e.g., English) were at times frowned upon. According
to the participants, typical Gujarati careers included doctors, dentists, and pharmacists, though in
the past, retail trade (e.g., newsagent and grocery store owners) was also a highly popular career
choice among Gujaratis. While most of the participants had chosen to pursue degrees and careers
which led to a (financially) secure future, those who had not described the negative effects of an
upbringing that puts so much importance on future financial security. Jayni, a British participant,
described how her university degree (English Literature) and her choice of university (a university
outside London, which was not Oxbridge), were highly unusual options for Indians to pick. In
her conversation with me, she stresses a need for Indians to diversify with regard to acceptable
educational options and not be hesitant about taking the initiative to pursue paths which are
traditionally atypical for Indians. Another participant working in the development sector indicated
that her career choice was not typically Indian and how it therefore may not be as respected by
other Indians. She joked that career choice is so important among Indians that at least one of the
first three questions that potential spouses get asked by elders is career-related:

    Now we have a new way of doing arranged marriages which is introduction marriage
and what are the first three questions that you ask, “What do they do?”, “How old are
they?”, you know, stuff like “What do their parents do?”, silly things like that. (Pooja,
UK)

While some career choices were perceived to be typically Indian, the question arises whether oc-
cupations that are traditionally not common among Indians are indicative of a non-Indian identity.
From their narratives and descriptions, it would seem as though “being Indian” is stereotypically
associated with careers such as doctors, since large numbers of Indians pursued such professions,
though participants like Pooja and Jayni highlight that the notion of “Indianness” based on pro-
fession just represents a stereotype for them; as such, it is not relevant for them and does not
influence their identity.
5.3.8 Business-Mindedness

Gujaratis are traditionally known as “successful” businesspeople. This has led to the adoption of a common stereotype that Gujaratis are careful with money and know how to handle it, or more negatively, that they are frugal and stingy. Words such as “cheap”, “stingy”, and “money-minded” were used by participants in descriptions of differences between Gujaratis and other Indians. Some participants recognized this as a stereotyped image of Gujaratis, but others indicated that there was some truth behind this and thus accepted this image of Gujaratis. Some participants addressed this point in a positive light:

People call me quite cheap and stuff ... But I think it’s ‘cause I’m sensible with my spending. (Sagar, UK)

We do get teased a lot that Gujarati people are bit selfish, not selfish, but stingy, which is fine, ‘cause I think also Gujarati people and the way that they handle money, they should, which is fine, ‘cause I don’t think that’s a bad thing. We know how to do business, I guess. (Hiral, SA)

Some people could say [that Gujaratis are] stingy or money-orientated ... ‘cause I think Indian people are very business-minded ... That’s a big part of the culture actually, money, in a weird way, not in a greedy way, but it just is a big part of culture ... It’s a good attitude, ‘cause look at the credit crunch, like people- We’ve been brought up to be sensible ... They [English people] don’t think twenty years ahead, or ten years ahead, or tomorrow. (Minal, UK)

Others described this common Gujarati characteristic in a more negative light, illustrating through examples how Indians were always trying to negotiate on prices, get bargains and discounts, and were constantly thinking about saving for the future, but not living for the present:

Rahul (UK): Well, Guju- Gujarati people tend to be quite stingy.
Sheena: And do you think that’s true?
Rahul (UK): Well, from my family, yes. I mean, my parents look at the price of rice, week in, week out. They are always trying to save money ... I mean, it [being careful with money] has its benefits, I mean for the future, but sometimes you feel that maybe you should just let loose and have a bit of fun in the present rather than just wait for the future.

5.3.9 Indian Physical Appearance

The participants’ Indian physical appearance (e.g., brown skin, black hair, and dark eyes) meant that an Indian identity was compulsory. In all three countries, skin color was frequently mentioned in descriptions of ethnic identity: “Obviously I’m Indian, because like my skin color [is brown]” (Aditi, UK); “That part of us that’s Indian, it’s always going to be with us, it’s on our face, it’s on our skin color, it’s you know, it’s written all over us, and even within us, it’s part of us” (Kinari,
In Singapore, a North-South divide exists among the Indians in Singapore. Rather than using the collective term “Indian”, those of original North Indian heritage often prefer to identify as “North Indian” and those of original South Indian heritage often prefer to identify as “South Indian” (Rai, 2004). So, unlike the U.K. and South African participants, Singaporean Gujarati participants did not make references to their skin color to solely assert their Indian identity, but more so to emphasize their North Indian identity: “First of all, of course, we’re lighter-skinned [than the South Indians]” (Sonal, Singapore). A lighter skin color was associated with being beautiful: “They [the Chinese in Singapore] are like, ‘Oh, so you’re North Indian. Oh, so what kind of North Indian are you? Oh this [Bollywood] actress is really pretty’” (Sonal, Singapore). A lighter skin color also allowed North Indians to integrate more easily into the larger Singaporean society and therefore be more accepted by other local groups:

The light-skin dark-skin thing has been a problem in, I think, every society, and over here, the Chinese are notoriously racist ... We [North Indians] don’t really stand out as much. You know, one really dark face [i.e., one South Indian] amongst like a whole bunch of Chinese people ... I know friends who are dark, who’ve got a lot of shit in their school-career kind of thing. So the Chinese people accept you [North Indians] far more. (Sonal, Singapore)

Many participants acknowledged that it was impossible for second and subsequent generation Indians to claim a fully local identity, no matter how much they wished to do so, because factors like their Indian appearance made a partial Indian identity compulsory. Pratik’s conversation with me contains contradictory remarks about the relationship between skin color and identity. He begins by commenting that “being British” means “being white”, then rejects this statement when I press for more information on this topic, and then later reinstates that “being British” does in fact mean “being white”:

Pratik (UK): You’re obviously British ‘cause you live here, but then you’re obviously Indian ‘cause of your color and your roots, but mainly your color. Like, even you can be the most British person you want, but you’ll never be fully British, ‘cause you’re brown, do you know what I mean?
Sheena: Yeh, so do you think that being British means that you’re white?
Pratik (UK): No, I wouldn’t say that, but being British means like you adopt the practices and customs of being British, do you know what I mean? So you assimilate yourself into the culture, really, so you merge into a British culture and British lifestyle, which most Indians like 99.9% of Indians in this country don’t ... So if you’re completely British, like number 1, then you won’t like eat your Indian food, you won’t speak your language, you won’t like- you know none of that. You won’t have Indian weddings, you know, you’ll be fully merged, so I don’t think anyone can call themself ‘1’ British, even if they claim that they are. I don’t think- ‘cause you’ll never be accepted as one, ‘cause you’re brown, ‘cause your color, innit?

Pratik is referring to the identity questions on the survey, where ‘1’ refers to non-Indian (i.e., British) and ‘5’ refers to Indian.
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Others in the U.K. differentiated the terms “British” and “English”. For these participants, “being English” indicated a “white person”, whereas “being British” could refer to any skin color:

I definitely feel British. I definitely feel- I would actually call myself a British citizen, like a British Indian. I wouldn’t say I’m English, because I just don’t think that’s right and I just feel like, an English person is a white person. If a white person was born and bred in India, I would feel a bit wrong calling them an Indian person. So, erm, yeh, I would call myself a British citizen. British Indian. (Seema, UK)

A few participants drew a finer distinction, claiming that “British” and “English” were not appropriate terms that could be employed in their situation, and felt more comfortable labeling themselves as a “Londoner”:

Well, generally, when I’m abroad, and people ask me where I’m from, I tend to say London rather than any country, ‘cause I feel more at home in the city rather than in the country. London’s such a multicultural city compared to the rest of the country. When you say England, people tend to think just whites, whereas if you say London, you could be from anywhere in the world. (Sumir, UK)

Participants in the U.K. had grown up in multicultural and cosmopolitan London, where it is possible to find people of all backgrounds, ethnicities, and skin color. For this reason, many may have felt that it was easy to adopt a local British identity, since their notion of Britishness was based on experiences of living in an ethnically diverse city, where they were not a minority and were easily accepted by others. Along the same lines as Sumir’s comment, Reena highlights how the claims made by second generation British Indians to feeling British may differ substantially in other places outside of London. She illustrates her point by describing a time when she was made to question her strong allegiance to her British identity:

[I consider myself] British ‘2’, because I think it’s all very well for us to say all this stuff, ‘cause we live in London, right, so it’s so cosmopolitan, and a lot of the people around us are from lots of different places, but if you go to other parts of Britain, I think we’d have a very different experience. So I’ve been out to kind of like little villages and stuff to kind of buy a car or whatever and I’ve sat in pubs and these are places where there are no ethnic minorities at all, and it’s just white Caucasian and I’ve felt really out of place. People will look at me and be like “Where did she come from? She’s not English or she’s not British”. So, in that sense, other places outside London, you can feel as though you’re not British, so I think our view of what is British again is quite kind of erm, I guess we’re in a bubble. (Reena, UK)

5.3.10 Indian Names

All participants had Indian first and last names. Names are an overt marker of ethnic identity and distinguish Indians from other members of the local community (R. Desai, 1963, p. 10; C. B. Sinha,

Reena is referring to the identity questions on the survey, where ‘1’ refers to non-Indian (i.e., British) and ‘5’ refers to Indian.
Interestingly, only one participant identified ethnic names as being a distinctive marker of Indian identity:

I don’t think that anyone can call themself ‘1 British, even if they claim that they are. I don’t think- ‘cause you’ll never be accepted as one, ‘cause you’re brown, ‘cause your color, innit!’ ... And especially your name ... like your name. (Pratik, UK)

Some may change their name in order to conceal their ethnicity and assimilate into the majority group (e.g., changing Müller to Miller). Mukadam (2003, p. 323-325) found that second-generation Gujarati females in England are using diminutive versions of their first names to a greater extent than their male counterparts (e.g., Mohini → Mo; Janita → Jan), though there was no conclusive evidence that this process is linked directly to creating a more ‘Anglicised’ persona. Through my time spent in the Gujarati diaspora communities, I was aware of diminutive versions of names being used by some of my participants. However, neither I nor other researchers have yet investigated the motivations behind this, and reasons could include fostering familiarity between the users, simplifying a name which is otherwise difficult for the locals in the country to pronounce, and/or assimilating into local society. But according to the participant quoted above, Pratik, “even if you have a Western name, like Sam or something, even like if you have Indian food at home or something, then you’re not 100% British, ‘cause you’re still keeping your traditions and stuff” (Pratik, UK). Since all participants had Indian names, despite being born outside of India, this may be considered an important identity marker for the participants’ parents who chose these names for their children. However, surprisingly only one participant explicitly identified Indian names as a marker of ethnic identity. Since the other 134 participants did not mention this, it is unclear whether this is an identity marker that they perceive as important in Indian identity. Two possibilities seem to exist: 1) Having Indian names may not be such an important ethnic identity marker among the younger generation since they did not talk about this in the interview or 2) This may be such an obvious marker of their ethnicity that they felt that it did not need to be explicitly stated in the interview. In order to determine the importance of this identity marker for their ethnic identity, a follow-up interview could be conducted in which they are asked about the types of names they would give to their children.

5.3.11 Indian Wedding Traditions

Participants described Indian wedding traditions as being a part of their ethnic identity: “I think it [an Indian wedding] is like so part of who we are. And like having a white dress wedding is not us” (Shreya, SA, original emphasis); “In the end, that’s who I am. I’m Indian, so I cannot be

Pratik is referring to the identity questions on the survey, where ‘1’ refers to non-Indian (i.e., British) and ‘5’ refers to Indian.
marrying with ‘I do’, ‘You do’, it’s not us” (Anshul, Singapore). This finding from the interviews aligns well with survey results which showed that, of all identity markers which participants were asked to rate along a scale of ‘Indianess’ (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing ‘non-Indian’ and 5 representing ‘Indian’), ‘wedding traditions’ was rated as most Indian, with a mean response (of the 135 participants) of 4.04. Many wedding customs are common among Hindus, Jains, and even Muslims, and combine local, religious, and family traditions. Traditional Indian weddings are longer and larger in size than weddings of other ethnic groups. They can last up to 7 days. While the number of people attending an Indian wedding in the diaspora may vary, with numbers beginning at 300 and averaging 1000 people, one participant describes how her wedding involved 3000 people. A traditional Indian wedding involves various rituals and ceremonies and is not just about the couple itself, but about two families being brought together socially. Most participants described Indian weddings as fun and festive and would choose to maintain this aspect of their Indian identity, though some also highlighted how they would prefer something shorter and more intimate, while still incorporating certain Indian elements (e.g., clothing, some of the Indian ceremonies, etc.):

I don’t like the long thing [in Indian weddings], yeh, that’s just too much, so it’d be something small, but I like the- I think I prefer the sari (a garment traditionally worn by Indian women) and things like that to a white dress. (Deepika, UK)

I’ve seen my cousin’s wedding. The rituals are so long. And the clothes, the jewelry, it’s-. Actually I’m 50/50 for that [about having an Indian wedding], yeh, I’m 50/50 for that. (Sarika, Singapore)

Of the 135 participants, only six chose ‘1’ (i.e., a non-Indian wedding) for the question about wedding preferences on the survey, the majority of whom were female (four out of the six participants) and from Singapore (four out of the six participants). This seems to suggest that this is a fairly stable ethnic identity marker that is likely to be maintained in future generations. While there seems to be a trend among some participants to incorporate some aspects of local culture into Indian weddings (e.g., first dance), it is unlikely that this identity marker will completely assimilate to mainstream culture any time soon.

5.3.12 Summary

In sum, participants associated “being Indian” with a number of identity markers, some of which were similar or identical to the markers used in the survey (e.g., food) and others which were different (e.g., Indian physical appearance). Several of the identity markers can be considered to be universal markers of Indian ethnic identity, since they appeared in descriptions of ethnic identity for all participants, regardless of location. An example of this is the strong sense of community
among Indians. Others, however, are specific to certain locations only. An example of this is the importance of being able to speak the heritage language, as well as the ability to do so, both of which featured more prominently among the British and Singaporean participants than the South African participants. Finally, identity markers such as ‘food’ have illustrated the evolving nature of identity markers in the diaspora (i.e., altered dietary habits among some, e.g., from pure vegetarian to non-vegetarian) and have highlighted that markers of ethnic identity do not necessarily remain static from one generation to the next.

5.4 Challenging Traditional Indian Ideas

Tensions may arise when there is a difference in outlook between children and parents: “Basically, I’m very westernized and my parents are still very traditional, so obviously there’s going to be a lot of clashes, innit?” (Pritesh, UK). Pritesh portrays that clashes are caused between generations as a result of changing lifestyle patterns and views (traditional vs. western). While participants often equated “being traditional” with “being Indian”, a change in lifestyle with each new generation in the diaspora is almost certainly inevitable, but this does not necessarily mean that their ethnic identity is weakened, but rather that it may be of a different form than that of previous generations (Isajiw, 1990).

Participants described what they considered to be outdated viewpoints held by the older generation. They simultaneously depicted the struggles they faced with some of the demands and expectations associated with belonging to the Gujarati community. These included the search for a life partner, dating, living arrangements prior to marriage, gender differences, and cliquish behavior and attitudes. The question arises whether this generational difference in viewpoint menaces Indian ethnic identity or rather whether challenging certain rules, expectations, and behaviors that are typically associated with being traditionally Indian has little to do with strength of ethnic identification, but rather portrays an evolution of ethnic identity rather than assimilation that is, a complete shift toward another (i.e., local) identity.

5.4.1 Marriage

For many of the participants who were in their twenties, marriage was a topic that had begun to emerge in discussions with parents, extended family, or with the community:

She [my sister] is 28. Not only my parents, but like everyone in the family, my mother’s sisters and her brother, everyone’s like telling her, “You must come to weddings so you can meet guys and get proposals and all that.” She gets angry, she doesn’t like that. (Keval, SA)
Keval’s sister is 28 and unmarried. Many of the participants’ parents and grandparents had been married at an early age. It was generally unthinkable in their times to be female and not married at the age of 28. However, there is a shift among the new generation of Gujaratis in the diaspora, with several describing their wish to delay marriage or not get married at all for a number of reasons, including their wish to establish a career beforehand or to travel. Despite these wishes, many felt the pressure from the Indian community to be married by a certain age, ideally before the age of 30, and portrayed the struggles they faced in adhering to traditional Indian marital norms:

I’m 26. Pressure’s on [to get married], pressure’s on ... It’s quite grating and draining ... It’s because like there is this whole, I guess it’s instilled in everyone who’s Indian that you know, you must get married quite young, because you know, you don’t want to end up alone and you’ve got to have children. There’s kind of like this whole path that’s set out for you. You go to school, you go to university, you get a good job, then you get married, then you have babies. Well, it’s just like I don’t want that life. (Reena, UK)

One of the biggest differences between the Indian and the mainstream local culture was the role that others had in the choice of their future spouse. Participants discussed their parents’ wish that their future spouse would be Gujarati and belong to the same caste. This was most notably the case in South Africa: “Even when we want to get married into a different caste, it will be a big issue in our family” (Asha, SA). Such viewpoints were present to some extent in the U.K. too, though not in terms of caste, since the majority of the participants are Jains and Jainism has traditionally rejected the caste system, but in terms of being from the same community. For example, Pritesh, from the U.K., discusses how his parents indirectly emphasize the importance of his wife being of the trade community (Bania caste), by noting the last name adopted by the trade community rather than the name of the caste itself: “You’re growing up around your parents saying ‘Make sure you find yourself a nice Shah girl’” (Pritesh, UK). Some participants expressed the difficulty they felt in accepting such restrictions, and the ways in which they challenged these constraints:

For them [my parents] ideally, they’d want us to find someone from the same caste. That was my mother’s hope, and then that obviously didn’t happen. Then they said “anybody Gujarati”, but I mean you don’t just choose these things. (Hiral, SA)

You can’t expect to have brought me up in a country like this that’s so far away from my own culture and for me not to have taken on board some of those British values or to have, you know, or to have ended up falling in love with a white guy, because that’s what I’m surrounded by, what were you expecting? So we’ve shed a lot of tears and had quite a lot of arguments and stuff like that. (Reena, UK)
In Singapore, where the Gujarati population is much smaller in number than in South Africa and the U.K., spouses were often sought overseas, as the number of potentially eligible spouses in Singapore was limited. In some cases, marrying outside the Gujarati community but remaining within the North Indian community (but not the South Indian community; see Rai (2004) on the North-South divide in Singapore) was accepted. In Indian culture, parents traditionally have a big influence on the choice of potential marriage candidates for their child. Some interviewees did not object, believing that “arranged marriages work out much better than love marriages” (Asha, SA). Such viewpoints were found more among the South African Gujaratis than among the British and Singaporean Gujaratis. Remaining within one’s culture and community meant more long-lasting marriages:

My mum has the idea that if I marry a Gujarati, it won’t end in a divorce, that the marriage will last for a 100 years until death do us part. And she assumes that if I marry a Chinese or a Malay, I’ll break up in two or three years. (Amit, Singapore)

It also meant fewer problems with children: “[When you mix cultures], there’s a problem with your children” (Rakesh, SA), and fewer compromises, e.g., in dietary habits:

I’ve seen a lot of people at the mandir (temple) and when they don’t marry people in Swaminarayan (a faith group which consists of a large percentage of Gujarati Hindus in which followers offer devotion to and worship Lord Swaminarayan), then you break apart, because you either give up one thing or the other. And for us, our values are very tight. What you eat, who you- Ok, not who you’re with, but a lot of our values are strict, and if your partner doesn’t understand them, then you either have to give up your values for him or give him up for your values. So it’s a win or lose situation. So if you marry inside like a Swaminarayan or even a Gujarati who understands, it’s a win-win situation, because then you’re together and you share the same values and customs, traditions. Then when you are at the mandir (temple) the whole time, he doesn’t get angry with you and says “You don’t spend time with me” and all of that. He’ll understand you. (Tejal, SA)

Not everybody agrees with these views, though. Some believe that such generalizations are uncalled for and each case should be assessed separately:

There’s a saying that, or someone told me that, my foi (uncle) actually, that the more differences there are, the harder your marriage will become, which is true to some extent, I think ... and maybe that’s why we keep it within our community, but there are many successful marriages, it depends on the two of you and what you make of it. (Payal, SA)

5.4.2 Dating

Dating is not viewed favorably in Indian culture and is considered “too Western” for most Indian parents (C. B. Sinha, 2005). While the term ‘dating’ has several meaning, I define dating as a form of courtship in which two people undertake social activities together as a couple in order to
determine whether the other is suitable as a partner or a spouse; sexual relations may be involved. The majority of the participants’ parents were against the idea of dating, and a few participants were too: “I find that maybe my white friends, what they’re up to outside of school, I don’t really agree with ... Whether it’s just like dating or doing something else” (Sagar, UK). The lack of acceptance of dating in Indian culture differentiated participants from other races in their country for whom dating was acceptable. This was a point of frustration for some of the participants, and this also heightened their sense of not belonging to the wider local society:

My parents, they are not ok with it, they are not ok with dating ... That is like one of the things that is very different about North Indians as compared to like all the other races in Singapore, like even South Indians. All of them have like- date people and stuff and they don’t have arranged marriages, but like North Indians are still stuck in that arranged marriages phase. (Jyoti, Singapore, original emphasis).

Participants challenged these traditional views on dating by being in relationships. Some of the participants were currently in a relationship and others had been in one at an earlier stage in their lives. They found their parents’ viewpoints about dating to be outdated and sometimes full of contradictions:

They’re still very, very against the whole boyfriend thing. You know, dating before marriage, but they are ok with a love marriage, which is just so strange. It’s very strange. It’s like, so you’re not supposed to date, but you can have a love marriage. (Tina, Singapore)

However, in most cases, dating customs and habits were kept secret from their parents. There were only certain very specific circumstances in which participants told or would tell parents about a relationship:

If he was Gujarati, then I’d be upfront and tell them, whether he was within the caste or not, they’d have to deal with it, ‘cause he’s Gujarati. If he was Hindi or something else, then you’d have to make sure that you’re looking at marriage before you tell them. (Radha, SA)

[My boyfriend and I have been together for] 10 years ... I told my mum two years after we were dating ... and then my dad probably about five years ago ... I only wanted them to know if I wanted to marry him, not- otherwise it’s not the type of thing to say, it’s inappropriate. (Minal, UK)

Despite many of them disagreeing with their parents’ viewpoints on this matter and covertly dating, participants portrayed the struggles they faced with concealing information from their parents: “You are sort of betraying them by not telling them these things, but if you tell them these things, it’s going to hurt them in some sort of way” (Rekha, SA) and their wish to be able to share such information with parents, but simultaneously realizing that doing so would be inappropriate and unacceptable in Indian culture: “I think it’s really sad that we can’t share
these things [information about a person you’re dating or in a relationship with] with our parents, because they’re really, really important things in our lives” (Reena, UK).

5.4.3 Living Arrangements Prior to Marriage

Another struggle faced by some of the participants was living arrangements prior to marriage. In South Africa, participants felt that it was expected that children live with their parents until they got married and most were happy to do so: “I don’t think it [cohabiting with your partner before marriage] is in my culture” (Asha, SA). In the U.K., some participants felt that it was precisely the Indian culture which prevented them the liberty of living together as a couple prior to marriage: “If you are an English person, you maybe live with your boyfriend for 2 or 3 years to try it out and see if it works out, whereas it’s a complete taboo to do that in an Indian world” (Pooja, UK). All the South African Gujarati participants attended the closest university to their home, and most therefore continued to live in their family’s home during this time. By contrast, many British Gujaratis lived away from home during their time at university. Their narratives often portray the freedom they had experienced, for example, in terms of drinking alcohol, partying, and dating, and the difficulties they faced in returning to live at home after several years of being away. In Singapore, it was mostly high rental rates which made it difficult for young couples to live together before marriage, though it was unclear from most of their narratives whether they would have wanted to if financial restrictions did not exist. However, one Singaporean participant openly discusses that this would be unacceptable in Indian culture, which is consistent with the findings in South Africa and the U.K.:

I don’t think it would be accepted [to cohabit with a partner before marriage] ... I was getting to that point. I could see that. And I was trying to figure out how to talk to my parents about it. And maybe, in a sense, it was a sense of relief when we broke up because I didn’t have to deal with that big issue coming my way. (Kajal, Singapore)

Kajal’s narrative portrays the struggles she faces by belonging to a community where cohabiting before marriage is disapproved. She describes the measures she would take to get around the situation: “I think I would most probably covertly live with somebody, but not overtly ... Of course it does [annoy me that I have to do this], because there is an element of lying involved” (Kajal, Singapore), though she increasingly realizes that she may have to leave Singapore in order to be able to live together with a partner without being negatively judged by the local Singaporean Gujarati community:

I actually now realize that I may have to live with somebody before I get married to that person, which means- which is why you asked me if I can live in Singapore. If I
consciously say that’s a choice I’m going to make, then I can’t live in Singapore, it’s as simple as that. (Kajal, Singapore).

### 5.4.4 Gender

Research has shown gender differences in parenting in Asian families, with parents claiming that they are more likely to place restrictions on their daughters than their sons (Archer, 2003; Brannen, Dodd, Oakley, & Storey, 1994; O’Brien, Jones, Sloan, & Rustin, 2000). This dates back to a time when it was customary for males to be the sole breadwinners of the family and females to play the role as homemakers and mothers of children. Such gender demarcation in the roles in the nuclear family still exists, even in Gujarati diaspora communities (see, for example, Mehrotra, 2004): “At home, being a girl, you know, you must cook, you must clean, you must learn to do this, you must learn to do that” (Rupal, SA). Given the gender bias that females encountered, it is not surprising that participants describe the Indian culture as male chauvinistic: “There’s still a slight emphasis on men. It bugs me because a lot of times people ask me it’s only you and your sister, you don’t have a brother?” (Kajal, Singapore).

Female respondents in all three countries indicated the obligations and restrictions they encountered as females and the frustrations that they felt. Nima’s experiences highlight how the physical separation from India has resulted in her mother (born and raised in India) developing a static view of Indian culture, one which represents Indian culture from a past moment in time. Interestingly, diaspora Indians such as Nima’s mother are considered to be more conservative than Indians in India, a point raised by a number of participants. This conservatism tends to be more prominent among the older generation and especially among those who came from the more rural areas of India. Nima’s narrative highlights the difficulty she faces in conforming to the conservatism in dressing which her mother enforces on her, when she is aware that even the culture’s place of origin (i.e., India) has advanced in this regard.

Parents are overprotective, especially in our Indian society. They are overprotective, especially over girls. (Kinari, SA)

She [my mother] is very conservative about what I can wear, right? Even though it’s so hot in Singapore, I’m not allowed to wear shorts. I’m not allowed to wear short skirts. And we’ve argued quite a few times about this. I’m like, everyone’s doing it, there’s no problem. And she’s like “We’re Indian, You have to keep your culture, blah, blah, blah blah … I think it’s quite nonsense actually, because you know, when I go back to India, I see all these Indian girls wearing the same kind of clothes that Singaporean girls wear … I guess she’s still stuck in the Indian mentality when she was there, when she left India. (Nima, Singapore)
A lot of people think that it’s good to be educated, but for girls, it’s not good to be educated over a certain amount. Well, it’s like “Why not?” (Radhika, UK)

Radhika’s quote above highlights how the gender bias has even extended to areas which are generally highly valued by Indians, e.g., education. While Radhika describes the idea that females should not be more educated than males, such as their partner, other participants discuss the restrictions that females encounter in career choice. Certain careers for females were not viewed favorably. These included careers which were traditionally deemed inappropriate for females or ones which would put strain on the family and prevent them from carrying out family duties typically done by Indian women (e.g., cleaning and cooking):

Rupal (SA): So they say that being a pilot is strenuous on family, because after you get married, you have a responsibility towards your in-laws and that you should look after your husband and you should be able to be at home and not up in the sky and some other continent.
Sheena: And what are your thoughts about that?
Rupal (SA): Personally I feel that’s very selfish, if I could say ... I believe that if it is meant to be, it will happen, and that if I do get married and have those responsibilities, I believe that my in-laws or my husband should understand and respect me and support me on the decision.

Rupal’s narrative is not unique. Several of the female participants described how traditional views on gender roles were still upheld by many, which is not surprising when considering that many of the female figures in Gujarati households are housewives, more so in South Africa and Singapore than in the U.K. Females expressed the struggles and frustrations they felt with accepting this gender bias:

I think there is this sort of Indian thing that probably a lot of- you know, they want the guys to have the better education and stuff. Well, it’s not like you’re going to sit at home after you’ve become a doctor and sit and cook and clean all day. You’re still going to go out and do your job. (Radhika, UK)

I’ve heard that in studying a doctor, that most Indians, Indian ladies or girls that study to become a doctor, they don’t practice it after university ... I don’t think that’s fair, because I mean, times have changed, it’s becoming really difficult to live and I think that everyone should have the right to work, and not just doing housework, but like everything. (Anushka, SA)

5.4.5 Cliquish Behavior

A community in which “everyone kind of sticks together, everyone is in contact with one another” (Anand, UK), while positively viewed by many (see Section 5.3.2), also had negative aspects associated with it. Indians were described as predominantly only interacting with other Indians and were thus often labeled as being cliquish:
There are definitely things I don’t like about Indian culture, erm, for example, the cliqueness. And I don’t think that’s so much about Indian culture, it might be something specific to the British Indian experience, I don’t know, but that cliqueness is always something I’ve had difficulty with. (Jayni, UK)

This point was brought up by participants in all three countries, making this characteristic among Indians not solely unique among British Indians. Interestingly, some participants drew a finer distinction and highlighted how Gujaratis not only interacted mostly with other Indians, but in fact predominantly with other Gujaratis, as seen in Parag’s quote below:

I might be a bit stereotypical here, but sometimes Indians don’t find it so easy to mix with other people. (Samir, SA)

The North Indians, they are very cliquish, so the Gujarati Samaj (society) will have their own events and then the Sindhis will have their own stuff going on, whereas for the South Indians, they are very diverse and they are scattered everywhere, so there’s no like subdivisions among them. (Parag, Singapore)

The cliquish behavior among Indians extends to all generations of Indians, though it is more prominent among the older generations. Many of the participants struggled with this. For them, cliquish behavior meant a lack of privacy and anonymity. Participants in all three countries described instances in which something they had done or someone they had been with quickly became public knowledge to their parents or others in the community:

There’s always a bit of lack of privacy, because whilst I love our community, in a way you can’t do anything without the community knowing or there’ll always be sort of someone somewhere who’ll see you and report back on your activities. And that kind of- you can never really be anonymous in a way ... That’s quite hard, because you know, you get to an age where you want a bit of privacy and you don’t want everyone knowing your every action. And I think it’s quite hard to conduct a very private life amongst a very tight Indian community. (Jayni, UK)

It also led to the danger that the information being disclosed about a particular person might not always be accurate, since “Gujaratis, they have one bad thing, and it’s gossiping. Whether it’s truth or not, they will say it” (Samir, SA).

Indians were described as being “clones of each other” (Pooja, UK), who all liked the same kind of music (e.g., R&B and Bhangra), dressed in a similar way (e.g., straight hair) and talked in the same way (e.g., “Speaking a bit rude girl and rude boy ... Like instead of saying this, they say dis, like D-I-S” [Pooja, UK]; the role of English dialects is discussed in more detail in Section 5.5.3 below). Some participants struggled with this lack of distinctiveness among Indians, especially those growing up in countries that value individualism (e.g., England). Pooja’s narrative describes how she feels trapped by having people constantly watching over her and how she cannot be her true self in this Indian community:
Within this Indian sort of community, you’re always confined to be what someone else wanted you to be, or to still stick within a certain realm, as such, and so I think that I just felt very frustrated by being among this sort of group, ‘cause I couldn’t. You know, when you’re young, you do experiment, you try some alcohol maybe, or you wanna go out, or you just. I mean, it’s not even about stuff like that, it’s about being into a type of music that might not be the trend. And I think I just feel like I couldn’t do that among them and I couldn’t really be myself and so. And I also felt that I was just tired of people like observing you and watching you and gossiping about you. I do feel that is a very strong part of an Indian community, and maybe it’s the same in every type of community, but I feel like I can be more myself when I don’t have people watching me. (Pooja, UK)

Growing up in a tight-knit community led to excessive concern among the older generation about personal reputation in the community. Participants described their parents’ wish that they abide by Indian norms in order to maintain a positive face in society and indicated the frustrations they felt as a result of always having to adhere to such rules:

“What will the community think if you do this Hiral, what will people say?” I don’t live for people, I live for myself (Hiral, SA).

I hate the fact that, I don’t know how to put this, you know how Indians, they think so much about their reputation, and that sort of thing, like you have to live a certain way, you have to do a certain thing, do certain things, because other people will talk, like that sort of thing. For example, my boyfriend, he’s black. I haven’t-, I don’t know how many people know, if they did, they wouldn’t be very happy about it, erm, just because he’s black sort of thing. My parents, the thing that they are most concerned about is that other people will talk, that’s why they don’t want me to be with him. (Seema, UK)

Seema’s narrative suggests that, in her view, members of the Gujarati community have close-minded attitudes toward other groups of people, which has led them to form unjustified generalizations about whole groups of people, e.g., labeling all Muslims as terrorists or all Blacks as criminals: “You know they have a little mindset about the Muslims and terrorists and you know all that ... I think it’s wrong [to think like this]” (Vishal, SA). Politics also plays a role in some of these close-minded attitudes, which the younger generation struggled to accept: “The fact that we sort of bring over our political history from other places and bring that onto U.K. soil, I find that disgusting. Like our on-going bad relations with British Pakistanis is just ridiculous. That’s quite bad” (Jayni, UK). These close-minded attitudes also extended to certain topics: “We’re still uncomfortable about talking about certain things. I think there are things that we haven’t quite come to terms with yet as a group” (Jayni, UK). Such topics included homosexuality, which is traditionally considered taboo in Indian culture:

My parents, they seem- and their friends, they seem to be stuck in a very different era, where they are very, very concerned about gay people, they are very concerned about their children dating outside their race, or the decline of religion and everyone is
going to die of whatever. I really, really don’t like how conservative Indian culture is sometimes. (Nima, Singapore)

Participants described these views held by the older generation toward certain groups of people or toward certain topics as “conservative” (Nima, Singapore), “backward” and “shocking” (Jayni, UK), and “offensive” (Payal, SA), and fought against them.

In sum, participants in this study define cliquish behavior as being characteristic of being Indian. It should be borne in mind, though, that such behavior may be typical among immigrant communities in general, especially among those clustered in ethnically segregated neighborhoods. It seems that the less Gujaratis belong to Indian cliques, the less they may be traditionally Indian, as they mix more with local society and are influenced by the local mind-set.

### 5.4.6 Summary

In sum, generational differences in viewpoint on topics related to marriage, dating, living arrangements prior to marriage, gender, and cliquish behavior indicate some struggles that participants face when they do not share the same viewpoints as their parents. Many of these struggles can be generalized across the three sites, for example, struggles related to the gender bias and to the cliquish behavior displayed by Indians. Similarly, in all three countries, dating is generally not viewed favorably by Indian parents, nor is living together with a fiancé before marriage. South African participants tended to accept and/or agree with the latter more than the British and Singaporean participants. In all three countries, parents and other family members place restrictions on the choice of marriage partner, though this is found to a greater extent in South Africa than in England and Singapore. While many of the struggles are shared among all participants, South Africans seemed to generally be more willing to accept and/or follow traditional Indian ideas than British and Singaporean participants.

The above sections have highlighted the many ways that Gujaratis in the diaspora cope with the aforementioned struggles, from challenging traditional ideas (e.g., by being in relationships, often clandestinely) to attempting to temporarily distance themselves from the community (e.g., by living abroad where they would experience more freedom of choice). The clashes that are caused between generations as a result of changing lifestyle patterns and views (traditional vs. western) does not necessarily mean that the participants’ ethnic identity is weakened, but rather that it may be of a different form than that of previous generations (Isaiiw, 1990). No evidence emerges from the interview data that the participants’ ethnic identity is menaced, but rather their narratives portray an evolution of their ethnic identity rather than assimilation, i.e., a complete shift toward
another (i.e., local) identity. Their ethnic identity may thus be more accurately defined as “Indian in the diaspora”, rather than as strictly “Indian”.

5.5 “Being British / Singaporean / South African”

In addition to their ethnic identity, participants spoke of a ‘second’ identity, namely their local British, Singaporean, or South African identity. This section discusses several factors that participants describe as contributing to and heightening their sense of local identity. Some of the points discussed below are relevant to all three contexts (e.g., birthplace), while others are country-specific (e.g., National Service in Singapore).

5.5.1 Birthplace

Birthplace was one of the first identity markers mentioned by second and subsequent generation Gujaratis in references to their local identity: “I’m British ‘cause I was born here and I’m Indian ‘cause of my roots” (Ishani, UK); “I’d say [I’m] Singaporean, because I was born in Singapore ... My loyalty would go more to Singapore” (Vanisha, Singapore); “I’m 80-85% South African ... Because I was born here, I feel closer to this place” (Mahavir, SA). One participant discusses how birthplace remains important in descriptions of identity even after moving overseas:

Being born in Singapore, I feel that I am a Singaporean. The best example you should have is my cousin who is in India now. He was born in Singapore, so now whenever I ask him, “So now you’re an Indian, Ajul?”, he’ll be like “No, no, no, I’m still a Singaporean. Don’t call me an Indian. I just stay there because of my father who is working there. I’m a complete Singaporean.” (Sarika, Singapore)

All participants agreed that birthplace was an important identity marker in definitions of their local identity. While birthplace is central in descriptions of local identity, one participant highlights that for her there is a difference between homeland (which for her is South Africa) and motherland (which for her will always be India), and as such, no matter how many generations of Indians are found in the diaspora, this distinction will always illustrate their local vs. ethnic identity.

South Africa is our hometown, it’s not our motherland. It’s our homeland, not motherland. And I had this argument, you know when India was playing the cricket world cup and South Africa was sent home. And I put up a status on Facebook saying, “I’m coming home, I’m coming home” [i.e., India is “coming home” with the trophy]. And my cousins, they just like, they hit me with like a whole lot of things, saying, “You know, if you’re so proudly Indian, you should have gone to India. Go to India and then put up your status.” And I said, “Well, you know, your hometown can change. Your homeland can always change, but your motherland will never change.” And I said that at one point in time, Indians weren’t allowed in South Africa and I said “then where were people going? They weren’t going to the U.K., they weren’t going to anywhere else in the world, but they were in India.” And I said “now all of a sudden, because
we’ve become a “rainbow nation”, it doesn’t mean that we are not Indian anymore.” (Kalpa, SA)

5.5.2 Childhood and Formative Years

In addition to birthplace, references were made to childhood and formative years being spent in Singapore, South Africa, and the U.K., which were described as defining characteristics of local identity: “First I’m South African ... I’ve been brought up in South Africa ...” (Hiral, SA); “I would say I’m Singaporean, but of Indian origin ... I’m born and bred here ...” (Mihir, Singapore); “British Indian ... ‘Cause I was born here and I’ve been brought up here, but then like my roots and my culture is all Indian” (Ankur, UK). Other aspects of their lives were consequently influenced as a result of having spent their childhood and formative years outside of India. Participants in England discussed how their schooling had involved aspects of the dominant culture: “My primary school ... was very, very British. We sang hymns every morning. And we, you know, before we ate, we prayed. It was a lot more different to things that we do in Hinduism” (Rahul, UK); “I go to a Christian School and most of the things I encounter in my daily life are Christian” (Heena, UK); “I feel I’m mostly British ... We go to a British school, so we do all subjects in English and I find it easier to understand [English]” (Toral, UK). The situation was somewhat different in Singapore. Singapore’s emphasis on National Education includes constant teaching about a set of national values including respect for other cultures. As a result, Singaporeans learn about the various cultures and races present in their country at school, e.g., during Racial Harmony Day celebrations, and not just about the dominant (Chinese) culture. Most of the South African participants attended a Hindu-ethos school, which focused on the transmission of Hindu values, but nonetheless even South African participants discussed how being locally schooled meant that they knew more about South Africa than India in certain respects, e.g., in terms of history and geography:

I would say that I’m South African following Indian traditions and cultures ... I was born in South Africa and I understand the- everything there is about South Africa like the national flower, the national bird, whatever it is. It’s just- Like India, I don’t really know much about it ... I think maybe if I found out more about it, I might feel a bit differently. But I feel like I’m South African, following Indian traditions and cultures. (Rupal, SA)

Being schooled in Singapore, South Africa, and the U.K. meant that participants also had many opportunities to socialize with locals in their country. In many cases, these locals were often the same race and nationality as them (e.g., British Indian), but not in all cases. In Singapore, there

---

4The term “rainbow nation”, coined by Archbishop Desmond Tutu to describe post-Apartheid South Africa, captures the diversity of the country, in terms of races, tribes, languages, etc.
was a particular tendency among participants to have close friends of other races due to the small size of the Gujarati community, the perceived tensions between North and South Indians, and the mixed racial composition in schools. As a result of these factors, their close circle of friends was generally much more diverse than that of the South African participants and somewhat more diverse than that of many of the U.K. participants:

Because we live in a multicultural society here, so it [my group of friends] is a blend of Indian–local Indians I’d say, Indians, Chinese, Malays. (Bhavini, Singapore)

My friends are mainly Chinese and Malays. (Rania, Singapore)

I actually enjoy the racial harmony that we have here and I don’t think I would get it there [India] ... Most of my friends are non-Indians ... Most of them are from school, I’d say ... I have Catholic friends, Christian friends, Chinese, like proper Chinese, Buddhist, Muslim friends, really everything. (Sandeep, Singapore)

5.5.3 Local English Accent

English is the official language of England and is one of the official languages of Singapore and South Africa. Participants are therefore required to use English on a daily basis (e.g., at school, at work, in the shops, etc.). Most described English as now being the language they were more proficient in, even those participants whose only language before the start of primary school had been Gujarati: “My first language, I think now, is kind of English, you know. The language I kind of think in is English” (Sagar, UK, original emphasis). The ability to speak English fluently was viewed as a defining characteristic of local identity:

I kind of have a mixed feeling [about my identity]. Obviously I’m Indian, because like my skin color and I talk Gujarati and that’s really what I’m brought up with, but then I speak English fluently, completely, so like I think-, and ‘cause I go to school, it’s like-I dunno, I’m surrounded by people who are constantly speaking English, so things like that. I think I’m a kind of a mix. (Aditi, UK)

English is also one of India’s official languages and many Indians from India speak English fluently, albeit not usually natively and often with a distinctive Indian English accent. It is therefore not only the ability to speak English fluently, but the ability to speak English like native speakers of their country of birth, that is, without a typical Indian accent, which heightened participants’ sense of local identity:

Bina (UK): Parts of me feel I’m more British ... I think I would classify myself as like a very British Indian ... (original emphasis)
Sheena: What do you think makes you quite British?
Bina (UK): I think it’s just like general influences, like clothes, the way I speak, the way I interact with people. (my emphasis)
In addition, the ability to use and comprehend local varieties of English was also a defining characteristic of their local identity. For example, the knowledge and use of Singlish was viewed as a defining characteristic of Singaporean identity: “I am born and bred here ... I have a very strong Singaporean accent, my Singlish is quite drastic” (Anshul, Singapore). Singlish is the local variety of English. One of its chief defining characteristics is its heavy use of words and phrases from Singapore’s local languages and dialects, and it is unique to Singapore. The use of Singlish was one way in which Singaporean Indians, who are often mistaken for Indians from India, are able to prove that they are Singaporean citizens:

Bhavini (Singapore): What has happened here is like right now, there’s a lot of people, a lot of foreign expats coming down to Singapore, and now what I’m feeling is like each time when someone asks me, “Are you- Are you from-”. No one will tell me, “Oh you’re Indian from Singapore?” They’ll ask me, “You’re an Indian from India?” You know, “Are you from India?” So it’s kind of like now we have to prove our identity, that no hey listen, I’m a Singaporean. Unless- until they realize I speak a bit of the local language, I have to prove my- like my identity.

Sheena: So how would you prove your identity?

Bhavini (Singapore): I’d speak a bit of Singlish, or Chinese, and then mostly the accent will probably show that I’m Singaporean.

While Singlish is not viewed favorably by the Singaporean government (see, for example, the speech given by then Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong at the Launch of the Speak Good English Movement 2000 [Tong, 2000]), many Singaporeans embrace Singlish and consider it to represent an emotional symbol of Singaporean identity (Velayutham, 2007, p. 134; Leimgruber, 2011, p. 17): “I must say that Singlish really bonds Singaporeans here, as in you can just tell, I mean it just goes above the whole race factor” (Tina, Singapore). Interestingly, Anshul, who strongly identifies as Singaporean, even used the ubiquitous Singlish word lah⁵ in his otherwise perfect Gujarati sentence:

\[
\text{I want to go lah}
\]

While their English accent distinguished them from Indians from India and accentuated their local identity, participants in South Africa and several in England highlighted how their accent also at times revealed their race and thus distinguished them from other locals in their country:

Yash (SA): My accent makes me Indian, ‘cause people notice that...
Sheena: When you speak, people can tell you’re an Indian South African or South

⁵The Singlish word lah is used to soften the force of an utterance and simultaneously create solidarity (Richards & Tay, 1977), though it can also be used to signal power (Bell & Ser Peng Quee, 1985).
African Indian?

Yash (SA): Yes, exactly the same way as we can hear an English-American, or English Indian, or Indian-Indian.

Sheena: Do you sound different to whites, blacks, and coloreds?

Yash (SA): Yes, they can hear a bit of spiciness in our voice (laughter). I'm serious. I'm telling you, you can hear the Indianism in an Indian's voice in South Africa and you can really hear the Indianism in an Indian Indian [i.e., an Indian from India who has recently arrived to South Africa] in South Africa. (original emphasis)

I've lost my Indian accent now quite a lot ... Most of us loose it ... Priya's still got quite a strong one ... You need to listen to Anant or Darshan speak. A lot of their words are like bud bud. They sound like they are typically Indian ... I think it comes from like being. Our first language was Gujarati. We were only speaking Gujarati, then you start speaking English, but obviously the accent is still going to stay. The Indian accent ... Eventually you’re speaking English, but your Gujarati accent is still there, and then it gets to a point where you’re speaking like bud bud English ... (Poonam, UK)

Sounding different to other locals in their country was a source of embarrassment for some and intensified their feelings of not belonging to local society:

Especially in school, in Norbury Manor, where there’s lots of dhoryas (white people). Like when they’re talking and you’re talking opposite them, you sound really Indian compared to them and it’s quite sad. I was like “Oh man, I wish I didn’t sound so Indian” ... Everyone wants to fit in, so you do [feel embarrassed]. (Poonam, UK, original emphasis)

However, others embraced the Indianness in their English accent, mostly participants in South Africa, and had negative views of those who rejected their Indian accent and sounded “white”. This finding seems to suggest a relationship between feeling positive about one’s Indian English dialect and not needing to maintain Gujarati (discussed in more detail later in this chapter). The vast majority of the South African participants had attended a Hindu-ethos school and looked negatively upon those Indians who went to “white schools” and had adopted Western ways in various aspects of their life, including speech:

The Indian people who go to all the white schools ... they- even if they talk to you, they like have this white accent. Everything, like their lifestyle has to change, their dressing, everything ... I don’t like it. (Sohenee, SA)

One Gujarati I know, she used to be part of our friend group. She was like- We used to classify her as a white, because you know you get those want to bes, like I want to be white, because they look cooler or whatever. So we used to classify her- Even when she talks, she sounds like she’s proper pure bred white. There’s no like Gujarati aspect to her. The only thing she shocked us with was when we had our Matric dance in May; she came there with a ghagra (traditional clothing of women in Gujarat, among other states), like a shalwar kameez (traditional dress worn by women in South Asia). (Kalpa, SA)

---

6This is a shortened version of bud bud ding ding. The term originates from the fact that persons of Indian/Pakistani descent were often seen as bus conductors (bud bud is the sound of an exhaust and ding ding is the bell on a bus).
In England, “another aspect [of being Indian] is the way you speak ... They [British Indians] always talk the same” (Pooja, UK). Pooja illustrates her point with an example, cited in part above, in the section on cliquish behavior (Section 5.4.5):

Speaking a bit rude girl and rude boy ... Like instead of saying this, they say dis, like D-I-S. And there’s always like new slangs and it’s just like a collective thing ... I think that follows the idea that Indians follow each other, so when there’s one good word that’s in, everyone kind of follows it. (Pooja, UK)

This accentuates the point made earlier about Indians displaying cliquish behavior. Indeed, Indians who don’t sound Indian enough may become victims of traumatic experiences such as bullying; such experiences may in turn increase their desire to disassociate themselves even further from the Indian community:

[Growing up,] I think most of them [my friends] were non-Indian, ‘cause I was out in a grammar school in Surrey. And not even that, after Gujarati School, I just hated the whole Indian thing, like, ‘cause I remember like Dipak and Dipan and like Kartik and all that lot, they used to just rip me, ‘cause I got quite a posh accent, so they used to be really horrible to me, so I just kind of just basically because of that I didn’t really embrace my Indian culture, because I’d only, I’d always associate it with kind of being bullied almost or just being looked down on, because I was different, so I kind of just like avoided that whole thing. (Reena, UK)

### 5.5.4 National Service and the Educational System in Singapore

National Service is a 22- or 24-month period as Full-Time National Servicemen (NSFs) that all males above the age of 18 who are Singaporean citizens and non-first generation Permanent Residents have to participate in. According to Singaporean Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong, National Service has become a defining part of Singaporean identity (Lian & Chow, 2012). This was a point raised by Singaporean male interviewees: “I’m quite proud to do the army and you know, say I’m a true blood Singaporean” (Kayan, Singapore); “Having gone through National Service, you understand the origins of the country. You feel more towards our country” (Mihir, Singapore). Young males often mentioned how their affiliation with Singapore grew after having completed National Service: “I’ve got a lot of affection for this country [Singapore] ... I’m very patriotic ... This is the country I serve, in times of war, this is the country I’m gonna fight for” (Anshul, Singapore). National Service brings together all male youth, regardless of race and background, and thus helps to create unity among Singaporeans. It also serves to differentiate “real Singaporeans” from “newcomers”, e.g., Indians from India: “The easiest way for me to prove that I’m Singaporean is just to say that I served NS [National Service], because that’s the key thing that ties Singaporean youth together” (Chirag, Singapore).
Ortmann (2009, p. 35) makes the point that true Singaporeans are bonded over experiences such as the suffering they endured and the struggles they faced. This includes: (a) suffering encountered during National Service and (b) struggles faced while going through the tough educational system in Singapore:

(a) So, let’s say, when I go to Poly, right? They’ll be a bunch of students who have done NS. We’ll just click, because we’ve been through the hardships, then we just talk about how our life was there, so that’s a bunch of friends right there. (Chirag, Singapore)

(b) Our first board exam comes in standard 6, so when we’re just 12 years old, we are like put under immense pressure. My brother is 12 and so I can really see how much he is suffering compared to his- He has friends in international schools like Singapore American School and stuff like that. And then you look at him and you look at his friends and his friends are like so happy and they have so much of free time, they go for extra stuff and all that, and my brother is at home usually finishing his homework, stuff like that. (Vimal, Singapore)

Since all Singaporean males participate in National Service and since all Singaporeans are educated through the same educational system, these experiences and the consequent struggles and hardships they face were often used in descriptions to differentiate them from new arrivals in the country, i.e., Indians from India. While National Service and the tough educational system made participants connect more with Singaporeans of other races and reinforced their ‘second’ (i.e., local) identity, this did not necessarily make them feel less Indian, but instead made them feel different to Indians from India.

5.5.5 Lack of Knowledge and Refusal of the Caste System

The term “caste” was mentioned by participants on a number of occasions, but mostly in terms of their disapproval and rejection of the Indian caste-based system. In Singapore and the U.K., participants generally felt that the caste system had very little meaning for them or was not even present in their own lives:

This race, this caste, all these things have no meaning to me. (Anshul, Singapore)

Well, what they say about the caste system [is something I don’t like about Indian culture]. I don’t believe in the caste system. I think that’s something that’s you know- that’s something I wouldn’t want there to be ... [It’s] not as much [present here] ... They [Indians from India] do view people from other castes differently compared to their own. I did notice that [when I was in India]. (Roshni, UK)

Caste identities have tended to dilute in both the Singapore and the U.K. case. In the U.K., the vast majority of the participants are Jains, and Jainism has traditionally rejected the caste system. In the Singaporean case, the diluting of caste identities is as a result of three main factors (p.c.
with Dr. Rajesh Rai, National University of Singapore, 13th June 2011). First, the small size of
the Gujarati community makes sustaining the types of boundaries related to caste, sub-regional
affiliation, and even religious affiliation difficult. Second, a number of the earliest prominent
figures of Indian descent in Singapore were Gujarati Muslims (e.g., Rajabali Jumabhoy and Ali
Khan Surati), and they tended to have a pan-Gujarati or even a pan-Indian identity rather than
a Muslim identity. (Nowadays there is perhaps more emphasis on Muslim identity, though the
small number of Gujarati Muslim participants in my sample precludes me from making definitive
statements on this matter.) Third, state policy in Singapore is quite strict in ensuring that schools
are secular, and this thus plays a very important role in diluting caste identities.

In South Africa, caste was considered to be important within the Indian community: “We’re not
status-orientated as opposed to- Well, our community here is, there’s no doubt. Everything’s about
your caste and who your parents are” (Meeta, SA). However, it was mostly the older generation
who still believed in the caste system. The younger generation generally did not believe in the
relevance of and need for the caste system and found it meaningless in their lives:

> You know us Gujaratis, we’re also divided into different castes, so that’s also another
issue ... I don’t believe in all this caste system. I’m like, if we’re Gujaratis, we’re
Gujaratis, we don’t have to be divided into Muggs, Mistrys, Dhajis and all that stu.
(Asha, SA)

The older generation always says you marry in your own caste and whatnot. My parents didn’t do that. That doesn’t mean that they are not going to be happy.
(Samir, SA)

However, even if the participants chose to reject the caste system, they found that it still had
implications on certain aspects of their life, for example, their marriage partner:

> Our caste system, I hate that. That bugs me, and I think in our generation, it’s fading ...
Amongst people I know of our generation, it’s fading, ‘cause that’s not how we look
at it ... I got engaged earlier this year and before I did, when I found the guy and
everything, the first thing my granny would ask, my parents are not so much about
that, they don’t care. So my granny says, “So what caste is he?” And I was like, “Does
that really matter? Does that really matter or me being happy matters?” And so I’m
getting married to a different caste, but for me, that’s not a problem. Initially it was
for my grandma, but now she’s come to terms with it and she’s accepted it and she’s
happy with it ... It’s very sad actually [to cause divisions in society because of caste]
and to pass it down to your children, that’s very sad. (Alpa, SA)

Caste traditionally played an important role in Indian identity and had implications on many
aspects of the lives of Indians (e.g., friend circle, marriage partner, etc.). Caste still continues to
be significant in India. While caste is considered to be important in certain diaspora contexts, this
is generally the case among the older generations. The participants’ narratives portray that this
is one aspect of Indian identity that they are increasingly rejecting or are even unaware of. Such
rejection and lack of knowledge on their part of the caste system thus makes them identify less with traditional Indian ideas.

5.5.6 Us Versus Them: Distinguishing Themselves from Indians from India

There was a tendency among the diaspora Gujaratis in all three sites to distinguish themselves from Indians from India (see also Kandar, 2000, p. 253; Sharma, 2005, p. 15). Certain characteristics, often negative (e.g., strong Indian accent, bad smells, oily hair, etc.), were assigned to the Indians from India by the diaspora Indians as a means to differentiate themselves from the Indians from India. In addition, terms such as FOB (“Fresh off the Boat”) were used by the diaspora Indians to categorize Indians from India who have left their birthplace for a new country:

Pritesh (UK): When you first said typically Indian, the first thing that springs to mind is *freshie*, fresh off the boat (both are derogatory terms referring to newly immigrated Indians), they got an Indian accent.

Priya (UK): With a person from India, back then, when I was younger, I might call them names or whatever, but nowadays, obviously they got their own values, I’ve got my own values.
Sheena: What kind of names would you call them?
Priya (UK): Erm, *bud bud ding ding*7, fresh off the boat, *freshie*.

Furthermore, the diaspora Indians indicated in their narratives that a diaspora Indian may also be labeled terms such as FOB if they do something that is indicative of what FOBs do:

If they are Indian girls, they kind of have got a plait with oily hair or something like that ... Even I could have that and someone could call me a *bud bud*. I mean, yeh, as jokes, my friends have called me a *bud bud ding ding*. “Stop being a *bud bud* or something like that.” (Priya, UK)

5.5.7 Summary

In sum, several factors were alluded to by participants as contributing to or heightening their sense of local identity. In descriptions of local identity, diaspora Gujaratis in all three sites distinguished themselves from Indians from India, and at times, from other locals in their country. Some of the markers of local identity were applicable in all three contexts. For example, participants in all three countries highlighted their birthplace and childhood and formative years being spent in Singapore, South Africa, and the U.K. as defining characteristics of local identity. Other markers of local identity were important only in certain locations. For example, language, and specifically

---

7The term originates from the fact that persons of Indian/Pakistani descent were often seen as bus conductors (*bud bud* is the sound of an exhaust and *ding ding* is the bell on a bus).
accent, was mostly described to be a defining characteristic of local identity among the Singaporean participants. Their knowledge and use of Singlish aligned them with other locals from their country of birth. While English accent was also a marker of local identity to some extent in the other two sites, participants in South Africa and several in England highlighted how their English accent also at times revealed their race. South Africans tended to embrace the Indianness in their English accent. Their low levels of Gujarati proficiency, but strong sense of Indian identity (displayed through language and other means) seems to suggest a relationship between feeling positive about one’s Indian English dialect and not needing to maintain Gujarati. Other markers of local identity were specific to certain locations only. For example, in Singapore, a number of policies exist to ensure harmony among and interaction between Singaporeans of all races (e.g., the country’s emphasis on National Education and male participation in National Service), which participants described as reinforcing their local identity.

5.6 Factors Promoting a Strong Sense of Identity

The above sections discussed markers of local and/or ethnic identities among the participants. In this section, factors that promote a strong sense of identity – both cohesive and distinctive – are discussed. More specifically, this section focuses on the important role of heritage language schools, the home, and national policies in maintaining, developing, and fostering a strong sense of ethnic and/or local identities. In addition, it considers the way in which certain events and experiences may impact the identity formation of individuals and communities in the diaspora.

5.6.1 Gujarati School

Gujarati School is recognized as being very efficient in maintaining some factors which are perceived as important for Indian identity by the participants, e.g., religion, language, sense of community. Throughout my discussions with the participants, the importance of the Gujarati School’s role in their ethnic identity formation emerged: “Going to Gujarati classes made me feel proud of my culture and background and my family life. I’m proud to be Indian” (Karishma, UK); “[Had I not gone to Gujarati School], I would probably be so English” (Anjali, Singapore). Despite residing in Singapore, Anjali uses the word “English” and not “Singaporean”. Her word choice here highlights how “being English” is being associated with “being Western”, and thus how Gujarati School played a role in helping to maintain her ethnic identity.
In South Africa, where the vast majority of my participants were third, fourth, or fifth generation Gujaratis, Gujarati School was an important site to gain knowledge about aspects of their heritage which their locally-born parents might not have been able to pass on to them:

That’s one thing I’m very thankful to the school for is that they taught us a lot about our religion ... We would do the _Ramayana_ (ancient Indian religious epic), we would do the _Mahabharata_ (ancient Indian epic), we would do the _Bhagvat Gita_ (700-verse Hindu scripture that is part of the _Mahabharata_), they used to teach us Hindi, so the _bens_ (term used to refer to their Gujarati teachers) were more like mothers that taught me those small things that my parents being South African couldn’t do. (Kinari, SA)

Gujarati School provided an opportunity to forge friendships with other children of the same age and background, which some regarded as an important defining characteristic of being Indian: “If I would never have gone to Gujarati School in the first place, I would never have had any Gujarati friends, so I would feel kind of awkward calling myself Gujarati” (Bhavik, Singapore). Gujarati School also provided regular contact with the Gujarati community and aided in integrating into Gujarati society:

I think language brings them together. Gujarati School is kind of the focal point of the Gujarati community here. (Sonal, Singapore)

The only really Indian contact I had was at Gujarati School. (Priti, UK)

Probably the biggest advantage with Gujarati School is that it helps you integrate into the Gujarati society, whereas people who don’t go to Gujarati School have a hard time integrating into the Gujarati society, so they don’t come to any of the functions and stuff. (Jyoti, Singapore)

Even those who did not particularly enjoy attending Gujarati School highlighted that they would nevertheless send their children there, as “it’s not just about learning the language, it’s about mixing with people from the same background as you, taking part in shows and celebrating festivals together” (Karishma, UK).

### 5.6.2 Home

Along with Gujarati School, parents and grandparents were also cited as playing a pivotal role in ethnic identity development and maintenance among the younger generation. In the U.K. and Singapore, most of my participants had their first exposure to the Gujarati language at home. The home was where oral and aural skills in Gujarati were acquired and maintained, whereas Gujarati School was a site where participants primarily gained literacy skills in the language. In South Africa, fewer opportunities existed for the participants to learn to speak Gujarati at home, as homes tended to be predominantly English-speaking, and as a result, the school played a larger
role in transmitting the Gujarati language: “I think just the one difference is they [Indians from India] can speak Gujarati and we find it difficult, because our parents talk to us in English” (Anita, SA). Later on in the interview, Anita explains that even her grandfather speaks to her in English: “To his children [i.e., Anita’s parents], he speaks Gujarati, but to us [i.e., Anita and her siblings], he’ll speak in English (Anita, SA). While Anita’s case resembles that of many of the South African participants, this was not universally the case for all: “I also think, to an extent, it’s disrespectful, because they [my grandparents] don’t know like the language properly, so I prefer speaking to them in Gujarati” (Soheenee, SA). It was generally grandmothers, as opposed to grandfathers, as well as those from India who had not worked in South Africa (and would therefore not have needed to learn English), who tended to be more proficient in Gujarati than English and hence were important figures in passing on the Gujarati language to their South African born grandchildren.

Parents and grandparents are perceived central figures in passing on aspects of Indian identity, especially culture and religion, and were often regarded as important and authentic bearers of knowledge about ethnic customs. Children were educated by parents and grandparents about the various Indian festivals and religious holidays, and took part in these celebrations with their family. They learnt about their religion through the stories that their parents and grandparents shared with them and upheld other aspects related to their religion as a result of the home environment, e.g., being vegetarian (for Hindus and Jains). Parents were also described as important figures in imparting Indian ethnic values and morals to their children. Participants generally had a stricter upbringing than their friends from other cultures and encountered more restrictions growing up, e.g., less freedom in having friends of the other gender, in going out, and in dating. Many participants highly valued the morals and values that had been instilled in them from a young age, which they considered to be an important aspect of being Indian (see Section 5.3.3):

I’m not exposed to a lot of things ... Things that are going around now like alcohol, drugs, all of that, things like that, I’m not exposed to, because I’ve been brought up in a way to like shadow me away from all of that, which is a very good thing, and you know, it- it’s, I mean, it- I’ve been learning about all these things and the consequences of it, so I’ve been really glad that my family has protected me from everything. (Divya, SA)

However, some questioned this aspect of Indian culture, believing that such restrictions did not allow them the freedom to explore, make mistakes, and therefore learn for themselves, and indicated their wish to distance themselves from this traditional aspect of Indian identity:

I think the conservative part of it [Indian culture] has always been there to protect us, especially at a young age, it protects us from the- doing the wrong things. But at the same time, it doesn’t allow us to explore. It restricts us and the only way we learn things is if we make a mistake. (Kinari, SA)
5.6.3 Apartheid

Apartheid legally separated South African inhabitants in four race groups: Black, White, Colored, and Indian. South Africa transitioned from the system of Apartheid to a human rights-based constitutional democracy in 1994. Some of the older South African participants had experienced Apartheid, though most were very young at this time (under the age of 10). Despite living in a post-Apartheid era, some of the effects of Apartheid were still felt in present-day South Africa: “A lot of people are still a little bit race-conscious, you know, from the Apartheid days” (Mahavir, SA); “I don’t see the difference, the color, or anything. But you’d notice in our community, especially in Lenz (Lenasia), ‘cause we’re so- we’re very confined. Nobody thinks differently” (Payal, SA). Participants expressed the viewpoint that it was specifically the older generations, who had grown up under Apartheid, who were still race-conscious: “I don’t see different color skins. Everyone is the same to me, whereas to them [the older generation], black’s black, white’s white, and whatever” (Meeta, SA); “If you talk to some older generation people, they won’t want to mix with the white man. They’ll say ‘Ach, he did this to us’” (Samir, SA). While living under Apartheid had heightened a sense of ethnic affiliation among the different races and had resulted in less mixing with and exposure to other races, the younger generation is seen to divert from this trend:

I was born in ’93, which was one year before independence. So to me, it’s all good. I mean, you don’t forget what happened in the past, what we went through, how we got here, but as it stands, now it doesn’t mean, now this guy was born in ’93 with me, but just because he’s white, I’m going to treat him funny. Because he’s born with me, we’re born in the same time, whether what your grandparents did, it’s not what you did. (Samir, SA)

However, this was not universally the case, and there were instances in which the views and effects of Apartheid days were carried over to the present day:

Apartheid’s over. I thought “How do people still carry on with these views?” And these are the younger generation. I’m not talking like- like it’s not an old man or something. Like they are our age and they still carry on like that ... They were brought up in the new South Africa and they shouldn’t be following those old ways. (Mayuri, SA)

Samir and others believe that such race-conscious mindsets, which in turn heighten a sense of ethnic identity and weaken a sense of national identity, are related to a person’s upbringing and what a person learnt from his or her parents and others as a child:

Our age is fine ... Majority. You do get your exceptions, even with our generation. Once again, it comes back to what you learnt, you know, when you were smaller ... A lot of it has to do with your parents. If they put poison, so to say, in you[r mind], you’re gonna go with that. (Samir, SA)
In sum, Apartheid could be considered as a positive factor in strengthening ethnic identity formation among Gujaratis, since it heightened their sense of community (see Section 5.3.2). However, this section has illustrated that maintaining a strong sense of ethnic identity isn’t necessarily always viewed favorably among participants. The younger generation highlight some negative aspects associated with it (e.g., the creation of ethnically segregated groups, as a result of less mixing with and exposure to other races). The younger generation are increasingly seen to question the race-conscious mindsets that exist in South Africa (though some exceptions exist), which suggests that the close sense of community and cliquish behavior, two factors that define traditional Indian identity, may slowly be weakening among the younger generation.

5.6.4 Racism

Both the Singaporean and South African participants described instances where they had been victims of racism and the impact that such experiences had on their identity development. The majority of the South African participants had attended a Hindu-ethos school and as a result, most of their contact was with other Indians during this time. In addition, they all lived in Lenasia, a suburb of Johannesburg that is predominantly Indian, with some black Africans. None of the South African participants suffered from racism during their school years; however, a few described instances where they had been victims of racism after leaving school:

There was once a case of like where I was a victim of racism here in South Africa. It was like the first year of university ... I went for an open day with my best friend. Now my best friend is a bit dark in complexion. So we were sitting and these white boys came and they needed to find a seat. There were seats like empty next to us. They passed by and they were like “No, no, these girls are too dark to sit next to” ... It built like a fear in me, like how would I be able to study the whole year with boys like this- like we’re going to have to do group projects and stuff and if they are going to carry on like this, I cannot be a victim all the time. So that was one of the main reasons I quit architecture and went on to do BComm (Bachelor of Commerce).

(Mayuri, SA)

Mayuri describes the impact that these racist comments had on her. Having grown up in a largely Indian neighborhood in Johannesburg, she had never received comments like these ones until she left her hometown: “I went to an all Indian school and like my primary school is in Lenasia, so it was mainly Africans and Indians, so like no whites, and I’ve- like no one ever told me stuff like that. So it was like a bit harsh when I heard it” (Mayuri, SA). Having spent many years embracing her Indianness and having also been encouraged to do so (e.g., at school and home), it was a tough experience for her to then later experience that a marker of her ethnicity, skin color, was being used by other groups to instigate racist comments. Such an incident had such a large impact on her that she later decided to switch her university course to the Bachelor of Commerce program,
a course which traditionally has more Indian students than architecture, so that she could study in a more Indian environment.

The opposite is seen in Singapore. While South African Gujarati participants like Mayuri experienced racism after they left Lenasia and began university, Singaporeans were subjected to racist comments from other groups when they were younger (during primary school, and for some, during secondary school as well):

When I was in secondary school, in sec 1, sec 2, and sec 3, yeh, sec 1, sec 2, sec 3, the first three years of secondary school life were terrible. I suffered, because those batch of people were racist ... The Chinese people, they were really, really racist towards me. [They would say] racist comments ... They used to make fun of everything. Color, smell, but I didn’t smell. Like they would- there’s a lot of stereotypes and all that, so I suffered. (Chirag, Singapore).

Chirag and others describe in their narratives how racist comments usually came from the Chinese, who are the dominant group in Singapore, and resulted from their darker skin color and other aspects which became associated with those of darker skin (e.g., oily hair). Jyoti elaborates on this point:

In primary school, Indian people tend to- they just like differ too much from the Chinese people. Like they have- like they put oil in their hair and stuff, and it really smells like- ‘cause of the coconut oil and stuff ... So it’s like this whole thing gets associated with being darker-skinned ... They tend to think that Indians are too different, so they [the Chinese] like don’t integrate with them. So that’s why I think racism comes about. (Jyoti, Singapore).

Racist comments and jokes led some to feel embarrassed about being Indian and have negative feelings about their ethnic identity at the time, with some even going to the extent of trying to refuse their ethnic identity and abandon it. While this is true to some extent for Sapna, she highlights how such comments may have in fact strengthened her sense of ethnic identity in the long run: “In secondary school and stuff like that, people usually make a lot of racist jokes about Indians, so I felt really embarrassed that I was one of them, but now I’m actually ok with it” (Sapna, Singapore). Others outright rejected such comments and refused to accept them: “I feel angry sometimes [because of racial discrimination] ... Your color doesn’t make you a person after all. It’s just the outer looks, the inner looks are more important” (Sarika, Singapore). The number of racist comments usually decreased with age, as a result of various factors, including integration strategies used by the Indians:

Once you are older, I think the kids also reduce like the visible differences to like other races. They would tend to dress more like them, or don’t put the things [ash on their forehead] and stuff like that, and you don’t put like oil in your hair or whatever. (Jyoti, Singapore)
However, the Singaporean Gujarati participants received far fewer racist comments than the South Indians:

I have to face a lot less racism than like my friends who are South Indian, ‘cause they are a lot darker ... There are like racist connotations to like being darker, like in a sense. I don’t know, they [the Chinese] just have this view that “Oh you know, you are dirtier or smellier or stuff like that.” (Jyoti, Singapore)

The South Indians were considered by many of the North Indians and the Singaporean society as a whole as being the lower class Indians. South Indians tended to have lower paid jobs (often as construction workers), were more ethnically inclined than the North Indians, and were often referred to as “Banglas” (a racist term) by both North Indians and other races:

Whenever some Chinese see the dark-colored [South Indians], they would be like “Hey Indian” and then they’d call them “Bangla” nowadays ... It’s just Bangladeshi people. The workers are from Bangladesh, so their name is actually Bangla, but it’s quite rude to call somebody [Bangla], so that’s now the term we all use to irritate some of them.” (Sarika, Singapore)

While Sarika acknowledges that “it’s quite rude to call somebody [Bangla]”, she nonetheless uses this term, which suggests that she wishes to distance herself from the South Indians and instead emphasize a finer distinction in her Indian identity, that of North Indian.

By contrast to the Singaporean and South African participants, none of the U.K. participants experienced racism or racist comments because of their ethnicity and viewed their dual-identity as British and Indian as an advantage:

Obviously the U.K. is predominantly a white people country ... I’ve never ever received any racist comments or anything. But I feel like I’m at an advantage, because I was born here, but because I’m also Indian, it’s kind of like I bring something else to the U.K. (Dimple, UK)

Interestingly, a few participants mentioned that it was possible to feel proud of one’s ethnicity in the U.K., since the U.K. is a lot more tolerant of ethnic minorities than other countries they had visited. Two participants described instances where they had faced racial discrimination overseas:

It’s a bit frustrating when I go to the States, ‘cause I’ve been stopped nearly every time. And they look at you weird. When I was coming back from skiing, I got off the train at Geneva and there were like 100-200 people ... walking through customs ... this is from France to Switzerland. I was walking through and I was the only Asian in the crowd and they singled me out and stopped me ... I find France and Switzerland, they are a little bit racist. (Ravi, UK)

I think the only problem we had was when it was crossing Austria to Germany, and these passport control officers, and they’re a bit racist, and like they didn’t check anyone else’s, just me and my boyfriend’s. They were staring- My boyfriend is black, so they were just staring at him, first of all, and we were staring back, thinking “OMG (abbreviation for ‘Oh my God’), what do these people want?” ... I just felt a bit
humiliated. I felt a bit like, you know, it was definitely like racist ... Yeh, it’s just these people who aren’t educated, like they are not exposed to different people and they just don’t know ... I just thought, if that happens in England, like that will be in the papers the next day. Do you know what I mean? If it happened to a black person on a train in England, and no one else was asked for their passport apart from the black person, that would be in the papers ... You don’t get away with that sort of stuff here, but over there, it’s like, you know, it’s really different if you’re a black person or an Asian person. (Seema, UK)

In sum, experiencing racism had a negative impact on ethnic identity for some, leading them to feel embarrassed and try to refuse and abandon their ethnicity. For others, and it seems likely for all participants in the long run, it had the opposite effect and heightened a sense of feeling Indian and increased their desire to identify less with other races. In the U.K., and especially London, participants felt that ethnic minorities were tolerated and even appreciated. Such positive feelings that they experienced from the majority group led them to embrace both their local and ethnic identity and to perceive their dual-identity as British and Indian as an asset.

5.6.5 Area of Residence

All of the participants had grown up in areas which had a high concentration of Gujaratis and Indians and many still continued to live in such areas. It may be expected that stronger ethnic identities are fostered through a higher level of interaction with the ethnic population, though not all researchers agree (Bisin, Patacchini, Verdier, & Zenou, 2010). Living in such areas and having daily contact with Gujaratis and Indians had an impact on other aspects of the participants’ life, e.g., their friendship circle. Many participants described having mainly Indian close friends during their childhood, which was especially the case among the South African Gujarati participants, as they not only lived in a predominantly Indian neighborhood but most also attended a Hindu-ethos school. Growing up in such an environment led some to feel that they would not be as comfortable around non-Indians, and this intensified their fear of having to mix with other races, e.g., at university:

Because I live in Lenasia, I don’t really go out and meet non-Indian people. I’m like stuck, I’m stuck in the Indian-based community, so I haven’t had any experiences, but I just have a perception of Indian people being a bit easier [to deal with]. (Divya, SA)

I am a bit nervous about mingling with different cultures and people. I haven’t done that for the past 12 years, ‘cause I’ve been here in this school and you know, only mixing with Indian children. Other people, I don’t know how to relate to them. (Vishal, SA)

Some of the South African and U.K. participants tried to maintain a familiar environment, with a predominantly Indian group of friends after leaving their hometown, though for some, that changed with time as their exposure to other groups increased:
Falling into that Indian culture as a kind of protective bound in the first year, and then branching out, being more confident to branch out in the second and third year to just see what else was out there. (Anand, UK)

I was in the Hindu-ethos school, with a whole lot of Hindu or Indian people and when you go out there, you see the other cultures. I did discriminate a few times, but we got used to it eventually ... If we are in a lecture hall, I wouldn’t go and sit next to another race group. I would look for an Indian group and go and sit with them or if there’s an assignment that has to be done in a group, I’ll prefer going to an Indian because I was brought up that way. But eventually as time went on, I fit into the groups. (Tanvi, SA)

In Singapore, participants generally had more exposure to other ethnic groups from a young age, since the Gujarati and Indian community were smaller in number and schools were more ethnically diverse. Participants described how they were sometimes the only Indian student in their class, and how many of their close friends were of other races: “My friends are mainly Chinese and Malays” (Rania, Singapore).

While living in areas with a high concentration of Gujaratis and Indians heightened a sense of Indian identity for some, it led others to feel a generational gap and conflict. Through such a close contact with the Indian community, some participants became cognizant of vast differences between themselves and the Gujarati community and hence came to identify less with this group. In the following quotes, Pooja reveals the difficulties of being an individual in such a close-knit society and Meeta describes her wish to escape the Indian community by moving elsewhere (e.g., Cape Town, where there are fewer Indians):

I think, when you’re in England, you’re given this idea that you should be able to be, especially London, to be an individual ... And I think whenever you’re growing up, there’s always this like, you want to burst and be that- whichever person you want to be. And within this Indian sort of community, you’re always confined to be what someone else wanted you to be, or to still stick within a certain realm, as such, and so I think that I just felt very frustrated by being among this sort of group, ‘cause I couldn’t- (Pooja, UK)

Meeta (SA): I have issues about the shell that they [Indians] are in. And it’s always about a façade. You’ve gotta put on such a good face for people. Why be pretentious, I honestly don’t care. People care more about you and the stuff you’re doing than they would care about what’s going on.
Sheena: Do you see yourself living in South Africa afterwards?
Meeta (SA): I don’t know. Maybe not Joburg, but-

In sum, the ethnic composition of a residential area seems to play an important role in identity development and have an impact on various aspects of participants’ lives. For many, living in an area with a high concentration of Gujaratis and Indians fostered some of the ethnic identity markers
described in Section 5.3, such as language, religion, and tradition, which in turn created a stronger sense of feeling Indian. Living in areas with a high concentration of Gujaratis and Indians can therefore be considered to be a factor that positively strengthens several ethnic identity markers. The internal conflicts faced by participants such as Pooja and Meeta may signify a more juvenile rebellion against their parents’ generation rather than complete refusal of their Indian identity.

5.6.6 National Policies

Certain countries take specific measures in teaching its citizens what it means to be a citizen of that country. For example, children in many states of the U.S. are required to recite the Pledge of Allegiance at the beginning of every school day. Of the three countries I worked in, Singapore is a particularly good example of a country that places importance on teaching its citizens what it means to be a citizen of Singapore. The government has introduced a variety of measures to promote a sense of national identity, including the annual National Day celebrations and the National Education Plan.

The National Day of Singapore is celebrated on the 9th of August every year and commemorates Singapore's independence from Malaysia in 1965. Participants described how National Day fostered a sense of national identity:

I love Singapore ... I feel like it’s the safest country to be in. And I’ve been singing the Singaporean National Anthem and all that. So I am a proud Singaporean, you know. When National Day comes, you feel a little nostalgic and all that. Yeh, that tends to happen. (Aarti, Singapore)

Interestingly, some participants claimed to know only the Singaporean National Anthem and not the Indian one. This was in stark contrast to the situation in the U.K. and South Africa, where participants generally knew both.

In addition to National Day celebrations, Singapore's emphasis on National Education includes constant teaching about a set of national values including respect for other cultures. Introduced in May 1997 under Lee Hsien Loong, the then deputy prime minister, the National Education Plan is “to equip ... [the young] with the basic attitudes, values and instincts which make them Singaporeans” (Loong, 1997). As a result of active measures on the part of the government to foster a national identity, it is not surprising that it was most often in Singapore than in the U.K. and South Africa that feelings of loyalty toward the country were expressed, which naturally heightened their sense of local identity:

I’m proud to be Singaporean. I feel that that identifies me with who I am, because like being in Singapore like means that like that you’re a global citizen in a sense ... I would say that by saying- If I say that I’m an Indian, I’m not being fair to my friends
which I’ve made in Singapore or to what my country has given me, so I would say that I’m a Singaporean. (Parag, Singapore)

Singaporeans discussed their affection toward Singapore through the good lifestyle they had in Singapore, which many felt would not have been the case in India: “It’s done a lot for me. It’s given me a good education. The earning capability and all the benefits from the government are quite good, so I think it’s given me a good lifestyle, so I’m really quite Singaporean” (Mihir, Singapore). Various positive aspects of Singapore were constantly highlighted in their narratives, which made them patriotic and proud Singaporeans:

I got a lot of affection for this country [Singapore] ... I’m very patriotic. Anybody says something about Singapore, I’ll feel- Maybe in Singapore itself, I’ll be complaining “Oh life is so tough, competition is—”. But when I go elsewhere, I will not give anybody a chance to, you know, look down on my country, because this is the country I serve, and in times of war, this is the country I’m gonna fight for ... The life which I’ve been given in Singapore- The earlier generation suffered in Singapore, but when me and my sister, our generation, we are like the blessed generation. You know, it’s so safe, girls can just go out at 2-3am and come back, nothing’s going to happen ... We are safe from natural disasters, it’s such a lovely place, so there’s a lot of affection lah in this country and although we have a young history, the way from a village, in forty years, we’ve become one of the top countries, financial hubs in the world. It’s something to be proud of lah. (Anshul, Singapore)

In spite of the emphasis on national identity, Singapore also places equal importance in teaching its citizens to have and maintain an ethnic identity. This can be seen in the education sector, where students are required to learn both English and their mother tongue:

I think, for me, [being] bilingual is important for me, ‘cause they emphasize it in Singapore being bilingual. I still remember in Primary School, we used to wear the badge that says “I’m bilingual”. They want us to know English language and your mother tongue, so I was happy that Gujarati was recognized so now I can say I’m bilingual. (Shona, Singapore)

Gujarati has not received the same prestige in the U.K. and South Africa. While some improvements with regard to the recognition of Gujarati in the U.K. were highlighted by participants, e.g., the transition from being a community language to now being a modern foreign language, national qualifications in Gujarati often do not hold the same prestige as other subjects in these countries.

To sum up, Singaporean Gujaratis described how they could embrace their ethnic identity and still feel “part of Singapore” (Shona, Singapore). The government and ministers in Singapore were described as playing an important role in this and recognizing the community, despite its small size, e.g., by attending Indian events as guests of honor:

Even though it [the Gujarati community] is a small community in Singapore, but it’s still a part of Singapore, being a Gujarati, ‘cause sometimes for some of our functions, ministers come down to grace the event being guests of honor, so they know our culture and traditions. Like Navratri (a Hindu festival), usually it’s Navratri, so I think last
year, they—two years back, they had some minister come down and he—they [the minister and his wife] themselves took part in the garbas (a form of dance that originated from the state of Gujarat in India) and all—and the lady wore a sari (a garment traditionally worn by Indian women), so it like emphasizes that we are part of Singapore. (Shona, Singapore, original emphasis)

On the other hand, a lack of a shared national identity has been alluded to in England and no explicit instructions are given to its citizens on what it means to be British, so much so that “we have allowed the weakening of our collective identity. Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream” (Cameron, 2011). So, one big difference between Singapore and the U.K. is that Singapore has explicit public policies about racial integration. Based on the data obtained from participants, such policies did not necessarily mean that Singaporean participants had fewer inner conflicts about their dual identity as Indian and Singaporean than participants in the U.K. and South Africa. However, the different policies in place in the three countries and the different positions taken by the three countries as far as racial integration is concerned generally pushed participants in the U.K. and South Africa to feel more Indian and less British and South African, respectively, than in Singapore. In Singapore, a stronger sense of shared national identity exists. However, as highlighted in this section, respect for different ethnic groups, created through the various policies in place in Singapore, can lead to a strong sense of ethnic identity in addition to a strong sense of national identity.

5.7 Identity as Viewed by Others and by Themselves

The way others view an individual plays an important role in how the individual’s identity is formed and developed. Some participants considered the adoption of an Indian identity compulsory, because of factors like their Indian physical appearance: “You can be the most British person you want, but you’ll never be fully British, ‘cause you’re brown” (Pratik, UK), but were also quick to admit that they were not fully Indian and were not regarded as Indians in India: “There [in India], you are seen as the Westerner, so you are treated as a guest” (Jayni, UK). Participants described how certain factors revealed to Indians in India that they were foreigners in India, including their way of dressing, speaking, and for one participant, even her way of walking: “My friends from India used to say to me that they knew that I wasn’t from there, because I walked with too much confidence for a girl” (Reena, UK).

Displaying the expected norms and behaviors of a certain group may lead to identity labeling. One participant discusses how people consider her to be very Indian, but also very Western, and
describes how she finds these groupings based on somewhat superficial qualities both simplified and problematic:

The interesting thing is how other people see you. Some people see me as extremely Indian, because I religiously have to have my rotli, dar, bhat, shak (a typical Gujarati dish consisting of chapatti, lentils, rice, and curry) every day and I’m quite into Jainism, so I’m very Indian in that sense. Then a lot of people think I’m completely white, a complete coconut, because I reject Bollywood and I reject Hip-Hop and R&B, I’m not really a fan of Jay Sean or any of that sort of stuff, so sometimes I almost feel like being Indian has become a bit simplified, so if you like Bollywood, that equates to you being Indian and that’s really problematic. My best friend is actually an Indian, but is a South Indian, and he said that he still feels really Indian, but he isn’t into all that Bollywood and stuff, so to compensate for all of that, he is a bit of an intellectual Indian and knows all about Indian history and politics, which your average Indian who considers themself as very Indian probably wouldn’t have a clue about. (Jayni, UK)

Other researchers have also mentioned how heritage language learners tend to be more familiar with popular culture (e.g., music, cinema, fashion) than with academic knowledge pertaining to areas such as geography, history and politics (see, for example, Ilieva, 2012, p. 22). Jayni’s quote illustrates how deviations from the expected group norm generate the idea that one does not belong in a certain identity category.

Tempting as it may be for others to infer a person’s ethnic identity from concrete traits, such as their physical features, or their adherence to expected group norms, these signs may in fact be quite deceptive. This leads to how the participants self-identified and their claims of having multiple identities. Most participants described their identity as national-racial (e.g., Singaporean Indian) or racial-national (e.g., Indian Singaporean), but insisted that identity is not a fixed category, but rather dynamic, fluid, and multi-faceted. Participants described having the “best of both worlds”, i.e., more choices than some of the native locals who did not have another ethnic identity to draw on:

I’m obviously a citizen of Britain and I respect and follow all the ideals that this country is based on, but I bring to that a heritage which is beyond that, which is an Indian heritage. It’s almost a shame that you can’t also throw in Kenyan, because there’s obviously that factor as well. (Jayni, UK)

---

8 Coconut is a derogatory term used to describe a South Asian person who has assimilated too far into mainstream society and thus acts like a white person (by, e.g., befriending white people or preferring Western TV shows) despite their brown (i.e., Indian) appearance – in other words, someone who has become white on the inside while remaining brown on the outside.

9 Jay Sean is a British singer-songwriter of Indian (Punjabi) origin.

10 The North-South divide among Indians, which is visible in Singapore, also exists in other Indian diaspora contexts, such as the U.K., albeit less prominently. Unlike Singaporeans, participants in the U.K. infrequently made references to this distinction in the follow-up interviews. The reason behind this may lie in the population concentration of the various Indian groups in both countries. North Indians are the dominant Indian group in the U.K. Use of the term ‘Indian’ in this context may therefore automatically imply ‘North Indian’. By contrast, South Indians are the dominant Indian group in Singapore. Use of the term ‘Indian’ in this context may therefore imply ‘South Indian’. North Indians in Singapore, wishing to distinguish themselves from South Indians, may consequently be more focused on the North-South divide and refer to it more frequently.
They also described how they were actively “picking and choosing” (Seema, UK) which aspects of their Indian side they identified with, which at times led to contradictory statements in their narrative:

Even though I’m not interested in it [the Indian entertainment industry], I like the fact that it has got its own film industry, its own music industry, and it’s doing well, ‘cause it’s something that I can be proud of, even though it’s not something I like. (Seema, UK).

Seema’s comment further portrays a sense of flexibility that participants felt they had in choosing when to express their ethnic or local identities. For her, the successes that the Indian entertainment industry has overseas led to her wish to be associated with this aspect of Indian culture.

Different situations determine which aspect of their identity gets accentuated at a given moment:

Parts of me feel I’m more British, but then again, when I do stuff like Gujarati class or you know, go to [Indian] events, or something like that, that’s when I feel more Indian. So I think it depends on like where I am, what I’m doing. (Bina, UK)

Sometimes I find that you don’t have that kind of general knowledge or something [to be British] ... One day, they [my white friends] just made a joke about Monty Python and I was like “I do not understand this at all.” But I think popular culture differences are kind of always there. (Sagar, UK)

Several British and South African participants, having been interviewed just before or soon after the World Cup in South Africa (2010) and the Olympics in Britain (2012), discussed how such events heightened their sense of local identity:

[I felt] totally South African last year at the World Cup. That feeling was amazing. I mean, you didn’t even feel different to anybody else, because everyone is in the same excitement, so that’s when I really felt totally South African. (Payal, SA)

In the South African case, where skin color marked different races during Apartheid, such sporting events promote displays and feelings of national identity and pride and seem to be important in uniting the different races.

Contrary to dominant stereotyping, many scholars have shown that the second generation does not suffer from an identity crisis (Rayaprol, 2005, p.138; Mukadam, 2003). However, Mukadam (2003) points out that not all researchers agree and second and later-generation Indians have been categorized as ‘neither one thing nor another’ (Gidoomal, 1993), ‘between two cultures’ (Anwar, 1975; Watson, 1977) and as ‘the half-way generation’ (P. H. Taylor, 1976). My data show that “there in fact appears to be a fusion of East and West” (Mukadam, 2003, p. 44) among second and subsequent generation Gujaratis in the diaspora:

We feel different to British white people, we are doing things our way, we have our culture, we are kind of trying to live up to that, we are trying to maintain the language,
you feel that way but going there [India], you see what the true non-Westernized, who
have never maybe been outside their countries borders, yeh it is definitely You recognize
a lot of aspects which are the same, but, uh, maybe not a lot, but I recognize a few
things, which are the same, but I definitely feel different to them. It’s kind of like we
build our own community of how to adapt to that lifestyle, but in the Western world.
(Anand, UK).

Those who self-reported as suffering from an identity crisis were often those who attempted to
reject their ethnic identity, but found that certain aspects could not be excluded, e.g., skin color,
making the adoption of a partial Indian identity compulsory for all. Some of these participants
portrayed the difficulties they faced as they tried to bring their Indian and non-Indian worlds
together, which at times they described as being complete opposites of one another:

At least two different worlds. It’s really different. You can’t balance them and you can’t
bring them together ... You can’t mix them [the Indian friends with the non-Indian
friends], it’s like you’ll have one [event with one group] there, you’ll have one [event
with the other group] here, it’s- you can’t gel the two, I tried it and you can’t gel it.
(Meeta, SA)

I think it’s really difficult to grow up without an identity. Most people won’t understand
that, because they have the comfort of either-or, or they choose. I guess some people
who are very Indian have chosen to do that, because they kind of have that feeling
maybe, or they, I don’t know, they don’t know the repercussions of going down the
middle path. But, um, yeh, I think it is very difficult. (Reena, UK)

When participants were asked to describe their identity in their own words, it often emerged
that their identity was hybrid. One participant, who identified strongly with her British side,
admitted at a later point in the interview that she could not really claim to be fully British:

I wanted to originally say British, but then I do feel that I want to hold on to my roots
and that I want to pass them on and they are important to me, so I wouldn’t want to
just constitute as British. (Pooja, UK)

Another participant who also identified strongly with her British side reconstructed her identity
with each new question I asked, going from “I definitely feel British” to “I would call myself a
British citizen, (long pause) British Indian” to “Oh my God, you’re making me think now. I feel
like I’m not from India, but at the same time I am kind of ... I feel Indian because of this bit and
that bit” (Seema, UK). In Singapore, the general use of the hyphenated identity label among all
groups meant that a blend of both local and racial identity was compulsory:

There’s no like Singaporean person kind of thing. It’s always Singaporean Chinese,
Singaporean Indian, Singaporean Malay kind of thing, so it’s like there is already a
division. Like you already have a second like division in your society. It’s not like in
America you have like Americans like who are like from America. But over here, it’s
not really like that. (Jyoti, Singapore)
To sum up, the participants in all three sites ultimately acknowledged in their narratives that it was difficult to choose just one identity label and words like “confusion”, “uncertainty”, and “indecisiveness” came up frequently in their descriptions of their identity:

I am a Singaporean by blood and I am proud of that. Having relatives in India also makes me an Indian. It seems to be an indecisive decision between choosing from one of them. (Priyanka, Singapore)

It’s a really tough question [about how I identify], because you become patriotic, but you also become, you know, aware of where your roots are from, so I mean if you look at a typical India-South Africa match in cricket, I’d support India, but I’d choose not really to watch those games because it puts you in the middle. (Payal, SA)

I consider myself to be British. I feel I relate more to the culture and way of life here. However, if I was being completely honest, I’d say I don’t completely identify with either culture and am torn between the two, which at times can be very difficult and other times quite enriching. But mostly it leads to confusion. (Reena, UK)

Despite sentiments such as those described by Priyanka, Payal, and Reena, many readily described how they had in fact taken aspects of both cultures to create a flexible and multi-faceted identity, leading to the conclusion that both their local and ethnic identities are fostered and neither is completely being jeopardized.

5.8 Employing Identity Labels

Employing identity labels is controversial. The term “Indian” has varying connotations, depending on which diaspora context is being referred to. It may refer to everyone originating from the Indian subcontinent (i.e., including those from modern-day Sri-Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nepal), or simply those originating from present-day India. Participants discussed how Gujaratis often get grouped together under the broader Indian category, and how problematic this can be for them at times:

Some people, who aren’t say, they are not from India or not from Kenya, but people who aren’t Indian, or Asian, they kind of class all Indians as one, where to be honest, it’s not like that, because you all come from different parts of the world. And even if people speak negatively about them, they say “Oh, Indians are like this. Indians are like that.” ... I don’t like it. It actually angers me when people do that or people speak like that, ‘cause it just goes to show that they’re not as open-minded as you’d think ... It’s like saying British people are so rude, when to be honest, there are so many different cultures in Britain that you don’t really know who you are defining when you say British people. (Dimple, UK).

Using the term “Indian” may be viewed as problematic, as it refers to many sub-groups (e.g., Gujarati, Marathi, etc.), who each have their own characteristics (e.g., language, culture, etc.). For
this very reason, one participant, Shilpa, highlights how Indians in South Africa generally tend to classify Indians into their various subgroups rather than using the collective label “Indian”:

We won’t refer to Indians in South Africa as Indians, you know, like especially if you are Indian. We would say- We would classify them, if it’s Gujaratis, Tamils, or Hindis, our three main categories. We don’t see many Sikhs in South Africa. I think- There are, but they would fall part of Hindi. So, we do classify and we have our own temples, we have our cultures are the same, you know, but traditions may be different. So we- like they [the Tamils] fast for *Purattasi* (an auspicious Tamil month dedicated to God Perumal, in which fasting is undertaken; takes place in the sixth month of the Tamil year) and stuff; we fast for *Shravan* (an auspicious Hindu month dedicated to Lord Shiva, in which fasting is undertaken; takes place in the fifth month of the Hindu year). It’s at different times, but we do the same things basically, you know. But there is a divide. (Shilpa, SA)

In addition, the term “Indian” is often incorrectly used to refer to all people of South Asian origin (i.e., anyone of Indian, Pakistani, or Bangladeshi descent). This is particularly problematic, since Indians believe that their interests are different from other South Asian communities. For example, as noted above, Indians in the U.K. tend to see themselves and be seen by others as comparatively better educated, prosperous and cohesive than Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities in the U.K.

At times, the broader term “Indian” may be employed by dominant groups in the local society, as they are unaware of the different sub-communities within the larger Indian community, for example, Punjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Malayalam, Tamil, etc. In Singapore, especially prior to the introduction of the Non-Tamil Indian Language (NTIL) subjects, all Indians were often erroneously classified by others as Tamil-speaking South Indians, since the Tamils form the largest Indian group in the country. Two common scenarios faced by Singaporean Gujaratis are described by Amit (Singapore) below. In the first scenario, he describes how friends from other cultures may ask Singaporean Gujaratis to translate sentences from Tamil into English for them. In the second scenario, they may ask Singaporean Gujaratis to perform customs which are typical of South Indian culture. As he describes below, Gujaratis are not in a position to do either of the above, since the language and customs of the two groups differ substantially.

We’ve got racial harmony day, where there are lots of racial harmony songs in Tamil, Chinese, Malay, all different languages. So, usually, in the Tamil language section, they’ll ask me, “Amit, translate for me”. I’ll say “I don’t understand.” They’ll say “Sure you do. This is your language. How do you translate?” I’ll say “I don’t understand the language, I don’t understand. Don’t ask me.” (Amit, Singapore)

The Tamils have a festival called the *Thaipusam* (a Hindu festival celebrated mostly by the Tamil community on the full moon in the Tamil month of Thai, i.e., January/February), where they run on the coals and everything. So, in my school, they had this event where they set up Indian booths, Chinese booths, and had this coal pathway. So they asked for someone to demonstrate. So everyone turned to me. “Amit, you’re Indian, right? Go and run.” I said, “That’s not my custom. I don’t believe in running across
the coals.” “But you’re Indian, right? Indians only run on coals, on the coal pathway, and all that.” I said “You’re wrong. It’s the Tamil who believe in that. North Indian have other rituals, respecting God and doing other-.” Then my teacher forced me to do it to show all my Chinese friends. So I just ran. (Amit, Singapore)

Despite other ethnic groups using the collective term “Indian” to refer to Singaporean Indians, they themselves prefer to identify as either “North Indian” or “South Indian” rather than employing the collective term “Indian” (Rai, 2004). The participants often made the conscious effort of explicitly informing me that they were not simply “Indian”, but rather “North Indian” (or “Gujarati”). From their discussions, it arose that the Singaporean participants held many negative views of South Indians (e.g., see Section 5.3.9) and did not want to be associated with them. They described in their narratives how they often took the effort to explain to local Singaporeans about the various Indian sub-groups and languages, such as Gujarati, through the use of certain techniques, including: (1) describing the various Indian languages as dialects, similar to the Chinese situation, and (2) describing Gujarati as a language similar to Hindi, which most Singaporeans are aware of, because of the Bollywood film industry and popular Bollywood actors like Shah Rukh Khan.

How I explain to them is that I try to explain it to them in terms of what they experience in their countries, so I’ll say, so you know how you have separate dialects in China, for example Hokkien, Nakiou, it’s the same way, we have separate dialects, but it’s not just about the dialects, we also come from different states, so I come from the Gujarat state, originally my great great grandparents were from there, so that’s why I’m a Gujarati and I speak a different language and even unlike all the different Chinese dialects where you write the same script, even our scripts are different. (Tina, Singapore).

Gujarati, in a sense, not many of them know, but they might know of Hindi as the national language of India... Also through Bollywood. They say “Oh Shah Rukh Khan, right? Ashwara Rai?” I’m like “Yeh, yeh, that’s Hindi”. But we cannot be considered [by others as] North [Indians], because North Indians are like Punjabis, right?11 ‘Cause my friend is like “You’re from Punjab, is it?” And I’m like “No, I’m not”... Earlier I used to [use the North-South distinction], but they didn’t use to get the term, so I was like “I’m from Bombay”, because they know Mumbai. So then they’re like “Oh, the Bollywood city”. And I’m like “Yeh, the Bollywood city”. (Eshana, Singapore)

Participants in the U.K. also described how the labels used by outsiders did not always best describe them. They made specific references to “Kenyan” in their descriptions of their identity:

I’m obviously a citizen of Britain and I respect and follow all the ideals that this country is based on, but I bring to that a heritage which is beyond that, which is an Indian heritage. It’s almost a shame that you can’t also throw in Kenyan, because there’s obviously that factor as well. (Jayni, UK)

---

11In her statement “But we cannot be considered [by others as] North [Indians], because North Indians are like Punjabis, right?”, Eshana is referring to the fact that being classified as North Indian may lead people to assume that she is Punjabi, since Punjabis are the dominant North Indian group in Singapore in terms of population size.
Many of the participants had close ties to Kenya through one or both of their parents having migrated from there:

Dimple: The majority of my family is from Kenya, from what I know, and to be honest, the way my family lives, it’s more of a Kenyan lifestyle.
Sheena: In what way?
Dimple: Just in the sense that whenever they talk about anything, they’ll say “back home, we did this. Back home, we did that.” And they always mean Kenya, not India.

Throughout their childhood, participants had made many trips to Kenya to see grandparents and extended family, and in many cases, these trips to Kenya vastly outnumbered the trips made to India. In addition, the Gujarati spoken by the participants contained many Swahili words, which had been passed down from their parents, and thus was different from the Gujarati spoken by Indians from India, as well as other diaspora Indians. Participants also described having more similarities with the Kenyan Gujaratis than with Indian Gujaratis:

With the Indians, I find it’s a different kind of way in which they are brought up, the way they are, whereas Kenyans I clicked more with, because they’re more outgoing ...
It [the upbringing of Indians from India] is very traditional, it’s more like stricter, I think. (Priya, UK)

Interestingly, Priya suggests that Indians from India are more traditional than diaspora Indians. This is in contrast to earlier comments (see, for example, the quote by Nima in Section 5.4.4). The data suggest that both feelings may in fact be present. On the one hand, a young diaspora Indian from the U.K. may be more modern than an Indian from India of the same age, due to the stronger Western influence that the diaspora Indian receives by living outside of India. On the other hand, the older generation in the diaspora, especially those who came from the more rural areas of India, may be more conservative in their outlook and viewpoint than those currently living in India, especially in more urban areas. India has progressed, and this is especially visible in the more urban areas (e.g., Mumbai), but the older diaspora Indians’ physical separation from India may have resulted in their developing a static view of India, one which represents Indian culture from the moment in time when they left India to move overseas.

Others described identity labels as being problematic, in that nationality and race were not really what they identified with, and were just two small parts of a larger picture:

Both parts- My Singaporean identity and my Indian identity are really just two small parts of a bigger whole. I think there’s other things that define me a lot more than my race and my nationality, ‘cause I don’t identity that much with either. (Sonal, Singapore)

The controversial and problematic nature of using the term “Indian” has been highlighted in this section. While a need for the use of identity labels may exist, e.g., for census purposes, the
use of a pan-ethnic identity like “Indian” should be used with caution for a number of reasons. First, the identity label “Indian” is often erroneously used to refer to those who are not in fact Indian, but may instead be from neighboring countries (e.g., Bangladesh and Pakistan). Second, the collective label “Indian” ignores the various distinctions between the different Indian sub-groups in question. Indians are divided into many sub-groups (e.g., Gujarati, Marathi, etc.), who each have their own individual characteristics (e.g., language, culture, customs, etc.), which may be vastly different to those of other sub-groups. Interestingly, participants in this study were found to use the terms “Gujarati” and “Indian” interchangeably. Ethnic labels based on regional-linguistic divisions (e.g., Gujarati, Punjabi, Malayalee, etc.) are commonly employed both in India and the diaspora, though broader labels such as “Asian Indian” are also used in the diaspora, especially when comparisons between the local society (e.g., British society) and the Indian society are made. Third, official identity labels may fail to fully capture one’s complete identity. As demonstrated by the British participants, who made specific references to “Kenyan” in descriptions of their identity, the official label used in the U.K. to classify Indians - “British Asian” - does not take into account their historical journey to the U.K.

5.9 Future of Indian Identity in the Diaspora

In this chapter, I have shown that certain markers (e.g., language, culture, etc.) are associated with feelings of ethnic identity and that particular factors (e.g. Gujarati school, a Gujarati home) help diaspora Gujaratis maintain a strong sense of ethnic identity. However, some participants questioned whether a strong ethnic identification would exist with future generations in the diaspora. The participants I interviewed were certain that there would be a further assimilation among Gujaratis toward the dominant culture, especially in terms of certain factors that have traditionally been central to the definition of Indian identity. For example, the ethnic sense of community may be at risk in Indian diaspora communities as children increasingly are placing their parents in old age homes, resulting in two-generation rather than three-generation households. Participants described changes that they witnessed between their generation and their parents’ generation, and predicted the changes that would take place between their generation and generations to come:

I think throughout each generation, it’s getting more and more western by living in this country ... The culture that I believe in differs substantially from my parents, who are more kind of Indian and traditional. And like mine have become more western and I just can’t see how my children and my grandchildren- they’ll be even more western. (Dhruv, UK)
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Certain ethnic identity markers are less stable than others, and are likely to become weaker with each new generation in the diaspora, for example, religion. Participants described aspects of religion which they felt that they were losing, and which they were therefore certain would not be passed down to their children:

The religious aspect, which I think is a bit of a shame, and I do feel like it’s something that I am slowly feel like- even though I don’t want to, I’m losing. I think even like with Indian cooking and with all the- you know I just think, I listen to my mum and I listen to the way she connects, you know, she can say, if there’s a person, she can connect how we know that person through like 5 family members. I would not be able to do that. Or you know, the way that they know all this like- all this stuff about Indian ceremonies or er, you know, they- I think we used to like not wash our hair on Wednesdays, there’s a lot of things, cultural things, that my mum just grew up with- my mum and dad grew up with, and so they just know it. And although we’ve grown up with it, because it’s important in our family, it wasn’t first-hand, like it would have been in India or Kenya, so I feel like it’s something I still don’t really know, and by this age I think my mum would know it, have known it when she was younger ... I’m a bit ashamed [that I don’t know these things]. (Pooja, UK)

Similarly, several participants described how they did not know the reasons behind certain customs and traditions. Indian customs and traditions had often been passed down from generation to generation, but it was sometimes not understood why they were being followed, and this led some participants to question the validity of carrying out such customs and traditions. When the reasoning is lost, there is less of a likelihood that they will be passed on to future generations:

I find it a bit odd that we do things nowadays that I don’t understand why we do it, like let’s just say, when the sun comes out, then you do the surya namaskar (Sun Salutation, which involves a sequence of asanas) or something. But you don’t really know the purpose of it. You’re just doing it because your parents told you it’s the right way. (Vishal, SA).

Just as ethnic identity markers such as religion and Indian customs and traditions seem to become weaker with each new generation in the diaspora, a similar pattern exists for language: younger generations in the diaspora generally display lower levels of Gujarati proficiency than older generations. Fishman’s (1972) three generation model of language shift applies in the U.K. and South Africa, and seems to somewhat apply in Singapore. While Gujarati is not a “world language” like English, many of the participants considered it necessary to know Gujarati, for example, to communicate with monolingual elders. However, there will be less of a need for future generations to know Gujarati for reasons such as this and participants admitted that they could not imagine themselves speaking Gujarati to their children, even though many of them wished for their children to know Gujarati:

My single biggest fear in life is that my children won’t speak Gujarati, and that fear is so great because there is a very large chance that this will be the case. I would always intend to raise my children to be able to speak Gujarati, but the truth is that
I never, ever converse with my peers in Gujarati. In fact, to do so would feel weird and forced. So even if I was to marry a Gujarati, I would be unlikely to converse with him in Gujarati, and listening to us would be the main way a child learns to speak. To raise them speaking Gujarati would probably be very contrived and unnatural and this is because, sadly, English is the language I think and dream in. (Jayni, UK)

I think my children will be more British than Indian, which is just because they won’t know the- Because I know the language, I know how to read and write. That makes me, I think, more in touch with my Indian side. (Dhruv, UK)

5.10 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown that Gujarati adolescents and young adults in the diaspora hold on to their Indian identity, which they express through various identity markers, but the significance of each in their construction of identity varies. Several general patterns are seen to emerge from the participants’ first-hand accounts of the ways that they perceive, define, experience, and express their identity.

First, certain identity markers featured prominently in descriptions of ethnic identity for participants in all three sites. These can therefore be considered to be universal markers of ethnic identity among Gujaratis in the diaspora, which have remained constant from one generation to the next, are likely to remain stable in generations to come, and are therefore expected to continue to feature in descriptions of ethnic identity among Gujaratis in the diaspora. These are external expressions of ethnic identity, such as eating ethnic foods on a regular (or daily) basis and their Indian physical appearance, and internal markers of ethnic identity, such as their pride and belief in family values and morals. That “being Indian” was seen to involve innate characteristics such as their physical appearance affected not only how second and subsequent generation Gujaratis viewed themselves, but also how others viewed them, and highlights that ethnic identity may at times be equated to racial identity.

Second, some markers featured prominently in descriptions of ethnic identity for participants in certain locations only. For example, the ability to speak the heritage language emerged in descriptions of ethnic identity among Singaporean and U.K. participants, but proficiency in the heritage language was generally not an important marker of ethnic identity among the South African participants. Similarly, other markers of ethnic identity were heavily fostered and maintained in the home or at Gujarati School. They therefore generally featured more prominently among younger participants than older participants. An example of this includes participation in Indian cultural activities, which all participants reported being heavily involved in during their childhood. As they grew older, participants generally participated less in Indian cultural activities, due to lack
of time, lack of interest, etc. So, this marker of ethnic identity, while at times acknowledged to constitute a general Indian identity, may no longer have been relevant in definitions of their own ethnic identity.

Third, some markers that may traditionally be used in definitions of ethnic identity may become weakened or altered among individuals and communities in the diaspora. This is not surprising, since the ethnic identity which second and subsequent generations in the diaspora retain may not be of the same form as that of the first generation (Isajiw, 1990). Examples of altered markers of ethnic identity include marriage ceremonies and dietary habits. While food is often considered to be one of the most lasting symbols of ethnic identity (Isajiw, 1990) and eating Indian food on a regular (or daily) basis appears to be an element of their ethnic identity which the participants are deeply attached to, changing dietary habits (e.g., a shift from eating purely vegetarian food to eating meat) seem to be developing among some of the diaspora Gujaratis, possibly due to a need that individuals may feel to integrate into local society.

Fourth, other markers which may have traditionally defined “Indian identity” seem to be lost in the diaspora. For example, caste distinctions seem to be dissolving among the newer generation in the diaspora in some cases (as seen in the South African context), and seem to have already dissolved in other cases (as seen in the Singaporean and British contexts). Similarly, participants identified a heavy Indian accent as typically Indian, but highlighted that this was not a marker of Indian identity for them, since they all spoke English with a British, Singaporean, or South African accent. While Indian accent thus may be an identity marker for older generations, especially those who themselves emigrated from India, one might predict that this marker will not define future generations of Indians in the diaspora, born outside of India. However, ethnic dialects can be passed down to descendants who are not from the country where the dialect originated, or to people who are not native speakers of the non-English language that originally influenced the formation of the dialect (cf. African American English, Chicano English, etc.). It therefore cannot be assumed that Indian Englishes will die out. It is possible that, despite participants’ assertions that an Indian accent is not important to them, Indian dialects of English might become more pronounced if Gujarati and other Indian languages are lost, and these may then be used by the community to index in-group ethnic identity. This is shown to an extent among the South Africans in this study, and has also been shown for Tamil communities in the U.S., U.K., and Canada (e.g., Canagarajah, 2012a). These Indian dialects of English might diverge from Indian English as spoken in India but would nonetheless be quite distinctive to each diaspora community.

Fifth, some markers which I initially thought may be important and which were used as markers of identity in the survey did not turn out to be important for the participants. These include
identity markers related to entertainment, e.g., watching Bollywood films, Indian TV series and comedies, and listening to Indian radio. While some indicated that they had watched and listened to the various forms of entertainment listed above when younger, mostly as a result of their family doing so, participants did not generally identify these markers as constituting Indian identity for them. Their appreciation of these various forms of entertainment seems to be on a more global and international level (e.g., foreign entertainment, such as American), unlike their parents, many of whom still frequently enjoyed and regularly watched Indian films and TV and listened to Indian radio.

The participants in this study also expressed their local British, Singaporean, or South African identity through certain identity markers. Some identity markers that expressed their local identity were unanimously cited by all participants, e.g., birthplace and childhood years, whereas others were dependent on certain factors, such as gender (e.g., National Service among males in Singapore). In defining their local identity, references to and comparisons with Indians from India were constantly made. However, as seen with the identity marker ‘local English accent’, contrasts were also at times drawn with other local groups in their country. While their local English accent distinguished them from Indians from India, it also at times distinguished them from other locals in their country and revealed their ethnicity. Thus, it seems more accurate to speak of their identity not as Gujarati or Indian, but as Gujarati or Indian in the diaspora.

The findings in this chapter portray the difficulties in accurately measuring ethnic identity and reveal that simple statements about identity in surveys are not enough to fully understand this complex and multifaceted concept. I illustrate this point by taking an example from the Likert scale used in the identity section of the survey: For the ethnic identity measure “clothes”, Gujaratis in the diaspora probably will not choose to wear Indian clothes on a daily basis, but they may really enjoy wearing them from time to time. Given this complexity, what number on the Likert scale accurately represents this scenario? Similarly, with the ethnic identity measure “desserts”, Gujaratis in the diaspora may prefer an Indian dessert with an Indian meal, but they may not like an Indian dessert after having had fish and chips. Since identities are not monolithic or static, having to pick a definite answer for something that is multifaceted and/or fluid is not easy. Supplementing the quantitative data with qualitative interview data has therefore provided a more balanced overview of identity formation among Gujaratis in the diaspora, and further supports the need to undertake mixed method studies on identity.

While their ethnolinguistic vitality is strong, there is a likelihood that their distinct group identity will shift toward the mainstream culture in future generations, though certain factors, e.g., Gujarati School, will continue to reinforce and foster their ethnic cultural identity in the
diaspora context and thus delay the process of complete assimilation. The important role of the Gujarati School in passing on aspects of ethnic identity (e.g., language, culture, religion) is further seen when other environments, such as the home, are no longer able to do so (e.g., as seen among the locally-born parents in South Africa, who are not able to transmit the heritage language to their children). Furthermore, this chapter has highlighted the differences in acculturation and assimilation into the host society. These differences are influenced by a number of external factors, e.g., the country’s history, including history and current impact of racism; its policies concerning schooling and the treatment of ethnic minorities, and the particular composition and concentration of different ethnic groups in each different country, which in turn have an impact on the identity formation and development of these individuals.

Struggles that Gujaratis in diaspora face as they try to negotiate competing mainstream and ethnic cultural ideas highlight and reinforce the statement that they are “not completely like their parents, nor completely like their white peers” (Bhatti, 1999, p. 238). Through ethnic self-identification and cultural adaptation, they attempt to make sense of their unique position in the diaspora and create a sense of belonging, sometimes successfully and at other times unsuccessfully, by adopting a fluid, multi-faceted and at times contradictory identity.
Chapter 6

Factors affecting Heritage Language Maintenance and Proficiency

6.1 Introduction

Immigrant communities are faced with the challenge of maintaining their native languages. With each new generation born in the host country, maintaining heritage languages can become increasingly difficult. This difficulty arises from a number of factors. The longer a community is in the diaspora, the lower the likelihood of intergenerational language transmission, the fewer ties and contacts they may have with the native land, and the greater the need and incentive to learn the language of the host society (e.g., for professional, economic, and social reasons), to name a few. Factors such as these lead to decreased language use, which in turn trigger language shift.

Researchers have identified a number of factors which generally influence heritage language proficiency and successful language maintenance and transmission among immigrant communities. These include frequency of or opportunities in language use, the home environment, birth order, speaker generation, socioeconomic class, social networks, language attitudes, motivation, ethnic identity, to name a few (see Sections 2.4.1 and 2.6 for a detailed overview). Some of these factors were found to be important in the current study as well, as discussed in detail in Chapters 4 and 5.

This chapter combines the results of the qualitative and quantitative analyses and discusses the factors which are pertinent to language maintenance and language proficiency among young
Gujaratis in the U.K., Singapore, and South Africa. Any discrepancies which arise between qualitative and quantitative findings are also examined. Furthermore, this chapter seeks to explain the reasons for the differences in language proficiencies in the three locations: why Singaporean Gujaratis have the highest average proficiency in Gujarati and South African Gujaratis the lowest. This chapter ends with a discussion on the future of Gujarati in the three diaspora contexts.

Table 6.1 presents a summary of the main qualitative and quantitative findings of this study regarding which factors proved to have a significant/important effect on participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency\(^1\) and those which were found to be insignificant/unimportant. Some of these factors were initially presented in Chapter 4, and some are introduced here. The summary is followed by detailed discussion of the various factors, with a focus on those determined to be significant/important. For the purposes of this study, the factors affecting language proficiency have been artificially separated out into individual variables (e.g., age, gender, birth order, school status, etc.); however, as demonstrated by the analysis of the data presented in this chapter, the factors often intersect (e.g., birth order tends to correlate inversely with still being in Gujarati School for some participants). Because ‘identity’ was discussed in detail in Chapter 5 and because it was found to not always have a direct bearing on language maintenance and proficiency, the discussion in this chapter generally focuses on factors other than identity per se. However, identity also intersects with the other factors under consideration and so has more of an impact than is obvious from the examination of the various factors in isolation from one another. I return to more direct consideration of identity in Chapter 7, when final conclusions regarding Gujarati proficiency and maintenance are drawn.

Table 6.1: Main factors affecting participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity (Chapter 5)</td>
<td>Connections between ethnic identity and heritage language proficiency were made by British and Singaporean participants, but not by South African participants.</td>
<td>Somewhat significant. Significant positive correlation with the identity markers ‘clothes’ and ‘music’ in the U.K. Not significant in Singapore and SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency was determined by an oral proficiency test consisting of 7 questions which participants answered in Gujarati (see Section 3.11.3 for more information).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Generation</td>
<td>Fishman’s (1972) three generation model of language shift applies to the Gujarati community in the U.K. and South Africa, and somewhat applies to the Gujarati community in Singapore.</td>
<td>Qualitative analyses supported by quantitative findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 6.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Country of Origin       | South Africans described their proficiency in Gujarati as lower than Singaporean and British participants. | Singapore: significant positive correlation  
                           |                                                                                      | South Africa: significant negative correlation  
                           |                                                                                      | U.K.: not significant |
| (Section 6.2)           |                                                                                      |                                                                                       |
| Language Use in the Home| Using Gujarati in the home was connected with high proficiency in Gujarati.          | Significant                                                                            |
| (Section 6.3)           |                                                                                      |                                                                                       |
| Language Use in the Home: Grandparents (Section 6.3.1) | Grandparents, especially grandmothers, played a vital role in language transmission and maintenance, though the presence of any non-English speaking grandparent in the home significantly increased the likelihood of participants learning the heritage language at home. | Not significant                                                                        |
| Language Use in the Home: Parents (Section 6.3.2) | Parents, especially in the U.K. and Singapore, seem to play an important role in language transmission and maintenance. The use of Gujarati by parents (influenced by factors such as parents’ birthplace, gender, occupation, length of time in the diaspora, and marriage patterns) substantially increases the probability that participants will attain higher proficiency in Gujarati. | Parents’ L1: not significant  
                           |                                                                                      | Parents’ birthplace (i.e., India or not India): significant  
                           |                                                                                      | Language which the mother uses to address her child: significant  
                           |                                                                                      | (significant correlation with language proficiency and significant predictor of language proficiency)  
                           |                                                                                      | Language which the father uses to address his child: not significant  
<pre><code>                       |                                                                                      | Language which the participant uses to address his/her parents: significant |
</code></pre>
<p>| Language Use in the Home: Siblings (Section 6.3.3) | English was the dominant language used among siblings, and thus the presence of siblings did not aid in language transmission and maintenance. | Language which the participant uses to address siblings, and vice versa: not significant |
|                         |                                                                                      |                                                                                       |
|                         | Continued on next page                                                                |                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Use with Gujarati Friends</td>
<td>English was the dominant language used with Gujarati friends, and therefore Gujarati friends were described as not playing a role in heritage language proficiency.</td>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address Gujarati friends: significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use in Other Domains</td>
<td>Gujarati was generally used in solidarity-stressing and private domains, e.g., in the home (predominantly for domestic matters, e.g., related to discussions involving food, but not education, politics, etc.), religion, culture, and in one status-stressing and public domain, the media. Being actively used in certain domains restricts various aspects of language use (e.g., lexical knowledge), which in turn impacts general language proficiency and fluency.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 6.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Other Languages</td>
<td>Knowing Hindi was described by some as helping them to learn Gujarati, though others disagreed and indicated that knowing Hindi caused their Gujarati to deteriorate and made it less ‘pure’.</td>
<td>Knowledge of other North Indian languages: significant positive correlation and significant predictor of language proficiency Knowledge of country’s official language(s) besides English: significant negative correlation and significant negative predictor of language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 6.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Younger participants generally had better proficiency in Gujarati than older participants, due to a number of factors, some of which are related to other factors considered in this study: a) they had not started their main school, b) they were living at home, c) they were attending Gujarati School, and d) their grandparents were still alive. These factors provided them with more opportunities to use and practice the language.</td>
<td>Significant correlation, i.e., younger participants had better proficiency in Gujarati than older participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 6.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2N/A indicates that the variable in question was not included in the survey questionnaire from which the quantitative findings are derived.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>No mention by any of the participants that gender might impact proficiency levels.</td>
<td>Not significant: Females did not have higher proficiency than males.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>First-born children had higher proficiency in Gujarati than later-born siblings. Participants without siblings generally had a higher level of proficiency in Gujarati than those with siblings. Qualitative analyses supported by quantitative findings in more than half of the cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ First Language</td>
<td>Increased likelihood of more Gujarati use and higher proficiency among those who had used Gujarati in early years.</td>
<td>Significant positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., language spoken before beginning primary school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Residence</td>
<td>Growing up in areas with a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians meant more daily exposure to Gujarati and more occasions to use and practice the language outside the home and Gujarati School, which in turn was described by some to contribute to language fluency. The data suggest that there may be a strong negative correlation between not living in Indian residential areas and language proficiency. Qualitative analyses not supported by quantitative findings, since participants displayed a range of abilities in Gujarati, despite the majority of participants growing up in areas with a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 6.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips and Ties to India</td>
<td>Singaporean participants maintained close ties to India and made regular trips to India; British and South African participants less so. Trips to India provided opportunities to use Gujarati and played an important role in language maintenance. Such trips also increased a sense of importance of Gujarati and belonging among participants and encouraged them to continue to improve and maintain skills in the language. Qualitative analyses somewhat supported by quantitative findings, since Singaporean participants had a higher average proficiency score than British and Singaporean participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 6.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Qualitative Findings</td>
<td>Quantitative Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward Gujarati (Section 6.10)</td>
<td>Attitudes toward Gujarati ranged from positive to negative. Positive attitudes resulted in a greater likelihood of increased language use and consequently higher proficiency, whereas negative attitudes generally had the opposite effect.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati School (Section 6.11)</td>
<td>Gujarati School was generally viewed as playing a central role in language transmission and maintenance. Gujarati School was an especially important place for gaining literacy skills in Gujarati, though Gujarati School also aided in refining spoken skills.</td>
<td>Number of years studying Gujarati at Gujarati School: significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Status (Section 6.11)</td>
<td>Gujarati skills were reinforced through Gujarati School, especially literacy skills. Recent graduates generally felt that their Gujarati proficiency had been higher when they were Gujarati School students.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use: Additional Work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School (Section 6.11.1)</td>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School ranged from writing letters to grandparents to private tutoring sessions. Such activities were described as enhancing language proficiency.</td>
<td>Significant positive correlation and significant predictor of language proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued on next page*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reasons for Studying Gujarati (Section 6.11.2) | Various reasons given as to why participants studied Gujarati at Gujarati School, ranging from linguistic reasons to cultural or religious reasons, and ranging from others (e.g., parents) wanting them to study the language to the participants themselves wanting to study Gujarati. Their reasons for studying Gujarati affected how they viewed the usefulness of Gujarati, and hence influenced their language use, which in turn impacted their proficiency levels. | Parents’ wish that their child studies Gujarati: not significant  
To aid in communication with grandparents: not significant  
Part of being Indian means that one should be able to speak, read, and write in Gujarati well: significant  
To have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati: significant positive correlation and significant predictor  
To understand one’s roots/origins: not significant  
To make new friends: significant positive correlation and significant predictor  
To organize and take part in cultural and religious events: significant negative correlation  
To have Gujarati on one’s CV: significant predictor  
Other reasons (i.e., not already listed on the survey)³: significant predictor |

Table 6.1 illustrates a number of factors which affected participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency. The summary table highlights the value of conducting a mixed methods study. Some factors were only quantitatively found to affect participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency, whereas others were only qualitatively found to do so. Such contradictions would not have been fully captured through the use of one method only. Only one factor, ‘gender’, was found to be neither quantitatively significant nor qualitatively important in explaining variations in heritage language proficiency. I therefore do not discuss gender below.

In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss in more detail the factors listed in the table above.

³Other reasons include Gujarati being an ‘easy’ subject to obtain high scores in, a national qualification in Gujarati increasing the chances of obtaining admission into university, receiving one’s guru’s aghna (spiritual teacher’s command) that one should be able to speak fluent Gujarati in order to gain his rajipoor (agreement), and needing an after-school activity like Gujarati classes because parents were working and no one was therefore at home to take care of the student in the afternoons.
6.2 Speaker Generation and Country of Origin

Intergenerational language transmission is key to language maintenance. If a language is not actively passed on from one generation to the next, there is a high likelihood of language shift taking place. The three generation model of language shift, originally proposed by Fishman (1972), summarizes the stages of language shift among immigrant populations, i.e., from the native language of immigrants (their L1) to the dominant language of the host society (their L2). As mentioned in Chapter 2, for the purposes of this study, the various generations of immigrants are defined as follows: First generation immigrants are those who left their home country and immigrated to a host country. Second generation refers to those who are born in the host country and have at least one foreign-born parent. Third generation immigrants represent locally born children of locally born parents, who have at least one foreign-born grandparent. According to Fishman’s model of language shift, first generation immigrants continue to speak their native language while learning the language of their host country, second generation immigrants grow up bilingually but become more fluent in the language of the host country, and third generation immigrants are monolingual in the host country’s language and have little or no ability in the language of their grandparents.

The results of the study in this dissertation confirm the validity of Fishman’s (1972) three generation model of language shift. It greatly applies to the Gujarati community in the U.K. and South Africa, and seems to somewhat apply to the Gujarati community in Singapore.

In the U.K., all participants with the exception of one were born in the U.K. and were second generation British Gujaratis. The one participant who was not born in the U.K. moved there from Kenya before the age of 5 and can therefore be labeled 1.75 generation (see Rumbaut, 2004, p. 1167). Apart from one mother who was born in the U.K., the parents of all the British participants were from Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, or Madagascar) or India, and had migrated to the U.K. from the 1960s onwards, and all parents, except the mothers of two participants, were L1 Gujarati speakers. British Gujarati participants had a mean objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency score of 15.04 units (out of 25) and all spoke English fluently (as displayed in the follow-up interview with me). They can therefore be considered proficient in both Gujarati and English, though the extent of their language ability in Gujarati varied, with some being more fluent in Gujarati than others. Gujarati oral proficiency scores ranged from extremely low (1.5 units out of 25) to very high (22 units out of 25), though an overwhelmingly large number of participants displayed strong abilities in the language: Thirty seven participants had scores which were above 50% (i.e., more than 12.5 units out of 25), two scored 50% (12.5 units out of 25), and nine had scores below 50% (i.e., less than 12.5 units out of 25). While the second generation were proficient
in both English and Gujarati, a shift seems to be taking place with the new (i.e., third) generation of British Gujaratis. Sagar, a former student and a current teacher at the Oshwal Gujarati School, describes the language shift that he is witnessing:

The important distinction to make is that when we were young, I think Gujarati for me was- it was a second language. It was almost like a bilingual thing, because your parents were- I think our parents were brought up in Kenya or something and they were speaking at home, whereas for the generation that I’m teaching now, even though they are just ten years younger, there’s a crucial difference that their parents are in their thirties or forties and I think their parents were born in the U.K. and so therefore their-Gujarati to them is kind of a second/foreign language. Definitely for the students now, it’s turned from being a kind of a second language to a foreign language now. (Sagar, UK)

From the data that are available (i.e., for the second generation), Fishman’s three generation model of language shift seems to apply, with participants being proficient in both English and Gujarati, though increasingly more fluent in English and less so in Gujarati. While no data are available for the third generation, Sagar’s comment above seems to suggest that Gujarati is transitioning from a first language to a second language to a foreign language within three generations. However, no concrete conclusions can be drawn about the language abilities of the third generation, since all the British participants in this study were second generation.

In South Africa, all participants were born in South Africa, and were second, third, or fourth generation South African Gujaratis, with the majority being third generation. In three cases both parents were born in India, in eleven cases one parent was born in South Africa and the other in India, and in twenty-three cases both parents were born in South Africa. The vast majority of the participants cited English as their mother tongue (L1) and generally had lower objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati (average proficiency: 13.16 units out of 25) than the British and Singaporean Gujaratis (average proficiency: 15.04 units out of 25 and 17.62 units out of 25, respectively). Their oral proficiency scores ranged from low (6.5 units out of 25) to very high (23 units out of 25), though only about half of the participants (19) had scores which were above 50% (i.e., more than 12.5 units out of 25), and these included the three South African participants whose parents were both born in India. Two participants scored 50% (12.5 units out of 25) and sixteen had scores below 50% (i.e., less than 12.5 units out of 25). These findings are not surprising, given that English was the language often used by parents (the majority of whom were second generation) to communicate with their children, and as a result the participants had a more limited exposure to the Gujarati language (often only at Gujarati School and with monolingual grandparents) than the Singaporean and British participants. Based on these findings, Fishman’s three generation model of language shift seems to apply, since the participants (about two-thirds
of whom are third and subsequent generation) are more proficient in English and generally have little ability in the language of their ancestors.

In Singapore, participants were second and subsequent generation. The participants were second generation from either the maternal or paternal line, but often third, fourth, or fifth generation from the other line. Only three participants had two locally born parents. In one case, the participant was sixth generation on his maternal side and his maternal ancestors were among the first Gujaratis to come to Singapore. The situation in Singapore is in stark contrast to the one found in South Africa, where the number of cases where both parents were born in South Africa greatly outnumbered the number of cases where one parent was locally born and the other was born in India. This difference can be explained by the size of the Gujarati population in both countries. While Gujaratis are a minority community in both countries, the actual number of Gujaratis differs greatly. In Singapore, there are 3,260 Gujaratis according to the 2000 Singapore Census (Leow, 2001, cited in Mehta, 2009, p. 303) and in South Africa, there are about 11 times as many Gujaratis, i.e., about 36,000 Gujaratis (cf. U. K. Desai, 1997, p. 1). As a result of the smaller Gujarati population in Singapore, the number of potential marriage candidates within the Singapore Gujarati community is smaller and therefore many choose to marry a Gujarati from overseas, often India. As Tina explains, marrying a Gujarati from Singapore “somehow ... doesn’t work here”:

I think the community here is too small ... A lot of Gujaratis in Malaysia get married to Gujaratis in Malaysia ... but somehow it doesn’t work here. The Gujaratis here do not get married to each other ... It’s very small, you kind of know each other, there are not even that many guys or girls to begin with. But then again, you see, I’m friends with all the Guju (slang for Gujarati) boys, but I wouldn’t think of going out with them ... The Gujarati boys here either get married out of caste or they find girls from India ... Now the girls over here usually go abroad if they get married to Gujus or they don’t get married to Gujus. (Tina, Singapore)

Objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency was on average very high for the Singaporean participants (mean score of 17.62 units out of 25). With the majority of the participants being second generation Gujaratis and with one parent often being from India, and often an L1 speaker of Gujarati, language was more likely to be transmitted successfully to the next generation. Also, with one parent from India, more trips on average were made to India by Singaporean participants than British and South African participants. These trips provided them with the opportunity to visit grandparents and relatives, and also to enhance their Gujarati language proficiency (see Section 6.9 for more information about the importance of trips and ties to India). While the majority of the Singaporean participants were second generation Gujaratis, even the three participants who were third generation received very high scores in the oral proficiency test, which seems to suggest
that Fishman’s three generation model of language shift might not necessarily be applicable in Singapore, though not all participants in Singapore agree: “This is quite a westernized world, so over here, usually the third or fourth generation overseas are not usually very into speaking Gujarati” (Raj, Singapore).

Speaker generation seems to be an important variable in accounting for the variations in language proficiency. The second generation U.K. participants were proficient in both English and Gujarati, though their abilities in Gujarati varied, and English was generally considered to be their stronger language. The South African participants, the majority of whom were third generation, were more proficient in English than Gujarati and most cited English as their mother tongue. The second generation (and the few third generation) Singaporean participants were proficient in both English and Gujarati, and on average their abilities in Gujarati were slightly higher than the second generation British participants. This difference in proficiency seems to be due to factors other than just generation, e.g., birthplace of parents, trips to India, the role of national attitudes, acceptance of minority languages in schools in the three locations, etc. This demonstrates, as noted above, that the various factors are not always independent, but rather that they often interact. What is clear from the findings in this section is that language shift seems to be taking place in all three countries, though at a slower rate in Singapore than in South Africa and the U.K.

6.3 Home Environment

The home is considered one of the main environments for mother tongue maintenance. As noted by Clyne and Kipp (1999), “the home has often been cited as a key element in language maintenance – if a language is not maintained in the home domain, then it cannot be maintained elsewhere” (p. 47). Similarly, Canagarajah (2008) illustrates the importance of the family in heritage language maintenance through his study on the Tamil community in the U.S., U.K., and Canada. According to his study, many feel that the failure of the family to transmit the language has led to the current low levels of proficiency among the youngest generation. In the following sections, I discuss the family composition of Gujaratis in each of the three locations and how this influences language use patterns in the home and the transmission of Gujarati to the next generation. In particular, I discuss the role that grandparents, parents, and siblings play in Gujarati language transmission and maintenance.
6.3.1 Grandparents

Gujarati households are traditionally composed of three generations. This practice stems from an established strong sense of responsibility toward both parents and children (Elliott & Gray, 2000). However, this traditional living arrangement is starting to become less common (Wenger et al., 2003). In my study, 90% of the participants were currently living at home with their parents. 35% of these participants reported that their grandparents were also currently living in their family home. Three generational households were most common in Singapore, followed closely by South Africa, and least common in the U.K. The survey did not capture information on those who had at some point in their lives lived with their grandparents.

Many of the participants’ grandparents tended to be predominantly monolingual Gujarati speakers, who had no or very little command of English. Only in South Africa, several participants stated that their grandparents spoke to them in English. In general, if one of the grandparents had a higher command of English than the other, it was usually the male. This is probably due to females having often received less education than males and generally being considered as homemakers. As a result, they had minimal need and opportunities to learn and use English when they were younger. Thus grandmothers in general had a more important role than grandfathers in Gujarati heritage language transmission. However, already the presence of any non-English speaking grandparent in the home was described as significantly increasing the likelihood of participants learning the heritage language at home. This finding is supported in previous research as well (see, for example, Ishizawa, 2004). Grandparents, especially grandmothers, were reported to help children with Gujarati School homework and to help them to prepare for national examinations in Gujarati. In her interview with me, Radhika (UK) explained how she received a grade ‘D’ in her mock GCSE Gujarati examination and how her grandfather then worked with her for a whole year to help her prepare for the actual GCSE examination in Gujarati, for which she obtained an ‘A*’. Similarly, in her interview with me, Dimple (UK) described how her parents who could speak Gujarati fluently could not help her with her Gujarati School homework, since they could not read and write in Gujarati. Instead it was her grandmother, who lives at home with her and her parents, who always helped her with her Gujarati homework. Dimple’s case is not uncommon. Factors such as former national language policies may have prevented many of the parents from becoming literate in Gujarati, even though they may be able to speak the language fluently.

Speaking Gujarati with elders, such as grandparents, is associated with respect. With most Gujarati grandparents generally having a poor command of English, grandchildren tended to use more or only Gujarati with them, so that their grandparents could understand them in the lan-
guage in which they felt most comfortable. Participants also described Gujarati as being a more respectful language, with various forms of polite greetings, e.g., *Jai Jinendra*, a Jain greeting. Furthermore, Gujarati makes a T-V distinction (R. Brown & Gilman, 1960), meaning that there is a polite/familiar distinction for the second person singular you, namely *tu* (familiar you) and *tame* (polite you). Modern-day English does not make such a distinction. Participants commented on how it would sound rude to address elders, such as their grandparents, with you. By using Gujarati, grandchildren were also able to demonstrate to their grandparents that the Indian culture was still very much present in them, despite having been born and brought up outside of India. Those who had a lower proficiency in Gujarati described a language barrier existing between them and their grandparents, especially when their grandparents were monolingual Gujarati speakers. This led to a weaker relationship being formed and developed between the two groups, as the grandchildren were able to only have minimal verbal interactions with grandparents. Several of these participants reported that their verbal communications with grandparents consisted of conversations which involved the same sentences and structures each time: “With my grandma, it’s obviously like I kind of say the same things, often it’s very colloquial Gujarati” (Heena, UK). Mixing the languages when addressing grandparents was common among the participants, especially among those who were not fully fluent in Gujarati.

Grandparents occasionally played a role in bringing up their grandchildren. This was to a great extent the case in the U.K., where there was less of a tendency to have stay-at-home mothers. In such cases, the grandchildren were either brought up by their grandparents or taken to their grandparents’ house after school while their parents worked. Consequently, grandparents were described as being important figures not only in helping to maintain language, but also to uphold other aspects of Indian culture and tradition:

I grew up with my *dadi* (paternal grandmother) and everything I learnt from her, you know, from the little bit of cooking, from how to speak, how to clean, I learnt everything from her. And because she doesn’t speak a lot of English, the Gujarati improved on its own. (Ishani, UK)

Ishani and others described how they feel that it is important for females to live with their in-laws after marriage. In this study, three participants, two females (aged 26 and 28) and one male (aged 29), were already married and one female participant (aged 27) was two weeks away from getting married at the time of the interview. All the female participants chose to live with their in-laws. While Poonam does not particularly get along with her in-laws, one of the reasons that Poonam and her husband chose to live with Poonam’s in-laws was language-related, highlighting again the important role that grandparents play in transmitting the heritage language to the grandchildren:
I think I like the idea of living with your in-laws, but ... I don’t get on with my in-laws, especially my mother-in-law, in the same way that I get on with my parents ... I think it’s just not practical [financially to live in our own house] ... and also so that the mother-in-law is around to look after the kids as well and to speak Gujarati. (Poonam, UK)

If grandparents did not live in the grandchildren’s home, they may have lived with another family member close by and hence the grandchildren would still see them often. Many commented that their grandparents lived only a 5-minute walk away, which is not surprising, since many of the Gujarati families were found to be living in the same area in all three sites (see Section 6.8). However, not all participants had grandparents living with them or even in the same country as them. For those who had grandparents living overseas, grandchildren maintained ties by calling them or by writing letters. However, a few of these overseas grandparents would regularly come and stay with the participants and their families for an extended period of time (e.g., several months a year).

In short, many participants described a strong need and desire to know Gujarati to communicate with grandparents. Grandparents were described as playing a major role in helping to maintain their Gujarati proficiency. Some participants, however, expressed regret that this trend is already slowly changing:

As far as our generation is concerned, unless the grandparents remain active, and also make a point of speaking in Gujarati, I don’t think children will speak it, because increasingly you see like the young bas (grandmothers) and bapujis (grandfathers) and stuff sort of the younger generation, they’ll converse in English and as soon as the grandchild knows that their grandparents can speak English, that’s it, they’re going to speak in English. (Jayni, UK)

While no statistically significant results between living in a three-generational household and objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency were reported in Chapter 4, it is important to note that these results only capture those who are currently living with their grandparents; they do not capture those who lived with their grandparents at an earlier age and whose grandparents may now have passed away, those whose grandparents spend a considerable amount of time every year living at home with them, and those whose grandparents live very close by and whom they therefore have the possibility to visit frequently. From the qualitative data, the vital role that grandparents played in transmitting Gujarati and maintaining proficiency in the language was mentioned time and time again:

My oral skills were there because I was at home with my grandparents. Aajee (today) I see these kids, there are some kids ke je ghare bole che (that if they speak at home), you can see, when they open their mouths, you can see, you know, that they speak Gujarati at home. (Ishani, UK)
Regarding speaking, I can only speak fluent Gujarati because I lived with my grandmother for 25 years. (Poonam, UK)

6.3.2 Parents

Parents’ decisions about their own language use in the home affects their child’s language acquisition (Pauwels, 2008). Various scholars have found parental language use to be a major contributing factor in language maintenance (Hakuta & D’Andrea, 1992; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Veltman, 1981). While the presence of any non-English speaking member in the household (parents, grandparents, other adults) increases the likelihood of a child speaking a non-English language, it is the parents who have the strongest effect (Mukadam, 2003; Stevens, 1985). Furthermore, research has shown that the sole use of the minority language in the home is more effective in language maintenance efforts than using two languages: “If a mother or a father chooses to use both languages with the child ... the chances of the child becoming actively bilingual are not great” (Sirèn, 1991, p.160).

Language use patterns among Gujarati parents when conversing with their children fell on a continuum: only English on one end of the continuum and only Gujarati on the other end. While the survey examines which language parents mainly use to speak to participants (English or Gujarati), some participants chose the ‘other’ option and reported both languages. However, in their discussions with me, an overwhelmingly larger number of participants in all three sites described their parents mixing English and Gujarati in conversations with them, though to varying degrees.

Some general differences in parental language use patterns emerged. First, South African households were described on the whole by participants as being more English-speaking than British and Singaporean households. This can probably be explained by the fact that there were more cases of both parents being locally born in South Africa and that parents from India generally used more Gujarati with their children than locally born parents. Locally born parents were described by participants as having lower proficiency in Gujarati, as a result of more exposure to local languages, such as English, and also due to past national language policies, e.g., locally born Singaporean parents were able to only take Chinese, Malay, or Tamil for their Mother Tongue (‘MT’) requirement, with most taking Malay, as Gujarati was not recognized as a MT subject until 1995.

Second, survey responses indicate that more mothers used Gujarati with their children than fathers did. This finding is significant in accounting for variations in objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency among the participants. Quantitative findings indicate that there is a positive
relationship between the language which the mother uses to address her children and the child’s objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in that language.

Third, stay-at-home mothers, most common in South Africa and Singapore, were generally described by participants as having a lower proficiency in English probably as a result of less exposure to local society and hence less contact with people from other ethnic groups. They thus tended to use more Gujarati when speaking to their children.

Fourth, language use patterns changed with time in many cases, with parents using more English the older the child became. A number of factors contributed to this trend. These include: a) a longer length of time spent in the diaspora leading to increased exposure to English for the parents born in India, and b) children’s proficiency in Gujarati decreasing with age (see Section 6.6) and parents therefore accommodating to their child’s linguistic needs. This also explains the discrepancies between parents’ mother tongue language (their L1) and their language use with children. Since their L1 may often not be the language they use in communication with their children, it is not surprising that variations in objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency cannot be explained by parents’ L1 (as indicated by the quantitative findings).

Fifth, parental marriage patterns seem to have an impact on language maintenance and language use. Research has shown that children of ethnically exogamous marriages are less likely to speak a non-English language than those of ethnically endogamous marriages (Stevens, 1985). Only one participant in my sample of heritage language learners had parents who did not have the same ethnicity and same mother tongue languages. In her case, one parent was Gujarati and the other was Japanese, and both parents spoke to her and her siblings in English. In addition, three participants had parents who were both Indian, but in each of these three cases, one parent was from the Malayalam community and the other was from the Gujarati community. In these three cases, both parents also spoke to their children in English.

While some participants reported mixing the two languages when communicating with their parents, just like many of the parents did, most claimed that they used more English in their speech than their parents. There were many cases reported by participants in which participants replied to parents in English, even when their parents predominantly spoke to them in Gujarati. Some general patterns in language use among the participants when addressing their parents emerged. Participants described speaking more Gujarati with parents born in India than with locally born parents. Similar findings have been reported by Stevens (1985) who describes that children living with one or two foreign-born parents are more likely to learn a non-English language than those with native-born parents. In some cases, participants had a higher proficiency in Gujarati than their parents as a result of factors like Gujarati School, which some of the parents did not
have an opportunity to attend during their childhood. More Gujarati was used when talking to grandparents than when talking to parents, since most parents were described as being somewhat, if not fully, proficient in both languages, leading the participants to perceive less of a need to speak in Gujarati with them. Participants reported speaking more Gujarati with their mothers than fathers. Similar findings for second generation British Gujaratis have also been described in Mukadam (2003, p. 304). Speaking Gujarati with parents is significant in accounting for variations in objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency among participants. Quantitative findings indicate that there is a positive relationship between participants using Gujarati when addressing their parents and objectively evaluated spoken heritage language proficiency. In fact, speaking Gujarati with their mother is a significant predictor of participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency. Finally, language use patterns with parents depended on factors such as the topic of conversation (e.g., school-related conversations generally took place in English, whereas food-related conversations typically occurred in Gujarati) and the situation at hand. One participant describes how she would probably use Gujarati if she wanted something from her parents. Another participant describes how she switches from Gujarati into English when she is arguing with her mother: “My mum isn’t very fluent in English, so 99% of our conversation goes on in Gujarati, except when I want to argue with her and I don’t know how to argue in Gujarati, so I just talk in English” (Nima, Singapore). See Section 6.5 for a more in-depth discussion on the ways in which language use is dependent on conversational topic, purpose, tone, and a number of other factors.

Some participants described their wish that more Gujarati would be spoken in the home. One South African participant, who wrote “I can hardly speak Gujarati” on the survey, told me the following:

One of my friends in the class is from Kerala ... If I phone her and her parents are talking to her, she can speak to them fluently in, I think it’s Malayalam. And then I feel bad, I can’t do that in Gujarati ... I think if my granny spoke to me in Gujarati, or even if my parents, like a little bit at a time, it would have been better. (Anita, SA)

In some of these cases, it was the participants who took the initiative to ensure that more Gujarati would be used in the home. One participant describes how she was inspired to enforce a Gujarati-only rule in her home as a result of two factors: 1) visits to the home of one of her Gujarati friends, where parents played an active role in encouraging the use of Gujarati among their children, and b) her strong belief in religion, where her guru (spiritual teacher) promotes Gujarati use only.

Speaking the home language was described as having an impact on the closeness and intimacy between parents and children: “I talk to my parents in Gujarati only, and that’s kind of helped
strengthen my relationship with them too” (Sagar, UK). The detrimental effects of not using the home language when this is the language in which parents can most adequately communicate is described as being a contributing factor in feeling more emotionally distant from parents and being less likely to engage in conversations with them (see also Tseng & Fuligni, 2000, p. 473, who report similar findings):

There’s nothing I have in common with my mum ... We are just two different people. She won’t, you know, she won’t like the things I like to do, like we can’t go out and watch a movie together, because she doesn’t understand English as much as I do and I don’t understand Hindi like she does. But even then, she’s not really the cinema type of person. Erm, we don’t go out to eat, because she’s a vegan and she doesn’t like to eat outside anyway, so there’s just like this cultural gap, generational gap, and I think she does feel like there is something wrong, that I’ve changed or whatever, but I don’t think she really understands that it’s not really that I’ve changed, it’s just that we don’t really have much in common, and I suppose one of it is that, you know, I don’t speak Gujarati. (Seema, UK)

In conclusion, parents seem to play an important role in language transmission and maintenance, as indicated by the quantitative findings, and as further supported by the qualitative data. The extent of this varies with location, with parents in South Africa being less important figures in language transmission than parents in the U.K. and Singapore. Some key concluding points can be drawn from the discussion in this section. Parents were generally described as having higher proficiency in Gujarati and as using more Gujarati than children (though a few exceptions exist). The likelihood of parents using Gujarati is influenced by a number of factors, including the parents’ birthplace, gender, occupation, length of time in the diaspora, and marriage patterns. The use of Gujarati by parents substantially increases the likelihood of their child learning and using Gujarati at home, which in turn leads to a greater probability that participants will attain higher proficiency in Gujarati.

6.3.3 Siblings

Quantitative findings indicate that there is no statistically significant relationship between objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency and language use with siblings, meaning that variations in participants’ objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency cannot be explained by the language used in communication with siblings. On closer inspection of the data, it can be seen that the vast majority of participants (94%) generally only used English to speak to their siblings. This was the case in all three countries and with participants of all ages. (See also Canagarajah, 2008 who notes similar findings among the Tamil diaspora communities in the U.S., U.K., and Canada.) While English was the dominant language used in conversation with siblings, there may have been certain words, such as cultural terms, e.g., darshan (prayer), or words which they did not
know the English term for, e.g., *laddoo* (an Indian sweet), which participants uttered in Gujarati when conversing with their siblings. Several participants from all three sites noted that the only times they would use Gujarati with their siblings was as a joke or when they wanted to say something which they did not want others (i.e., non-Gujaratis) to understand. In sum, English was the dominant language used among siblings, and thus the presence of siblings did not aid in language transmission and maintenance. While the presence of siblings could have contributed to lower objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati, it did not correlate with lower objectively evaluated spoken proficiency scores. For more information about the role of siblings in heritage language maintenance, see the discussion about only child vs. child with siblings in Section 6.7.

### 6.4 Language Use with Gujarati Friends

The phrase ‘Gujarati friends’ refers to friends of the participants who are the locally born (i.e., born in the U.K., Singapore or South Africa) and whose origin can be traced to Gujarat. It does not refer to those who migrated directly from Gujarat. Similar to the findings presented above on language use with siblings, English was also the dominant language used by participants when communicating with Gujarati friends. Gujarati friends were therefore described in the interviews as not playing a role in heritage language proficiency. No participant reported speaking only in Gujarati with Gujarati friends. A small number (9 participants out of 135) used both languages to address Gujarati friends, while the remaining 126 participants used only English. Reasons for using both languages were similar to the reasons for speaking Gujarati with siblings: using Gujarati to joke or to say something which should not be understood by non-Gujaratis. Interestingly, and contrary to qualitative findings, there is a statistically significant relationship between objectively evaluated spoken heritage language proficiency and language use with Gujarati friends, meaning that variations in participants’ objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency can be explained by the language used in communication with Gujarati friends. While qualitative data may be used to support, confirm, and help explain the patterns in the quantitative results, here we observe a case where the two types of data illustrate contradictions. The reason for this discrepancy is not clear. A possible explanation is that survey participants may have misunderstood the intended meaning of the term ‘Gujarati friends’, believing it to refer to people who migrated directly from India.
6.5 Language Use in Other Domains

The use of Gujarati in the diaspora is confined to certain domains. As indicated in Section 6.3, a commonly cited domain for Gujarati language use was the home. This was more the case among the British and Singaporean participants than the South African participants. However, it is not always the sole language used. Often the topic of conversation determines which language will be used, Gujarati being reserved in many cases for more domestic matters:

At times, [I speak] purely in English [with my parents] ... But the interesting thing is that anything to do with food will always be in Gujarati. So anything sort of in the domestic sphere, I think, is done in Gujarati. (Jayni, UK)

Many participants commented that at times they only knew the Gujarati words for certain common Indian grocery items, including pulses (i.e., grain legumes) and cereals (e.g., channa no lot – gram flour), vegetables and fruits (e.g., ringra – eggplant), and nuts and condiments (e.g., methi – fenugreek). Some of these Indian grocery items are solely used in Indian cooking, and the words for such items were passed down to participants from a young age by female family members, especially mothers and grandmothers. One South African participant also mentioned how her Gujarati reading skills were reinforced in the kitchen through certain common Indian grocery items, such as spices, being labeled by her mother in Gujarati. While Gujarati is often used in conversations related to food and other domestic matters (i.e., matters related to the private sphere), English was preferred for matters related to the public sphere, such as politics, or for more abstract intellectual or philosophical conversations:

Increasingly I talk about quite serious things with my parents. Especially with my dad, we like to discuss politics and all of that kind of stuff. And I don’t have the command in Gujarati to do that, so when we are discussing intellectual things, I just can’t do that in Gujarati. But I never discuss anything highly intellectual with my grandparents, so it’s fine to communicate in Gujarati [with them]. (Jayni, UK)

English was also the language generally used in conversations related to education, as the participants all underwent their schooling in English and so words or concepts related to education were often not known in Gujarati.

Another domain in which Gujarati was frequently used was the religious domain. This was more the case among the British and South African participants than the Singaporean participants. Indian greetings were religiously uttered in Gujarati, e.g., namaste, used by the Hindu Gujarati participants in South Africa when greeting fellow Hindu Gujarati people. This was the case even if households were predominantly English-speaking. Prayers, such as the naukar mantra (one of the most important Jain mantras), were learnt, memorized, and uttered in Gujarati from a young age by all the British Jain participants. Sometimes the meaning of the actual words in
the prayers was forgotten by participants once they became older, but the Gujarati text itself was still ingrained in their minds, perhaps because Gujarati may be considered by them to be the only ‘true’ or appropriate language for these prayers. Several participants also stressed the need to know how to read Gujarati for religious reasons. In the following quotes, Kalpa and Jayni highlight the importance of knowing Gujarati to access religious writings and scriptures in the original language:

With me, the biggest plus point for Gujarati is that our guru (spiritual teacher) gives ashirwad (blessing) only in Gujarati. Our sadguru santos (true teachers), they give-they use a bit of English here and there, but if you don’t understand the main points which are in Gujarati, you’re lost. Our main scriptures, Vachanamrut (the Lord’s spoken word), Shikshapatri (the Lord’s written word), Swamini Vato (The Guru’s word), there’s English translations, but if you read the Gujarati, it makes more sense. Our bhajans (devotional songs), like you know with the ā4, they put the like the matra (symbol) on top in the English text and you get confused, so you mess up, but if you like use Gujarati, it’s fluent, you can understand it, you can sing it well. So for me, Gujarati is a plus point. (Kalpa, SA)

As I have become more interested in Jainism, I have begun to follow a path where we read the first hand poetry and letters of a Gujarati saintly-figure. All of the writings are in Gujarati, so my ability to read and write enables me to access these literary and spiritual treasures more intimately than if I had to rely on translation only. (Jayni, UK)

Gujarati was also used in the cultural domain. Dhruv discusses how he has taken part in many Gujarati plays at Gujarati School where he had to memorize lines in Gujarati, which in turn has helped to strengthen and expand his vocabulary knowledge in Gujarati:

I’ve done a lot of plays, like in Gujarati, over the years. When I was in AS [Level at Gujarati School], I did Rushabhdev, which is a Jain play and I was playing the main role as well, so I had a lot of lines to learn. That was all in Gujarati, so obviously like to express myself, I had to act it perfectly. I had to know the exact meaning of everything, so I learnt a lot of new words from there. (Dhruv, UK)

Dhruv continues his conversation with me by stressing the importance of the cultural domain in enhancing and maintaining Gujarati proficiency:

I think the plays definitely help a lot ... It would be great if more people took part in these kind of cultural activities, because the extra bit is the bit where you learn the most, I think, in my opinion, apart- alongside with just teaching. (Dhruv, UK)

Suggestions were made by participants that Gujarati should be further incorporated into and promoted through the cultural domain, e.g., through festivals, dances, and other arts, since these were areas that generally appealed to young people and were ones which many were already heavily involved in. According to several participants, this would encourage young people to learn and use Gujarati.

4Kalpa is referring to the Gujarati symbol ો.
Interestingly, while participants like Dhruv, Kalpa, and Jayni feel that the cultural and religious domains help maintain Gujarati proficiency, the quantitative findings indicate the opposite. Based on the quantitative findings presented in Chapter 4, participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency is significantly but *negatively* correlated with studying Gujarati to take part in cultural and religious activities (reason 6 on the survey). This discrepancy may result from two factors: 1) cultural and religious activities are now increasingly being conducted in English to accommodate to the linguistic needs of the younger generations and 2) choosing this non-linguistic reason as one of their three reasons for studying Gujarati at Gujarati School may mean that participants are not as interested in the actual language component of Gujarati School.

Another domain in which Gujarati (and other related North Indian languages) were used and heard was in the media. Many of the homes, especially those with stay-at-home mothers, had India-based satellite television channels, the most popular one being Zee TV. The majority of the programs on such satellite television channels tend to be broadcast in Hindi. Hindi and Gujarati are closely related languages and thus knowing Gujarati helped some participants learn Hindi, or vice versa. This is further supported by quantitative findings, where knowing other North Indian languages is significantly correlated with participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati, and is also a significant predictor of their objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati. However, others commented that hearing so much Hindi through these programs actually deteriorated their Gujarati and made it less ‘pure’. This may also explain why some participants had many occurrences of code-mixing into Hindi in their Gujarati interview (see Section 4.7.3, example 7). Furthermore, many families listened to Indian radio stations in their homes, and at times, some of these radio stations had broadcasts in Gujarati (e.g., Kismet Radio in the U.K. has broadcasts in Gujarati from 6am to 10am daily). Language use has moved to the social media domain too. Some participants reported occasionally using the odd Gujarati words and phrases on social media websites like Facebook, on instant messaging services, like MSN Messenger, and in text messages to friends. In such cases, the Latin alphabet was used to transliterate the Gujarati script.

In conclusion, Gujarati seems to be preserved in solidarity-stressing and private domains, while English is the dominant language used in status-stressing and public domains. By being actively used in certain domains only, lexical knowledge is also restricted, which in turn impacts general language proficiency and fluency. Furthermore, there seems to be a shift from Gujarati to English in some domains which were traditionally ‘Gujarati only’ domains, e.g., the religious domain. Given this domain shift that is taking place, it seems likely that the number of Gujarati only domains in the diaspora will decrease. According to Jayni:
I imagine that Gujarati would be preserved in the realm of the kitchen. All food stuff would be still in Gujarati. Anything food-related would be in Gujarati. Anything religious might be in Gujarati. But outside of that, I’m really not so sure. (Jayni, UK)

6.6 Age

The quantitative findings presented in Chapter 4 indicate that age is an important factor in determining heritage language proficiency, with younger participants generally having higher proficiency in Gujarati than older participants. This is further supported when examining the subjective evaluations of the 73 graduates who participated in this study. Of the 73 graduates, 47 participants (64%) subjectively evaluated their Gujarati proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School as being higher than their current proficiency in the language, 5 participants (7%) evaluated their proficiency in Gujarati as currently being higher, and 21 participants (29%) felt that there had been no change in their Gujarati language proficiency between the completion of Gujarati School and the time when they answered the survey. As mentioned in Chapters 3 and 4, subjective evaluations of Gujarati proficiency were derived from survey responses. Participants were asked to recall how they thought their Gujarati was when they completed Gujarati School (graduates only) and at the time of completing the survey (current students and graduates) on a four-point Likert scale: very good, good, ok, not good.

The data from the qualitative interviews support the quantitative findings. Participants generally described their proficiency in Gujarati as being higher when they were younger. Dhruv (UK) describes his current level in Gujarati as follows: “I think it’s enough for me to be able to communicate with my relatives, but not enough for me to teach my children to a good enough standard”, but highlights that this was not always the case: “I remember mum saying that I could speak fluent Gujarati when I was young and I couldn’t speak much English, but now it’s kind of the other way around”. Participants identified a number of factors that resulted in a decrease in proficiency with an increase in age. These included: a) they had not started mainstream school, b) they were living at home, c) they were attending Gujarati School, and d) their grandparents were still alive. Each of these factors is discussed in more detail below.

Many of the participants claimed to have very high proficiency in Gujarati before beginning nursery or primary school, with some describing their Gujarati as being fluent at this point in their lives. For a large number of participants, Gujarati was also often the only language they knew at this point: “Up to the point when I started nursery, I couldn’t speak English. It [Gujarati] was my first language” (Minal, UK). This was more the case in the U.K. and Singapore, where many more of the households tended to be Gujarati-speaking and more the case among first-born children (see
Section 6.7 on birth order). However, the participants’ use of Gujarati and consecutively their proficiency in Gujarati tended to decrease once they began school, as English increasingly became present in their lives.

The vast majority of the participants (90%) lived at home with their parents and thus tended to have some exposure to Gujarati, whether it was through the home environment, through community events, or through living in neighborhoods which had a large concentration of Gujaratis (see Section 6.8 for a discussion on the importance of area of residence for language transmission and maintenance). Of the 10% who did not live at home with their parents, the majority were from the U.K. (9 of the 13 participants). Several of these participants noticed a decline in their Gujarati proficiency after moving out of the family home. When asked whether she currently uses Gujarati, Reena (UK) replied, “No, not at all”. Anand who had left his hometown to move abroad for work also describes a similar situation:

In the U.S., no, I don’t [use Gujarati at all]. Maybe like very, very, very rarely just to share kind of like an inside Indian culture joke or something, but no, I don’t, not to communicate. And sometimes again 50/50 on the phone when I’m with my parents, but no, not to other people in the U.S. In the U.K., yes, still slightly again half and half, but mostly just with family. Not with other I guess Indians my age or anyone like that really. I think it’s the family which basically keeps the language up. (Anand, UK)

Younger participants who were still attending Gujarati School had their Gujarati proficiency reinforced and maintained through the school environment. Participants who had completed Gujarati School noticed that their proficiency in Gujarati decreased the longer they had been away from Gujarati School. Right after completing the oral proficiency test, Neeti told me the following:

If you had asked me this right after I had graduated from my Guja (slang for Gujarati) School, then I would have I think done much better, used higher language, vocab, all those you know big bombastic words, because I used to memorize all those words before my essays- uh my essay exams. Yeh, so I think I’d have done much better. Now the thing is- like there I mean we used to have practice, because we would speak with our teachers, you know, lessons would be in Gujarati, everything would be in Gujarati, now like the whole day I’m at work. Only when I get back home, I talk to my mum in Guja.

(Neeti, Singapore)

Neeti’s case is not unique. When asked whether their Gujarati had deteriorated since completing Gujarati School, participants were quick to answer in the affirmative:

Definitely [decreased since completing Gujarati School 2 years ago]. I don’t speak it at home, so you just kind of forget [it]. (Priti, UK)

I would probably say that it has gone down [my level of Gujarati since completing Gujarati School], because I’ve had no one to speak it with, so I haven’t really gone over it. (Toral, UK)
Neeti, Priti, and Toral highlight the importance of using Gujarati in order to maintain language proficiency. For all of them, completing Gujarati School meant fewer opportunities to use the language. Interestingly, in his statement below, Ravi confirms the idea that Gujarati proficiency decreases with age, but maintains that this happens even while at Gujarati School. This is probably because family influence lessens and the influence of non-Gujarati speaking peers increases with age, further suggesting that factors affecting language proficiency are not always independent, but rather that they often intersect. However, he highlights that Gujarati School does play a role in reinforcing linguistic skills.

Sheena: Do you think your spoken Gujarati improved by going to Gujarati School?
Ravi (UK): No, just over the period, it deteriorated. But not because of Gujarati School, but if anything, it was deteriorating anyway and they [the teachers at Gujarati School] just maintained it at a slightly higher level.

Not surprisingly, participants felt that certain skills in Gujarati (e.g., reading and writing) deteriorated faster than other skills, since there were fewer opportunities and less of a need to use and practice those skills in their daily lives after completing Gujarati School.

The important role that grandparents played in transmitting the Gujarati language to their grandchildren was highlighted in Section 6.3.1. As participants grew older, the likelihood of their grandparents still being alive decreased. In the following conversation, Roshni describes how her fluency and use of Gujarati diminished after her grandparents passed away:

Roshni (UK): My fluency’s not that great, so-
Sheena: Do you think it’s deteriorated a bit since Gujarati School?
Roshni (UK): Yes, plus my grandparents passed away, so I can’t really speak that much in Gujarati.
Sheena: How old were you when they passed away?
Roshni (UK): I was 14 with my granddad and 22 with my grandmother.
Sheena: So up till then, you were really speaking a lot more Gujarati, you would say?
Roshni (UK): Yep.
Sheena: And were they living at your house?
Roshni (UK): Yep, they were living at my house.

While the majority noticed that their proficiency in Gujarati decreased with age, a few highlighted that this was not the case. Minal describes how she has the same level of Gujarati since completing Gujarati School, since she uses the language on a regular basis:

I think it [my proficiency in Gujarati] is probably about the same level … I use it a lot, a lot, to talk to my family, even sometimes when I speak to my boyfriend, I’ll say things in Gujarati. (Minal, UK, original emphasis)

Some participants realized the benefits and personal need of knowing and maintaining Gujarati only at a later age. These participants strove to develop their proficiency in the language once they became older by using it more frequently. Kinari describes how she realized the importance of
Gujarati at a later age, which in turn led her to switch from English to Gujarati when speaking with her grandmother. Similarly, Anjali describes how her spoken and listening skills have improved since completing Gujarati School, since she currently uses the language more frequently:

I do try and speak with her [my grandmother] in Gujarati ... I noticed that ever since I left Gujarati School, the Gujarati that I could speak in Gujarati School was very little compared to the Gujarati that I speak now ... When I was younger, well, my parents are both from South Africa, so we just speak in English, so like I didn’t get that much practice, and then when you’re younger, you just tend to be very lazy, so you don’t- so you’ll just speak in English with your grandmother or whatever, and then as you get older, you realize the importance and that. You need to practice, you know. (Kinari, SA)

Previously, you know, when I was in Gujarati School, I hardly spoke [Gujarati], like, ‘cause I never used to do my homework and anything like that. But like if you notice, my reading and writing skills are the same, because obviously I do read like from bhajans (devotional songs) and stuff, you know, aartis (songs sung in praise of a deity) and all, once in a while, you know, maybe twice a year, something like that, but the listening and speaking is more, because you know, I communicate with my mum in Gujarati, my grandmum in Gujarati, and then you know, when I go for the Gujarati functions, which I’m forced to go to, so you meet people there, so it’s going on (Anjali, Singapore)

In conclusion, qualitative and quantitative findings indicate that age seems to account for some of the differences found in Gujarati language ability. A number of factors positively influence language proficiency for younger participants, including: a) mainstream school not yet started, b) living at home, c) attending Gujarati School, and d) grandparents still being alive. These factors do not always apply to older participants so their Gujarati proficiency was generally lower except in a few cases where participants had made a conscious decision to use Gujarati. So while younger participants generally have more regular opportunities to use and practice the language, older participants have to consciously and actively find opportunities to develop their Gujarati to reach high proficiency in Gujarati.

### 6.7 Birth Order

In Section 6.6, the importance of the variable ‘age’ as it relates to Gujarati language proficiency was highlighted. While younger participants were generally cited as having higher proficiency in Gujarati than older participants, another related variable, namely birth order, showed opposite results. The importance of birth order as it relates to Gujarati language use and fluency was mentioned by many participants. First, older siblings were described as generally having higher proficiency in Gujarati than younger siblings. Second, first-born participants were more likely to have spoken Gujarati before beginning school and were more likely to have continued using the language to a greater degree than second- and subsequent-born children. Third, participants
without siblings generally had a higher level of proficiency in Gujarati than those with siblings. These points are discussed in more detail below.

From the interview data, it emerged that older siblings in the family had higher proficiency in Gujarati than younger siblings. In the conversation below, Bina, aged 15, describes her ability in Gujarati as better than both her sister’s (age 14) and her brother’s (age 7):

Sheena: Do you have brothers or sisters?
Bina (UK): Yep, I have one sister who is 14 and one brother who is 7.
Sheena: And would you say that their Gujarati is about the same as yours, yours is better, yours is worse than theirs, what do you think?
Bina (UK): I think mine’s better. My sister- They [my sister and brother] both go to Gujarati class, but they- obviously you know like my brother is a lot younger and stuff, but I think where I was at their age and where they are at that age is different ... Like my sister might find it difficult to speak to my grandparents in Gujarati, whereas for me, it’ll just come fluently.

Comments of this nature were made both by those who were first-born and by those who were not first-born. This phenomenon was usually explained by the fact that Gujarati tended to be the first language for the oldest child, but this was not necessarily the case for subsequent children born in the family. Meeta, aged 25, describes Gujarati being spoken as a first language by her sister, Hiral, aged 26, but not by her:

Sheena: Did you speak Gujarati when you were first born?
Meeta (SA): No, not that I can remember ... I think it was my [older] sister who spoke [Gujarati], it wasn’t me.

In households where Gujarati was actively spoken by parents, this finding is not surprising. Gujarati would have been passed on by parents to the first child. Subsequent children in the family would have a higher likelihood of more English exposure, given that the first-born child may be attending school at this stage and hence be exposed to more English, which they may then bring into the home domain. As demonstrated in the quotes by Meeta and Bina, even an age difference of one year seems to make a difference. The importance of birth order for language proficiency was also highlighted by those who had a larger age difference with their siblings. In the first narrative below, Sita is four years older than her sister, Anisha. In the second narrative, Poonam is 5 years older than Jasmine and 6 years older than Avina. Both Sita and Poonam describe that their siblings were born once they had already begun school and how this impacted their siblings’ Gujarati use and proficiency:

My [younger] sister, I’d say that because she was born when I started speaking English, so her- like she was sort of- whereas my mother tongue I would say is Gujarati, because when I was like- my first ever language I learnt was Gujarati. I think her- she would probably- she picked up English first ... I learnt most of my English, I think, after the age of 4 or 5, whenever I started school properly. (Sita, UK)
Jasmine can hardly speak at all. It would be very difficult for her to hold out a conversation with anyone ... Avina’s a tiny bit better, but again, nowhere near fluent ... I think I probably spoke Gujarati in the house for longer than they did, ‘cause I remember, up until about the age of 14 or 15, I was completely fluent in it. Up until the age of 5, I couldn’t speak any English at all, so even obviously after 5, 6, 7, 8, I was still quite fluent in Gujarati, whereas I think they probably started speaking English very early ... When I was 10, Jasmine was 5, so I was speaking to her in English and she picked that up more. (Poonam, UK)

While some participants felt that they spoke more Gujarati when they were younger and that English had become increasingly dominant in their lives the older they became, birth order nonetheless had an impact on current Gujarati usage for some: “The older one [i.e., cousin] still speaks more Gujarati than the younger one does” (Ishani, UK). This is not surprising, given that their proficiency in Gujarati may have been higher.

While interview data indicate that birth order is an important variable in determining variations in language proficiency, the measures of ‘objective evaluation now’ and ‘subjective evaluation now’ do not support this finding in all cases. My sample of heritage language learners contains 17 sets of siblings, of which 1 set includes twins, 14 sets include two siblings, and 2 sets include 3 siblings. Removing the twins from the sample, I present the scores for the other 16 sets of siblings in Table 6.2. Names in cyan indicate that the participant is a recent graduate of the Gujarati School and names in purple indicate that the participant is a current student of the school. Furthermore, scores in red indicate a higher proficiency in Gujarati for the older sibling than the younger sibling, scores in green indicate the same proficiency for the siblings, and scores in blue indicate a higher proficiency for the younger sibling than the older sibling (based on objective and subjective evaluations of language proficiency).

As can be seen in Table 6.2, there are 10 cases where the older sibling has a higher proficiency in Gujarati than the younger sibling, thus providing evidence that birth order is an important variable in determining language proficiency. However, there are 7 cases where the younger sibling has a higher proficiency in Gujarati than the older sibling and one case where the proficiency scores of the two siblings are identical. In terms of subjectively evaluated proficiency in Gujarati, there are 12 cases where the older sibling feels that he/she has a higher proficiency in Gujarati than the younger sibling, which again supports the idea that birth order plays a significant role in determining subjective evaluations of language proficiency. However, there are 5 cases where the younger sibling feels that he/she has a higher proficiency in Gujarati than the younger sibling and one case where both siblings feel that they have identical proficiency levels in the language. Birth

\(^5\)Subjective evaluation of proficiency (i.e., self-reported proficiency) was measured from 0 (not good) to 3 (very good) for each of the four skills: reading, writing, listening, speaking, resulting in a score range of 0-12. 0 indicates no language knowledge and 12 indicates fluency in the language.
Table 6.2: Gujarati proficiency scores among siblings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (oldest youngest)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Objective evaluation now (measured from 0-25)</th>
<th>Subjective evaluation now (measured from 0-12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priti – Toral</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>16 &gt; 13.5</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooja – Sumir</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>12 &lt; 19.5</td>
<td>5 &lt; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sita – Anisha</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>19.5 &gt; 17.5</td>
<td>12 &gt; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi – Neil</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>1.5 &lt; 2</td>
<td>3 &gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aarti – Rakhee</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>18.5 &gt; 15.5</td>
<td>6 &gt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajal – Sonal</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>22.5 &gt; 17</td>
<td>7 &gt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihir – Kayan – Harshana</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>10.5 &lt; 14.5 ; 14.5 &gt; 13 2 &lt; 6 ; 6 &lt; 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavini – Anshul</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>18.5 &gt; 15</td>
<td>6 &gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina – Jyoti</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>17.5 = 17.5</td>
<td>3 &gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya – Priyanka</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>20 &lt; 20.5</td>
<td>5 &lt; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazia – Ishaani</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>13.5 &lt; 14</td>
<td>9 &gt; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandeep – Mitul</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>20.5 &gt; 18</td>
<td>10 &gt; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona – Vikesh</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>14 &lt; 19</td>
<td>12 &gt; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayuri – Divya</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>11 &lt; 14.5</td>
<td>5 &lt; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neha – Yash – Rakesh</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>11.5 &gt; 11 ; 11 &gt; 9 12 &gt; 4 ; 4 &gt; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiral – Meeta</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>14.5 &gt; 11.5</td>
<td>6 = 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order seems to account for variations in proficiency in more than half of the cases, though Table 6.2 highlights that other factors may impact proficiency. This indicates once again that factors affecting language proficiency often times interact and are therefore not always independent. For example, current attendance at Gujarati School may explain some of the cases where the younger sibling has or feels they have a higher proficiency in Gujarati than the older sibling, that is, birth order tends to correlate inversely with still being in Gujarati School for some of the participants. This is further supported by the findings from the interview data. For example, Nazia describes a decrease in her Gujarati proficiency since completing Gujarati School, and describes her younger sister, Ishaani, as being better in Gujarati, since she is still at Gujarati School. In the case of the set of three siblings, the oldest sibling is married in both cases and does not live at home; one lives with her in-laws (Neha), whereas the other one does not (Mihir). This may also explain why Mihir has and also feels that he has a lower proficiency in Gujarati than his younger brother Kayan, but why Neha has and also feels that she has a higher proficiency in Gujarati than her younger brother Yash.

While most participants in this study had siblings, there were eleven participants who had no siblings. In my discussions with these participants, it emerged that being an only child was a contributing factor to high Gujarati proficiency. This is not surprising, given that the presence of
siblings generally meant an increased use of English, since English was the dominant language used among siblings (see Section 6.3.3). In the following two conversations, Ishani and Sagar discuss how being an only child has had a positive impact on their Gujarati proficiency:

Ishani (UK): Both my masis (aunts) both kids, if that makes sense, they all went to Gujarati school. We’ve all done really well, all As and A*s, but without sounding too-you know, beating myself up, my spoken Gujarati is much better than theirs.
Sheena: Do you think it also has something to do with the fact that you are an only child, because you know they are speaking English with their siblings?
Ishani (UK): That’s it. It probably has an influence on it.

Sheena: Do you have brothers- You don’t have brothers and sisters, right?
Sagar (UK): No, I don’t.
Sheena: You speak to your mum in Gujarati and your dad in Gujarati?
Sagar (UK): Yeh, so kind of at- I’m- And this is quite different from my friends who are Gujarati as well. They kind of speak a mixture of kind of Gujarati and English. I don’t know- they have a word for it, you know, Gujlish (mixture of English and Gujarati) or something like that. But it’s just with me, I’ve just been brought up in Gujarati, so it’s actually quite weird, I speak Gujarati at home and I can’t recall speaking to my parents in English, you know.

In conclusion, birth order seems to play an important role in determining variations in language proficiency. Older siblings, and especially the first-born ones, were described as having a higher level of Gujarati proficiency than younger siblings. This finding is also supported in more than half of the cases by the oral proficiency tests. In households where Gujarati is actively spoken, Gujarati would have been passed on by parents to the first child. If second and subsequent born children are born after the first-born child has begun attending school, the former are likely to be exposed to more English, since the first-born child will be shifting at a faster rate from Gujarati to English at this stage and will be more likely to bring English into the home domain. Those without siblings were described as being more proficient in Gujarati than those with siblings, as the presence of siblings generally meant an increased use of English, since English was the dominant language used among siblings.

6.8 Area of Residence

Previous studies have shown that living in areas which contain a high concentration of members of the ethnic group increases the likelihood of language transmission and maintenance (Clyne, 2001; Portes & Hao, 1998; Portes & Schaufler, 1994; Schrauf, 1999), though one may hypothesize that this only holds true if members of the ethnic group communicate in their native language and not the dominant language of the surrounding society. However, this study has highlighted that factors other than language use positively affect language proficiency (e.g., the community
upholding cultural traditions and a strong sense of ethnic identity). The vast majority of the participants in all three countries grew up in areas which had a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians. This meant plenty of exposure to Gujarati and numerous occasions to use and practice the language in daily life. Opportunities to hear and use Gujarati outside the home and Gujarati School included at community functions, when meeting other Gujaratis (especially monolingual elders), in grocery shops, etc. The importance of living in areas with a high concentration of Gujaratis and its impact on language exposure and use was most felt by participants when they left their hometown, e.g., to begin university or to move abroad (see Section 6.6 where Anand describes how his Gujarati use substantially diminished after moving to the U.S.). In Section 6.7, Bina describes how birth order might be one variable that explains why her proficiency in Gujarati is higher than her younger siblings’ proficiency in the language. She continues by describing how her family moved from Tooting (an area with a high concentration of Gujaratis) to Worchester Park (a predominantly white area) when she was nine and how this had an impact on her daily exposure to Gujarati and Gujarati people, and how this especially affected her younger siblings’ proficiency in Gujarati:

My [younger] sister might find it difficult to speak to my grandparents in Gujarati, whereas for me, it’ll just come fluently. But I think that might also be, you know, just—just the way like we’ve grown up and stuff, you know, like because where we used to live, it was very— we were all very close together and stuff, so we’ve kind of grown up speaking it and we were always with family and stuff, but now because we’ve come out quite far out, so it’s just— just different, I think. Just our daily life becomes so different and she just doesn’t need to speak it much and she doesn’t practice as much. (Bina, UK)

Bina describes the move from Tooting where she used to see Gujaratis everywhere to Worchester Park where there were hardly any Gujaratis as a “shock”. This move influenced various aspects of her life, including the people she saw on a regular basis and the daily exposure to Gujarati that she received:

Where we used to live, we had a lot of family around there who we used to see on a regular basis. Like even our friends, we had loads of Indian— like Gujarati friends and stuff, and so like I’ve grown up listening to Gujarati between you know my parents and other people or my grandparents and other people and stuff like that, so I think that influenced you know the way I speak to people or the way I react to things as well. (Bina, UK)

Despite the fact that the vast majority of participants in this study grew up and also currently live in areas with a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians, as noted, they nonetheless displayed a range of abilities in Gujarati, from near-native to beginner level according to the oral proficiency test, despite. In other words, and rather surprisingly, there is no significant relationship between area of residence and objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency. However, inter-
view data from some of the participants, generally provided by those who no longer were living in such areas, seem to suggest that living in areas with a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians had a positive impact on language proficiency, since it meant more daily exposure to Gujarati and more occasions to use and practice the language outside the home and Gujarati School. So, while quantitative data show no positive correlation with living in areas with a large concentration of Indians and objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency, the qualitative data suggest that there may be a strong negative correlation between not living in Indian residential areas and language proficiency; however this cannot be confirmed, since this was not measured and tested in quantitative analyses.

6.9 Trips and Ties to India

Singaporean Gujaratis frequently travelled to India. On average, they made trips to India once a year, or once every two years, compared to only one trip in their lifetime or none at all for many of the South African and British Gujarati participants. This difference is due to two main factors. First, many of the Singaporean participants had a direct family connection in India. All but five of the Singaporean participants had at least one parent from India and thus trips to India were common to visit grandparents and relatives. Second, the geographical proximity between Singapore and India also contributed to the higher frequency of trips to India.

Trips to India provided opportunities to use Gujarati. When visiting India and especially Gujarat, participants reported speaking more Gujarati than when they were in England, Singapore, or South Africa. Participants used Gujarati to communicate with family members and other locals who had limited English proficiency, and were often commended on their language skills and at times native-like abilities in the language:

I spent two months in Gujarat where I was commended on my excellent Gujarati, and the staff and students all said that of the many westerners who visit, they really felt they could communicate with me. I was able to help students with their homework, even when questions were in Gujarati. (Jayni, UK)

My cousins in India, they don’t study Gujarati as a like-. In Chennai, they study Tamil, and for Bombay, they study Marathi or Hindi, so they [Indians from India] are like, “Oh, you study Gujarati and here we don’t even learn that” ... When I go to India, they tell me, “Oh, you speak Gujarati just like a native speaker here”. They’re like, “We can’t differentiate you”. They say, “You have that accent and the way you speak it”, because we are Kathiyawadi (a Gujarati dialect spoken in the Kathiawadi region of Gujarat), so they think you have the Kathiyawadi accent. (Eshana, Singapore)

Chirag (Singapore) describes to me how his Gujarati improved during a 6-week visit to India, “because wherever you go, you hear Gujarati”. Similarly, Aakash (UK) describes how India provides
opportunities to improve Gujarati language skills, “because when you’re in India, you’re speaking it [Gujarati] every day, you’re listening to it, and it’s like it’s just stuck in your head”. He describes how his proficiency in Gujarati drastically improved during a month-long trip to India: “I think my spoken [Gujarati] was the best from when I went to India … I went there for a month and then I came back and I could speak the best Gujarati in the class, from being average to top easily”. However, he highlights that this high level in Gujarati which he reached in India was not maintained once back in England: “After 2-3 months of speaking some English [in England], you suddenly lose it [Gujarati] and then you’re back to normal again”. So, while living in areas with many Gujaratis had an impact on language use and exposure for some (e.g., Bina, UK, see Section 6.8), trips to India seem to have had a greater impact on language proficiency for others (e.g., Aakash, UK).

Trips to India also heightened a sense of importance of Gujarati among participants and created an incentive for them to continue to improve and maintain skills in the language. After trips to India, many personally sensed the value of Gujarati and a need to continue using the language in their day-to-day interactions. The following two quotes by Sandeep and Rakesh highlight the difference in general attitude toward Gujarati among those who went to India more frequently (e.g., Singaporeans) compared to those who did not (e.g., South Africans):

I go [to India] once every two years ... My mother’s side, all the relatives from my mother’s side are there ... I’m happy I chose Gujarati [as my MT subject], because I can speak it- even after I finish studying, I can speak it with my relatives and stu. (Sandeep, Singapore)

As a Gujarati person, it’s important to know your culture, it’s important to know your religion, it’s nice to know your language, it’s not key ... The key language is English; it’s spoken throughout the world. (Rakesh, SA)

While Singaporeans generally made frequent trips to India, British participants tended to make more trips to East Africa than India. As many of the families of the British participants had migrated from Kenya, Uganda, or Tanzania, trips to East Africa were often made to see extended family members or for social functions (e.g., family weddings). With the exception of two participants, all British participants had at least one parent from East Africa, with the majority having both parents from East Africa (and generally Kenya). The connection with Kenya had an impact on their Gujarati lexicon. Many of the parents of the British participants had incorporated words from Swahili into their Gujarati, and these words were then transmitted to their children: “I don’t even know if it’s even a Gujarati word or a Swahili word. I just know my parents use it ... I don’t even know if lucho (Gujarati word for ‘cunning’) is a Gujarati word” (Roshni, UK). While the use of Swahili words in their Gujarati was found among all participants whose parents had
migrated from East Africa, participants noticed that the use of Swahili in their Gujarati increased substantially during trips to East Africa:

The conversational part of the Gujarati [GCSE examination], I screwed up a little bit. I did ok in everything else, but the oral- I did exactly how I’d expected in the rest of it, but the oral part of it, I think I screwed up a little bit, because I actually went to Kenya the Easter before, and I spent the whole of that Easter in Kenya, and my Gujarati became very Kenyan Gujarati, so I was using Swahili words and stuff like that, like I was using things like *fagyo* (Swahili for ‘broom’), and you know, instead of saying *kerja* (Gujarati word for ‘banana’), I was saying *dhizi* (Swahili word for ‘banana’), and stuff like that, and you know, it became sort of very sort of slangy type Gujarati. (Dipak, UK)

The extent to which some of these Swahili words are very much entrenched in their Gujarati lexicon is highlighted by Denish, a British participant whose parents are both from India. He described to me an incident when everyone in his Gujarati class except for him got a word wrong in a year 4 examination, translating ‘ironing’ as *pasi* (Swahili word for ‘ironing’) instead of *istri* (Gujarati word for ‘ironing’), highlighting how many of these Swahili words are now ingrained in their Gujarati lexicon.

In conclusion, trips to India were frequently undertaken by Singaporean participants and to a much lesser extent or not at all by the U.K. and South African participants. Trips to India provided opportunities to use Gujarati, and were described as playing an important role in language maintenance. Furthermore, such trips increased a sense of importance of Gujarati and belonging among participants and encouraged them to continue to improve and maintain skills in the language. This factor may therefore represent one important reason (among others) in explaining why Singaporeans generally displayed higher objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency than participants from the U.K. and South Africa.

### 6.10 Attitudes toward Gujarati

Various adjectives were used to describe Gujarati, ranging from “colorful” (Sonya, Singapore) and “respectable” (Maya, Singapore) to “useless” (Seema, UK) and “tough” (Anand, UK). General attitudes toward Gujarati also ranged from positive to extremely negative, as displayed by the two quotes below:

It [Gujarati] is my *mother tongue* so I feel proud to speak, read, and communicate in my own language with *my* people ... It [Knowing Gujarati] is a long-term gift which has brought me closer to my values, society, and people. (Bansi, Singapore, original emphasis)

Gujarati is the Latin of India dead ... I don’t perceive Gujarati to be an asset at all ... English is definitely and infinitely more beneficial than Gujarati. (Sapna, Singapore)
Attitudes toward Gujarati whether positive or negative impact language proficiency. For example, having positive feelings about studying Gujarati at Gujarati School meant higher scores in Gujarati national examinations for the participants in this study (see Section 4.3). National examination scores were obtained from survey responses. Participants were asked to indicate their scores for the following examinations (if already taken): GCSE/AS/A Level in England, GCE O-Level/GCE A-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa. See Chapters 3 and 4 for more detail. In this section, I describe the attitudes that participants had toward their heritage language and toward the study of Gujarati at Gujarati School, and the ways in which their attitudes influenced heritage language use, proficiency, and maintenance.

The relevance of Gujarati in the participants’ lives was often viewed from a pragmatic perspective. The ability to speak Gujarati helped participants communicate with members of the Gujarati community, especially monolingual elders (e.g., grandparents), and strengthened their relationship with their parents:

I can now communicate better with my elders and my relatives who speak Gujarati. (Chandni, Singapore)

I talk to my parents in Gujarati only, and that’s kind of helped strengthen my relationship with them too. (Sagar, UK)

Gujarati was also considered useful for religious purposes. Knowing Gujarati enabled participants to access religious songs, prayers, and scripts in the original language, rather than having to rely on translations in English, and thus enabled them to participate in religious activities and functions:

I do attend a lot of bhajans (events where devotional songs are sung) and pujas (events where religious prayers are said) where we sing bhajans (devotional songs) from a book. These books are usually in Gujarati. Although I can’t follow very quickly, I can usually manage to participate because I can follow the songs to some extent. (Poonam, UK)

However, the usefulness or relevance of Gujarati in their professional life was minimal or absent. Many Singaporean participants commented on the disadvantage of taking Gujarati as a MT language when living in a country like Singapore where more dominant languages such as Mandarin are more useful in daily life. In the quote below, Kajal highlights the “huge disadvantage” she faces for not knowing Mandarin:

I live in Singapore. I don’t live in Ahmedabad or Bombay. I live in Singapore. It [Mandarin] is the language of business right now. It is a skill that is phenomenal, you know, and it is something I wish I had learnt at a younger age when it would have been easier ... I’m at a huge disadvantage ... Now I’m telling people, I’m like if I had a child, my kid would be coming out of my womb speaking Mandarin ... Mandarin is something that is so valuable right now ... I think that reading and writing Gujarati is
a skill that is good, but not necessary. I know it sounds- but I’m trying- I’m pragmatic. I’m seeing it now in a business scale, I’m hearing it from my friends who are lawyers and doctors. My friend Nishant, who is like the all-star Gujarati, like he is the quarterback for Gujarati School, you know, like he was in my class and honestly he has to learn Mandarin, he’s a doctor. So he has to go for conversational Mandarin classes ... My other friend who is a lawyer, like same story. I mean, I want to go into banking. All the people who are getting top jobs are all speaking Chinese. (Kajal, Singapore, original emphasis)

Attitudes such as these affect language maintenance and language transmission to the next generation. Kajal highlights how she would ensure her child learns Mandarin, for she believes that Mandarin is “valuable”, while Gujarati is “a skill that is good, but not necessary”. Participants in England made similar remarks, commenting on the usefulness of knowing other languages, especially European languages, such as French, German, or Spanish, when living in a country like England. In her narrative below, Seema describes Gujarati as being “useless” in England and not as “impressive” on a CV as other European languages:

To be honest, if I have children, it [Gujarati] is not something that you know I’d feel like I have to pass on, because at the end of the day, in this country, it’s pretty much useless, I think. I’d rather they learn something like French or Spanish or German. In terms of the future, if they want to go for a job, then that would look more impressive on their CV than Gujarati, I think. (Seema, UK)

Similar attitudes were found in South Africa. Gujarati was not viewed as being useful for professional purposes. South Africans described English as a “universal language” (Anish, SA) and the language that is therefore essential to know in today’s world: “As a Gujarati person, it’s important to know your culture, it’s important to know your religion, it’s nice to know your language, it’s not key ... The key language is English; it’s spoken throughout the world” (Rakesh, SA).

The general feeling held by participants that Gujarati was useless for professional purposes led some participants to consider Gujarati as less important than their other school subjects. One participant describes an occasion when she was supposed to meet up with friends for a school project, but the timing clashed with Gujarati School, so she could not join them. She feels that her other school subjects should take priority, “because that’s what will give you a degree and stuff ... If you know Gujarati, they [university admissions] won’t really care” (Kalpana, SA).

However, there were a few participants, mainly those working in the medical field in areas where there was a large concentration of monolingual Gujaratis, who described Gujarati as being useful in their professional lives. These participants described occasions where they used Gujarati at work to communicate with or act as translators/interpreters for monolingual Gujarati speakers:
In A&E, I did [use Gujarati]. If there would be patients that spoke Gujarati, like I’d either translate [for them] or see them myself. So it worked out- it was really useful. (Minal, UK)

[It is useful], especially if a patient comes from India and speaks only Guju (slang for Gujarati), they get delighted when they have an Indian doctor. (Mihir, Singapore)

While Gujarati was generally not considered important for professional purposes, having Gujarati on a CV was helpful for a small minority when applying to university or for jobs, as it indicated that they could speak another language. Aditi (UK) describes how her father received a place to study at Cambridge University and how he feels that Gujarati played an important role in this, because it was something that was unique and differentiated him from many of the other applicants. Sagar describes how certain universities accepted his Gujarati A Level in their offer to him to study Medicine, but others did not, which he believes may be because Gujarati might be considered as a “softer subject” (Sagar, UK) by some universities. While choosing to study Gujarati at Gujarati School for CV-related reasons was a significant predictor of participants’ objective evaluation of spoken Gujarati proficiency and while Gujarati was considered useful for some in university and job applications, for others, especially those based in Singapore and South Africa, having Gujarati on a CV was not useful. In fact, Singaporeans indicated that it would have been more useful to have a language like Mandarin on their CV:

Sheena: Are you glad you took Gujarati as your MT?
Sonal (Singapore): No, I wish I’d taken Chinese or something. Just because I feel like it would have been more useful. Now when I write it on my CV, it’s like what language do you speak? And I’m just like Gujarati, Hindi, great ... And it’s not a language which I use anywhere or which I speak anywhere outside of Gujarat and maybe Bombay, because they speak a lot of Gujarati in Bombay. Outside of that, I see no-. Yeh, it’s a dying language, I find, so I find it kind of a useless thing to know.

The discrepancies between the qualitative and quantitative findings highlight that some seemingly straightforward correlations were problematized once participants had the opportunity to talk at length about issues rather than having to choose among particular answers. This highlights the value of using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Sonal describes Gujarati as a “dying language” and one which is useful only in India, and in fact, only in certain parts of India. This point echoes the point made by Sapna at the beginning of this section, and is a point that was raised by South Africans and British participants as well:

If you go anywhere around the world, you’re not gonna use it [Gujarati] unless you go to India. (Rakesh, South Africa)

I don’t think Gujarati is that useful here. I mean, unless you’re going for a job that involves speaking Gujarati which maybe something like I don’t know working for immigration or something like that, you know, where you’re going to come into contact with
a lot of Gujarati people or something. But other than that, no, it’s not very useful. I can’t think of anything that it would come into use for. I don’t know, it’s not very - it’s not very impressive. Like you can go for any job, like even as a dentist, like if I could speak a European language, because we have a lot of say for example Eastern Europeans coming in, if I could speak Polish for example, that would look more impressive at the moment than Gujarati. And I think anyway, a lot of Gujaratis that come here, they can speak English, so it’s not like we have to speak Gujarati, because a lot of them can speak English anyway, so there’s no- not really that much need, I think. (Seema, UK)

Some described the need to know Gujarati from a symbolic, identity-related perspective. Knowing Gujarati was described as important for ethnic identity and several participants highlighted that it would be embarrassing to be a Gujarati person without being able to speak the language. Such viewpoints were found more among the U.K. and Singaporean participants: “How can I be Gujarati if I have not learned to read or write or speak well in the language?” (Sonya, Singapore); “If you can’t speak your own language, you’ve kind of lost half your culture” (Minal, UK), but not among all: “To be honest, I don’t feel like I’m missing anything by not speaking it, I don’t feel like I’m missing out on any part of my life” (Seema, UK). Among South Africans, the general attitude was that Gujarati was not important from a symbolic, identity-related perspective: “Not knowing Gujarati is not going to make you less of an Indian” (Keval, SA). Interestingly, studying Gujarati at Gujarati School because participants perceived it as important for identity-related reasons is a significant predictor of objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency (see Chapter 4 for more details), which highlights the important role that identity plays as far as language proficiency is concerned.

Gujarati was described as a more respectful language than English. It was therefore considered appropriate to use Gujarati when addressing those whom participants wished to show respect toward, e.g., grandparents and other elderly members of the community:

I think it’s sort of in the way that our parents’ generation will project themselves. Like for example, my bhabhi, who’s my cousin’s mum, she speaks fluent English and everything, but I don’t why it is, but all of us out of respect will only speak in Gujarati to her, even though she’s got perfect English, so it’s kind of that status that she has, meaning that out of respect, we’ll always talk in Gujarati. (Jayni, UK)

Furthermore, Gujarati makes a T-V distinction (R. Brown & Gilman, 1960), namely tu (familiar form) vs. tame (polite form). Maya describes how she uses this distinction to indicate respect toward her grandparents on the one hand and familiarity toward her sister on the other:

It’s more respectable ... For my grandparents, like Tame kem cho? (How are you?) Whereas for my younger sister: Tu kem che? Tu ave che? (How are you? Are you coming?) It’s more relaxed whereas for them, it [the latter] is more disrespectful. (Maya, Singapore)
For many, Gujarati was associated with traditional aspects of life and English with modernity. This distinction was also used to explain differences in language use with different family and community members. Those perceived as being more traditional were addressed in Gujarati by participants, and vice versa:

It’s just a psychological thing, like if you perceive a person to be traditional in his or her views, you talk to him in Gujarati, but if you think that ok, this guy is modern, you know, he’s forward-thinking, then you just use English with that person. (Parag, Singapore)

With Gujarati being described negatively through adjectives such as “uncool” (Rekha, SA), “dying” (Sonal, Singapore), “useless” (Seema, UK) and “tough” (Anand, UK) by some participants, one South African was led to question whether Gujaratis were less proud of their language and culture than other ethnic groups living in their country. In particular, several participants in South Africa made comparisons between black Africans and themselves in terms of language maintenance and patterns of language use. Black Africans were described as speaking their ancestral language at home and then learning English at school, whereas Gujaratis (and other Indians in South Africa) were described as speaking English both at home and at school:

In the African cultures, Zulu, Xhosa, all of them, they come to school, they speak to you in English. When they go home, their parents tell them no English. They have to speak in their language, so it’s like- that’s why when I see that, then I’m like why can’t our Gujarati parents enforce that to say learn our language, you know. (Kalpa, SA)

In conclusion, attitudes toward Gujarati ranged from positive to extremely negative. Some participants viewed the usefulness of Gujarati from a pragmatic and utilitarian perspective (e.g., to communicate with grandparents, but not for professional reasons) and others from a symbolic, identity-related one, though the latter was country-specific. The general attitude among South Africans was that Gujarati was not important from a symbolic, identity-related perspective, which differed substantially from the views held by the British and Singaporean participants. Some held extremely negative views of Gujarati and considered it useless in their diaspora context, which negatively affected their current language use and consequently their proficiency. As mentioned in Section 6.6, a conscious decision to maintain Gujarati is important for ensuring high proficiency levels among older participants. There is a higher likelihood of this conscious decision being taken if there are positive attitudes toward the language. As has been shown in this section, this can be brought about by participants sensing that the language is in some way useful in their lives (e.g., to communicate with monolingual family members).
6.11 Heritage Language Schools

All participants in this study were either current students or recent graduates of a Gujarati School. In the following three subsections, I describe the role of heritage language schools in language transmission and maintenance. In particular, I focus on the following topics:

- the general effectiveness of heritage language schools in teaching the heritage language to heritage language learners
- the reasons why participants studied Gujarati and attended Gujarati School and how these reasons impacted language proficiency and maintenance
- the ways in which teaching methods and teachers impacted the students’ learning and consequently their proficiency in Gujarati

6.11.1 The Effectiveness of Heritage Language Schools in Language Transmission

Gujarati School was described as an important site for language transmission and maintenance. Through Gujarati School, participants learnt to appreciate Gujarati: “Because we don’t really speak it at home, I don’t think it would be so important, but I think Gujarati class has made me realize how important it [Gujarati] is” (Karishma, UK). For some participants, attending Gujarati School was the very reason why they knew more than just basic Gujarati. This was especially the case in South Africa, where participants generally had fewer opportunities to use Gujarati elsewhere, but was mentioned by participants in Singapore and the U.K. too. Aakash compares his cousins’ command of Gujarati with his own, citing Gujarati School as the reason why he is fluent in the language:

If I speak to relatives and their sons, they barely know like any Gujarati at all. The only reason I know fluent Gujarati and I can read, write and speak it as well is because of Gujarati School, otherwise they have no clue. They barely know- maybe they just know general kem cho (a typical Gujarati greeting, which translates as ‘How are you?’) and that’s it. (Aakash, UK)

However, such viewpoints were not held by all. Some described the frustration or humiliation they felt at their poor command of Gujarati after spending many years at Gujarati School. So, while quantitative findings indicate that the longer participants studied Gujarati at Gujarati School, the higher their objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in the language, this is only somewhat supported by the qualitative analyses, and there were participants in all three countries who pointed out that their spoken proficiency did not improve even after studying at Gujarati School for many years.
It’s 10 years of your life and you haven’t learnt much Gujarati at all. I would have expected to graduate being fluent in Gujarati. (Rekha, SA)

I can’t speak Gujarati either, despite having learnt the subject for 12 years already. (Sapna, Singapore)

[It was embarrassing] when they asked me to read from the textbook and everyone is fluent and I still can’t read letters or words ... Most people would read a couple of pages each and then I would read two lines and that would take a long time. (Neil, UK)

For many of the U.K. and Singaporean participants, the home was where they generally developed oral fluency in Gujarati, whereas Gujarati School was where they learnt to read and write in the language. Participants made the point that in order to be able to speak Gujarati fluently, it was essential to also speak the language at home:

Gujarati School will help with your reading, writing, and listening, but with your oral, it’s 2 hours a week, which is never going to be enough to learn a language fluently, so if it’s not followed up at home, there’s no hope that anyone who goes to Gujarati School is going to learn how to speak properly. (Rupen, UK)

In South Africa, participants typically had fewer opportunities to use the language at home, as homes tended to be English-speaking. Samir is an exception to many of his South African peers. He believes strongly that it is important to know Gujarati as a Gujarati person and regularly uses the language outside of Gujarati School. He echoes the point made by Rupen above and indicates that the reason why general fluency in Gujarati among the youth in South Africa is low is because they do not use the language outside of Gujarati School:

To speak you need something external, a school can’t teach you to speak Gujarati, well that’s my personal opinion. You can’t learn to speak Gujarati at school. You need something from home. It’s a nice place to refresh it, and to improve here and there, but you need something from home. (Samir, SA)

In addition to using the language at home, participants highlighted the importance of undertaking other activities in Gujarati outside Gujarati School, which ranged from writing letters to grandparents to private tutoring sessions. Such activities were described as enhancing language proficiency. Quantitative findings also confirm this point. There was a significant positive correlation between doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School and objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency. Furthermore, doing additional work outside of Gujarati School was a significant predictor of objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency.

The ability to speak Gujarati was often considered more important than the ability to read and write in the language. Participants in all three countries expressed their wish that Gujarati
School would place more emphasis on speaking. While several initiatives to include a speaking component in lessons were undertaken and certain events that focused on speaking were organized (e.g., holding an annual speech day in the South African and Singaporean Gujarati Schools, and performing Gujarati plays in the U.K. Gujarati School), these were not considered enough to obtain full spoken mastery of the language. Various recommendations were made by participants. These included having open debates and discussions in classes, and having more occasions to use the language as in real life. Jayni makes a reference to the latter point, by highlighting the many occasions when she would have to learn long lists of vocabulary items, many of which would never be used in real conversations, and how she believes that this affected how people viewed the language:

What I couldn’t get over was the fact that even though you might you know like Gujarati, after going to Gujarati School, you were more likely to be put off, because instead of making it seem accessible and like Gujarati is you know a nice living language that we should treasure, they throw in all this vocab which no one’s ever gonna use, which makes you actually think that this language is archaic and not useful at all, so you kind of leave with the impression that there’s no worth to it and I just feel that was so sad. (Jayni, UK)

Furthermore, participants indicated the importance of assessing spoken Gujarati at all levels in national examinations. In Singapore, an oral component only exists at the PSLE (primary school leaving) phase. Many participants highlighted how their oral skills had consequently deteriorated and how they felt that this is a skill that should be tested at all levels: “What’s the use of learning the language if you don’t know how to speak it? And [the] oral [examination] is basically testing whether you can speak, so I think [an] oral [examination at all levels] is necessary” (Krupa, Singapore). In the U.K., there is an oral component at the GCSE (end of compulsory schooling) phase, but not at the more advanced AS or A Level phase. In South Africa, oral skills are examined for the Matriculation qualification. (See Appendix O for a brief description of the national examinations in Gujarati that are available in each of the three countries.)

While some felt that Gujarati School did not contribute to oral fluency, others mentioned how Gujarati School did play an important role in refining spoken proficiency: “At Gujarati School, you learn the right way of saying things” (Radhika, UK). Participants often described using a slang-like Gujarati at home, which they described as not being pure, and highlighted that “Gujarati School formalizes that language somewhat, so you’re using less of the slang and more of the proper” (Anand, UK). Participants in South Africa referred to “Kitchen Gujarati”, also known as “Khichdi Gujarati” (Payal, SA) (Khichdi is a South Asian dish made from rice and lentils). Examples of Kitchen Gujarati included deviations from Standard Gujarati pronunciations and
sentence constructions. Below are two examples of Kitchen Gujarati as compared to Standard Gujarati:

You speak Gujarati, but you add a "sm [sma]" or a "s [sa]" or a "m [ma]" wherever, so if you say ‘My name is Sheena’, maru nam Sheena che [maru nam ʃina che] (translation into Standard Gujarati), then I’ll say maas maru nas maam shes me nas ma ches me [mas maru nas mam ʃes me nas ma ches me] (translation into Kitchen Gujarati). (Payal, SA)

Alpa (SA): Our "s [sa]" become "hs [hə]"
Sheena: What’s an example of a word?
Alpa (SA): Just like or even "sh [ʃ]", we’ll say shu kare che [ʃu kare che] (‘What are you doing?’), we’ll say hu kare [hu kare], you know, and like my granny and them, like my mum’s name is Shakuntla [ʃakuntla], but they won’t- and she has a nickname Shaku [ʃaku], but they won’t say Shaku [ʃaku], they’ll say Saku [saku], you know, and they just change everything.
Sheena: So sh [ʃ] becomes s [sa] and s [sa] becomes h [hə].
Alpa (SA): Yeh, so it’s all different. Even the way we construct our sentences and that. Like I told you earlier, Tame kya jav cho? [ʃame kja ɟav cho] (‘Where are you going?’) and we say kya jay la? [ʃka ɟaj la]. It’s like we use lots of slang. Our kitchen Gujarati is lots of slang.

It was mainly females (e.g., mothers, aunts, etc.) who were described as using Kitchen Gujarati. Participants in South Africa picked up Kitchen Gujarati from elders and described using it a lot for gossiping and hiding information from people who were not proficient in Kitchen Gujarati. One participant described her Gujarati as “average”, but her Kitchen Gujarati as “excellent” (Rupal, SA). Others described how the extensive use of Kitchen Gujarati led to spelling mistakes in their written Gujarati and pronunciation errors when speaking Standard Gujarati. In addition to Kitchen Gujarati, Shilpa (SA) described how the Gujarati community in South Africa mixes Afrikaans into their Gujarati to form Gujikaans. According to her, the reason behind this phenomenon taking place is that Gujaratis in South Africa are often more exposed to Afrikaans than Gujarati and tend to have higher proficiency in Afrikaans than Gujarati, and such insertions therefore take place when they cannot remember a word in Gujarati. This therefore is different from the Swahili insertions by British Gujarati participants, which are now very much ingrained in the East African variety of Gujarati.

In conclusion, participants highlighted the importance of the Gujarati School for language transmission and maintenance. Its focus on reading and writing meant that participants were able to gain and enhance their literacy skills. While Gujarati School was also described as a place where spoken skills could be refined, participants generally felt that Gujarati School needed to place more emphasis on acquiring and improving spoken skills. Despite this, quantitative findings indicate that objectively evaluated spoken proficiency improved the longer participants stayed at Gujarati School. It seems that Gujarati School will continue to remain important for future generations,
particularly at a time when households in the diaspora are becoming increasingly English-speaking. Many considered the future of Gujarati to be very much dependent on the existence of a Gujarati School, without which the likelihood of Gujarati thriving in the diaspora was doubtful.

6.11.2 Reasons for Studying Gujarati and Attending Gujarati School

Reasons for studying Gujarati and attending Gujarati School varied. Some of the participants had no motivation whatsoever to attend Gujarati School and explained that it was difficult to find the time and energy to attend additional classes outside of their mainstream school. One Singaporean participant describes how Gujarati classes on Saturdays meant that he really only had one free day in the week: “My whole Saturday is wasted, ‘cause I’ll go home [after Gujarati School] and take a nap and then I’ll wake up in the evening, so it’s a bit- my weekend’s- almost half of its gone” (Rohit, Singapore). A few participants in Singapore claimed to attend Gujarati School merely for attendance purposes, since the school requires 75% attendance in order to sit national examinations. Participants in Singapore and the U.K. described the jealousy they felt toward their non-Gujarati friends who had their Saturday mornings free. At times, going to Gujarati School on Saturday mornings had an impact on their Friday evenings too. Many admitted that they completed Gujarati School homework on Friday evenings and some of the older current students regretted not being able to go out on a Friday evening till late. In Singapore, participants were envious of their friends of other races who had completed their Mother Tongue (‘MT’) classes during the school week. This led some to express the wish that they had taken another language to fulfill their MT requirement. Priya describes going to Gujarati School as a “chore”:

I was bored out of my brains when I had to go there. ‘Cause I was like every Saturday, other people get to sleep in, they get to watch Saturday Live on TV, you know, laze around, whereas people like you and me had to wake up early, at about 8- what- like 7 o’clock, get ready for 8:30 to be dropped off to Gujarati School, it was like a chore. (Priya, UK)

Reena (UK) describes how she “forfeited other things for it [Gujarati School]”, a point raised by several other participants as well. Those who were heavily involved in sporting activities indicated that they often had trainings and competitions for sports on Saturday mornings, which clashed with Gujarati School, leading them to miss their Gujarati classes or their sporting activities. Despite having to give up other activities for Gujarati School, Reena describes that in hindsight, it was a good decision to have studied Gujarati:

I used to play tennis in the mornings, so I had to give that up to go to Gujarati School ... All my other friends at school, they used to watch Saturday morning TV and they’d talk about it in school and I’d be like “I don’t know what you’re talking about, ‘cause I went to Gujarati School” ... I had to- I guess I forfeited other things for it, which is
why I didn’t like want to go, but I’m really, really glad that I did and that my mother forced me to. (Reena, UK)

Despite the lack of motivation and interest in going to Gujarati School expressed by some, a number of reasons were cited by participants for studying Gujarati and attending Gujarati School. Not surprisingly, some of their reasons for attending Gujarati School changed with age and length of time spent in Gujarati School (e.g., parental decision to send their children to Gujarati School might have been a reason why participants first began Gujarati School, but seeing their Gujarati friends might have been a reason for them to continue studying the language in later years).

In the survey, participants chose a maximum of three reasons from a list of nine reasons as to why they went to Gujarati School. These reasons were presented in Chapter 3 and are repeated below:

- Parents’ wish that their child studies Gujarati
- To aid in communication with grandparents
- Part of being Indian means that one should be able to speak, read, and write in Gujarati well
- To have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati (e.g., GCSE in England, GCE O-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa)
- To understand one’s roots and origins
- To make new friends
- To organize and take part in cultural and religious events
- To have Gujarati on one’s CV
- Other

In the following subsections, I use qualitative data from the follow-up interview to discuss and explain the reasons that participants frequently chose from the above options which were presented to them in the survey. (The last two reasons are briefly discussed above and were only infrequently chosen.)

6.11.2.1 Parental Decision

Many of the parents (and sometimes grandparents) wanted their children (and grandchildren) to study Gujarati and hence sent them to Gujarati School. This was the most cited reason by participants for attending Gujarati School, with 58% choosing this reason as one of their three main reasons for studying Gujarati. Since most of the participants began Gujarati School at a very young age (usually around the age of five), it was the parents who made the initial decisions
about their child’s heritage language education. In Singapore, many of the recent graduates began studying Malay as their MT until Gujarati became recognized as a MT subject. To have their children switch from Malay to Gujarati was a decision often undertaken by Gujarati parents, since they considered Malay to be a subject which their child had the potential of doing very badly in whereas Gujarati was a subject which most of their children had more daily exposure to and which they or others in the family could help their child with. While parents were influential in initially making the decision to send their children to Gujarati School, the important role that parents played in later years also emerged from interview data. Parents were described as encouraging and at times even forcing their children to continue with Gujarati School even when participants themselves were not interested in doing so. Various methods were used by participants to try and convince their parents to let them miss a class (or quit Gujarati School altogether), e.g., pretending to be sick. In general, these efforts were in vain and parents ensured that they continued to attend Gujarati School. In hindsight, a large number of participants reported that they were glad that their parents had ensured that they received Gujarati language education (see, for example, the quote by Reena above). While choosing this reason does not correlate with participants’ objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency, subjective evaluation of language proficiency is significantly but negatively correlated with choosing this reason as one of their three reasons, indicating that those who went to Gujarati School because of their parents’ wish that they do so subjectively evaluated their proficiency both at the time of completing Gujarati School and at the time of completing the survey as lower than those who did not.

6.11.2.2 To Communicate with Monolingual Elders

For some, attending Gujarati School was to improve their communication skills in the language, so that they could communicate with certain members of their family. One participant describes how the ability to be able to communicate with her grandmother was the very reason she felt that it was important to know Gujarati: “I mostly spoke it [Gujarati] ‘cause of ba (grandmother) ... There wasn’t really any other reason [for me to learn Gujarati]” (Priti, UK). The ability to speak to grandparents was highlighted as an important reason to know Gujarati by those who had monolingual grandparents. While this may be an important reason for some of the participants in this study, some fear that this is not likely to continue to be a reason for future generations, since future generations of Gujaratis in Singapore, South Africa, and the U.K. will most likely not have monolingual Gujarati family members living in the diaspora. This viewpoint is shared by Jayni (originally presented in Section 6.3.1 and repeated below):
As far as our generation is concerned, unless the grandparents remain active, and also make a point of speaking in Gujarati, I don’t think children will speak it, because increasingly you see like the young bas (grandmothers) and bapujis (grandfathers) and stuff sort of the younger generation, they’ll converse in English and as soon as the grandchild knows that their grandparents can speak English, that’s it, they’re going to speak in English. (Jayni, UK)

In addition, others emphasized that the Gujarati School’s focus on reading and writing meant that spoken skills were often not adequately developed at Gujarati School and these participants therefore felt that Gujarati School did not play a role in helping them to communicate with monolingual elders.

6.11.2.3 Identity

Studying Gujarati because it is important for identity-related reasons is a significant predictor of objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati. As described in Section 6.10, the importance of knowing Gujarati for identity-related reasons was repeatedly stressed by Singaporean and British participants. This was not a point typically raised by South African participants, who generally felt that knowing Gujarati was not important for ethnic identity. Even those South Africans who felt that language was important for ethnic identity typically felt that it was not essential to be fluent in the language. For example, in his interview with me, Kavit (SA) highlights that it is important to know just the basics of Gujarati, e.g., to be able to greet other Gujaratis, but it was not essential to know more. In Singapore, there has been an increase in the number of Gujaratis who are choosing to study Hindi as their MT subject. While Hindi is a North Indian language that is similar to Gujarati in many ways, several participants still felt that it was important to choose to study Gujarati rather than Hindi. One participant expresses his opinion on this matter, stressing how he finds it “ridiculous” if Gujaratis choose Hindi instead of Gujarati:

I think that’s ridiculous frankly. If you are a Gujarati, you should be able to speak Gujarati. I mean, if you are a Gujarati and then you attend Hindi School and then all your friends- most of your friends are Hindi, and then the culture also, it’s a bit different. Like even if Hindis and- those who study Hindi and those who study Gujarati, their lifestyle itself is a little different, like the way they speak, the jokes they understand, it’s a bit different, so I mean if you learn a different language, I believe that you will not be the Gujarati that you are. (Bhavik, Singapore)

As highlighted by Bhavik above and indicated by others in Singapore, the study of Hindi among Gujaratis would impact other aspects of their lives, e.g., integrating into and connecting with the Gujarati community, friend circle, etc., all of which are important for ethnic identity.
6.11.2.4 To Take National Examinations and Gain National Qualifications in Gujarati

In Singapore, students are required to study English and their mother tongue (‘MT’) language up to the GCE O-Level\(^6\) stage. One Singaporean describes how she would not have chosen to study Gujarati if it would not have counted for her GCE O-Level examinations; instead she would have preferred to have taken a language like Spanish. As Gujarati (or another MT language) is required for entrance into Singaporean universities, participants are required to study it. Many described that it was “easy to score” (Tina, Singapore) in Gujarati examinations compared to other subjects. This viewpoint was generally expressed more by Singaporeans than South African and British participants, and may result from the fact that many of the graduates had previously taken Malay which some described themselves as struggling with.

In the U.K., the ability to take formal examinations in Gujarati was described as a good incentive for students to continue with Gujarati School. Participants described gaining an extra GCSE qualification as advantageous. According to Sagar (UK), who currently teaches at the school, examinations which are nationally recognized are good incentives for both parents and children: “The way they try to get people to commit to Gujarati is by bringing examinations, proper examinations. Did I tell you about ASSET?” Sagar refers to ASSET examinations here, a new assessment scheme for proficiency in languages other than English recently introduced in the U.K., and further explains the importance of these examinations in his interview with me. It is possible to take ASSET examinations in all foreign and modern languages (including Gujarati), and various levels exist. ASSET has recently been introduced at the Oshwal Gujarati School and the various examinations that exist for ASSET are taken before students reach the GCSE year. According to Sagar, “because it’s a formal qualification, maybe parents will think that ‘Oh, because it’s a proper exam, therefore they go along, they’ll get this’”. However, he highlights that in fact “it [an ASSET qualification] doesn’t actually mean that much in terms of UCAS (the British admission service for students applying to university and college) and all of that”.

Many South Africans described taking Gujarati as a Matriculation subject to help them obtain admission into university. Gujarati in South Africa is considered as an extra subject and therefore the grade obtained in Gujarati is generally not considered in university applications. The one exception lies when students do badly in another subject, in which case Gujarati can take the place of one of their weaker subjects. One participant, who dropped Gujarati in grade 11, one year before Matriculation, describes why she did so:

The reason behind people taking it [Gujarati for Matriculation] was in case they screw up another subject like one of the six [core subjects], so the Gujarati mark would raise

---

\(^6\)See Appendix O for a brief explanation of the national examinations in Gujarati available in the three countries.
their aggregate or whatever. I didn’t find the need to do that, because I didn’t have that issue. And if you’re doing it for the wrong reasons, why do it? (Meeta, SA)

Another participant describes how she was encouraged to continue with Gujarati for Matriculation by one of her teachers, since it would not matter if she passed or failed it, as it would be her seventh subject, and universities only consider the scores obtained from the six core subjects. However, on receiving a lower grade for one of her core subjects and a higher grade for Gujarati, she was able to use her Gujarati score to get admission into university. The importance of choosing this reason as it relates to variations in language proficiency can be seen when examining the quantitative findings. Studying Gujarati to take national examinations in Gujarati is significantly correlated with objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati and is in fact a significant predictor of participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency.

In addition to national examinations, there were also internal examinations in all three schools that were held at the end of each academic year. While these were not recognized externally, various incentives were available to encourage the students to do well. For example, trophies, prizes, and certificates were given to the students who performed extremely well in these examinations, which participants described as an incentive and motivation to study hard for Gujarati.

6.11.2.5 Roots and Origins

Studying Gujarati for some was to understand their roots and origins. The Gujarati Schools in all three countries placed importance on teaching students about their background through the use of stories and other means. According to Aditi, studying Gujarati at Gujarati School helped her to know about her ancestral roots and origins:

I guess it [Gujarati School] is about learning my language, how to read, write, and speak it. And then partly to make new friends, who are from my religion and my culture, so that I can talk to them and things like that. And then also to like- to really know where I come from, ‘cause I think if I- otherwise I’d be kind of lost about who- not who I am, but like about my religion and that sort of side, like religious side of things. (Aditi, UK)

Similarly, when asked to sum up how she viewed her time at Gujarati School, Anjali highlights the importance of the school in teaching her about her roots and origins, and emphasizes that this was important in making her feel more Gujarati:

I also got to know, you know, like how our roots basically, our origin, like where we came from, you know, and the entire language, and people from our- our people in India, you know and stuff like that, so it was really helpful in that way, because if I was not gone to Gujarati School, if I just carried on with Malay, I would not really be so culturally like diverse and I would like probably just be so English, like very English, because the way I am, I would not be bothered about that at all. (Anjali, Singapore, original emphasis)
While there is no statistically significant relationship between objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency and studying Gujarati to learn about one’s roots and origins, this was a point that was nonetheless highlighted by some participants as an aspect that was important in their Gujarati School experience.

6.11.2.6 For Social Reasons

In the interviews, the reason that was most often cited among British and Singaporean participants for going to Gujarati School was to see friends. This was a point that was not mentioned by the South African participants, since the vast majority attended the Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir (SBSM) school and therefore saw their Gujarati friends in the main school in the mornings. At Gujarati School, participants had the possibility to socialize with others who were of the same age and background as them. Many of these friendships began at a young age and lasted beyond the completion of Gujarati School. Some participants described their best and closest friends being from Gujarati School:

Some of my best friends are probably from Gujarati School, you’ve known them since you were five years old, but it’s never like your school friends, because your school friends you see day in day out, and you know, these are Gujarati School friends, they share the same interests as you, they speak the same language as you, you can really, really relate to them. My school friends, they’re black and white and all this, so you can’t always relate to them. (Rahul, UK, original emphasis)

Participants also highlighted that knowing that they would see their friends was a personal motivation for them to attend Gujarati School (as opposed to being encouraged solely by parents to do so) and continue the study of Gujarati at Gujarati School: ‘I think that [my friends] is really what motivated me to carry on, ‘cause a lot of people dropped out of Gujarati School, because it’s just extra work if you look at it” (Rahul, UK). Similarly, Bina (UK) describes her friends as being one reason why she decided to continue onto AS Level after her GCSE examination:

I think I had a lot of influence from other people in that decision, because a lot of my friends who I had been friends with for so many years were doing it [AS in Gujarati] and it was just you know, you don’t want to- you’ve been with them for so long, you’re just like “Yeh, come on, one more year won’t hurt or anything”. So, that was part of it, to go and see my friends. (Bina, UK, original emphasis)

The importance of this reason as it relates to variations in Gujarati language proficiency can be seen when examining the quantitative findings. Studying Gujarati to make Gujarati friends is significantly correlated with participants’ objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati and is in fact also a significant predictor of their objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency.
6.11.2.7 For Cultural and Religious Reasons

Cultural and religious activities featured prominently in the U.K. and South African Gujarati Schools, but not in the Singaporean Gujarati School as a result of state policy which dictates that language education is secular. Many participants described these activities as the highlight and most memorable experience of attending Gujarati School. Participants in England described the Prefect Show as a particularly enjoyable experience. (This is a cultural show organized by GCSE class students in leadership positions - i.e., the head boy, head girl, their deputies, and the prefects. It involves the whole school, with minimal help from the teachers.) The school also often organized plays, dances, and other events. In South Africa, participants described events such as “Gandhi Satabdi”, which is a competition that involves dancing, speeches, etc., among various schools as a particularly memorable experience. Religious knowledge was also transmitted to the participants through the school, e.g., through morning assemblies, visits to places of worship, etc. For Kalpa, the choice to continue to study Gujarati at an advanced level was precisely for religious reasons. She describes in her interview with me how her guru (spiritual teacher) encouraged her to continue Gujarati after she stopped attending Gujarati classes for a brief period:

Number one, it was guru’s aghna (spiritual teacher’s command) to continue with Gujarati and since every like sanskrut (someone who is proficient in the Sanskrit language) that have come, they have been like “No, do Gujarati, do Gujarati”. And no one’s actually done Gujarati before, so I thought “No, let me actually continue with Gujarati”... Coming back to Gujarati was just to- as guru’s aghna (spiritual teacher’s command), so to obey guru’s aghna (spiritual teacher’s command), and like gain his rajipoor (agreement), because that’s the main thing for us [Swaminarayans]. (Kalpa, SA)

Participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency is significantly but negatively correlated with going to Gujarati School to take part in religious and cultural activities, indicating that those who chose this reason had lower objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati than those who did not. This is not surprising, given that many of these events are conducted in English and given that those who chose this reason as one of their three reasons might not necessarily have been as interested in the language component of Gujarati School.

The above subsections highlight the diversity of reasons that participants gave for choosing to study Gujarati and attend Gujarati School. In addition, in the above subsections, I have highlighted how choosing certain reasons over others had a positive (or negative) impact on participants’ objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency, and also how picking certain reasons were significant predictors of their objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati. In the following section, I discuss the ways in which teaching methods and teachers impacted the participants’ learning experience and consequently their proficiency in Gujarati.
6.11.3 Teachers

In the interviews with both current students and graduates, participants described their Gujarati School teachers as being different from their mainstream school teachers. As the Gujarati School teachers are part of the local Gujarati community, they are personally known to the participants. In some cases, teachers were related to participants, either through their extended family (e.g., as their aunt) or through their immediate family (e.g., as their mother). As a result, there is a connection via the community or family between current/former students and teachers, which makes them familiar figures to the participants, even outside the school context. While generally viewed positively, one negative aspect to this was favoritism. Students were sometimes favored because of family connections, even when the students themselves misbehaved or performed poorly in their schoolwork. A Head Boy of the Oshwal Gujarati School mentioned how he was elected Head Boy because he was liked by the teachers: “I think the Head Boy position was given to me more, because the teachers liked me and because I was sociable” (Dipak, UK). Those who were not favored viewed this negatively and compared this aspect with their mainstream school, where favoritism to the extent that it happened at Gujarati School would not have been allowed to happen at their mainstream school.

Gujarati School teachers were described as being motherly figures: “They were my mothers away from home” (Kinari, SA) and were described as treating the students like their own sons and daughters. Many of the teachers themselves were parents and their own children had attended Gujarati School, so they understood that coming to Gujarati School was an additional extracurricular activity for students. This was seen in their demeanor toward the students. They were described as being kinder and less strict than mainstream school teachers. They were also described as being more lenient than mainstream school teachers. For example, participants indicated that not doing homework had less dire consequences at their Gujarati School than at their mainstream school. In addition, teachers were described as doing more than just teaching the language. They also taught the participants ethics and morals, e.g., respecting elders and working hard.

Gujarati School teachers tended to use traditional teaching methods and less interactive methods to teach Gujarati. Participants pointed out the differences between learning a language at their mainstream school (e.g., French, Afrikaans, etc.) and learning Gujarati. For example, at Gujarati School, learning involved a lot of copying from the board, repetition, and completing exercises. There were generally no group activities or role plays involved. One British participant believes that it would be beneficial to organize fieldtrips for Gujarati, as is done for languages learnt at mainstream schools. According to him, a possible fieldtrip could be an outing to a market in...
Wembley, a suburb of London where there are a large concentration of Gujaratis, “cause if we’re learning fruit and things, if you go and see it or buy it and just talk to them, it’s really a lot better than actually just learning from a textbook” (Aakash, UK). While he admits that there are plenty of opportunities to practice Gujarati in Croydon, citing Grainmill, an Indian grocery shop located close to the Gujarati School where Gujarati is often heard and used, as an example, he describes a fieldtrip outside of the hometown as an exciting new opportunity to practice the language in real life:

Aakash (UK): I think the main thing is that if you went to Wembley, it’s a new environment, ‘cause if you go to like you know where Grainmill (name of an Indian grocery shop in Croydon) and all of those shops are? Sheena: Yep. Aakash (UK): We go there all the time with our parents and it’s like you’re not like talking to them at all and you just know them. It’s a lot different if you went to a market and you had to do your bargaining in Gujarati.

Many participants in South Africa described being “spoon-fed” by teachers. Teachers were described as giving students tailor-made essays, which students then “swotted” (i.e., memorized, “crammed for”) before examinations. Alpa and Hiral describe in their own words their experiences of learning Gujarati for Matriculation:

Honestly we didn’t learn much out of it, ‘cause everything was given to us and so even for our exam, the questions and answers were given to us, so we just learnt it all and wrote it down, so nothing valuable came out of it, so if I think in hindsight, it was a waste. (Alpa, SA)

They would give you the answers. So it would be like, “Ok, this is the question they’re gonna ask you in your exam. This is the answer you should give for it.” So it was always like just learn this, and you’ll get it. (Hiral, SA)

Hiral and Alpa’s descriptions of learning Gujarati resemble that of many other South African participants. Several of the current students described how swotting helped them obtain good grades in examinations, yet they also acknowledged the disadvantages of swotting. Anushka describes the advantages and disadvantages of swotting:

We are like spoon-fed, ‘cause we get everything and then you just like swot everything off and you just go write it in the exam ... I think it’s good because you just get the marks like that. But then, if you really want to understand it and things, then what’s the point, ‘cause you’re just swotting it and going to regurgitate it ... If you’re going to speak to someone, then you can’t swot your conversation off. (Anushka, SA)

For the graduates, the general feeling was that swotting was pointless: “For your comprehensions and that, you just sit and you swotted. You had no idea what you were reading” (Radha, SA). Radha believes that the extent of swotting that was undertaken at Gujarati School is one reason why
the level of Gujarati among former students of the school is currently so bad. Similar viewpoints were held by many others:

I think that [memorizing and then forgetting] is the biggest problem. It’s ‘cause now if you ask me to like write a poem or to say the poem, I wouldn’t know it, because I learnt it at that stage and that was it, whereas English poetry, you had to understand it, because you had to go and analyze it, whatever, so now you still remember it from school days. (Hiral, SA)

When asked about improving the school, several points were raised by participants. One was having more training for teachers. Ishani (UK), a recent graduate from the Oshwal Gujarati School who went on to be an assistant teacher at the school and later Deputy Head of the school, describes the need for teachers to introduce more innovative ways of teaching to keep the students interested in the content of the classes. She compares this with mainstream schools, where teachers have incorporated the use of technology and evolved their teaching methods with time. By contrast, many of the Gujarati School teachers still used traditional teaching methods, described by several participants (e.g., Shilpa, SA and Radha, SA) as “old-school”, and many were resistant to change, especially the older teachers who had been teaching at the school for a long time. One South Africa participant describes how Gujarati is taught at her temple in various interactive ways, including through games, such as hangman and computer games, and emphasizes in her interview with me how she believes that it is important to teach Gujarati in an enjoyable way to keep children interested in the language. Another improvement that was recommended by participants was the use of better textbooks. In Singapore, the students previously used workbooks from India. Some complained that the stories that they read did not apply to their situation and local context and how they therefore could not relate to them. For example, village stories that described how to get water from a well were inapplicable to their life in Singapore. This has since changed and teachers at the school have now created new textbooks that fit with the local Singaporean context. A similar situation is found in the U.K., where several teachers have begun writing their own passages which are applicable to the British Gujarati experience rather than relying on the passages found in textbooks from India. In particular, the syllabi for the AS and A Level examinations discuss current affairs and all participants who took these examinations thoroughly enjoyed studying these topics which were of particular relevance and interest to them: “The thing I liked about A Level was that it’s so relevant and it’s so interesting” (Sagar, UK). Another improvement that was suggested by several was more structured grammar teaching. When asked about difficulties they faced in Gujarati, the majority highlighted difficulties that were grammar-related. In particular, these difficulties included problems with tenses, gender agreement, and case endings (see Section
4.7.1), and were difficulties that remained with participants even after studying the language for many years:

My grammar’s always been not the best ... Even in A Level, like even my teacher always used to say to me that ... everything about my essays and my speaking was perfect. Just the only thing that would get me was my grammar. (Anisha, UK)

Interestingly, many emphasized that these were not difficulties that they faced with other languages that they were studying. For example, one participant describes how he knows which articles to use in French (masculine, feminine, or neuter), but he still struggles with this in Gujarati. In the U.K., participants highlighted that a lot of emphasis was put on practicing how to write Gujarati, with one participant recalling still doing handwriting practice at the age of ten. While some felt this was necessary, since Gujarati uses a different script to English, some highlighted that too much time was spent on this and not on important aspects of learning the language, like grammar.

Teachers were described as not always being professional and fully qualified, yet they helped students achieve good grades in the national examinations. According to one Singaporean participant, “I’m not sure whether they are fully qualified, because last I heard was they are just normal housewives or homemakers, and they just volunteer to help out. None of them go to a teaching school. None have a degree in Gujarati” (Amit, Singapore). However, he went on to say that they nonetheless taught well and had a deep knowledge of the Gujarati language, despite no actual teaching qualification. There was a general feeling of admiration and respect among the participants for their teachers, especially among the graduates:

To me, whether they were qualified or not didn’t really matter, because I felt that they were just like- they were doing a service like you know they’re coming and out of their time, they’re just teaching Gujarati and they’re just imparting whatever they know, so to me, that was a very noble thing to do, like you know, you’re trying to pass the culture onto the next generation. (Parag, Singapore)

The reputation of the schools was high as a result of the generally excellent grades achieved by students in national examinations, and the major role that teachers played in this was acknowledged by many participants. Students at the Oshwal Gujarati School compared their Gujarati School with other Gujarati Schools in the area and described the Oshwal Gujarati School as “the best in South London” (Minal, UK).

In the U.K., some who were struggling with the language made the point that there should have been a separate or additional class to help them. In recent years, however, a “catch-up class” has been introduced between the first and second years, so that students who have completed the first year of study at Gujarati School but who aren’t quite ready to enter the second year
can receive extra support. Despite such catch-up classes not existing during the time when most of the participants were at the school, the point was also made by many of them that there were often additional classes toward examination time and that teachers did more than their job description required them to do. In Singapore, especially when Gujarati first became recognized as a Non-Tamil Indian Language (NTIL) subject, a teacher was available to provide extra help in the language. This was especially needed for those who switched from Malay to Gujarati during their primary school years and had to prepare in only a few years to take the PSLE examination in Gujarati in Grade 6. Many Singaporean participants reported that they had private tutoring outside of Gujarati classes. These tuition sessions tended to be with Gujarati School teachers. One participant described how everyone in her class was having tuition except her. This led her to question the effectiveness of Gujarati School, since everyone except for her needed this extra support outside of class. Another participant described how tuition was necessary in her case, since the syllabus became tougher, everyone became more competitive, and she was in the unfortunate position of having two locally born parents who did not speak Gujarati at home, so she felt the extra support outside of Gujarati School was therefore needed. South African participants made similar remarks to British and Singaporean participants and described teachers as always being available. One participant describes how she was able to call teachers the night before an examination to ask questions she had, but how she got scolded for doing this with her mainstream school teachers. While some remarked that they didn’t quite realize at the time everything that the teachers did for them, in hindsight they were very grateful to them.

In the U.K., there is the possibility for recent graduates of the Oshwal Gujarati School to return to the school as assistant teachers or helpers after graduation. In recent years, there seems to be a trend among many to do so. Those currently acting as assistant teachers or helpers described this as a way to give something back to the school and also as a chance to see friends. One current student, who was considering helping out after graduation, describes how Gujarati School has “been a part of my life for over 10 years now” (Sumir, UK) and how he will miss not going there after graduation. For him, he sees acting as an assistant teacher or helper as a way to continue having Gujarati School feature in his life. Those who helped out also gained some teaching experience at a young age and such experiences also helped to reinforce linguistic skills in the language. Most volunteered at the school for one or two years, and stopped once they started university. However, a few continued and went on to become teachers after a few years of being an assistant teacher.
6.11.4 Summary

In sum, Gujarati School played a central role in language transmission and maintenance. Attending Gujarati School allowed participants to gain literacy skills and also reinforce spoken skills. However, many felt that more emphasis needed to be placed on the latter, which they often considered to be more important than knowing how to read and write in Gujarati. A number of reasons were cited for why they attended Gujarati School. These reasons had an impact on their views and attitudes toward Gujarati, which in turn influenced their language use, and consequently their proficiency levels. While Gujarati School was considered by many as an important institution for language maintenance, the Gujarati language instruction was often not equivalent to the language education they received in their main school, and Gujarati teachers were not always fully qualified. Suggestions for improving Gujarati language education included more training for teachers, more interactive teaching methods, more contextually relevant textbooks, and more structured grammar teaching. Despite this, Gujarati School is likely to remain an important institution for imparting Gujarati to future generations in the diaspora, especially as the opportunities to hear and use Gujarati outside Gujarati School decrease and the influence of English increases with each new generation in the diaspora.

6.12 Gujarati Language Development over Time

In Section 6.6, the importance of the variable ‘age’ as it relates to Gujarati language proficiency was highlighted. While age is an important variable in explaining variations in heritage language proficiency, language proficiency should not solely be seen as deteriorating with age, but instead as a process in which Gujarati skills may improve or deteriorate at different stages in participants’ lives, which can be explained by a number of factors, several of which have been highlighted throughout this chapter.

Some notable patterns emerged in terms of the variation found in participants’ Gujarati language ability and proficiency at different stages in their lives, i.e., their Gujarati skills improved or deteriorated depending on a number of factors. For many participants, Gujarati proficiency was strongest before the start of primary school (age 5), with several participants claiming to only know Gujarati at this stage in their lives. Their skills deteriorated rapidly with the start of school, at which point English increasingly became dominant in their lives. At around this time, many first began Gujarati School. Gujarati School played an important role in reinforcing their skills in Gujarati at a time when English was slowly becoming their dominant language (see Section 6.11). The effects of mainstream schooling on the participants’ language use are clearly evident when
comparing survey responses to the questions about the language they spoke before entering primary school and the language they currently speak with various members of their family. Trips to India played an important role in helping them to regain language skills and fluency, and in motivating many to continue speaking Gujarati (see Section 6.9). Once they became older, and especially once they completed Gujarati School, they often had fewer opportunities to use Gujarati and their language abilities started to wane. Other factors besides Gujarati School played a role in this as well. Participants described being caught up in other activities related to school, university, or their jobs, which meant that there was less time to go to community events and to mix with other Gujarati speakers. For some of the graduates, the only source of Gujarati they now had was in the home, whereas they previously also had Gujarati exposure at the Gujarati School and in community functions. While this was the case for many, some also highlighted how a change in attitudes at a later stage in their lives also motivated them to use more Gujarati, because they realized the importance of it (see Section 6.10).

What becomes clear here is that their Gujarati language development went through different phases. There were times when their language skills deteriorated and other times when they regained their language skills and when their fluency was high. Fluctuations in language ability seem to be heavily dependent on language use and exposure, i.e., language skills seem to improve when participants have the chance to use the language and when they are exposed to the language, a finding which is also confirmed by quantitative analyses.

6.13 The Future of Gujarati in the Diaspora

Having described various factors that played a role in determining variations in language proficiency among the participants, the question that remains is what future a minority language like Gujarati will have in diaspora contexts. Will Gujarati be maintained in the future? Which factors will ensure Gujarati language use, transmission, and maintenance in the future, and how can these factors best be fostered? With these questions in mind, some of which are addressed in more detail in Chapter 7, I discuss the participants’ first-hand accounts of the future of Gujarati in their diaspora context.

An overwhelming large majority of participants felt that the future of Gujarati in the diaspora looked bleak. Several factors led them to this viewpoint. First, Gujaratis in the diaspora were described as becoming increasingly western and modern in their outlook on life, which had a negative effect on heritage language maintenance and transmission. Second, participants in all three countries described the diminishing number of students over the years at their Gujarati
School. According to one participant in South Africa, there had been 400 students attending the school when she was a student there and now there were a mere 100 students. Another participant in South Africa describes how her class used to contain about twenty students and now there are only four of them studying the language. The diminishing number of students may result from a lack of interest on the part of the children, who might not see the value of learning Gujarati, but also from the new generation of parents, who are not L1 speakers of Gujarati for the most part, and who are increasingly becoming interested in sending their children to other extra-curricular activities (e.g., swimming, karate, violin, etc.) rather than to Gujarati School. However, there were some cases where the opposite was true: Parents who may have regretted not having had the opportunity to study Gujarati were often described as choosing to send their children to Gujarati School. Sagar, a recent graduate and a current teacher at the school, describes this trend:

40 year old parents or 10 years older than maybe yourself or something, they’re thinking that “Do they really need this Saturday mornings when they can learn the violin or something, which will stay with them for the rest of their life. They don’t really need to do Gujarati” and stuff, so a lot of them are not signing [their children] up [for Gujarati classes]. You do have the opposite as well, where you get parents, and there are quite a few parents like that as well, who are always eager to make you take part [in Gujarati], because they’re thinking that I never actually got the chance to do this, they’re actually thinking that, “because you know, I was born in the U.K. or came here when I was two or three, the parents, I never got a chance to study Gujarati. I at least want my children to, you know”, and they’re saying even at Parents Evening, they were saying that they actually can’t read themselves or something, but they just love seeing that their child can. (Sagar, UK)

While Sagar describes how many of the parents may not have had a chance to study Gujarati, opportunities/incentives to study the language have increased in recent years in all three sites. In the U.K., the school currently allows non-Oshwals to attend the school, which was not the case in the past. In Singapore, the introduction of Gujarati as a MT subject has created more incentives among young people to study Gujarati. In South Africa, the introduction of a morning school where Gujarati is incorporated into the main school syllabus has meant that all students receive some Gujarati education, even if they choose not to attend the optional afternoon Gujarati School.

Third, there have been changes in lifestyle and living patterns among the diaspora Gujaratis, with increasing numbers choosing to move away from Indian areas to other areas and increasingly choosing to live in two generational households. In South Africa, for example, participants who attended schools in other suburbs in Johannesburg were often unable to attend Gujarati School in the afternoons because they were situated too far away and they did not have the time. Fourth, the new generation of parents is increasingly speaking more English to their children. A lack of intergenerational language transmission enhances the likelihood of language shift taking place. This trend is likely to continue in future generations. Participants highlighted how they did not see
themselves talking to their children in Gujarati: “I certainly won’t talk to my children in Gujarati, ‘cause it’s so much easier to talk in English obviously” (Dhruv, UK). English was generally the dominant language among the participants. Jayni highlights her wish that her children grow up speaking Gujarati like herself, but regrettably admits that “to raise them [my children] speaking Gujarati would probably be very contrived and unnatural”:

My single biggest fear in life is that my children won’t speak Gujarati, and that fear is so great because there is a very large chance that this will be the case. I would always intend to raise my children to be able to speak Gujarati, but the truth is that I never, ever converse with my peers in Gujarati. In fact, to do so would feel weird and forced. So even if I was to marry a Gujarati, I would be unlikely to converse with him in Gujarati, and listening to us would be the main way a child learns to speak. To raise them speaking Gujarati would probably be very contrived and unnatural and this is because, sadly, English is the language I think and dream in. (Jayni, UK)

Fifth, many participants, especially those who had monolingual grandparents, described how there was a real need for them to know Gujarati for communication purposes, but that this will probably not be the case in future generations:

We’re kind of the last generation for it though, because I can’t see- because when I have children, that will be in many, many years, and like I can’t see it being used within England then, like what’s the need, ‘cause like my grandparents are one of the main reasons why you know Gujarati is useful, but by then, they’ll have died ... so I can’t see the use of it [in the future]. (Dhruv, UK).

Sixth, other languages were increasingly gaining higher priority for Gujaratis in the diaspora. These include languages which are considered more useful in the diaspora context in which they are living (e.g., Mandarin in Singapore). However, there is also increasing interest in taking Hindi among Gujaratis in the diaspora, especially among those in Singapore (both expats and locals). Hindi was often considered more useful and practical than Gujarati, since it is more widely spoken than Gujarati and is one of the national languages of India, the other being English. Seventh, participants highlighted that certain skills (e.g., speaking) are more likely to be maintained in the diaspora context than others (e.g., writing), since skills like writing were considered to be useless in the diaspora. This point is highlighted by Aarti, among others:

I think writing is really useless, because where do you use that? I mean, besides my exams which you know I had to- there was written Gujarati. I don’t see it being practical, writing, you know. [It’s] not like we even write to our, you know, like cousin nana (maternal grandfather) and nani (maternal grandmother) in India now, you know, nothing like that also, we just talk to them on the phone. (Aarti, Singapore)

Despite this negative outlook described for Gujarati by the majority of participants, there were some positive feelings about Gujarati language maintenance. In particular, participants highlighted certain factors as being especially important in helping Gujarati to be maintained and in slowing
down Gujarati language shift in the diaspora. First, Gujarati School was described as an important institution that played a valuable role in preserving, transmitting, and emphasizing the value and importance of Gujarati: “Because we don’t really speak it at home, I don’t think it [Gujarati] would be so important, but I think Gujarati class has made me realize how important it is” (Karishma, UK). However, there was some fear expressed that Gujarati School may no longer be in existence by the time the participants have children. This was mentioned by participants in all three countries. Second, comparisons were made with other Indian languages in the diaspora. According to South African participants, Gujarati was still in a better position than other Indian languages. Participants often described how their other Indian friends (e.g., Tamil and Hindi) did not know or understand any of their ancestral languages, but how Gujaratis at least seemed to know the basics of Gujarati. Third, the Gujarati community was described as an insular community, especially in Singapore, which increases the likelihood of language being sustained in the diaspora. Fourth, the country’s role in promoting community languages was highlighted. This was especially the case in Singapore, where the Ministry of Education has been described as placing a lot of importance and emphasis on North Indian languages in recent years, which is likely to help its survival and transmission. Similar findings were found in the U.K, with the introduction of additional ways of assessing Gujarati (e.g., through ASSET examinations). In Singapore, the requirement to study a MT language meant that participants generally felt the need to do well, which seems less likely the case in a country like South Africa, where participants often highlighted that their scores were often dismissed in university applications unless they did poorly in one of their other subjects. However, with Gujarati featuring in the mainstream school curriculum in South Africa, even those who do not attend the afternoon Gujarati classes were able to gain some exposure to Gujarati. Finally, in Singapore and the U.K., participants highlighted that the links that these countries have with India will mean that Gujarati families will continue to migrate to these two countries, which increases the likelihood of Gujarati being maintained there.

6.14 Summary

In this chapter, I highlighted the major factors that account for the variation in Gujarati ability among the participants and contribute to higher language proficiency. In addition, I illustrated the value of using a mixed methods approach. Whereas the survey provides an essential overview of the chief factors affecting Gujarati maintenance and proficiency, the qualitative study helps explain the ‘big picture’ survey results. What becomes clear when the results of both methods are brought together is the importance of the actual use of the language in everyday life. Other factors (e.g.,
age, trips and ties to India, etc.) are also closely linked to actual language use, highlighting that
the various factors affecting proficiency are not always independent, but rather that they often
interact. Furthermore, this chapter analyses general differences in proficiency levels in the three
countries, i.e., why South Africans had a lower average proficiency in Gujarati than Singaporean
and British participants. I continue these discussions in Chapter 7. Based on the findings from
this chapter, I provide a number of recommendations to heritage language schools and parents to
ensure heritage language maintenance and high proficiency levels in Gujarati.
Chapter 7

Conclusions and Limitations

7.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the causes behind the differences in Gujarati proficiency among heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents, with a particular emphasis on whether there is a relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic and cultural identity. As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, studies that have examined the role that identity plays in explaining variation in heritage language proficiency have tended to focus on one community in one location (e.g., C. L. Brown, 2009; Chinen & Tucker, 2005; Kang & Kim, 2011) or on several different ethnic communities in one location (e.g., Phinney et al., 2001; Mah, 2005; Smolicz, 1992). Other studies have focused on speakers in one location who speak different dialects of the same heritage language (e.g., Albirini, 2013 on Egyptian and Palestinian Arabic heritage speakers in the U.S.). Few studies have focused on one community in different transnational locations (see Canagarajah, 2008; Canagarajah, 2012a; Canagarajah, 2012b) on the development of new identities among the Tamil diaspora communities in London, Toronto, and California). Performing a fine-grained analysis and focusing on one ethnic group in different locations can, I believe, achieve a number of goals. It can a) help to explain the differences in speaker proficiency, b) add to our general understanding and knowledge of heritage language learning and ethnic identity formation, and c) illustrate how differences in identity formation, acculturation, and assimilation into the host society, as well as issues that are more ‘external’ to the speakers (e.g., government policies, population concentration, surrounding languages/dialects, etc.) may impact proficiency. I explored these issues both quantitatively through examining the extent to which the proportion of variation in proficiency among Gujarati heritage learners could be explained by selected identity and demographic variables, and
linguistic experiences/history, and qualitatively through analyzing participants’ personal narratives on these topics.

7.2 Methods and Procedures

This study is a mixed methods study, which combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The mixed methods design used in this study is the triangulation design (Creswell et al., 2003). In this design, qualitative and quantitative data are collected and analyzed separately but concomitantly using two or more methods (in this case, three methods were employed: surveys, interviews, and oral proficiency tests\(^1\)), with each approach being given equal weight. See Section 3.3 for more information about the triangulation design.

In this study, I conducted surveys with 135 heritage learners of Gujarati, who were either current students or recent graduates of a Gujarati School in Singapore, South Africa, or the U.K. I obtained quantifiable data related to demography, language acquisition, ethnic identification, subjective evaluations of language ability and national examination scores through detailed questionnaires, and triangulated these data with quantitative data from oral proficiency tests, which provided an objective evaluation of the participants’ spoken abilities in Gujarati. At the same time, I also conducted and analyzed semi-structured follow-up interviews of about 60 minutes long with each survey participant, which enabled participants to discuss their views about speaking a heritage language and growing up as second and subsequent generations of Gujaratis in their respective countries. By incorporating both sociolinguistic and applied linguistic methodologies, and combining qualitative and quantitative approaches, the quantitative statistical results obtained from the surveys and oral proficiency tests were enriched by information obtained from the semi-structured follow-up interviews. In this way, using participants’ own words and insights, the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were used to support and confirm the patterns in the quantitative results including to help explain, or at least illustrate, contradictions and complications. The study demonstrates that the multifaceted and shifting nature of identity cannot be fully captured with any single research methodology, whether ‘objective’ tests of language proficiency, surveys eliciting subjective responses to pre-determined frames (including survey items regarding subjectively evaluated language proficiency), or open-ended interviews focusing on participants’ own views and evaluations.

\(^1\)In addition, other measures of proficiency were considered (participants’ self-evaluations, participants’ scores on national examinations). Further, the holistic ratings yielded by the oral proficiency tests were compared with two other measures (type-token coding, speech rate). In these ways, an even broader perspective was gained.
7.3 Major Findings

In this section, the major findings from Chapters 4, 5, and 6 are summarized. Table 7.1 presents the significant quantitative findings concerning the relationship between language proficiency and ethnic identity. Table 7.2 and Table 7.3 present the identity markers that fit into participants’ own descriptions of ethnic and local identity. Table 7.4 presents the main qualitative and quantitative findings concerning the relationship between language proficiency and demographic and language acquisition factors.

Discussion of findings: Table 7.1: Significant quantitative findings concerning the relationship between language proficiency and ethnic identity. First, significant correlations exist between individual identity variables and participants’ current subjectively evaluated language proficiency (indicated by $X$); those who identified themselves as Indian through some of the identity variables also subjectively evaluated their language proficiency in Gujarati as being higher. A lesser number of significant correlations exist between sense of Gujarati identity and objective evaluation of spoken proficiency (indicated by $X$), and between sense of Gujarati identity and subjectively evaluated language proficiency in the past, at the time of completing Gujarati School (indicated by $X$). The U.K. participants who identified themselves as Indian through two of the identity variables (i.e., music and clothes) had high objectively evaluated spoken proficiency. Similarly, the U.K. participants who self-identified as Indian had high subjectively evaluated proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School, and the Singaporean participants who preferred Indian events and the South African participants who connected better with their Indian friends had low subjectively evaluated proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School (indicated by $(-)$). No significant correlations exist between any of the identity variables and national examination scores. In addition, a larger number of correlations exist between the individual identity variables and language proficiency for a) the U.K. participants and b) the current students, meaning that the British participants and the current students who identified themselves as Indian through some of the identity variables also felt that they had (or in a few cases, actually did have) higher proficiency. Finally, in all but one case, the identity variables were not able to significantly predict language proficiency. Only self-identifying as Indian was a significant predictor of current subjectively evaluated language proficiency (indicated by *).
Table 7.1: Significant quantitative findings: Relationship between language proficiency and ethnic identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Markers</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>U.K.</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Current Students</th>
<th>Recent Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X(-)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identification</td>
<td>X *</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key for Table 7.1:
- X = correlated with self-evaluation of Gujarati proficiency then (at the time of completing Gujarati School)
- X = correlated with self-evaluation of Gujarati proficiency now (at the time of completing the survey)
- X = correlated with objective evaluation of spoken Gujarati proficiency
- (-) = negative correlation
- * = significant predictor of self-evaluation of Gujarati proficiency now (at the time of completing the survey)

Table 7.2: Main qualitative findings: Ethnic self-identifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Markers</th>
<th>Does X (identity marker) fit into participants’ own ethnic self-identifications?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>HIGH Knowledge of the heritage language was central in ethnic self-identification definitions among participants in the U.K. and Singapore, but not among participants in South Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>HIGH The strong sense of community among Gujaratis was unanimously cited by participants in all three sites as one of the most defining characteristics of Indian identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values and Morals</td>
<td>HIGH Maintaining family values and morals (e.g., respectful address, honor toward parents and other elders, etc.) was described by all as a defining characteristic of being Indian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activities</td>
<td>MEDIUM Cultural activities were usually acknowledged to constitute a general Indian identity. However, they were not always relevant in definitions of ethnic identity for all (especially older) participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Markers</th>
<th>Does X (identity marker) fit into participants’ own ethnic self-identifications?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>MEDIUM Some participants specifically discussed the connections between and merging of their religious and ethnic identity. Muslims in Singapore identified more strongly with their religious identity than their ethnic identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>HIGH Participants ate Indian food on a regular or daily basis. Some changing dietary habits were noted by participants (e.g., vegetarian → non-vegetarian), which some deemed necessary for integration purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Professional Success</td>
<td>MEDIUM Certain university degree choices and career paths were deemed ‘typically Indian’ by participants, e.g., being doctors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-Mindedness</td>
<td>LOW Some participants recognized this as a stereotyped image of Gujaratis, but others indicated that there was some truth behind this and thus accepted this image of Gujaratis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Physical Appearance</td>
<td>HIGH The participants’ Indian physical appearance meant that an Indian identity was compulsory. Skin color was used to distinguish North Indians from South Indians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Names</td>
<td>MEDIUM All participants had Indian first and last names, so this may be considered an important identity marker for the participants parents who chose these names for their children. It is unclear whether this is an important ethnic identity marker for participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Wedding Traditions</td>
<td>HIGH This seems to be a fairly stable ethnic identity marker that is likely to be maintained in future generations, even though there seems to be a growing trend among Gujarati diaspora communities to incorporate some aspects of local culture into Indian weddings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Partner</td>
<td>MEDIUM A traditional Indian marriage arrangement involves a Gujarati of the same caste or community chosen by the parents or others in the family (“arranged marriage”). Some accepted this, more so in South Africa than in Singapore and the U.K., but others had difficulties agreeing to these restrictions and challenged them by marrying out of caste or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>LOW Dating is not favorably viewed upon in Indian culture. Some accepted these views of dating, but others considered them to be too traditional and challenged them, by being in relationships, though generally dating habits were kept secret from parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
Does X (identity marker) fit into participants’ own ethnic self-identifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Markers</th>
<th>Living Arrangements Prior to Marriage</th>
<th>Gender (Male Dominated Society)</th>
<th>Cliquish Behavior</th>
<th>Caste System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Living with a partner before marriage is considered unacceptable in Indian culture. On the whole, South African participants willingly accepted this traditional view. In the U.K., some participants challenged these views. In Singapore, high rental rates made it difficult for young couples to live together before marriage, though it seems that it would be unacceptable to do so even in the case that financial restrictions did not exist, which is consistent with the findings in South Africa and the U.K.</td>
<td>In traditional Indian society, females encounter more restrictions (e.g., in terms of dressing, education level) and are expected to carry out household duties, such as cooking, cleaning, etc. Females from all three countries challenged the gender bias.</td>
<td>Indians were described as predominantly only interacting with other Indians, and sometimes only with other Gujaratis. This behavior was more common among the older generations. The less Gujaratis belong to Indian cliques, the less they may be traditionally Indian, as they mix more with local society and are influenced by the local mind-set.</td>
<td>Caste distinctions have tended to dilute in Singapore and the U.K. In South Africa, caste is still considered important within the Indian community, especially among the older generation, and continues to have implications on the participants’ lives (e.g., in terms of their marriage partner). There was general disapproval, rejection, or unawareness of the Indian caste-base system by the majority of participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of findings: Table 7.2. Main qualitative findings concerning the importance of certain ethnic identity markers in participants’ own descriptions of ethnic identity. First, certain identity markers featured prominently in descriptions of ethnic identity for participants in all three sites. These include external expressions of ethnic identity (e.g., eating ethnic foods on a regular or daily basis) and internal markers of ethnic identity (e.g., their pride and belief in family values and morals). These can therefore be considered to be universal markers of ethnic identity among Gujaratis in the diaspora. Second, some markers featured prominently in descriptions of ethnic identity for participants in certain locations only (e.g., the ability to speak the heritage language) or for participants of a certain age only (e.g., participation in Indian cultural activities). Third, some markers that may traditionally be used in definitions of ethnic identity have become weakened or altered among Gujaratis in the diaspora, e.g., changing marriage cere-
monies. Fourth, some markers which I initially thought may be important and which were used as markers of identity in the survey did not turn out to be important for the participants. These include identity markers related to entertainment, e.g., watching Bollywood films, Indian TV series and comedies, and listening to Indian radio stations.

Discussion of findings: Table 7.3. Main qualitative findings concerning the importance of certain local identity markers in participants’ own descriptions of local identity. First, some markers of local identity were unanimously cited by all participants, e.g., birthplace and childhood years. Second, others were dependent on certain factors, such as gender (e.g., National Service among males in Singapore). Third, some markers which may have traditionally defined “Indian identity” seem to be lost in the diaspora, e.g., typical Indian accent. Fourth, references to and comparisons with Indians from India were constantly made in definitions of their local identity, though as seen with the identity marker ‘local English accent’, contrasts were also at times drawn with other local groups in their country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Markers</th>
<th>Does X (identity marker) fit into participants’ own descriptions of local identity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>HIGH \hspace{1cm} One of the first identity markers mentioned by all participants in reference to their local identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood and Formative Years</td>
<td>HIGH \hspace{1cm} This identity marker had an impact on various aspects of the participants' lives, e.g., schooling, friend circle, knowledge of local vs. Indian society, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local English Accent</td>
<td>MEDIUM \hspace{1cm} All participants spoke English like native speakers of their country of birth, i.e., without a typical Indian accent, though at times their local English accent revealed their ethnicity (e.g., British INDIAN).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service and the Educational System in Singapore</td>
<td>HIGH \hspace{1cm} True Singaporeans were described as being bonded over experiences such as the suffering they endure (e.g., during National Service) and the struggles they face (e.g., as a result of what they term the “tough” educational system in Singapore).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of findings: Table 7.4. Main quantitative and qualitative findings for the relationship between spoken language proficiency and demographic factors and linguistic experiences/history. First, the factor that emerges as being the most important in explaining differences in language proficiency is the frequency of use of the language in everyday life. Other factors (e.g., age, trips and ties to India, etc.) are closely linked to language use. Second, some discrepancies exist between qualitative and quantitative findings, e.g., the impact of the presence of grandparents on language proficiency was found not to be significant based on quanti-
tative findings, but significant according to qualitative analyses. Third, the differences in average language proficiencies of the young Gujaratis living in the three locations (i.e., why Singaporean Gujaratis have the highest average objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati and South African Gujaratis the lowest) are explained through some of the factors presented in Table 7.4. For example, the high frequency of trips to India and close ties that Singaporeans maintained with India was one important factor in explaining why their average objectively evaluated spoken proficiency was generally higher than British and South African participants.

Table 7.4: Significant findings for the relationship between language proficiency and demographic and language acquisition factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity (Chapter 5)</td>
<td>Connections between ethnic identity and heritage language proficiency were made by British and Singaporean participants, but not by South African participants.</td>
<td>Somewhat significant. Significant positive correlation with the identity markers ‘clothes’ and ‘music’ in the U.K. Not significant in Singapore and SA Qualitative analyses supported by quantitative findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Generation (Section 6.2)</td>
<td>Fishman’s (1972) three generation model of language shift applies to the Gujarati community in the U.K. and South Africa, and somewhat applies to the Gujarati community in Singapore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin (Section 6.2)</td>
<td>South Africans described their proficiency in Gujarati as lower than Singaporean and British participants.</td>
<td>Singapore: significant positive correlation South Africa: significant negative correlation U.K.: not significant Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use in the Home (Section 6.3)</td>
<td>Using Gujarati in the home was connected with high proficiency in Gujarati.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use in the Home: Grandparents (Section 6.3.1)</td>
<td>Grandparents, especially grandmothers, played a vital role in language transmission and maintenance, though the presence of any non-English speaking grandparent in the home significantly increased the likelihood of participants learning the heritage language at home.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued on next page*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Use in the Home: Parents (Section 6.3.2)</td>
<td>Parents, especially in the U.K. and Singapore, seem to play an important role in language transmission and maintenance. The use of Gujarati by parents (influenced by factors such as parents’ birthplace, gender, occupation, length of time in the diaspora, and marriage patterns) substantially increases the probability that participants will attain higher proficiency in Gujarati.</td>
<td>Parents’ L1: not significant Parents’ birthplace (i.e., India or not India): significant Language which the mother uses to address her child: significant (significant correlation with language proficiency and significant predictor of language proficiency) Language which the father uses to address his child: not significant Language which the participant uses to address his/her parents: significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use in the Home: Siblings (Section 6.3.3)</td>
<td>English was the dominant language used among siblings, and thus the presence of siblings did not aid in language transmission and maintenance.</td>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address siblings, and vice versa: not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use with Gujarati Friends (Section 6.4)</td>
<td>English was the dominant language used with Gujarati friends, and therefore Gujarati friends were described as not playing a role in heritage language proficiency.</td>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address Gujarati friends: significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use in Other Domains (Section 6.5)</td>
<td>Gujarati was generally used in solidarity-stressing and private domains, e.g., in the home (predominantly for domestic matters, e.g., related to discussions involving food, but not education, politics, etc.), religion, culture, and in one status-stressing and public domain, the media. Being actively used in certain domains restricts various aspects of language use (e.g., lexical knowledge), which in turn impacts general language proficiency and fluency.</td>
<td>N/A²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Other Languages (Section 6.5)</td>
<td>Knowing Hindi was described by some as helping them to learn Gujarati, though others disagreed and indicated that knowing Hindi caused their Gujarati to deteriorate and made it less ‘pure’.</td>
<td>Knowledge of other North Indian languages: significant positive correlation and significant predictor of language proficiency Knowledge of country’s official language(s) besides English: significant negative correlation and significant negative predictor of language proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²N/A indicates that the variable in question was not included in the survey questionnaire from which the quantitative findings are derived.

Continued on next page
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Section 6.6)</td>
<td>Younger participants generally had better proficiency in Gujarati than older participants, due to a number of factors, some of which are related to other factors considered in this study: a) they had not started their main school, b) they were living at home, c) they were attending Gujarati School, and d) their grandparents were still alive. These factors provided them with more opportunities to use and practice the language.</td>
<td>Significant correlation, i.e., younger participants had better proficiency in Gujarati than older participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>No mention by any of the participants that gender might impact proficiency levels.</td>
<td>Not significant: Females did not have higher proficiency than males.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order (Section 6.7)</td>
<td>First-born children had higher proficiency in Gujarati than later-born siblings. Participants without siblings generally had a higher level of proficiency in Gujarati than those with siblings.</td>
<td>Qualitative analyses supported by quantitative findings in more than half of the cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ First Language</td>
<td>Increased likelihood of more Gujarati use and higher proficiency among those who had used Gujarati in early years.</td>
<td>Significant positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., language spoken before beginning primary school) (Section 6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Residence (Section 6.8)</td>
<td>Growing up in areas with a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians meant more daily exposure to Gujarati and more occasions to use and practice the language outside the home and Gujarati School, which in turn was described by some to contribute to language fluency. The data suggest that there may be a strong negative correlation between not living in Indian residential areas and language proficiency.</td>
<td>Qualitative analyses not supported by quantitative findings, since participants displayed a range of abilities in Gujarati, despite the majority of participants growing up in areas with a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trips and Ties to India (Section 6.9)</td>
<td>Singaporean participants maintained close ties to India and made regular trips to India; British and South African participants less so. Trips to India provided opportunities to use Gujarati and played an important role in language maintenance. Such trips also increased a sense of importance of Gujarati and belonging among participants and encouraged them to continue to improve and maintain skills in the language. Qualitative analyses somewhat supported by quantitative findings, since Singaporean participants had a higher average proficiency score than British and Singaporean participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward Gujarati (Section 6.10)</td>
<td>Attitudes toward Gujarati ranged from positive to negative. Positive attitudes resulted in a greater likelihood of increased language use and consequently higher proficiency, whereas negative attitudes generally had the opposite effect.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati School (Section 6.11)</td>
<td>Gujarati School was generally viewed as playing a central role in language transmission and maintenance. Gujarati School was an especially important place for gaining literacy skills in Gujarati, though Gujarati School also aided in refining spoken skills.</td>
<td>Number of years studying Gujarati at Gujarati School: significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Status (Section 6.11)</td>
<td>Gujarati skills were reinforced through Gujarati School, especially literacy skills. Recent graduates generally felt that their Gujarati proficiency had been higher when they were Gujarati School students.</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use: Additional Work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School (Section 6.11.1)</td>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School ranged from writing letters to grandparents to private tutoring sessions. Such activities were described as enhancing language proficiency.</td>
<td>Significant positive correlation and significant predictor of language proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
7.4 Answers to Research Questions

In Chapter 4, I presented the findings from quantitative analyses (RQs 1 and 2). In Chapter 5, I presented a discussion on the intricacies of the complex and multi-faceted concept of identity among second and subsequent generation Gujaratis in the diaspora (RQs 1 and 3). In Chapter 6, I discussed a number of factors in addition to identity which play a role in language maintenance/shift and in language proficiency among second and subsequent generation Gujaratis in their host country (RQs 2 and 3). In this section, I present my answers to the research questions, based on the findings presented in Chapters 4, 5, and 6.

RQ1. What role does identity play in determining heritage language ability? More specifically:

RQ1a. Is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

3^Other reasons’ include Gujarati being an ‘easy’ subject to obtain high scores in, a national qualification in Gujarati increasing the chances of obtaining admission into university, receiving one’s gurus agnaha (spiritual teacher’s command) that one should be able to speak fluent Gujarati in order to gain his rajipoor (agreement), and needing an after-school activity like Gujarati classes because parents were working and no one was therefore at home to take care of the student in the afternoons.

---

Table 7.4 – Continued from previous page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Studying Gujarati (Section 6.11.2)</td>
<td>Various reasons given as to why participants studied Gujarati at Gujarati School, ranging from linguistic reasons to cultural or religious reasons, and ranging from others (e.g., parents) wanting them to study the language to the participants themselves wanting to study Gujarati. Their reasons for studying Gujarati affected how they viewed the usefulness of Gujarati, and hence influenced their language use, which in turn impacted their proficiency levels.</td>
<td>Parents’ wish that their child studies Gujarati: not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To aid in communication with grandparents: not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part of being Indian means that one should be able to speak, read, and write in Gujarati well: significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To have a nationally recognized qualification in Gujarati: significant positive correlation and significant predictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To understand one’s roots/origins: not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To make new friends: significant positive correlation and significant predictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To organize and take part in cultural and religious events: significant negative correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To have Gujarati on one’s CV: significant predictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other reasons (i.e., not already listed on the survey)(^3): significant predictor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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There is a partial relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati. While no relationship between objective evaluation of heritage language ability and ethnic identity exists, the belief that being Gujarati entails speaking Gujarati (chosen as one of the reasons for attending Gujarati School) is a significant predictor of spoken Gujarati proficiency. Furthermore, self-identifying as Indian and holding the belief that being Gujarati entails speaking Gujarati correlate with current subjectively evaluated language proficiency and both are also significant predictors of current subjectively evaluated language proficiency. In addition, a number of individual identity markers (i.e., films, music, and clothes) also correlate with current subjectively evaluated language proficiency. Furthermore, the analysis of the data presented in Chapter 6 has highlighted that many factors other than identity per se (e.g., school status) are not unrelated to identity, thus further supporting the presence of a relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity. Finally, qualitative findings (discussed in Chapter 5 and 6) point to a relationship between a number of factors associated with Gujarati identity and Gujarati language ability.

RQ1b. Is the local context a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

Local context is a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity. In other words, this relationship varies depending on country of origin. The connection between language ability and ethnic identity is weaker in South Africa than the other two sites, when assessed through the analysis of the qualitative data (see Chapter 5), as well as the analysis of the quantitative data: British and Singaporean participants who self-identified as Indian also subjectively evaluated their Gujarati proficiency as being higher, whereas the correlation between these two factors was not significant for the South African participants. Further analysis of the quantitative data indicates a number of other country-specific relationships between language ability and ethnic identity. British participants who identified themselves as Indian through several identity markers (i.e., film, events, music, and wedding), and South African participants who identified themselves as Indian through the identity marker clothes’ subjectively evaluated their Gujarati proficiency as being higher. In terms of objective evaluation of Gujarati proficiency, which was determined by the oral proficiency test, British participants who preferred Indian music and Indian clothes had higher objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati. No statistically significant relationship exists between any of the identity variables and objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency for Singaporean and South African participants.
RQ1c. Does current attendance at a Gujarati heritage language school influence the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati?

Current attendance is partially a moderator variable for the relationship between heritage language ability and ethnic identity. While school status does not influence the relationship between objective evaluation of spoken proficiency and ethnic identity for heritage speakers of Gujarati, qualitative data analysis highlights that Gujarati School plays a pivotal role in the transmission of language, the formation of ethnic identity, and the maintenance of both. In addition, there were more significant correlations between identity markers and subjectively evaluated Gujarati proficiency for current students than for graduates.

In summary, of the nine indicators of identity (i.e., eight external markers of identity, as well as a self-evaluation of their strength of ethnic identification), the identity variables ‘music’ and ‘clothes’ are the only two identity variables that are significantly correlated with the British participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency, as measured through the oral proficiency test, indicating that the British participants who enjoyed listening to Indian music or wearing Indian clothes had higher objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati, and vice versa (RQ1b). None of the identity variables are significantly correlated with the participants' objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Singapore and South Africa (RQ1b) or with objectively evaluated spoken proficiency when participants from all three continents are considered together (RQ1a). In addition, current attendance vs. recent graduation from Gujarati school does not impact the relationship between the identity variables and participants' objectively evaluated spoken proficiency (RQ1c). These findings highlight that ethnic identification, as measured through the identity variables in this study, does not play a prominent role in determining variations in objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency.

Ethnic identification, as measured through the identity variables in this study, played a more prominent role in determining variations in current subjective evaluations of language proficiency. This was especially the case for the U.K. participants and the current students, i.e., a number of correlations exist between the individual identity variables and subjectively evaluated language proficiency for participants who were British citizens or current students. The latter is not surprising, given that the Gujarati School provides an environment where ethnic identity is fostered and language proficiency is enhanced. In addition, the importance of the variable ‘self-identity’ becomes evident when examining the correlations between self-identity and subjective evaluations of language proficiency. The way in which participants self-identified is a significant predictor of participants’ current subjective evaluations of language proficiency (RQ1a). Interestingly, on closer
examination, there is a relationship between these two variables in Singapore and the U.K., but not in South Africa (RQ1b). Furthermore, this relationship exists for both current students and recent graduates (RQ1c).

RQ2. Besides identity, what quantitative evidence exists for a relationship between Gujarati language proficiency and demographic and language acquisition factors? More specifically, is there a positive relationship between heritage language ability and the following factors:

1. Country
2. School status
3. Age
4. Gender
5. Parents’ birthplace
6. Living in a three-generational household
7. Parents’ L1
8. Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends, and vice versa)
9. Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)
10. Knowledge of other languages
11. Gujarati School experiences (i.e., number of years at Gujarati School, feelings about going to Gujarati School, reasons for going to Gujarati School, additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School)

There is a relationship between subjective evaluation of language ability and the following factors (a positive relationship is indicated in red and a negative relationship is indicated in blue):

1. Country
2. School status
3. Age
4. Gender
5. Parents’ birthplace
6. Living in a three-generational household
7. Parents’ L1
8. Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends)

(a) Language which the father uses to address the participant
(b) Language which the participant uses to address his/her mother
(c) Language which the participant uses to address his/her father
Language which the participant uses to address Gujarati friends

Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)

Knowledge of other languages

(a) Knowledge of other North Indian languages

(b) Knowledge of official languages of the country that the participant resides in

Gujarati School experience

(a) Number of years studying Gujarati at Gujarati School

(b) Feelings about going to Gujarati School

(c) Going to Gujarati School because of parents’ wish that the participant goes there

(d) Studying Gujarati because it is important for ethnic identity

(e) Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

The following factors are significant predictors of subjective evaluation of spoken language ability (significant positive predictors are in red and significant negative predictors are in blue):

1. Country

2. School status

3. Age

4. Gender

5. Parents’ birthplace

6. Living in a three-generational household

7. Parents’ L1

8. Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends)

(a) Language which the participant uses to address Gujarati friends

9. Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)

10. Knowledge of other languages

(a) Knowledge of other North Indian languages

(b) Knowledge of official languages of the country that the participant resides in

11. Gujarati School experience

(a) Studying Gujarati because it is important for ethnic identity

(b) Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School

There is a relationship between objective evaluation of spoken language ability and the following factors (a positive relationship is indicated in red and a negative relationship is indicated in blue):
1. Country
   (a) For Singapore
   (b) For South Africa
2. School status
3. Age
4. Gender
5. Parents’ birthplace
   (a) Mother’s birthplace
   (b) Father’s birthplace
6. Living in a three-generational household
7. Parents’ L1
8. Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends)
   (a) Language which the mother uses to address the participant
   (b) Language which the participant uses to address his/her mother
   (c) Language which the participant uses to address his/her father
   (d) Language which the participant uses to address Gujarati friends
9. Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)
10. Knowledge of other languages
    (a) Knowledge of other North Indian languages
    (b) Knowledge of official languages of the country that the participant resides in
11. Gujarati School experience
    (a) Number of years studying Gujarati at Gujarati School
    (b) Studying Gujarati to take nationally recognized examinations in the language
    (c) Studying Gujarati to make friends
    (d) Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School
    (e) Studying Gujarati to take part in cultural and religious activities

The following factors are significant predictors of objective evaluation of spoken language ability (significant positive predictors are in red and significant negative predictors are in blue):

1. Country
2. School status
3. Age
4. Gender
5. Parents’ birthplace
6. Living in a three-generational household
7. Parents’ L1
8. Language use (with parents, siblings, and Gujarati friends)
   
   (a) **Language which the participant uses to address his/her mother**
9. Language spoken in the early years of one’s life (i.e., before the start of primary school)
10. Knowledge of other languages
    
    (a) **Knowledge of other North Indian languages**
    
    (b) **Knowledge of official languages of the country that the participant resides in**
11. Gujarati School experience
    
    (a) **Studying Gujarati because it is important for ethnic identity**
    
    (b) **Studying Gujarati to take nationally recognized examinations in the language**
    
    (c) **Studying Gujarati to make friends**
    
    (d) **Studying Gujarati because it will look good on one’s C.V.**
    
    (e) **Studying Gujarati for other reasons (reasons specified by participants)**
    
    (f) **Doing additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School**

**RQ3.** Based on qualitative evidence, what factors underlie the relationship between language proficiency and the factors mentioned in RQs 1 and 2? What other factors might affect language proficiency?

The relationship between language proficiency and the factors mentioned in RQs 1 and 2 seem to be most closely associated with a) amount of language use and b) amount of language input/exposure, and somewhat with c) knowledge of other languages. Other individual factors that are closely associated with spoken Gujarati proficiency (e.g., birth order) can also be subsumed under one of these three overarching variables. The latter points to the idea that the factors presented in RQs 1 and 2 often interact with one another (e.g., birth order with (a) amount of language use and (b) amount of language input and exposure). While the factors have been considered independently for the purposes of the quantitative analysis, they are in reality often not independent of one another.

**Strength of ethnic identification** proved to be insignificant in explaining variations in objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency. Only the identity variables ‘music’ and ‘clothes’ were significantly and positively correlated with British participants’ objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency. It is not clear why a preference for Indian music and Indian clothes would be
correlated with high objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency for the U.K. participants. It may be that a preference for Indian music, which often tends to be in Hindi, gives participants more exposure to other Indian languages. Since knowing other North Indian languages is correlated with objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency and is also a significant predictor of objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency, this seems likely. Furthermore, knowing Hindi, a language that has many similarities with Gujarati, was described by some participants as helping them to learn Gujarati. This, however, then begs the question as to why Indian films, which also tend to be in Hindi, are not significantly correlated with objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency. One reason for this may be that Indian films often contain English subtitles, and so the participants may only be gaining passive knowledge and understanding of Hindi. The other question that remains is why this relationship exists only in the U.K. and not in South Africa and Singapore.

For clothes, it seems that preferring to wear Indian clothes may be associated with tradition (as highlighted by Bansi below). This in turn may be associated with speaking Gujarati, since speaking Gujarati was considered by some as being connected with traditional aspects of life compared to English which participants linked with modernity (see Section 6.10):

I had some friends and professors who actually mistook me for an India Indian student as compared to a Singaporean Indian student ... I think maybe it could have been a certain gesture of my clothing ... because I used to wear Punjabi suits ... in my polytechnic. Most [Singaporean] Indians wouldn’t really wear their Indian costumes ... I used to wear like everything, so you know, and that would be Punjabi suits as well, so maybe like for the minorities, they would think that “Ok, you’re wearing a traditional costume, you might be from the traditional part of the world or something” ... Mainly the India Indians used to wear them [Indian outfits at polytechnic] ... I love wearing Indian outfits, and it’s also like it reminds me that I’m- you know, I have some roots of Indian [in me], and yeh, basically it’s comfortable and beautiful. (Bansi, Singapore)

Again, as with ‘music’, the question remains as to why this relationship with objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency and the identity variable ‘clothes’ only exists in the U.K., and not in Singapore or South Africa. One possibility may be that wearing Indian clothes in public might seem “strange” in the U.K. compared to Singapore and South Africa (where dominant groups of society, e.g., the black Africans in South Africa and the Chinese in Singapore might also wear ethnic garments in public). Choosing to wear Indian clothes in the U.K. might therefore indicate a stronger Indian identity.

While single identity variables generally turned out to be fairly insignificant in explaining variations in objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency, other factors proved to be more significant. In particular, language use emerges to be the most important factor in explaining differences in language proficiency. In other words, higher objectively evaluated spoken proficiency
in Gujarati resulted from frequent use of Gujarati. This includes whether a) participants used Gujarati to speak to their parents or Gujarati friends, b) they used Gujarati before the start of primary school, or c) they did additional work in Gujarati outside of Gujarati School. The importance of language use in predicting language retention or attrition has been cited by a number of researchers (e.g., Schmid, 2007). Using the language more frequently and in a greater number of contexts increases the possibility of participants retaining various aspects of Gujarati and being able to retrieve them quickly in conversation. Language use explains why Singaporeans had the highest average objectively evaluated spoken proficiency, followed by participants from the U.K. and then South Africa. Singaporeans had more opportunities to use Gujarati than South African participants. These opportunities came about from a number of factors, e.g., Singaporeans made more trips and had closer ties to India than British and South African participants, as a result of many having a direct family connection in India (i.e., having at least one parent from India) and as a result of the geographical proximity between Singapore and India.

**Language input and exposure** influences language use. According to Benmamoun et al. (2010), adult heritage speakers who do not receive sufficient language input during childhood often have difficulty with certain linguistic features. As mentioned above, Singaporeans had the highest average objectively evaluated spoken proficiency and South Africans had the lowest. Not only did Singaporeans have more opportunities for Gujarati language use than South Africans, they also received more language input. For example, the majority of the South African participants were third generation who received very little Gujarati language input from their locally-born parents (cf. the three generation model of language shift: Fishman, 1972). This was not the case for the second generation Singaporean and British participants, the majority of whom had L1 Gujarati speaking parents. Most of the Singaporean participants had at least one parent born in India. In particular, India-born mothers, and especially stay-at-home mothers, played a more significant role in language transmission and maintenance. They tended to have a lower proficiency in English probably as a result of less exposure to local society and little contact with people from other ethnic groups, which led them to use more Gujarati when speaking to their children. In addition to the home, Gujarati School was also a site where participants received heritage language input. The length of time at Gujarati School is significantly correlated with objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency, meaning that the longer the participant studied Gujarati at Gujarati School (and therefore the more language input they received), the higher their objectively evaluated spoken proficiency.

The connection between language input/exposure and language use is further seen with other variables. For example, objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency is significantly but nega-
tively correlated with the variable ‘age’, meaning that younger participants had better objectively evaluated spoken proficiency in Gujarati than older participants. Younger participants had more opportunities to be exposed to and use Gujarati, e.g., at Gujarati School, through the home environment, etc., whereas older participants had to consciously and actively find opportunities to maintain and develop their Gujarati. Interestingly, while ‘age’ was significant, school status was not (though length of time at Gujarati School was). This may result from the focus that Gujarati School places on developing literacy skills rather than spoken skills. While younger participants had better proficiency than older participants, another related variable, namely birth order, showed opposite results. First-borns were described as having (and often did have) higher proficiency in Gujarati than later-born siblings. In households where Gujarati is actively spoken by family members, there is a greater likelihood that first-born children would have used Gujarati before primary school which positively impacted their current language use and subsequently their proficiency. If second and subsequent born children are born after the first-born child has begun attending school, the former are likely to be exposed to more English, since the first-born child will be shifting at a faster rate from Gujarati to English at this stage and will be more likely to bring English into the home domain. This also explains why the presence of siblings did not significantly correlate with objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency, since siblings tended to communicate with each other in English.

Positive attitudes toward the Gujarati language, Indian culture, and Indian people resulted in a greater likelihood of increased language use and consequently higher proficiency, whereas negative attitudes generally had the opposite effect. While South Africans felt proudly Indian, in addition to feeling South African, and had positive feelings toward the Indian culture and Indian people, they did not generally view knowledge of Gujarati as important for ethnic identity. This may also explain why they performed on average more poorly in the oral proficiency test than British and Singaporean participants. Participants’ attitudes toward Gujarati impacted their reasons for attending Gujarati School. For example, studying Gujarati to gain national qualifications in the language is significantly correlated with objectively evaluated spoken language proficiency, and most probably results from personal motivation to do well in the language. Similarly, choosing to study Gujarati to organize and take part in cultural and religious events is negatively correlated with objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency, which arises from the fact that many of these events are increasingly being conducted in English, and as such participants receive no language input through these activities.

In addition to language use and language input/exposure, language knowledge (i.e., knowledge of languages other than English and Gujarati) has important effects on variations in language
proficiency. As mentioned above, knowledge of North Indian languages, e.g., Hindi, was significant for developing Gujarati language proficiency. However, knowledge of other languages was negatively correlated with objectively evaluated spoken Gujarati proficiency. The other languages that participants were learning tended to be quite different from Gujarati. Therefore, it seems that being proficient in languages which are similar to Gujarati (e.g., in terms of grammar, pronunciation, etc.) aids in developing spoken proficiency skills in Gujarati.

In sum, as highlighted in Section 7.3 and as indicated in this section, the relationship between language proficiency and the various factors (i.e., those mentioned in RQs 1 and 2 and those which emerged from qualitative analyses, e.g., birth order) seem largely connected with language use, language input/exposure, and somewhat with knowledge of other languages.

### 7.5 Limitations

This section discusses a number of limitations of this study. These limitations, which include practical, methodological, and theoretical limitations, are subsumed under two broad headings: limitations related to data collection procedures (Section 7.5.1) and limitations related to data collection instruments (Section 7.5.2).

#### 7.5.1 Limitations Related to Data Collection Procedures

**7.5.1.1 Duration of Fieldwork**

Fieldwork was carried out over a period of 18 weeks (6 weeks in each country). The objectives of the fieldwork were to obtain a holistic overview of the linguistic and socio-cultural situation of the Gujarati community in each of the countries, gain access to the community, establish relationships, seek potential participants, and collect data. The duration of fieldwork impacts both quality and quantity of data. A longer period, ideally 6 months in total (2 months per country), would have been preferable to carry out the above activities more thoroughly and in more depth. For example, more time in the field would have allowed me to include more participants in South Africa (currently 37 participants), and thus reach a sample size which is similar to the other two sites (48 participants in the U.K. and 50 participants in Singapore).

**7.5.1.2 Timing**

There was a considerable time delay between completing the survey and doing the follow-up interview for some of the participants. This time delay was due to a number of reasons. First, the research participants were unpaid volunteers who had other responsibilities and obligations (e.g.,
school/work-related commitments, extra-curricular activities, etc.), so I had to respect their priorities and availability. Second, given the large number of participants and the fact that the majority of the interviews were conducted in person, it was often difficult to interview participants immediately after they had completed the survey. This time delay between completing the survey and conducting the interview caused a lack of continuity in data collection, which may have resulted in some changes in responses or viewpoints on certain issues, and may have therefore produced some discrepancies between the quantitative (i.e., survey) and qualitative (i.e., interview) data, as well as discrepancies across participants that were artifacts of the time delay rather than genuine differences in participants’ stated views.

In addition, the study was conducted at different times during the academic year. Given the multi-site nature of the study and the different school schedules in the three countries (September-July in the U.K., and January-November in Singapore and South Africa), some of the current students participated in the survey during their summer vacation and others during the academic year. Furthermore, some were at the beginning of the academic year, whereas others were a few weeks away from taking national examinations. These differences in timing affected the sample size (e.g., people had a tendency to be less willing to participate in the study closer to the time of national examinations), the answers participants gave (e.g., their attitudes toward the study of Gujarati may have differed at the start of the academic year compared to a few weeks away from taking a national examination), and/or the length of the interview (see Section 7.5.2.2.2). From field experiences, it was found that the ideal time to conduct fieldwork (i.e., when participants were generally more available and willing to participate) was at the start or in the middle of the academic year. Conducting fieldwork during vacation periods was least preferred, since participants tended to be out of the country or unavailable then.

7.5.1.3 Location

Data collection took place in a variety of locations, such as participants’ homes, my home, the Gujarati School, or a café. Preference was given to the location that best suited the participant, however it was emphasized to the participant that the location they choose should have as little background noise as possible and no other family members should be present during the data collection. The former was especially important for recording purposes. In Singapore, participants preferred to meet in public places for the interview. This at times negatively affected the sound quality of the data recorded. Locations may have also impacted the responses received from participants. For example, participants may have felt more at ease in a less formal environment (e.g., a café or their home) than at the Gujarati School.
7.5.1.4 Representativeness of the Sample

The nature of the study, with its focus on the Gujarati language, may have dissuaded certain people from participating (e.g., those who had negative views on Gujarati and the Indian culture or those who perceived their current proficiency in Gujarati as being low). This in turn may have impacted the representativeness of the sample, since it may not have been fully illustrative of the entire population under investigation. I tried to obtain as many participants for the study by working through people’s social networks and by asking participants who had already completed the study and also teachers at the school to suggest potential participants, whom I then approached as a ‘friend of a friend’ (Milroy, 1987). Furthermore, I tried to present the study in an appealing way, so that potential participants did not view participation in the study as extra work or as a difficult activity, but rather as enjoyable and interesting. For example, it was made clear to participants that the proficiency portion of the study was not a ‘test’ per se, and that low proficiency in Gujarati would not be judged negatively.

7.5.2 Limitations Related to Data Collection Instruments

7.5.2.1 Survey Limitations

Several limitations related to the survey design became apparent during fieldwork. While many of these limitations were later addressed in the follow-up interview, they may have had an impact on the quantitative findings.

7.5.2.1.1 Grandparents. One of the questions that participants were asked on the survey was whether they had any grandparents currently living at home with them (under Section B: Background Information). Two options were available to participants: ‘yes’ and ‘no’. The nature of the question did not allow participants to answer in the affirmative if a) their grandparents had previously lived with them, but may now have passed away, and b) if their grandparents spent a considerable amount of time every year living at home with them. While this information was not captured in the survey, this information was gathered in the follow-up interview. The role that grandparents play in terms of heritage language transmission and maintenance was found to be insignificant according to quantitative data analyses, but significant according to qualitative data analyses. This inconsistency in the findings may be partially explained by the failure of the survey to capture this information.

7.5.2.1.2 Confusion with terminology. Participants were asked to name their parents’ first language (mother tongue) (under Section C: Language Information). While most participants
understood these to be synonymous, a few participants named their parents’ first language as the language that their parents were currently most proficient in (e.g., English) rather than their actual first language/mother tongue (e.g., Gujarati). This information was always captured in the follow-up interviews, and changes were made to survey responses if it was clear that participants had misunderstood the term. This misinterpretation, while it only affected a small number of participants, highlights a need for future surveys to provide more detailed definitions of terms and to provide examples of terms that may be ambiguous to participants.

7.5.2.1.3 Language use questions. The survey examined which language parents mainly used to speak to their children (English, Gujarati, or other) (under Section C: Language Information). As indicated in Section 6.3.2, during the follow-up interview, many participants described their parents mixing English and Gujarati in conversations with them, though to varying degrees. It may therefore have been beneficial to have included more options on the survey, for example, ‘mostly in Gujarati’, ‘some Gujarati, but mostly English’, etc. This would have provided a deeper understanding of the language use patterns among Gujarati parents when conversing with their children and would have enabled this information to be captured not only qualitatively, but also quantitatively.

7.5.2.1.4 Number of years at Gujarati School. The number of years at Gujarati School indicated by participants on the survey (under Section E: Gujarati School) ranged from 2 to 16 years (average: 9.90 years). The low end of the range scale is due to a few participants having attended other Gujarati Schools in the area before attending the Gujarati Schools chosen for this study. The high end of the range scale is as a result of a few of the South African participants having added the number of years at the afternoon Gujarati School with the number of years at the morning Gujarati School, even though they were attending both simultaneously. While this information was later captured in the follow-up interview, the average number of years obtained from survey responses (i.e., 9.90 years) is slightly higher than it should be. The inaccuracy in the data obtained from some of the responses to this question highlights that some caution needs to be taken when interpreting the quantitative findings related to this variable (e.g., the relationship between language proficiency and length of time at Gujarati School).

7.5.2.1.5 National examination scores. While the national examinations for Gujarati in each of the three countries are generally of comparable level (see Chapter 3), the letter grades (e.g., A, B, etc.) that students can obtain might not necessarily be of equivalent value in each of the three countries. In South Africa, the Matriculation Certificate has been benchmarked and
the main subjects (e.g., Math, Science, English as a Home Language) are considered equivalent to the U.K. AS level, i.e., an A in Math at Matriculation (SA) is equivalent to an A in Math at AS level (U.K.). However, as the South African Matriculation qualification in Gujarati is taken by very few students at one of three possible levels (Home Language [HL], First Additional Language [FAL], and Second Additional Language [SAL]), none of these subject levels in Gujarati have been benchmarked, and hence the CEO of the South African assessment agency, ‘Independent Examinations Board’ (IEB), was not in a position to say definitively whether grades on these subject levels were equivalent to those in the U.K., though in her correspondence with me, she did indicate that she would expect a Matriculation qualification in Gujarati to be considered equivalent to the U.K. AS Level in Gujarati (p.c. with Anne Oberholzer, 6th December 2012). In Singapore, the Ministry of Education (MOE) was unable to equate overseas certifications (e.g., U.K. or South African qualifications) with their GCE national examinations (i.e., GCE O-Level and GCE A-Level Levels), since no central authority in Singapore exists that assesses or grants recognition for qualifications obtained from overseas institutions (p.c. with Alden Law, MOE, 22nd January 2013). Given this, it is uncertain whether an ‘A’ in the U.K. at AS level is equivalent to an ‘A’ in South Africa for Matriculation, and whether an ‘A’ in the U.K. for GCSE is equivalent to an ‘A’ at GCE O-Level in Singapore.

7.5.2.1.6 Questions about identity. An original set of questions related to identity was designed for the participants in this study. See Section 3.11.1 for more details. The questions that were created to determine strength of ethnic identification captured the characteristics that I and other members of the Gujarati community whom I consulted on this issue considered to be salient in the life of the participants who were all in their teens or twenties. These included the following topics: films, social events, music, food, clothes, entertainment, friends, wedding, and ethnic self-identification. While these questions captured eight external aspects of identity, in addition to ethnic self-identification, it would have been beneficial to have also included some questions on the survey that measured internal aspects of identity (e.g., values and attitudes). Instead, information related to this was obtained from the follow-up interview. So, while this information was captured in the study through qualitative analyses, collecting quantitative data related to internal aspects of identity could have provided a more complete overview of identity and led to a fuller understanding of the precise nature of the relationship between ethnic identity and language proficiency. Furthermore, in order to make comparisons and generalizations across countries, the same identity questions, with some very small modifications, were used in all three contexts. While in some previous studies, a single identity scale was used across diverse ethnic
groups (see, for example, Phinney, 1992), others used scales tailored with specific ethnic groups in mind (e.g., Suinn et al., 1992, which measures the level of acculturation among Asian populations; Felix-Ortiz et al., 1994, which measures the level of acculturation among Latino/a populations). However, the question remains whether it is legitimate to measure identity using the same identity questions for the same ethnic group in different locations.

7.5.2.1.7 Identity scale. The scale used to assess the strength of identification ranged from (1) 100% non-Indian (i.e., British/Singaporean/South African) to (5) 100% Indian for each of the identity variables. A description of each of the five values on the scale was provided to the participants (see Section 3.11.1). Given the multi-site nature of this study and the wish to draw comparisons, using different identity labels and descriptions on the scale for each of the countries was not desirable. However, during the interview, it was found that the pan-ethnic identity label “Indian” has different connotations for participants depending on which diaspora context is being referred to (see Section 5.8). This could have impacted the answers provided by them on the survey, since participants in different locations may have interpreted the term “Indian” differently.

7.5.2.1.8 Additional questions. The survey included questions related to: 1) demography, 2) language, 3) identity, and 4) Gujarati School experience (see Section 3.11.1). However, some additional personal data about the participants should have been collected in the survey, for example on individual learner differences (e.g., their ease/difficulty in learning languages, their motivation and attitude toward learning Gujarati, and their learning styles and strategies). Collecting more information about participants and their individual characteristics would have further enabled the variations in proficiency levels to be accounted for with quantitative measures.

7.5.2.2 Follow-Up Interview Limitations

Limitations related to the follow-up interview were generally methodological. They are presented in the subsections below.

7.5.2.2.1 In person vs. by phone. The majority of the interviews were conducted in person, though a few had to be conducted over the phone, depending on participants’ availability or preference. In-person interviews are more common in sociolinguistics (Milroy & Gordon, 2003, p. 57) and were preferred for the purposes of this study, since they create a more relaxed interview setting in which natural data can be obtained, thus reducing any effects of the ‘observer’s paradox’ (Labov, 1972). While it would have been desirable to use the same method throughout in order to ensure that the quality of the answers obtained from participants was not affected by the method
of data collection, this was generally unavoidable, since the research participants were unpaid volunteers and their preferences and availability had to be taken into account.

7.5.2.2 Length of the interview. Interview times varied. Of the 135 interviews conducted, the shortest interview lasted 20 minutes and the longest interview lasted 1 hour and 45 minutes (average interview time was 43 minutes). According to Labov (1984), interviewers conducting sociolinguistic studies should aim to obtain “from one to two hours of speech from each speaker” (p. 32). And whereas the interviews I conducted were not classic ‘sociolinguistic interviews’ per se, it nonetheless would have been desirable to obtain at least an hour of speech per participant. Increasing the length of the shorter interviews and keeping all interviews to approximately the same length would have allowed interview responses to be of about the same amount of depth and detail. In addition, longer interviews would have aided in the participants feeling more relaxed and in the data obtained being more natural, since participants after some time may background the fact that they are being interviewed to focus on the conversation at hand, thus minimizing the effects of the ‘observer’s paradox’ (Labov, 1972). However, interviews lasted as long as the participants allowed them to continue; in this way, interview data was not forced out of them and the interview was a more natural and enjoyable experience.

7.5.2.3 Subjectivity. Given my insider role, there may have been a certain degree of subjectivity present when conducting the interview and analyzing the data. This could have biased the information presented or the conclusions drawn. For this reason, a mixed methods approach was employed, since limitations such as these were often adequately addressed through the quantitative component of the study.

7.5.2.3 Oral Proficiency Test Limitations

Practical, methodological, and theoretical limitations related to the oral proficiency test (objective evaluation of proficiency) are presented in the subsections below.

7.5.2.3.1 Method of conducting the oral proficiency test. The original plan was to have an interviewer (a native speaker of Gujarati based in the U.K.) call all participants and ask them the oral proficiency test questions. This method was chosen in order to create a more natural environment for speaking Gujarati. While it was possible to conduct the oral proficiency test over the phone in the U.K., the time difference and the poor quality of the phone reception when calling participants in Singapore and South Africa meant that the oral proficiency tests in these two countries could not be easily carried out in this way. An alternative was therefore sought: The
questions which the interviewer asked in the oral proficiency test were pre-recorded, and I then played the questions to these participants on a computer. Using two different methods may have impacted the answers given by the participants, since it may have seemed more natural to talk to a native speaker than to answer questions played on a computer. Furthermore, in cases where the interviewer had to prompt the participant for further clarification or a longer answer, it would have seemed more natural that prompts would have been given by a native speaker of Gujarati than a heritage speaker (i.e., me).

7.5.2.3.2 Speech rate. The reliability of using a scoring rubric (see Appendix M) for the objective evaluation of heritage language proficiency was assessed using two alternative measures of proficiency, type-token coding of native-like vs. non-native-like productions (Section 4.8) and speech rate (Section 4.9). For the latter, following other researchers, it was maintained that the faster the rate of speech in the heritage language, the more proficient an individual is in the heritage language. This allowed all participants to be compared to one other and to be ranked from top (first) to bottom (135th) in terms of rate of speaking. However, it would have been beneficial to add a control group of native Gujarati speakers to see how comparable the speech rate of the heritage speakers was to the speech rate of native speakers, i.e., to the baseline (see, for example, Polinsky, 2008; Albirini, 2013), in order to determine how close the participants were to the native speakers’ rate of speech. Such comparisons between the speech of the heritage group and a control group were not undertaken due to the difficulty of finding young monolingual native speakers of Gujarati in each of the three sites.

7.6 Recommendations

Based on the findings outlined in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, I provide a number of recommendations to parents, heritage language schools, and to policy makers on how to successfully support heritage language maintenance and ensure high proficiency levels. The recommendations provided below presume that maintaining the heritage language in question is desirable, though as this study has shown, this may not always be the case (see, for example, the views held by the Gujarati community in South Africa). In such instances, the linguist needs to reach a balance between respecting the community’s wishes, while simultaneously also playing a role in educating members of the community about the consequences of abandoning a language. The latter can be accomplished by presenting the community with facts about language and bilingualism, helping to discard any language myths they may hold, and highlighting the fact that language loss may contribute to the
loss of other aspects of life that may be considered to be important to community members, e.g., culture and religion.

7.6.1 Recommendations for Parents

As indicated in Section 6.3, the home is considered one of the main environments for heritage language maintenance and transmission. Parents play a significant role, though the impact that parents have on language maintenance and transmission varied with location. Parents in South Africa mostly did not have Gujarati as their L1 and were therefore often unable to pass on Gujarati to their children, which was unlike the situation with parents in the U.K. and Singapore. However, even in cases where parents themselves are not in a position to pass on the heritage language to their children, they can create an environment which ensures a greater likelihood of high language proficiency for their children. Below are some recommendations for parents:

- Solely using Gujarati in the home rather than mixing English and Gujarati (for parents who are L1 speakers of Gujarati).
- Transmitting positive attitudes toward the heritage language to children.
- Emphasizing the ‘added’ value of knowing the heritage language, e.g., for religious and cultural purposes, for communicative purposes with monolingual family members, etc.
- Encouraging children to have regular contact with members of the ethnic group (e.g., by attending community functions, by sending children to Gujarati School, etc.).
- Ensuring that children have regular and close contact with monolingual family members (e.g., grandparents).
- Making regular trips to India (the feasibility of which depends on locale) or to areas in their country which have a high concentration of Gujaratis and Indians.

7.6.2 Recommendations for Heritage Language Schools

The important role of heritage language schools for heritage language maintenance and transmission and for ethnic identity formation and development has been highlighted throughout this dissertation. The three heritage language schools in this study were described by participants and witnessed by me during ethnographic fieldwork as sites where language skills (and especially literacy skills) could be acquired and strengthened, ethnic identity could be nurtured, friendships with children of the same age and cultural background could be formed, and in the case of the U.K. and South African Gujarati Schools, cultural and religious knowledge could be gained. However, from my experience of visiting the three Gujarati Schools and many other such institutions, and
from my interviews with participants, it also became clear that there were some issues with the heritage language education they received. I highlight some of these below and suggest a number of recommendations to heritage language schools.

**Different learner levels and different varieties of the heritage language.** In foreign language classrooms, all students begin the language learning process with approximately the same level of proficiency, e.g., a beginner class will contain students who have no (or very little) proficiency in the language, and students may or may not be of the same age. On the other hand, in heritage language classrooms, where classes are organized by age, students of the same age often have very different levels of proficiency. A further challenge is to handle the different varieties of Gujarati spoken at home, which differ from the Standard Gujarati taught in heritage language schools. This is a challenge that has been reported for a number of languages, e.g., Arabic (Albirini, 2013).

**Teaching methods and materials.** As described in Section 6.11.1, some participants described feeling frustrated and disappointed that their Gujarati knowledge was so poor after spending an average of 10 years at Gujarati School. In particular, many references were made to their poor grammar skills and their inability to speak well in the language. This leads us to question the quality of instruction at heritage language schools, and whether they are receiving language education that really addresses their needs, both linguistically and pedagogically. Teaching methods were labeled as being traditional, outdated, and even “old-school”, and differed substantially from the way that many participants learnt foreign languages at their main school (e.g., French, Afrikaans, etc.). In addition, teaching materials contained content that was irrelevant in their diaspora context, e.g., village stories that described how to get water from a well were inapplicable to their life overseas.

**Teaching location and class times.** Some practical concerns were also mentioned by participants, the two main ones being related to class times and location. In all three countries, Gujarati heritage language study is an additional activity that participants were involved in outside of their main school: in the weekday afternoons in South Africa, on Saturday afternoons in Singapore (which then changed to Saturday mornings in 2001), and on Saturday mornings in the U.K. Gujarati classes conflicted with other activities (e.g., sport) and reduced students’ free time. Furthermore, classes were held at different locations: in a co-ed school (in SA), in a girls’ primary school (in Singapore), and in a building owned by the community (in the U.K.). In the U.K., the building was described as not always being fully conducive to effective teaching (e.g., small classrooms, classrooms whose set-up prevented technology from easily being incorporated into teaching,
etc.). In Singapore, some male participants felt embarrassed about having to attend a girls’ school for their classes.

Based on some of the problems highlighted above and described in more detail in Section 6.11, I put forth a number of recommendations for heritage language schools.

Major recommendations include:

- **Teaching**
  - Using the information presented in the type-token analyses (Section 4.8) and incorporating more structured grammar teaching during class time. A particular focus should be given on certain aspects of grammar which appeared to be problematic for all participants and which Gujarati heritage language learners continue to struggle with even after completing Gujarati School, e.g., tenses, gender agreement, and case endings (see Section 4.7.1).
  - Placing more emphasis on speaking (e.g., open debates, discussions in class on a particular topic) and more focus on the language as it is used in real life (which will also positively impact the way that Gujarati is viewed by the youngest generation: archaic/old language → modern language).
  - Ensuring that the level of instruction is tailored to the diverse members of the heritage language learner population and providing extra support / “catch-up” classes for those who need it.
  - Using the language that they may be exposed to outside of the school context (e.g., the East African variety of Gujarati in the U.K., Kitchen Gujarati in SA) as a means to teach Standard Gujarati to students (as has been done for AAVE in the U.S. – see, for example, Rickford, 2005).

- **Delivery of lessons**
  - Using more up-to-date teaching techniques (e.g., use of technology, such as computers and powerpoint) and providing at least some teacher training.
  - Using more interactive teaching methods (e.g., role plays, group activities).

- **Teaching materials**
  - Providing a more culturally relevant curriculum, e.g., for the higher level classes, include components that focus on current affairs pertinent to Indians in their country (as is done in the U.K. AS Level and A Level syllabi).
Creating textbooks locally rather than using textbooks from India; these textbooks should address topics that are relevant to the heritage language learners’ situation and local context.

Minor recommendations include:

- **Extra activities**
  - Organizing fieldtrips (e.g., to an Indian market in their area).
  - Ensuring that cultural and religious activities are conducted in Gujarati.
  - Encouraging recent graduates to return to the school as helpers / assistants (as is done in the U.K.).

- **Practical**
  - Holding classes at the most convenient time for students and teachers (general consensus among the participants in this study was that Saturday morning seems the most ideal time).
  - Holding classes in an appropriate location, i.e., a location owned by the heritage language community that is equipped for teaching (e.g., a school, rather than a community building).

### 7.6.3 Recommendations for Policy Makers

As mentioned in Section 2.2.1, heritage language maintenance is influenced by language policies. Advocates of minority languages have repeatedly stressed that a language policy which favors and supports minority languages may play a key role in helping these languages to survive and thrive outside of their homeland (see, for example, Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Strubell, 1999). Based on the findings presented in the preceding chapters, I provided a number of recommendations to policy makers:

- Recognizing Gujarati on the same level as other foreign languages, e.g., French, by ensuring that grades obtained in Gujarati are considered in university admissions (as is the case in Singapore).
- Introducing assessments at earlier stages in students’ learning (as is the case with the U.K. ASSET qualification in Gujarati), which will allow students to gain extra qualifications and recognition in the language.
Introducing Gujarati language instruction in main schools where feasible, e.g., in areas with a high concentration of Gujaratis and Indians (as is the case with the South African Gujarati School).

Providing financial support to heritage language schools and for heritage language education in general.

Establishing a bilingual policy where students are required to learn the dominant language of the country they are living in, in addition to their ancestral language (similar to Singapore's ‘bilingual language education’ policy).

Promoting the benefits of bi/multiculturalism and bi/multilingualism, so children and parents perceive their position in the diaspora as an asset rather than a hindrance, e.g., through events like Racial Harmony Day (as organized in Singapore).

Some of the recommendations listed above are easy to implement, for example, encouraging recent graduates to return to Gujarati School as helpers/assistants, as is done in the U.K. Other recommendations may work in certain situations or contexts only. For example, the feasibility of making regular trips to India depends on the distance to India and family connections in India. This recommendation is therefore more likely to be readily adopted in the Singaporean context than the British or South African one. Other recommendations may be more difficult or challenging, since they require a change in mindset or habit, for example, encouraging teachers, particularly older teachers who may be unfamiliar with new forms of technology, to change their methods of teaching to incorporate more up-to-date teaching techniques. Finally, it may not be possible to implement some recommendations immediately, and so they can be considered to be long-term goals for a country. These include many of the recommendations listed for policy makers.

Conducting a multi-site study has illustrated some model examples from each country that other countries can consider adopting. For example, creating textbooks locally rather than using textbooks from India, as is done in Singapore, or providing a more culturally relevant curriculum, as is done in the U.K., would ensure that the topics that are covered are applicable to the heritage language learners’ situation and local context. Similarly, through a multi-site study, many interesting and intersecting factors that contribute to high proficiency levels have been highlighted. In Singapore, especially, there are a number of interesting intersecting factors that contribute to the general higher proficiency levels found among Singaporeans compared to British and South African participants. In particular, positive national attitudes and favorable national policies seem to play a key role.
7.6.4 Recommendations for Further Study

A number of recommendations for further study are presented below.

7.6.4.1 Extending the Study to Other Gujarati Communities

First, this study focused on participants from three English-speaking countries: English is the sole official language of England, and is one of the official languages of Singapore and South Africa. Focusing on the same ethnic group but extending this study to countries where a non-English language is the dominant language would add an interesting and unique perspective to this study. Second, this study was centered on Gujaratis in the diaspora. It would be useful to draw a comparison with heritage language learners in India (e.g., Mumbai, where there are large numbers of Gujaratis present, or with Gujaratis from Gujarat, where Gujarati is not the medium of instruction) to see how they construct their identities (e.g., through religion, language, caste). Third, the participants were all born and grew up in areas with a large concentration of Gujaratis and Indians. Extending this study to locations where there are fewer Gujaratis and Indians (e.g., the North of England) could be a possible new site for future research. Fourth, the Gujaratis in this study were attending or had attended a heritage language school. A useful comparison to draw with the current sample of research participants would be with Gujaratis who have not attended heritage language classes, but still nonetheless speak their heritage language to some extent. Examining these two different groups would further reveal the impacts of heritage language education on heritage language proficiency and identity formation. Fifth, this study focused on adolescents and young adults under the age of 30. An extension of this study would be to also include the parents of the participants to determine how their views compare with and impact their child’s heritage language proficiency.

7.6.4.2 Refinement of the Methodology Applied in this Study

First, the quantitative measures of identity used in this study focused on external aspects of ethnic identity (e.g., participation in ethnic practices) and it remains to be seen how these factors correlate with internal aspects of ethnic identity (e.g., belief in group values), as well as behavioral and attitudinal indicators of ethnic identity. Creating a new survey instrument that also includes non-external expressions of identity would be beneficial for a future study. Second, the survey was self-designed and pilot tested with representatives from each of the three countries. Based on their feedback, adaptations and modifications were made before the actual study was carried out. In a follow-up study, the current survey could be re-designed and re-administered, based on the
interview responses received. Third, this study individually collected data from 135 participants. A future study could incorporate a focus group element into the study (as has been done in other studies; see, for example, Mah, 2005; Batista Buteri, 2003; Pereira, 2010), which would allow participants to reflect on and react to comments made by others. Fourth, this study used a synchronic approach. Focusing on some of the same individuals five or ten years from now through a longitudinal study would allow the evolution and change through time of the impact of different factors (e.g., identity, language use) on heritage language proficiency to be determined, and thus contribute to advancing knowledge on factors that contribute to heritage language retention or attrition in the long run.

7.7 Conclusions

This study provides a unique and original contribution to the study of the interrelation between heritage language development and ethnic identity. It incorporates sociolinguistic and applied linguistic methodologies and combines qualitative and quantitative approaches to examine the reasons behind the varying language proficiencies of members of one ethnic group in three different continents. No study to date has focused on this topic in three different locations using the aforementioned methodologies and approaches. Working in three countries which have notable differences (e.g., in terms of government policies, histories, population concentrations, surrounding languages/dialects, etc.) has shown that some factors affecting language proficiency are universal (e.g., language use), whereas others are country-specific (e.g., ethnic identity, as measured through eight external markers of identity [related to films, social events, music, food, clothes, entertainment, friends, wedding], as well as a self-evaluation of participants’ strength of ethnic identification). The assumption that ethnic identity is tied to language proficiency was seen to be valid in some contexts (i.e., in the U.K. and Singapore), but not in others (i.e., South Africa). While this highlights the power of the methodology used in this study, it also illustrates the intricacies of the links between ethnic identity and language proficiency.

In addition, this study has shown that the various factors affecting language proficiency often intersect (e.g., birth order inversely correlates with still being in Gujarati School). For the purposes of the quantitative analyses, the various factors were artificially separated out, but in reality, and as demonstrated by the qualitative analyses, they often interact. One very important intersection in any study of the interrelation between language and identity is that language itself is often an important component of identity, and so even this basic separation is rather artificial.
The advantages of conducting a mixed methods study were displayed on a number of occasions. For example, through detailing the intricacies of identity in Chapter 5, this study has portrayed the shortcomings of accurately and reliably measuring ethnic identity through the use of a survey. Having to choose a fixed answer for something that is multifaceted and/or fluid is difficult. This may explain the sometimes rather unexpected results which were obtained (e.g., the lack of the expected quantitative correlations between most markers of Indian identity and Gujarati proficiency). Adding a qualitative component to the study has therefore provided a more balanced overview of the interrelation between heritage language proficiency and heritage ethnic identity. While the survey yields findings that can be generalized to a larger population, the limits of quantitative methods were visible during the interviews, when participants were able to discuss issues in more detail than was possible in the survey. The parallel application of the two methods therefore produced a more complete understanding of the factors contributing to heritage language proficiency.

This study found that proficiency in Gujarati was generally higher among Singaporean participants, followed by U.K. participants, and lastly by South African participants. Some key differences across the three sites can explain this trend:

- Attitudes toward Gujarati and the importance of the heritage language in descriptions of ethnic identity (more favorable in Singapore and the U.K. than in South Africa)
- National policies on heritage language education and the country's role in promoting ethnic heritages and community languages (e.g., favorable policies regarding heritage language education make Gujarati more accepted in schools in Singapore than in South Africa and the U.K.)
- Opportunities to use and to be exposed to the heritage language outside Gujarati School (more opportunities existed in Singapore and the U.K. than South Africa, e.g., through the home environment)

In sum, Gujarati is likely to be maintained in Singapore, due to favorable national language and racial policies that encourage and support strong positive feelings of both local and ethnic identity. In the U.K., the current generation is proficient in both English and Gujarati, though to varying degrees. However, future generations will probably shift toward English, as opportunities and incentives to speak Gujarati decrease (e.g., monolingual grandparents no longer being present in the home). Most South Africans are already displaying extremely low levels of proficiency in Gujarati and this pattern is likely to continue among future generations. However, the loss of proficiency in the heritage language does not necessarily entail the loss of ethnic identity. This
study has illustrated several other linguistic means whereby ethnic identity can be maintained, for example strategic code-switching or use of an ethnic variety of a larger language such as Afrikaans or English. In addition, extra-linguistic markers of ethnic identity may be maintained, heightened, or innovated when a longstanding heritage language recedes or is lost. Ethnic cultures are more resilient than is often thought, and when people feel strongly that maintaining their culture is important, they will find ways to do so, whether through language or through non-linguistic means (e.g., practices, beliefs, attitudes), or both.
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Letters of Cooperation
Fig. A.1: Letter of Cooperation from the Oshwal Gujarati School (England)

Oshwal Association of the UK

Chairman: Dhinjiil Kumbh Shah

Secretary: Rajesh Sobhag Dal

SOUTH AREA

Please reply to:
Oshwal Gujarati School
1 Campbell Road
Croydon CR0 2SQ

18th May 2011

Letter of Cooperation

To the Georgetown Institutional Review Board (IRB):

I am familiar with Sheena Shah’s research project entitled Language proficiency and ethnic identity amongst heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents (IRB number: 2010-108). Sheena Shah has shared with me the details of her project. I give her permission to recruit participants from our school.

I understand that this research will be conducted outside of school hours and that participant involvement in this research study is strictly on a voluntary basis.

Therefore, as a representative of the Oshwal Gujarati School (South Area), I agree that Sheena Shah’s research project may be conducted with students from our school.

Yours Sincerely,

Yogendra M Shah
Head of School

Registered Office: Oshwal Centre, Coopers Lane Road, Northow, Herts (Phone 01707 645313)
Registered in accordance with the Charities Act 1998 Charity Reg No. 28/05
Fig. A.2: Letter of Cooperation from the Singapore Gujarati School (Singapore)

SINGAPORE GUJARATI SCHOOL LIMITED
(સુનિયાપોરી ગુજરાતી સ્કૂલ)
225 Joo Chiat Road, Singapore 427488.

23rd May 2011

Letter of Cooperation

To the Georgetown Institutional Review Board (IRB):

I am familiar with Sheena Shah’s research project entitled “Language proficiency and ethnic identity amongst heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents” (IRB number: 2010-100). Sheena Shah has shared with me the details of her project. I give her permission to recruit participants from our school.

I understand that this research will be conducted outside of school hours and that participant involvement in this research study is strictly on a voluntary basis.

Therefore, as a representative of the Singapore Gujarati School Limited, I agree that Sheena Shah’s research project may be conducted with students from our school.

Yours faithfully,
Singapore Gujarati School Limited

[Signature]
Mita Shah
Director

Ministry of Education School Registration No. 132, Charities Act, 1994 Registration No. 1368
Toll/Fax: 6345 2257 Email: admin@sgsl.org.sg Web page: www.sgsl.org.sg
Company Registration No. 199805672E
Letter of Cooperation

To the Georgetown Institution Board (IRB):

I am familiar with Sheena Shah's research project entitled Language Proficiency and ethnic identity amongst heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents (IRB number: 2010-108). Sheena Shah has shared with me the details of her project. I give her permission to recruit participants from our school.

I understand that this research will be conducted outside of school hours and the participant involvement in this research study is strictly on a voluntary basis.

Therefore, as a representative of the Shree Bharat Sharda Mandir Gujarati School (South Africa), I agree that Sheena Shah's research project may be conducted with students from our school.

Sincerely,

Mr S Dayah
(School Director)
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Assent Form for Current Gujarati School Students
Georgetown University
Assent of Minor to Participate in Research Study

SURVEY + INTERVIEW

You are invited to participate in a research study titled "Language proficiency and ethnic identity amongst heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents". This study is being conducted by Sheena Shah, a graduate student at Georgetown University, USA, as part of her PhD dissertation. This study is being done to determine what factors play a role in determining the proficiency level of heritage speakers of Gujarati who are attending a Gujarati School in their respective countries (England, Singapore or South Africa).

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary at all times. You can choose not to participate at all or to leave the study at any time. Regardless of your decision, there will be no effect on your relationship with the researcher, the Gujarati School, and the Gujarati community.

You are being asked to take part in this study because you are Gujarati, were born in England, South Africa or Singapore, and are a current student at a Gujarati School in one of these countries.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to fill out a survey and take part in two interviews.

The survey should take you around 20 minutes to complete. You will receive a survey via email and will be asked to fill out the survey at your convenience (paper copies of the survey are also available if you wish to complete the survey by hand). In this survey, you will be asked demographic information, language information, questions related to issues of identity, and questions about your Gujarati School experience. Some sections of the questionnaire will ask you to simply choose one or more responses from the options available and other parts of the questionnaire will ask you to respond freely to the questions asked, thus providing you with the opportunity to go into more detail in your responses.

After the survey, you will be asked to take part in two interviews. This first interview should last no more than one hour. We will choose a location and time for the interview that works best for you. During the interview, you will be asked to discuss your answers to the questions from the survey and to elaborate on any of your answers if you wish to do so. Some further additional questions may be asked in this follow-up interview, if they seem appropriate and necessary to your particular case. This interview will be tape-recorded with your permission. The second interview is a 3-5 minute informal phone conversation with a native speaker of Gujarati. This phone conversation will be in Gujarati and will be tape-recorded with your permission.
You will be in the study for about 1.5 hours. The first session should last 20 minutes, the second session should last no more than one hour and the third session should last 5 minutes.

You can stop participation at any time. However, if you decide to stop participating in the study, we encourage you to talk to the researcher first.

There are no risks associated with participating in this study.

If you agree to take part in this study, there will be no direct benefit to you. However, I anticipate that the information gathered in this study will benefit heritage language communities in assessing methodologies that work in transmitting the heritage language to their target population.

Every effort will be made to keep any information collected about you confidential. However, it is impossible to guarantee absolute confidentiality. In order to keep information about you safe, study data will be kept in a password-protected file on the researcher’s personal computer. All data will be in digital format and only the researcher will have access to this data.

If you have any questions regarding the research project, please contact the principal investigator, Sheena Shah at +1-202-716-8081 or via email at ss723@georgetown.edu or her faculty advisor, Dr. Allison Mackey at +1-202-687-2228 or mackeya@georgetown.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Georgetown University IRB at (202) 687-6553 or irbboard@georgetown.edu.

**STATEMENT OF PERSON OBTAINING ASSENT**

I have fully explained this study to the participant. I have discussed the study’s purpose and procedures, the possible risks and benefits, and that participation is completely voluntary. I have invited the participant to ask questions and I have given complete answers to all of the participant’s questions.

__________________________________________  ____________________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Assent          Date

**ASSENT OF PARTICIPANT**

I understand all of the information in this Assent Form.

I have gotten complete answers for all of my questions.

I freely and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I understand that I will be audio recorded as a part of this study.

__________________________________________
Date of Birth
Your Signature

Today's Date

Your Name (Printed)

Once you sign this form, you will receive a copy of it to keep, and the researcher will keep another copy in your research record.
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Consent Form for the Parents of Current Gujarati School Students
Georgetown University
Parent or Guardian Consent for a Minor to Participate in Research Study

SURVEY + INTERVIEW

STUDY TITLE: Language proficiency and ethnic identity amongst heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sheena Shah TELEPHONE: +1-202-716-8081

ADVISOR: Dr. Alison Mackey

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to consider allowing your child to participate in this research study. Please take as much time as you need to make your decision. Feel free to discuss your decision with whomever you want, but remember that the decision to allow your child to participate, or not to participate, is yours. If you decide that you allow your child to participate, please sign and date where indicated at the end of this form.

If you have any questions, you should ask the researcher who explains this study to you.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

This study is being done to determine what factors play a role in determining the proficiency level of heritage speakers of Gujarati who are attending a Gujarati School in their respective countries (England, Singapore or South Africa).

This study is being done for my PhD and the information collected during the research will be used for conference presentations, publications, as well as for my PhD thesis.

STUDY PLAN

Your child is being asked to take part in this study because s/he is Gujarati, was born in England, South Africa or Singapore, and is a current student at a Gujarati School in one of these countries. About 150 subjects from England, South Africa and Singapore will take part in this study. About 75 of the participants will be current students at a Gujarati School in their respective countries and about 75 will be graduates of a Gujarati School.

If you decide to allow your child to participate in this study, s/he will be asked to fill out a survey. This survey should take him/her around 20 minutes to complete. Your child will receive the survey via email (paper copies of the survey are also available if you wish your child to complete the survey by hand) and s/he will be asked to fill out the survey at his/her
convenience. In this survey, your child will be asked demographic information, language information, questions related to issues of identity, and questions about his/her Gujarati School experience. Some sections of the questionnaire will ask your child to simply choose one or more responses from the options available and other parts of the questionnaire will ask your child to respond freely to the questions asked, thus providing your child with the opportunity to go into more detail in his/her responses.

After the survey, your child will be asked to take part in two interviews. This first interview should last no more than one hour. We will choose a location and time for the interview that works best for you and your child. During the interview, your child will be asked to discuss his/her answers to the questions from the survey and to elaborate on any of his/her answers if he/she wishes to do so. Some further additional questions may be asked in this follow-up interview, if they seem appropriate and necessary to his/her particular case. This interview will be tape-recorded with your permission. The second interview is a 3-5 minute informal phone conversation with a native speaker of Gujarati. This phone conversation will be in Gujarati and will be tape-recorded with your permission.

Your child will be in the study for about 1.5 hours. The first session should last 20 minutes, the second session should last no more than one hour and the third session should last 5 minutes.

You or your child can stop participation at any time. However, if you decide to stop participating in the study, we encourage you to talk to the researcher first.

Risks

There are no risks associated with participating in this study.

Benefits

If you agree to let your child take part in this study, there will be no direct benefit to him/her. However, I anticipate that the information gathered in this study will benefit heritage language communities in assessing methodologies that work in transmitting the heritage language to their target population.

Confidentiality

Every effort will be made to keep any information collected about your child confidential. However, it is impossible to guarantee absolute confidentiality.

In order to keep information about your child safe, study data will be kept in a password-protected file on the researcher’s personal computer which only the researcher can access.

Any data obtained on paper (e.g., data obtained from the survey) will be destroyed once it has been scanned onto the computer. All data will be kept in digital form only and only the researcher will have access to this digital data.
The data stored in digital form will be identifiable (directly linked to participant names), but only the researcher will have access to this information. No participant names will be reported in publications or presentations; a code will be used at all times for such purposes. Please note that, even if your child’s name is not used in publication, the researcher will still be able to connect your child to the information gathered about him/her in this study.

Participant confidentiality will be maintained at all times.

YOUR CHILD’S RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary at all times. Your child can choose not to participate at all or to leave the study at any point. If you or your child decides not to participate or to leave the study, there will be no effect on your or your child’s relationship with the researcher, the Gujarati School, and the Gujarati community.

If you or your child decides that you no longer want to take part in the study, you are encouraged to inform the researcher of your decision. Together, you and the researcher will decide on a case-by-case basis whether or not the information already obtained through your child’s participation will be included in the final report.

QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS?

If you have questions about the study, you may contact Sheena Shah at +1-202-716-8081 or ss723@georgetown.edu. You may also contact the researcher’s faculty advisor, Dr. Alison Mackey at +1-202-687-2228 or mackeya@georgetown.edu.

Please call the Georgetown University IRB Office at +1-202-687-6553 (8:30am to 5:00pm, Monday to Friday) if you have any questions about your rights as a research participant.

STATEMENT OF PERSON OBTAINING INFORMED CONSENT

I have fully explained this study to the participant. I have discussed the study’s purpose and procedures, the possible risks and benefits, and that participation is completely voluntary. I have invited the participant to ask questions and I have given complete answers to all of the participant’s questions.

________________________________________  ________________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent   Date

CONSENT OF PARENT OR GUARDIAN ON BEHALF OF MINOR PARTICIPANT

I understand all of the information in this Informed Consent Form.

I have gotten complete answers for all of my questions.

I freely and voluntarily agree to allow my child to participate in this study.
I understand that my child will be audio recorded as a part of this study.

Printed Name of Minor __________________________ Minor's Date of Birth __________________________

Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian _____________ Date __________________________

Printed Name of Parent or Legal Guardian __________

Once you sign this form, you will receive a copy of it to keep, and the researcher will keep another copy in your child's research record.
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Consent Form for Graduates of Gujarati School
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
INVITATION FOR RESEARCH

You are invited to be in a study that investigates the factors that play a role in determining the proficiency levels of heritage speakers of Gujarati who have attended a Gujarati School in England, Singapore or South Africa.

This information sheet describes the research and its purpose. Being in the study is voluntary. You do not have to be in the study.

PROJECT TITLE: Language proficiency and ethnic identity amongst heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sheema Shah

WHY IS THIS RESEARCH STUDY BEING DONE?

This study is being done to determine what factors play a role in determining the proficiency level of heritage speakers of Gujarati who have attended and completed a Gujarati School in their respective countries (England, Singapore or South Africa).

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED?

You will be asked to complete an online questionnaire. Some sections of the questionnaire will ask you to simply choose one or more responses from the options available and other parts of the questionnaire will ask you to respond freely to the questions asked, thus providing you with the opportunity to go into more detail in your responses. The questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to fill out.

You will be asked to take part in a short 3-5 minute informal phone conversation with a native speaker of Gujarati. This phone conversation will be in Gujarati and will be tape-recorded with your permission.

You will be asked to take part in a follow-up interview in English with me (which will be conducted via phone (skype) and/or in person, depending on your preference and availability). This will allow you to discuss your answers to the questions from the questionnaire and to elaborate on any of your answers if you wish to do so. Some further additional questions may be asked in this follow-up interview, if they seem appropriate and necessary to your particular case.
This interview will be tape-recorded with your permission. This interview will last about an hour.

ARE THERE ANY RISKS?

There are no risks.

WHAT ABOUT MY PRIVACY?
WHO CAN GET INFORMATION ABOUT ME?

All of the information collected will be used for research purposes only. The data obtained will be stored on a secure computer, which only I will have access to. I will assign a code to you, which only I will know. Your identity will thus not be revealed to others.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS?

Being in this study is voluntary. You do not have to be in it. You do not have to answer every question. You can quit whenever you want to. You will not be penalized in any way. It will not harm your relationship with the Gujarati School or anyone in the Gujarati community.

BENEFITS

There will be no direct benefit to you. I anticipate that the outcomes of my study will benefit heritage language communities in assessing methodologies that work in transmitting the heritage language to their target population.

CONSENT

I have read the above information about the project “Language proficiency and ethnic identity amongst heritage learners of Gujarati in three continents” and have been given an opportunity to ask questions. I agree to participate in this project, and I have been given a copy of this consent document.

__________________________________________ Date ________________

Signature of Participant

________________________

Printed Name of Participant

__________________________________________ Date ________________

Signature of Research Representative: Sheena Shah
WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS?

Call Sheena Shah at +1-202-716-8081 if:
- You have questions about the study.
- You have any problems related to the study.
- You have any unexpected physical or psychological discomforts.

Call the Georgetown University IRB Office at +1-202-687-1506 if:
- You have any questions or concerns about your rights.
- You have a complaint.
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Questionnaire for Current Students of Gujarati School (England)
Questionnaire (U.K. current students)

1. Gujarati Speakers in South London

Please answer the following questions. This is not a test, so there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. I am just interested in your personal opinion. All your answers will be kept confidential. Thank you very much for your time and help! I really appreciate it!

Answers marked with a * are required.

2. Background Information

1. Name * ____________________________

2. Age * ____________________________

3. Are you a boy or a girl? *
   □ Boy  □ Girl

4. Where were you born? Please write the city and country. *
   ____________________________

5. Which country was your mum born in? *
   ____________________________

6. Which country was your dad born in? *
   ____________________________

7. What is your mum's job? *
   ____________________________

8. What is your dad's job? *
   ____________________________
9. Name of your main school (e.g. Winterbourne Primary School, Norbury Manor, Whitgift School...)

________________________________________

10. Do your grandparents (dada or dodima or nana or nani) also live at home with you? *
    □ Yes    □ No

3. Language Information

11. What is your mum’s first language? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________

12. What is your dad’s first language? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________

13. What language does your mum mainly speak to you in? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________

14. What language does your dad mainly speak to you in? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________

15. What language do you mainly speak to your mum in? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________

16. What language do you mainly speak to your dad in? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________

17. What language do you mainly speak to your brothers and sisters in? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________    □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

18. What language do your brothers and sisters mainly speak to you in? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________    □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

19. What language do you mainly use with your British Gujarati friends? *
    □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other ____________
20. What language did you mainly speak at home before starting primary school? Please ask your parents if you do not remember. *
☐ English ☐ Gujarati ☐ Other ________________

21. Besides English and Gujarati, what other languages do you know (more than a few words, but you do not need to be fluent in the language)?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Preferences

22. If you had the choice, would you be more likely to choose to watch an Indian film (e.g. a Bollywood film in Hindi) or a Western film (in English)? *

Western  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

23. Which would you prefer to go to: a Diwali function at the Oshwal Mahajankwadi or a Christmas party at your school? *

Christmas party  Diwali event
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

24. Do you listen to more Indian music or more English music? *

English  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

25. Do you like eating Indian desserts (e.g. kheer, panna) or Western desserts (e.g. apple crumble and custard)? *

Western  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

26. Do you like wearing Indian clothes (e.g. Punjabi dress, kurti) or Western clothes (e.g. jeans)? *

Western  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

27. Do you like Indian comedians or English comedians? *

English  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5
28. Do you connect better with your Indian friends or your non-Indian friends? *
   Non-Indian   Indian
   □ 1   □ 2   □ 3   □ 4   □ 5

29. Would you prefer to have a traditional Indian wedding or a Western wedding (a white wedding dress style wedding)? *
   Western   Indian
   □ 1   □ 2   □ 3   □ 4   □ 5

30. Do you consider yourself British or Indian? *
   British   Indian
   □ 1   □ 2   □ 3   □ 4   □ 5

31. Please explain your answer to question 30. *
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

5. Gujarati School

32. How many years have you been going to Gujarati School? * ____________

33. What best describes how you feel about going to Gujarati School? *
   □ I like going   □ I don’t mind going   □ I don’t like going

34. How do you feel about your time at Gujarati School so far? Are you glad you’re going to Gujarati School? Do you wish you didn’t have to go? Is it a waste of time? Please explain your answer. *
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

35. Which of the following are reasons why you are going to Gujarati School? Please choose a MAXIMUM of three reasons. *
   □ My parents want me to go.
☐ To help me talk better with my grandparents.
☐ Being Indian means that I should be able to speak, read and write in Gujarati well.
☐ To have another language at GCSE.
☐ To understand my roots/origin.
☐ To make new friends.
☐ To organise and take part in cultural shows and other fun events.
☐ Because it will look good on my C.V.
☐ Other (please specify) ____________________________

36. Apart from doing Gujarati homework, do you do any additional stuff in Gujarati outside Gujarati school (e.g. reading books in Gujarati, writing letters in Gujarati)? *
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

37. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 36, what additional stuff in Gujarati do you do outside Gujarati School?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

38. How good are you at the following? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Are you planning to do the GCSE in Gujarati? *
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I haven’t decided

40. Are you planning to do the A-Level in Gujarati? *
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I haven’t decided

41. What do you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason. *
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
42. What don’t you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason. *

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

43. Do you think that knowing Gujarati will help you in the future? Explain your answer. *

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

44. If you were to have children, would you choose to speak to them in English or Gujarati? Why? *

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. Thank you for your participation!
Appendix F

Questionnaire for Graduates of Gujarati School (England)
Questionnaire (U.K. graduate participants)

1. Gujarati Speakers in South London

Please answer the following questions. This is not a test, so there are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers. I am just interested in your personal opinion. All your answers will be kept confidential. Thank you very much for your time and help! I really appreciate it!

All questions marked with an * are required.

2. Background Information

1. Name * ________________________________

2. Age * ________________________________

3. Gender *

☐ Male    ☐ Female

4. Where were you born? Please write the city and country. *

________________________________________________________________________

5. Which country was your mum born in? *

________________________________________________________________________

6. Which country was your dad born in? *

________________________________________________________________________

7. What is your mum’s job? *

________________________________________________________________________

8. What is your dad’s job? *

________________________________________________________________________
9. Name of all the schools you attended (e.g. Winterbourne Primary School, Norbury Manor, Whitgift School...)

Junior School: ____________________
Secondary School: ____________________
College (if applicable): ____________________

10. If you have already finished school, what did you do after school (university, job, etc)?
Please give details.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

11. Do you currently live at home with your parents? After answering this question, please then answer either question 10 or question 11. *

☐ Yes
☐ No

12. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 9, do your grandparents (dada or dadima or nana or nani) also live with you?

☐ Yes
☐ No

13. If you answered ‘no’ for question 9, where do you live and with whom?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Language Information

14. What is your mum’s first language? *

☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) ____________________________

15. What is your dad’s first language? *

☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________

16. What language does your mum mainly speak to you in? *
☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________

17. What language does your dad mainly speak to you in? *
☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________

18. What language do you mainly speak to your mum in? *
☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________

19. What language do you mainly speak to your dad in? *
☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________

20. What language do you mainly speak to your brothers and sisters in? *
☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________
☐ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

21. What language do your brothers and sisters mainly speak to you in? *
☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________
☐ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

22. What language do you mainly use with your British Gujarati friends? *
☐ English
☐ Gujarati
☐ Other (Please Specify) __________________________
23. What language did you mainly speak at home before starting junior school? Please ask your parents if you do not remember. *

- English
- Gujarati
- Other (Please Specify) _______________________________

24. Besides English and Gujarati, what other languages do you know? (more than a few words, but you do not need to be fluent in the language)

Language 1: __________________
Language 2: __________________
Language 3: __________________
Language 4: __________________
Language 5: __________________

4. Preferences

Please choose a value on the scale.
1 indicates "completely British"
2 indicates "more British than Indian, but not completely British"
3 indicates "50% British and 50% Indian"
4 indicates "more Indian than British, but not completely Indian"
5 indicates "completely Indian"

25. If you had the choice, would you be more likely to choose to watch an Indian film (e.g. a Bollywood film in Hindi) or a Western film (in English)? *

Western
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

26. Which would you prefer to go to: a Diwali function at the Oshwal Mahajanwadi or a Christmas party at your school/university/job? *

Xmas party
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Diwali event
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

27. Do you listen to more Indian music or more English music? *

English
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Indian
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

28. Do you like eating Indian desserts (e.g. kheer, penda) or Western desserts (e.g. apple crumble and custard)? *

Western
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Indian
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
29. Do you like wearing Indian clothes (e.g. panjabi dress, kurta) or Western clothes (e.g. jeans)? *

Western  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

30. Do you like Indian comedians or English comedians? *

English  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

31. Do you connect better with your Indian friends or your non-Indian friends? *

Non-Indian  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

32. Would you prefer to have a traditional Indian wedding or a Western wedding (a white wedding dress style wedding)?

Western  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

33. Do you consider yourself British or Indian?

British  Indian
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5

34. Please explain your answer to question 33. *

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

35. How many years did you go to Gujarati School? *

________________________________________________________________________
36. Think back to when you were at Gujarati School. What best describes how you felt about going there? *
   □ I liked going.
   □ I didn't mind going.
   □ I didn't like going.

37. Having completed Gujarati School and looking back, how do you feel about your time at Gujarati School? Are you glad you went? Do you wish you hadn't gone? Was it a waste of time? Please explain your answer. *

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

38. Which of the following are reasons why you went to Gujarati School? Please choose a maximum of three reasons. *
   □ My parents wanted me to go.
   □ To help me communicate better with my grandparents.
   □ Being Indian means that I should be able to speak, read and write in Gujarati well.
   □ To have another language at GCSE.
   □ To understand my roots/origins.
   □ To make new friends.
   □ To organise and take part in cultural shows and other fun events.
   □ Because it would look good on my C.V.
   □ Other (Please Specify)

39. When you were at Gujarati School, apart from doing Gujarati homework, did you do any additional stuff in Gujarati outside Gujarati School (e.g. reading books in Gujarati, writing letters in Gujarati)? *
   □ Yes
   □ No

40. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 39, what additional stuff in Gujarati did you do outside Gujarati School?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

41. By the time you left Gujarati School, how good were you at the following? *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. How good are you at the following now? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Did you do the GCSE in Gujarati? *
   - Yes
   - No

44. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 43, what grade did you get? (e.g. A, B, etc)

__________________________________________________________________________

45. Did you do the A-Level in Gujarati? *
   - Yes
   - No
   - It wasn’t offered when I was there

46. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 45, what grade did you get? (e.g. A, B, etc)

__________________________________________________________________________

47. What did you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason. *

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

48. What didn’t you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason. *

__________________________________________________________________________
49. Has knowing Gujarati helped you since you left Gujarati School? Explain your answer.

50. If you were to have children, would you choose to speak to them in English or Gujarati? Why?

6. Thank you for your participation!
Appendix G

Questionnaire for Current Students of Gujarati School (Singapore)
Questionnaire (Current students - Singapore)

A. Gujarati Speakers in Singapore

Please answer the following questions. This is not a test, so there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. I am just interested in your personal opinion. All your answers will be kept confidential; your identity will not be revealed to others. This survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. Thank you very much for your time and help! I really appreciate it! :)

Answers marked with a * are required.

B. Background Information

1. Name* ____________________________

2. Age* ____________________________

3. Are you a boy or a girl?*
   □ Boy    □ Girl

4. Where were you born? Please write the city and country.*

5. What is your nationality?*
   □ Singapore Citizen
   □ PR (Permanent Resident)
   □ Other ____________________________

6. Which country was your mum born in?*

7. Which country was your dad born in?*

8. What is your mum’s job?*

9. What is your dad’s job?*

10. Name of all the schools you attended
    Primary School: ____________________________
    Secondary School: ____________________________
    JC or Poly (if applicable): ____________________________

11. Do your grandparents (dada or dadima or nana or nani) live at home with you?*
C. Language Information

12. What is your mum’s first language (mother-tongue)?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

13. What is your dad’s first language (mother-tongue)?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

14. What language does your mum mainly speak to you in?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

15. What language does your dad mainly speak to you in?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

16. What language do you mainly speak to your mum in?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

17. What language do you mainly speak to your dad in?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

18. What language do you mainly speak to your brothers and sisters in?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________ □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

19. What language do your brothers and sisters mainly speak to you in?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________ □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

20. What language do you mainly use with your Singaporean Gujarati friends?*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

21. What language did you mainly speak at home before starting primary school? Please ask
    your parents if you do not remember.*
   □ English    □ Gujarati    □ Other _____________

22. Besides English and Gujarati, what other languages do you know (more than a few words,
    but you do not need to be fluent in the language)?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

D. Preferences

Please choose a value on the scale.
1 indicates "completely non-Indian"
2 indicates "more non-Indian than Indian, but not completely non-Indian"
3 indicates "50% non-Indian and 50% Indian"
4 indicates "more Indian than non-Indian, but not completely Indian"
5 indicates "completely Indian"

23. If you had the choice, would you be more likely to choose to watch a Western film in English (1) or an Indian film, e.g., a Bollywood film, in Hindi (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Which would you prefer to go to: a Christmas party (1) or a Diwali function (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christmas</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diwali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Do you listen to more English music (1) or more Indian music (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Do you like eating Western desserts, e.g., apple crumble and custard (1), or Indian desserts, e.g., kheer or paal灾 (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Do you like wearing Western clothes, e.g., jeans (1), or Indian clothes, e.g., Panjabi dress or kurta (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Do you like watching non-Indian comedies, e.g., Singaporean, American, Malay (1), or Indian comedies (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Indian</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you connect better with your non-Indian friends (1) or your Indian friends (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Indian</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Would you prefer to have a Western wedding, e.g., a white wedding dress style wedding (1), or a traditional Indian wedding (5)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Do you consider yourself Singaporean or Indian?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singaporean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Please explain your answer to question 31.
E. Singapore Gujarati School (SGS)

33. How many years have you been going to SGS?*
   __________________

34. What best describes how you feel about going to Gujarati School?*
   ☐ I like going.       ☐ I don’t mind going.       ☐ I don’t like going.

35. How do you feel about your time at Gujarati School so far? Are you glad you’re going to Gujarati School? Do you wish you didn’t have to go? Is it a waste of time? Please explain your answer.*

   __________________
   __________________
   __________________

36. Which of the following are reasons why you are going to SGS? Please choose a MAXIMUM of three reasons.*
   ☐ My parents want me to go.
   ☐ To help me talk better with my grandparents.
   ☐ Being Indian means that I should be able to speak, read and write in Gujarati well.
   ☐ To have another language at O-Level
   ☐ To understand my roots/origins
   ☐ To make new friends
   ☐ To organise and take part in cultural shows and other fun events
   ☐ Because it will look good on my CV
   ☐ Other (please specify) __________________

37. Apart from doing Gujarati homework, do you do any additional stuff in Gujarati outside Gujarati school (e.g., reading books in Gujarati, writing letters in Gujarati)?*
   ☐ Yes      ☐ No

38. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 37, what additional stuff in Gujarati do you do outside SGS?

   __________________
   __________________
   __________________

39. How good are you at the following?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40. Did you do the O-Level in Gujarati or are you planning to do the O-Level in Gujarati?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I haven’t decided

41. If you have already completed the O-Level in Gujarati, what grade did you get? (e.g., A, B, etc)

42. Are you planning to do the A-Level in Gujarati?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I haven’t decided

43. What do you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*

44. What don’t you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*

45. Do you think that knowing Gujarati will help you in the future? Explain your answer.*

46. If you were to have children, would you choose to speak to them in English or Gujarati? Why?*

THANK YOU!
Appendix H

Questionnaire for Graduates of Gujarati School (Singapore)
Questionnaire (Graduates - Singapore)

A. Gujarati Speakers in Singapore

Please answer the following questions. This is not a test, so there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. I am just interested in your personal opinion. All your answers will be kept confidential; your identity will not be revealed to others. This survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. Thank you very much for your time and help! I really appreciate it! :)

Answers marked with an * are required.

B. Background Information

1. Name* ____________________________

2. Age* ____________________________

3. Gender*
   □ Male □ Female

4. Where were you born? Please write the city and country.*
   ____________________________

5. What is your nationality?*
   □ Singapore Citizen
   □ PR (Permanent Resident)
   □ Other ____________________________

6. Which country was your mum born in?*
   ____________________________

7. Which country was your dad born in?*
   ____________________________

8. What is your mum’s job?*
   ____________________________

9. What is your dad’s job?*
   ____________________________

10. Name of all the schools you attended
    Primary School: ____________________________
    Secondary School: ____________________________
    JC or Poly: ____________________________
    University (if applicable): ____________________________
11. If you have already finished school, what did you do after school (university, job, etc)? Please give details.


12. Do you currently live at home with your parents? If you answered 'yes' for this question, please go to question 13. If you answered 'no' for this question, please go to question 14.*
   □ Yes  □ No

13. If you answered 'yes' for question 12, do your grandparents (dida or dadima or nana or nanji) also live at home with you?
   □ Yes  □ No

14. If you answered 'no' for question 12, where do you live and with whom?


C. Language Information

15. What is your mum’s first language (mother-tongue)?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other ____________

16. What is your dad’s first language (mother-tongue)?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other ____________

17. What language does your mum mainly speak to you in?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other ____________

18. What language does your dad mainly speak to you in?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other ____________

19. What language do you mainly speak to your mum in?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other ____________

20. What language do you mainly speak to your dad in?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other ____________

21. What language do you mainly speak to your brothers and sisters in?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other _________  □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

22. What language do your brothers and sisters mainly speak to you in?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other _________  □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

23. What language do you mainly use with your Singaporean Gujarati friends?*
   □ English  □ Gujarati  □ Other ____________
24. What language did you mainly speak at home before starting primary school? Please ask your parents if you do not remember. □ English □ Gujarati □ Other □

25. Besides English and Gujarati, what other languages do you know (more than a few words, but you do not need to be fluent in the language)?

D. Preferences

Please choose a value on the scale.
1 indicates "completely non-Indian"
2 indicates "more non-Indian than Indian, but not completely non-Indian"
3 indicates "50% non-Indian and 50% Indian"
4 indicates "more Indian than non-Indian, but not completely Indian"
5 indicates "completely Indian"

26. If you had the choice, would you be more likely to choose to watch a Western film in English (1) or an Indian film, e.g., a Bollywood film, in Hindi (5)*

Western 1 2 3 4 5
Indian 5 4 3 2 1

27. Which would you prefer to go to: a Christmas party (1) or a Diwali function (5)? *

Christmas 1 2 3 4 5
Diwali 5 4 3 2 1

28. Do you listen to more English music (1) or more Indian music (5)?*

English 1 2 3 4 5
Indian 5 4 3 2 1

29. Do you like eating Western desserts, e.g., apple crumble and custard (1), or Indian desserts, e.g., khaur or ponda (5)?*

Western 1 2 3 4 5
Indian 5 4 3 2 1

30. Do you like wearing Western clothes, e.g., jeans (1), or Indian clothes, e.g., Panjabi dress or kurta (5)?*

Western 1 2 3 4 5
Indian 5 4 3 2 1

31. Do you like watching non-Indian comedies, e.g., Singaporean, American, Malay (1), or Indian comedies (5)?*

Non-Indian 1 2 3 4 5
Indian 5 4 3 2 1

32. Do you connect better with your non-Indian friends (1) or your Indian friends (5)?*
33. Would you prefer to have a Western wedding, e.g., a white wedding dress style wedding (1), or a traditional Indian wedding (3)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Do you consider yourself Singaporean or Indian?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Please explain your answer to question 34.*

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

E. Singapore Gujarati School (SGS)

36. How many years did you go to SGS? * ________________

37. Think back to when you were at SGS. What best describes how you felt about going there? *

- [ ] I liked going.
- [ ] I didn’t mind going.
- [ ] I didn’t like going.

38. Having completed SGS and looking back, how do you feel about your time at SGS? Are you glad you went? Do you wish you hadn’t gone? Was it a waste of time? Please explain your answer.*

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

39. Which of the following are reasons why you went to SGS? Please choose a MAXIMUM of three reasons.*

- [ ] My parents wanted me to go.
- [ ] To help me communicate better with my grandparents.
- [ ] Being Indian means that I should be able to speak, read and write in Gujarati well.
- [ ] To have another language at O-Level
- [ ] To understand my roots/origins
- [ ] To make new friends
- [ ] To organise and take part in cultural shows and other fun events
- [ ] Because it would look good on my CV
- [ ] Other (please specify) __________________________
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40. When you were at SGS, apart from doing Gujarati homework, did you do any additional stuff in Gujarati outside Gujarati school (e.g., reading books in Gujarati, writing letters in Gujarati)?
   □ Yes    □ No

41. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 40, what additional stuff in Gujarati did you do outside SGS?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

42. By the time you left SGS, how good were you at the following?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. How good are you at the following now?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Did you do the O-Level in Gujarati?*
   □ Yes    □ No

45. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 44, what grade did you get? (e.g., A, B, etc)
   ________________________________________________________________

46. Did you do the A-Level in Gujarati?*
   □ Yes    □ No

47. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 46, what grade did you get? (e.g., A, B, etc)
   ________________________________________________________________

48. What did you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

49. What didn’t you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
40. When you were at SGS, apart from doing Gujarati homework, did you do any additional stuff in Gujarati outside Gujarati school (e.g., reading books in Gujarati, writing letters in Gujarati)?

□ Yes □ No

41. If you answered 'yes' for question 40, what additional stuff in Gujarati did you do outside SGS?

________________________________________

________________________________________

42. By the time you left SGS, how good were you at the following?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. How good are you at the following now?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Did you do the O-Level in Gujarati?*

□ Yes □ No

45. If you answered 'yes' for question 44, what grade did you get? (e.g., A, B, etc)

________________________________________

46. Did you do the A-Level in Gujarati?*

□ Yes □ No

47. If you answered 'yes' for question 46, what grade did you get? (e.g., A, B, etc)

________________________________________

48. What did you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

49. What didn’t you like about Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
Appendix I

Questionnaire for Current Students of Gujarati School
(South Africa)
Questionnaire (Current students – South Africa)

A. Gujarati Speakers in South Africa

Please answer the following questions. This is not a test, so there are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers. I am just interested in your personal opinion. All your answers will be kept confidential; your identity will not be revealed to others. This survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. Thank you very much for your time and help! I really appreciate it! :) Answers marked with an * are required.

B. Background Information

1. Name* ________________________________

2. Age* ________________________________

3. Are you a boy or a girl?*
   □ Boy    □ Girl

4. Where were you born? Please write the city and country.*
   __________________________________________

5. What is your nationality?*
   □ South African Citizen
   □ Indian Citizen
   □ Other ________________________________

6. Which country was your mum born in?*
   __________________________________________

7. Which country was your dad born in?*
   __________________________________________

8. What is your mum’s job?*
   __________________________________________

9. What is your dad’s job?*
   __________________________________________

10. Name of all the schools you attended
    Primary School: __________________________
    Secondary School: _________________________

11. Do your grandparents (*dada or dadima or nana or nani) live at home with you?*
    □ Yes    □ No
C. Language Information

12. What is your mum’s first language (mother-tongue)?
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

13. What is your dad’s first language (mother-tongue)?
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

14. What language does your mum mainly speak to you in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

15. What language does your dad mainly speak to you in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

16. What language do you mainly speak to your mum in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

17. What language do you mainly speak to your dad in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

18. What language do you mainly speak to your brothers and sisters in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________    □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

19. What language do your brothers and sisters mainly speak to you in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________    □ I don’t have any brothers and sisters

20. What language do you mainly use with your South African Gujarati friends?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

21. What language did you mainly speak at home before starting primary school? Please ask your parents if you do not remember.*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other ________________

22. Besides English and Gujarati, what other languages do you know (more than a few words, but you do not need to be fluent in the language)?

D. Preferences

Please choose a value on the scale.
1 indicates "completely non-Indian"
2 indicates "more non-Indian than Indian, but not completely non-Indian"
3 indicates "50% non-Indian and 50% Indian"
4 indicates "more Indian than non-Indian, but not completely Indian"
5 indicates "completely Indian"
23. If you had the choice, would you be more likely to choose to watch a Western film in English (1) or an Indian film, e.g., a Bollywood film, in Hindi (5)?*

Western  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

24. Which would you prefer to go to: a Christmas party (1) or a Diwali function (5)? *

Christmas  
1 2 3 4 5

Diwali  

25. Do you listen to more English music (1) or more Indian music (5)?*

English  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

26. Do you like eating Western desserts, e.g., chocolate brownie (1), or Indian desserts, e.g., kheer or penda (5)?*

Western  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

27. Do you like wearing Western clothes, e.g., jeans (1), or Indian clothes, e.g., Panjabi dress or kurta (5)?*

Western  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

28. Do you like watching non-Indian comedies, e.g., Isidingo or 7 de Laan (1), or Indian comedies (5)?*

Non-Indian  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

29. Do you connect better with your non-Indian friends (1) or your Indian friends (5)?*

Non-Indian  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

30. Would you prefer to have a Western wedding, e.g., a white wedding dress style wedding (1), or a traditional Indian wedding (5)?*

Western  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

31. Do you consider yourself South African or Indian?*

South African  
1 2 3 4 5

Indian  

32. Please explain your answer to question 31.*

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
E. Gujarati School

33. Do you attend the Independent School (morning classes) or the Gujarati School (afternoon classes)?*
   □ Independent School
   □ Gujarati School
   □ Both

34. How many years have you been studying Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School so far?*

35. What best describes how you feel about going to SBSM/Gujarati School to study Gujarati?*
   □ I like going.
   □ I don’t mind going.
   □ I don’t like going.

36. How do you feel about studying Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School? Are you glad you’re going to SBSM/Gujarati School to study Gujarati? Do you wish you didn’t have to go and study Gujarati there? Is studying Gujarati a waste of time? Please explain your answer.*

37. Which of the following are reasons why you are studying Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School? Please choose a MAXIMUM of three reasons.*
   □ My parents want me to study Gujarati.
   □ To help me talk better with my grandparents.
   □ Being Indian means that I should be able to speak, read and write in Gujarati well.
   □ To have the possibility to take nationally recognised exams in Gujarati (e.g., Matric).
   □ To understand my roots/origins.
   □ To make new Gujarati friends.
   □ To learn about my religion and culture and to take part in religious and cultural events.
   □ Because it will look good on my CV.
   □ Other (please specify) ________________________________

38. Apart from doing Gujarati homework, do you do any additional stuff in Gujarati outside SBSM/Gujarati School? (e.g., reading books in Gujarati, writing letters in Gujarati)?*
   □ Yes  □ No

39. If you answered 'yes' for question 38, what additional stuff in Gujarati do you do outside SBSM/Gujarati School?

40. How good are you at the following?*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity in Gujarati</th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Are you planning to do the Matric in Gujarati?*
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] I haven’t decided

42. What do you like about studying Gujarati at SBSM Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*
   
   
   

43. What don’t you like about studying Gujarati at SBSM Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*
   
   
   

44. Do you think that knowing Gujarati will help you in the future? Explain your answer.*
   
   
   

45. If you were to have children, would you choose to speak to them in English or Gujarati? Why?*
   
   
   
   

THANK YOU!
Appendix J

Questionnaire for Graduates of Gujarati School (South Africa)
Questionnaire (Graduates – South Africa)

A. Gujarati Speakers in South Africa

Please answer the following questions. This is not a test, so there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. I am just interested in your personal opinion. All your answers will be kept confidential; your identity will not be revealed to others. This survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. Thank you very much for your time and help! I really appreciate it! :)

Answers marked with a * are required.

B. Background Information

1. Name* __________________________

2. Age* __________________________

3. Gender*
   □ Male       □ Female

4. Where were you born? Please write the city and country.*
   __________________________

5. What is your nationality?*
   □ South African Citizen
   □ Indian Citizen
   □ Other __________________________

6. Which country was your mum born in?*
   __________________________

7. Which country was your dad born in?*
   __________________________

8. What is your mum’s job?*
   __________________________

9. What is your dad’s job?*
   __________________________

10. Name of all the schools you attended
    Primary School: __________________________
    Secondary School: __________________________
    University (if applicable): __________________________
11. What did you do after school (university, job, etc)? Please give details.*


12. Do you currently live at home with your parents? If you answered 'yes' for this question please go to question 13. If you answered 'no' for this question, please go to question 14.*
   - Yes
   - No

13. If you answered 'yes' for question 12, do your grandparents (dada or dadima or nana or nanu) also live at home with you?
   - Yes
   - No

14. If you answered 'no' for question 12, where do you live and with whom?


C. Language Information

15. What is your mum's first language (mother-tongue)?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other

16. What is your dad's first language (mother-tongue)?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other

17. What language does your mum mainly speak to you in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other

18. What language does your dad mainly speak to you in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other

19. What language do you mainly speak to your mum in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other

20. What language do you mainly speak to your dad in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other

21. What language do you mainly speak to your brothers and sisters in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other
   - I don't have any brothers and sisters

22. What language do your brothers and sisters mainly speak to you in?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other
   - I don't have any brothers and sisters

23. What language do you mainly use with your South African Gujarati friends?*
   - English
   - Gujarati
   - Other
24. What language did you mainly speak at home before starting primary school? Please ask your parents if you do not remember.*
   - English  
   - Gujarati  
   - Other __________

25. Besides English and Gujarati, what other languages do you know (more than a few words, but you do not need to be fluent in the language)?

__________________________

D. Preferences

Please choose a value on the scale.
1 indicates "completely non-Indian"
2 indicates "more non-Indian than Indian, but not completely non-Indian"
3 indicates "30% non-Indian and 50% Indian"
4 indicates "more Indian than non-Indian, but not completely Indian"
5 indicates "completely Indian"

26. If you had the choice, would you be more likely to choose to watch a Western film in English (1) or an Indian film, e.g., a Bollywood film, in Hindi (5)?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Which would you prefer to go to: a Christmas party (1) or a Diwali function (5)? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christmas</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diwali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Do you listen to more English music (1) or more Indian music (5)?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you like eating Western desserts, e.g., chocolate brownie (1), or Indian desserts, e.g., kheer or penda (5)?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Do you like wearing Western clothes, e.g., jeans (1), or Indian clothes, e.g., Panjabi dress or kurta (5)?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Do you like watching non-Indian comedies, e.g., Isidingo or 7 de Laan (1), or Indian comedies (5)?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Indian</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Do you connect better with your non-Indian friends (1) or your Indian friends (5)?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Indian</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. Would you prefer to have a Western wedding, e.g., a white wedding dress style wedding (1), or a traditional Indian wedding (5)?

- Western
- Indian

34. Do you consider yourself South African or Indian?

- South African
- Indian

35. Please explain your answer to question 34.*

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

E. Gujarati School

36. Did you attend the Independent School (morning classes) or the Gujarati School (afternoon classes)?*

- Independent School
- Gujarati School
- Both

37. How many years did you study Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School?* ________________________

38. Think back to when you were studying Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School. What best describes how you felt about going there to study Gujarati?*

- I liked going
- I didn't mind going
- I didn't like going

39. Having completed your Gujarati studies at SBSM/Gujarati School and looking back, how do you feel about your time there? Are you glad you went there and studied Gujarati? Do you wish you hadn't gone there and studied Gujarati? Was studying Gujarati a waste of time? Please explain your answer.*

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

40. Which of the following are reasons why you studied Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School? Please choose a MAXIMUM of three reasons.*

- My parents wanted me to study Gujarati.
- To help me communicate better with my grandparents.
- Being Indian means that I should be able to speak, read and write in Gujarati well.
- To have the possibility to take nationally recognised exams in Gujarati (e.g., Matric).
☐ To understand my roots/origins.
☐ To make Gujarati new friends.
☐ To learn about my religion and culture and to take part in religious and cultural events.
☐ Because it would look good on my CV.
☐ Other (please specify) ________________________________

41. When you studied Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School, apart from doing Gujarati homework, did you do any additional stuff in Gujarati outside SBSM/Gujarati School (e.g., reading books in Gujarati, writing letters in Gujarati)?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

42. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 41, what additional stuff in Gujarati did you do outside SBSM/Gujarati School?

__________________________________________________________

43. By the time you finished your studies in Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School, how good were you at the following?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. How good are you at the following now?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>Ok</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Did you do the Matric in Gujarati?*
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

46. If you answered ‘yes’ for question 45, what grade did you get? (e.g., A, B, etc)

__________________________________________________________

47. What did you like about studying Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.*

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
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48. What didn’t you like about studying Gujarati at SBSM/Gujarati School? You can write more than one reason.


49. Has knowing Gujarati helped you since you left SBSM/Gujarati School? Explain your answer.


50. If you were to have children, would you choose to speak to them in English or Gujarati? Why?


THANK YOU!
Appendix K

Questions for the Follow-Up Interview (Graduate Participants in England)
Trips to Kenya/India
How many times have you been to Kenya/India?
What was the purpose of your trips (e.g., wedding, to visit extended family, tourism, etc.)?
How did you feel when you went to Kenya/India?
Did you like being there? What did you not like about your time there?
Do you feel as if there are any differences between an Indian from Kenya/India compared with an Indian from the United Kingdom (i.e., a British Asian)? If yes, what are the differences? Do you feel as if you “click” equally well with all Indians regardless of the country they come from?

Friends
Growing up, were most of your friends Indian or non-Indian? Were these friends you met through Gujarati School (or other community events) or were they friends from your mainstream school?
What about now? Are most of your friends Indian or non-Indian? Are you still in touch with your friends from Gujarati School?

School/University/Work
Do/did you go to a predominantly white school? Or was your school more mixed?
What about university? Do/did you go to a predominantly white university? Or was your university more mixed?
What about your work environment? Is it predominantly white or more mixed?
Do/did you live at home when attending university?
What about when working, do you live at home?
How much interaction do you have with Indians at your university/work place?
Do you feel that knowing Gujarati was an asset when you applied for university/jobs? Or not really?

Living situation
Do you currently live at home with your parents?
If yes, why did you choose to live at home? Do you like it?
If no, why did you choose to live away from home? Do you prefer it to living at home?

Identity
How do you label yourself: British Asian/British/Indian? Why?
What does the label ‘British Asian’ mean to you?
Were there any times when you were embarrassed to be an Indian?

Indian culture
What aspects of the Indian culture do you particularly like?
What aspects of the Indian culture do you dislike?
In your opinion, what does it mean to be a 'typical Indian' (e.g., being a doctor, etc)?

**Grandparents**
Are your grandparents (dada, dodima, nana, nani) still alive?
If yes, where do they live?
How much contact do you have with your grandparents?
Do they speak some English?
Do you translate for your grandparents when they are at the doctors?

**Parents**
Have you ever noticed your parents switching between English and Gujarati when they are speaking? Do they use a certain language for certain things? Or do you feel that their switching between the two languages is kind of random?
If your parents talk to you in Gujarati and you talk to them in English, why do you answer them in English when they talk to you in Gujarati?
How do your parents feel about your Westernised Indian values?
Are your parents more traditional or more Western Indians?

**Siblings**
How many brothers and sisters do you have?
Are they male or female?
How old are they? **[To determine birth order of the participant]**

**Languages**
Do you understand any Hindi (or any other Indian languages)?
If yes, how, where, and why did you learn Hindi/other Indian languages?
Did knowing Gujarati help with learning Hindi/other Indian languages?

**Thoughts about Gujarati School**
How did you feel about going to Gujarati School? Please give 3 adjectives (e.g., excited, pleased, depressed...).
What grade did you get for the GCSE exam (and A-Level exam, if applicable). Do you feel like you deserved the grade(s) you got?
If you didn’t do the GCSE exam, why not?
How well did you tend to do in the end-of-year exams? Did you ever get any trophies (if you came 1st, 2nd or 3rd in your class) or a certificate (if you came 4th, 5th or 6th in your class)? Do you think it was a good idea to award such rewards to those who did particularly well in the end of year exams? Why/why not?
What do you think about having Gujarati School without exams?
What is your most memorable experience at Gujarati School?
What is your worst experience at Gujarati School?
Do you think that attending Gujarati School helped you improve your communication/oral skills or did other factors help you with that (e.g., living with your grandparents, etc)?
Would you have gone to Gujarati School if your parents hadn’t wanted you to go?
Was there anything you tried doing to avoid going to Gujarati School?
How could Gujarati School be improved?
Were you head boy/head girl or a prefect in your last year at Gujarati School?
Did you teach at Gujarati School after finishing the GCSE/A-Level exam in Gujarati? If yes, why did you choose to teach? How long did you teach for? Which age group?
Gujarati School is on Saturday mornings. Would another daytime have been better to hold Gujarati classes?
Do you remember any stories that some of the Gujarati teachers used to tell you? Did you like them?
What did you think of assembly time (e.g., did you like it, was it a drag...)?
What did you think of the handwriting practice that we used to do at Gujarati School?
Is another one of the Gujarati Schools better, in your opinion (e.g., the North London Gujarati School)?
Is the teaching they provide at Gujarati School appropriate to the age group?

Gujarati Usage/Knowledge
How often do you now use Gujarati? When? With whom?
Which skills (reading, listening, writing, speaking) have you used since leaving Gujarati School?
Has knowing how to read/write/speak Gujarati strengthened your sense of identity as an Indian?
Do you use Gujarati when talking with friends — even if it is as a joke?
What Gujarati words do you continue to use in English (e.g., food items — keri (mango))?
Why?
How much do language and culture go together — i.e., does losing one’s language mean losing one’s culture?
What are your thoughts about the future of Gujarati in the United Kingdom?

Teachers
What did you think of the teachers at Gujarati School? Were they strict/not so strict?
Did you think they were qualified for the job they were doing?
Are you still in touch with any of them?

Additional activities at Gujarati School
Did you take part in rangoli competitions?
Dance shows?
End-of-year shows?
Games held on Saturday evenings?
Antakshari (singing Gujarati songs)?
Youth club (sports)?

Additional activities you did as a child
[to determine if their childhood activities were predominantly Indian/English ones]
Brownies/Girl Guides?
Youth Club?
Kathak dancing (classical Indian dancing)?
Swimming?
Ballet?
Other?

Jainism
In your opinion, what does Jainism stand for?
Are you following the principles of Jainism?
Alcohol – yes/no?
If yes, do your parents know? Are they ok with this?
Boyfriend/girlfriend – yes/no?
If yes, is he/she Indian/non-Indian? Would you consider moving in with your boyfriend/girlfriend before getting married?
Fasting – yes/no?
Vegetarianism – yes/no?
If yes, how strict of a vegetarian are you (e.g., do you eat eggs? [Jains are not allowed to eat eggs]?)?

British practices
Have you ever had a British Christmas dinner?
If yes, where (e.g., at university) and when?
Did you like it? Have you had it again?

Children
If you were to have children, would you choose to speak to them in English or Gujarati?
Why? Do you feel confident about speaking to them in Gujarati? Does Gujarati come naturally to you?
Appendix L

Coding Categories for Themes in Semi-Structured Interviews

Coding categories for the semi-structured interviews I conducted are separated into:

- What constitutes Gujarati/Indian identity? (A-C)
- Factors affecting heritage language proficiency (D)

A. What constitutes "Gujarati identity" / "Indian identity"?

   a. The ethnic sense of community
   b. Ethnic morals and values
   c. The celebration of ethnic holidays
   d. Religious practices
   e. The performance of customs and rituals
   f. Wearing traditional Indian clothes
   g. Eating ethnic foods (specific Gujarati cuisine)
   h. Speaking the ethnic language
   i. Typical Indian careers
   j. Gossiping
   k. Speech / English pronunciation
   l. Stingy (money-minded, good at business, always trying to get deals/bargains)
   m. Struggles
      a. The search for a life partner
      b. Living arrangements prior to marriage
c. Expectations of girls vs. boys

B. How can one’s sense of a particular identity be heightened?
   a. Through Gujarati school
   b. Through the family/home
   c. Through national sporting events (e.g., Olympics in the UK, World Cup in SA, etc)
   d. Through national service and Singlish in Singapore
   e. Through history (e.g., apartheid in SA)
   f. Through a lack of being taught what it means to be British (cf. pledge of allegiance in the US)

C. What constitutes a particular British/Singaporean/SA Indian identity?
   a. Differences between Indians from India and Indians from England/Singapore/SA
   b. Friend circle growing up
   c. Differences in what "Gujarati" means in the UK, Singapore and SA
   d. Caste system and awareness of it

D. What factors affecting heritage language proficiency?
   a. Living with (monolingual) grandparents
   b. Age
   c. Language use
   d. Birth order
   e. Speaker generation
   f. Socioeconomic class
   g. Gender
   h. Social networks
   i. Language attitudes
   j. Ethnic identity
   k. Motivation
   l. L1 of parents (and place of birth of parents)
   m. Heritage language instruction in schools:
   n. Differences in the three Gujarati schools
   o. How the heritage language school compares with their mainstream school
   p. Reasons for studying Gujarati
   q. Religious / cultural activities
   r. Worst/best aspects of going to heritage language school
s. Teachers / teaching

t. A place to be Gujarati / a place which fosters Gujarati identity?
## Appendix M

### Assessment Criteria for the Oral Proficiency Test

#### Content and communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>The candidate responds fully to all questions, including open-ended ones. Uses relevant information to develop and justify individual ideas and points of view. Produces information confidently and spontaneously without being cued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Responds well to questions, including open-ended ones. Routinely gives relevant information, expresses opinions and provides justifications. Sometimes develops and explains own ideas. Generally confident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Communicates information and responds to questions. Readily expresses points of view. Can deal with some open-ended questions. Only occasional hesitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Communicates with simple, short pieces of information in response to straightforward questions. Can express simple opinions. Attempts to link straightforward ideas. Hesitant at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Communicates no relevant information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quality and range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Confident and accurate use of a variety of clause types, vocabulary, idioms and structures, including verb structures and tenses. Errors noticeable only in the most ambitious language. Fluent, coherent, consistent, controlled and varied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>A range of clause types, with some consistent manipulation of verb structures and tenses. Successful with complex language features, though with some inaccuracy. Overall, in control of the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Uses a range of straightforward structures and vocabulary, which may include different tenses and time frames. Can connect verbs. The response is sufficiently accurate for the basis of the message to be clear and reasonably coherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Only a few phrases or short sentences are accurate enough to be recognisable. Very simple sentence structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nothing coherent or accurate enough to be comprehensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pronunciation and intonation extremely accurate for a non-target language speaker. Only one or two instances of error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pronunciation and intonation very accurate for a non-target language speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pronunciation and intonation generally accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pronunciation and intonation are fair, but inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Incorrect pronunciation and intonation frequently prevent clear communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nothing coherent or accurate enough to be comprehensible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix N

### Tables: Descriptive Statistics, Correlation, and Linear Regression Model Results

Table N.1: Number of years of studying Gujarati at Gujarati School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at Gujarati School</td>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>2.116</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)The low end of the range scale is due to a few participants having attended other Gujarati Schools in the area before attending the Gujarati Schools chosen for this study. The high end of the range scale is as a result of a few of the South African participants having added the number of years at the afternoon Gujarati School with the number of years at the morning Gujarati School, even though they were attending both simultaneously; therefore some caution needs to be taken when interpreting these results.
Table N.2: Subjective evaluation of language proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of completing Gujarati School

Currently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.2: Subjective evaluation of proficiency (i.e., self-reported proficiency) was measured from 0 (not good) to 3 (very good) for each of the four skills: reading, writing, listening, speaking, resulting in a total value from 0 to 12. 0 indicates no language knowledge and 12 indicates fluency in the language.

Table N.3: Objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;C</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;R</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;C</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;R</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>4.365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.3: Objective evaluation of spoken proficiency was measured by two evaluators using a holistic proficiency scale. The evaluators used the grading scheme provided by the OCR examination board for the GCSE Gujarati examination in England. This grading scheme allocates points for content and communication (maximum 10 points), quality and range of structures used (max-
imum 10 points), and pronunciation and intonation (maximum 5 points), allowing participants to obtain a maximum of 25 points.

Table N.4: National exam scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (Percentage)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England: GCSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>16 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England: AS Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10 (58.8%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4 (23.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England: A Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore: GCE O-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (A1 or A2 not specified)</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>9 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (B3 or B4 not specified)</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore: GCE A-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (A1 or A2 not specified)</td>
<td>14 (73.7%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>5 (26.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa: Matriculation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8 (38.1%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5 (23.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.4: National examination scores were obtained by the participants in any of the following national examinations they had taken: GCSE/AS Level/A Level in England, GCE O-Level/GCE A-Level in Singapore, and Matriculation in South Africa. In Table N.4, the third column refers to frequency (i.e., number of participants who got a particular grade) and the percentage calculated from the sample size. The fourth column indicates the sample size.

Note that some caution needs to be taken when interpreting the national exam scores. There have been changes in the letter grades in recent years: A* was introduced in England at the A-Level stage in 2010 only. A1 and A2 were abolished in Singapore at the GCE A-Level stage in 2006; as of 2007, only A, B, C, etc., are used at the GCE A-Level stage. Furthermore, some participants in Singapore who took exams prior to the grade change did not indicate whether their A was A1 or A2, or similarly, whether their B was B3 or B4.
Table N.5: Correlations between objective and subjective evaluations of spoken proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rater 1 score before socialization</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rater 2 score before socialization</td>
<td>0.686**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rater 1 score after socialization</td>
<td>0.999**</td>
<td>0.690**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rater 2 score after socialization</td>
<td>0.917**</td>
<td>0.833**</td>
<td>0.920**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average score after socialization (from raters 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>0.978**</td>
<td>0.778**</td>
<td>0.979**</td>
<td>0.980**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Current subjectively evaluated spoken proficiency</td>
<td>0.472**</td>
<td>0.419**</td>
<td>0.474**</td>
<td>0.476**</td>
<td>0.485**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.6: Results from linear regression model for predicting subjectively evaluated language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School through strength of ethnic identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>-0.405</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-1.320</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identification</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.7: Results from linear regression model for predicting objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency through strength of ethnic identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.490</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>-1.325</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>-0.536</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>-1.446</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>-0.596</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>-1.533</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identification</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table N.8: Results from linear regression model for predicting national exam scores through strength of ethnic identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desserts</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.771</td>
<td>0.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identfi cation</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.9: Results from linear regression model for predicting the relationship between objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency and ethnic identity through country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (UK)</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (Singapore)</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (SA)</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.10: Results from linear regression model for predicting the relationship between national examination scores and ethnic identity through country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (UK)</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (Singapore)</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (SA)</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.11: Results from linear regression model for predicting the relationship between objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency and ethnic identity through school status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (current)</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (graduate)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.12: Results from linear regression model for predicting the relationship between national examination scores and ethnic identity through school status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (current)</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Identity (graduate)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table N.13: Results from linear regression model for predicting subjectively evaluated language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School through demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country: Singapore</td>
<td>-0.739</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>-0.701</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country: SA</td>
<td>-1.001</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>-1.090</td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>-1.134</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers birthplace: India</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers birthplace: India</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in family home with grandparents</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.14: Results from linear regression model for predicting objective evaluation of spoken language proficiency through demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country: Singapore</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country: SA</td>
<td>-1.885</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>-1.276</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>-0.590</td>
<td>0.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s birthplace: India</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in family home with grandparents</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table N.15: Results from linear regression model for predicting subjectively evaluated language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School through language use variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s L1</td>
<td>-0.594</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>-0.944</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s L1</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-0.552</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which mother uses to address participant</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which father uses to address participant</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address mother</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address father</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>-0.486</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address sibling(s)</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the sibling(s) use to address participant</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language participant uses to address Gujarati friends</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken before primary school</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.16: Results from linear regression model for predicting national examination scores through language use variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s L1</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s L1</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which mother uses to address participant</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>-0.698</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which father uses to address participant</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address mother</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address father</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the participant uses to address sibling(s)</td>
<td>-0.597</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>-0.810</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language which the sibling(s) use to address participant</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language participant uses to address Gujarati friends</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken before primary school</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table N.17: Results from linear regression model for predicting subjectively evaluated language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School through language knowledge variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of other North Indian languages</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>-1.214</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.18: Results from linear regression model for predicting current subjectively evaluated language proficiency through language knowledge variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of other North Indian languages</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>-0.298</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>-0.308</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.19: Results from linear regression model for predicting national examination scores through language knowledge variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of other North Indian languages</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of official languages (for Singapore and South Africa only)</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>-0.833</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N.20: Results from linear regression model for predicting subjectively evaluated language proficiency at the time of completing Gujarati School through Gujarati School experience variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years at Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about going to Gujarati School</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 1</td>
<td>-1.154</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>-1.543</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 2</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 3</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 4</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 5</td>
<td>-0.871</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>-1.304</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 6</td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>-0.371</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 7</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 8</td>
<td>-0.910</td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason 9</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work in Gujarati outside Gujarati School</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O

National Examinations in
England, Singapore, and South
Africa)

In the survey, participants recorded their scores in Gujarati for the following national examinations:

- GCSE, AS Level, and A Level in England
- GCE O-Level and GCE A-Level in Singapore
- Matriculation in South Africa

The table below shows how the national examinations in each of the different countries are approximately equivalent to one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCSE</td>
<td>GCE O-Level</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS Level</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>= Matriculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level</td>
<td>GCE A-Level</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Examinations in England.** The following national examinations in Gujarati can be taken by students in England:

- The ASSET language examinations can be taken by students of all ages. ASSET separately measures speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills at six different levels (Breakthrough,
Preliminary, Intermediate, Advanced, Proficiency, and Mastery). The different levels correspond to the Common European Framework (CEF) levels. ASSET examinations in Gujarati are currently available only at the Breakthrough, Preliminary, and Intermediate levels. Unlike other national language examinations in England, ASSET examinations do not have to be taken in all four skills. For example, a student who can speak but not write can still gain an ASSET qualification.

- **GCSE** (General Certificate of Secondary Education) examinations are taken by students in England at the age of 16. However, students at Gujarati School and other heritage language schools normally take the GCSE in their heritage language at an earlier age, usually a year or two years before they take GCSE examinations in other subjects.

- **AS Level** (Advanced Subsidiary Level) examinations are taken one year after the GCSE examinations.

- **A Level** (Advanced Level) examinations are taken two years after the GCSE examinations. Students in England take A Level examinations at the age of 18, though students usually take the Gujarati A Level exam at an earlier age, two years after completing their GCSE in Gujarati. Grades obtained in the A Level examinations are used in university applications.

**National Examinations in Singapore.** The following national examinations in Gujarati can be taken by students in Singapore:

- **PSLE** (Primary School Leaving Examinations) are taken by students at the end of primary education (i.e., in Grade 6).

- Secondary education in Singapore places students in the Special, Express, Normal (Academic), or Normal (Technical) course according to their grade at the PSLE level.
  
  - Students in the Special and Express courses take the **GCE O-Level** examinations four years after the PSLE.
  
  - Students in the Normal courses take the **GCE N-Level** examinations four years after the PSLE, and have the option to take the GCE O-Level examination in the fifth year.
  
  - Students take the **GCE A-Level** examinations in their sixth year of secondary education (i.e., toward the end of their second year at Junior College). Grades obtained in the GCE A-Level examinations are used in university applications.

**National Examination in South Africa.** The following national examination in Gujarati can be taken by students in South Africa:

---

1Junior College provides a two-year program leading up to the GCE A-Level examinations.
Matriculation is the qualification received on graduating from high school at the age of 18 and the minimum university entrance requirement for South African students.
Glossary

aarti = song sung in praise of a deity.
Ahimsa = non-violence; the most fundamental principle of Jainism.
ashirwad = blessing.

ba = Gujarati term for ‘grandmother’.
Bania = trade community.
bapuji = Gujarati term for ‘grandfather’.
ben = Gujarati term for ‘sister’ (can also be used to refer to any female, e.g., a Gujarati School teacher).
bhabhi = cousin’s mum.

Bhagvat Gita = 700-verse Hindu scripture that is part of the Mahabharat.
bhai = brother.
bhajan = a devotional song or an event where devotional songs are sung.
braai = South African English term for ‘barbeque’.

bud bud / bud bud ding ding = a term which originates from the fact that persons of Indian/Pakistani descent were often seen as bus conductors (bud bud is the sound of an exhaust and ding ding is the bell on a bus).

chai = Indian tea.
channa no lot = Gujarati term for ‘gram flour’.
Chopda Poojan = a ritual of the account books.

coconut = a derogatory term used to describe a South Asian person who has assimilated too far into mainstream society and thus acts like a white person (by, e.g., befriending white people or preferring Western TV shows) despite their brown (i.e., Indian) appearance – in other words, someone who has become white on the inside while remaining brown on the outside.

dada = paternal grandfather.
dadima = paternal grandmother.
darshan = prayer.
desi = a person from the Indian subcontinent and its diaspora.
dhizi = Swahili term for ‘banana’.
dhoryas = Gujarati term for ‘white people’.
Diwali = a five-day Hindu and Jain festival, popularly known as the ‘festival of lights’.
Eid = A Muslim celebration consisting of a feast, which marks the end of the fasting month of Ramadan.
fagyo = Swahili term for ‘broom’.
foi = Gujarati term for ‘uncle’.
freshie = a derogatory term referring to newly immigrated Indians.

Gandhi Jayanti = the birthday of Mohandas Gandhi.
garbas = a form of dance that originated from the state of Gujarat in India.
ghagra = traditional clothing of women in Gujarat, among other states in India.
Grainmill = the name of an Indian grocery shop in Croydon.
Gujikaans = mixing of Afrikaans words and phrases into Gujarati.
Gujlish = mixture of English and Gujarati.
Guju = slang term for Gujarati.
guru = spiritual teacher.
guru’s aghna = spiritual teacher’s command.

harmonium = a musical instrument used in many genres of Indian music.

Indobrit = “individuals of Indian cultural background and British nationality” (Mukadam, 2003, p. 45).

istri = Gujarati term for ‘ironing’.

Jai Jinendra = a Jain greeting.

jugu = Swahili term for ‘peanuts’.

kathak = a type of Indian classical dance.

Kathiawadi = a Gujarati dialect spoken in the Kathiawadi region of Gujarat.

kera = Gujarati term for ‘banana’.

keri = Gujarati term for ‘mango’.

kheer = Indian rice pudding.

khichdi = a South Asian dish made from rice and lentils.
kurta = an upper garment worn by Indian men and women.

laddoo = an Indian sweet.

lah = a Singlish word which is used to soften the force of an utterance and simultaneously create solidarity, though it can also be used to signal power.

lucho = Gujarati term for ‘cunning’.

Mahabharat = ancient Indian epic.

mandir = temple.

masi = Gujarati term for ‘aunt’.

matra = symbol.

methi = fenugreek.

Namaste = a greeting used by the Hindu Gujaratis.

nana = maternal grandfather.

nani = maternal grandmother.

Navratri = a Hindu festival.

nawkar mantra = one of the most important Jain mantras.

Paryushan = festival of forgiveness.

pasi = Swahili term for ‘ironing’.

penda = an Indian sweet.

puja = a ritual in honor of the Gods or an event where religious prayers are said.

Purattasi = an auspicious Tamil month dedicated to God Perumal, in which fasting is undertaken; takes place in the sixth month of the Tamil year.

rajipoor = Gujarati term for ‘agreement’.

Ramayan = ancient Indian religious epic.

Rangoli = a decorative design consisting of bright colors which is made during Hindu festivals (e.g., Diwali).

ringra = Gujarati term for ‘eggplant’.

rotli, dar, bhat, shak = a typical Gujarati dish consisting of chapatti, lentils, rice, and curry.

sadguru santos = true teachers.

samaj = society.

sansaar = world.

sanskrut = someone who is proficient in the Sanskrit language.
**Sanskrut varga 2** = Sanskrit language classes.

sari = a garment traditionally worn by Indian women.

Shah = the last name adopted by the trade communities of Gujarat.

shalwar kameez = traditional dress worn by women in South Asia.

Shikshapatri = the Lord’s written word.

Shishuvarga = kindergarten / pre-primary classes.

Shravan = an auspicious Hindu month dedicated to Lord Shiva, in which fasting is undertaken; takes place in the fifth month of the Hindu year.

Singlish = the local variety of English spoken in Singapore.

surya namaskar = Sun Salutation, which involves a sequence of asanas.

Swaminarayan = a faith group which consists of a large percentage of Gujarati Hindus in which followers offer devotion to and worship Lord Swaminarayan.

Swamini Vato = the Guru’s word.

tame = polite form of ‘you’ in Gujarati.

Thaipusam = a Hindu festival celebrated mostly by the Tamil community on the full moon in the Tamil month of Thai, i.e., January/February.

tu = familiar form of ‘you’ in Gujarati.

Tu / Tame kem cho? = a typical Gujarati greeting which translates as ‘How are you?’.

Vachanamrut = the Lord’s spoken word.

varnas = social divisions (literal translation from Sanskrit: ‘color’).
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